

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan: Chapter 14 – Infrastructure

Policy SP25: Infrastructure			
LP Ref no.	Name	SP25 Comments Summary	Council Response
LP0012	William Pack	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0023	Julie McDonald	Disagrees with Policy SP25. Development of GA2 will increase traffic congestion, air pollution and traffic accidents.	Comments regarding GA2: Land west of Sunnyside Farm have been taken into account and following a review of the Local Plan evidence this site has been removed from further consideration in this Local Plan.
LP0029	Neil Parker	Disagrees with Policy SP25. Information overload on consultation & registration page. Considers that consultation is not open and fair, thinks this method of consultation alienates those from lower socio economic backgrounds. Considers that consultation is in breach of equality act as members protected by the act are more likely to fall in lower socio economic groups.	The draft Local Plan public consultation was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the councils adopted Statement of Community involvement (SCI). The council engaged in an 8-week consultation which included face to face events and extensive use of publicity materials and online information. Details on how the council consulted is set out in the Regulation 19 Consultation Statement. The council strives to make sure the document is accessible to all; however, there are elements of the Local Plan and its supporting evidence base which are unavoidably technical.
LP0036	John M Scott MBE	Disagrees with Policy SP25.	Objection to policy SP25 noted
LP0037	June Blythman	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0043	John McDonald	Disagrees with Policy SP25. Refer to comments in Introduction chapter	Objection to policy SP25 noted
LP0045	Joanne Wilson	Unsure Policy SP25.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP25
LP0052	Lorna Bavage	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed.
LP0054	Gordon Paterson	Disagrees with Policy SP25. Existing infrastructure at capacity, H36 & H37 not sustainable development as a	Objection to policy SP25 and to policy 54 noted. Comments regarding H.36: Land off Mountbatten

		result. The Broadband strength in the area is not as good as it should be. Objection to Policy 54. The council will not be able to deliver the infrastructure required to support H36 and H37 as a new development.	Avenue and H.37: Land at Lilac Walk have been taken into account and following a review of the Local Plan evidence this site has been removed from further consideration in this Local Plan.
LP0056	RISE	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0075	Scott Duncan	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0076	Deborah Smiles	Agrees with Policy SP25. Whitburn infrastructure at capacity.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed. Comments regarding Whitburn infrastructure at capacity noted and considered. The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP summarises the Council's evidence regarding the impact of the development proposed in the draft Local Plan on the highway network, opportunities to travel by public transport and other sustainable travel modes, air quality, water and sewerage utilities, health, education and other infrastructure and the options for mitigating these impacts where necessary.
LP0101	Charlotte Allison	Unsure Policy SP25. Request more information on Tiledsheds crossing and the proposed flyover.	The request for more information is noted but this is not a comment on a Local Plan policy.
LP0102	Owen Mitchell	Disagrees with Policy SP25.	Objection to policy SP25 noted
LP0112	Lynne Jones	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0140	Michael Home	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for Policy SP25 welcomed.
LP0147	Stewart Miller	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0155	Zilla Rees	Agrees with Policy SP25. Against more housing development	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0162	Ms Jane Mills	Disagrees with Policy SP25. Against proposed development on GA2. The infrastructure is too poor to support existing needs. The infrastructure of the land is already delicate as the substrate is Magnesium Limestone and acts as a buffer for the nature reserve and SSSI at Cleadon Hills. Infrastructure needs upgrading first before anything building work is	Comments regarding GA2: Land west of Sunnyside Farm have been taken into account and following a review of the Local Plan evidence this site has been removed from further consideration in this Local Plan.

		planned. Area is polluted, dirty water and raw effluent enter our beautiful coasts.	
LP0181	Simon Wareham	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0225	Brian Ronald	Agrees with Policy SP25. Very encouraging in relation to paragraph 14.6	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0278	Lynne Ireland	Disagrees with Policy SP25. The roads in the villages cannot be adapted for additional housing. Roads already at capacity; congested. Local schools at capacity, health services have limited capacity for expansion.	The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP summarises the Council's evidence regarding the impact of the development proposed in the draft Local Plan on the highway network, opportunities to travel by public transport and other sustainable travel modes, air quality, water and sewerage utilities, health, education and other infrastructure and the options for mitigating these impacts where necessary.
LP0516	Ian Plant	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0517	Marilyn Morgan	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0579	Katharine Berbuto	Unsure Policy SP25.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP25
LP0581	Amy Rutherford	Unsure Policy SP25.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP25
LP0584	Barry Mulhatton	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0595	Lichfields	Policy SP25 objection. It is not appropriate for the developer of an individual site to address existing failings in infrastructure – it is only appropriate for development to provide infrastructure which is directly related to the development and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development (NPPF, paragraph 57). To ensure the plan is sound and consistent with national legislation and policy, this text should be deleted from the policy.	Development can exacerbate the impact of existing deficiencies in provision. The policy text referred to is therefore consistent with the tests for planning obligations.
LP0600	Sylvia Wilson	Unsure Policy SP25. Preserve existing Green Belt	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about SP25. Policy 41 seeks to protect the Green Belt in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

LP0604	Network Rail	We are supportive of Policy SP25, Policy 53 and 61 in particular.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0625	Robert Rowell	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0641	William Walton	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0655	Persimmon Homes	Disagrees with Policy SP25. Any planning obligations and provision of new infrastructure imposed on new developments should be directly related to the development and this should be made clear within this policy in relation to Part 2. Part 4 should allow for sufficient flexibility so that it does not burden development coming forward and the wording should be in line with the NPPF as high quality rather than world-class.	Development can exacerbate the impact of existing deficiencies in provision. The policy text referred to is therefore consistent with the tests for planning obligations. 'World class digital infrastructure' has been amended to 'Working with operators to maximise telecommunications coverage throughout the Borough subject to other relevant considerations'.
LP0656	Andrew Dorrian	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0676	Darius Seago	Agrees with Policy SP25. Improving road-rail network in south Tyneside would encourage growth	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0732	George Williams	Unsure Policy SP25: Plan should support the improvement of cycle lanes and pedestrian areas to encourage healthier lifestyles.	Please see the Delivering Sustainable Transport Policy which does support the provision of pedestrian and cycleway linkages.
LP0737	Mr R H Smith	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0749	Peter Youll	Unsure Policy SP25. East Boldon infrastructure at capacity; unable to sustain proposed developments	The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP summarises the Council's evidence regarding the impact of the development proposed in the draft Local Plan on the highway network, opportunities to travel by public transport and other sustainable travel modes, air quality, water and sewerage utilities, health, education and other infrastructure and the options for mitigating these impacts where necessary.
LP0756	Kirstin Lisa Richardson	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0764	Irene Lavender	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP0767	Jordan Hatch	Agrees with Policy SP25.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed

LP0769	F L Jones	Unsure Policy SP25.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP25
LP0771	Elaine Bennett	Disagrees with Policy SP25. Fellgate development cannot function with existing infrastructure in place.	The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP summarises the Council's evidence regarding the impact of the development proposed in the draft Local Plan on the highway network, opportunities to travel by public transport and other sustainable travel modes, air quality, water and sewerage utilities, health, education and other infrastructure and the options for mitigating these impacts where necessary.
LP0772	Danielle Pattison	Unsure Policy SP25.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP25
LP0774	James Palmer	Disagree SP25. Respondent questions the capacity for schools in Cleadon and Whitburn to accommodate the demand arising from housing development. Also asks what about the new GPs, chemists, and hospitals?	The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP summarises the Council's evidence regarding the impact of the development proposed in the draft Local Plan on the highway network, opportunities to travel by public transport and other sustainable travel modes, air quality, water and sewerage utilities, health, education and other infrastructure and the options for mitigating these impacts where necessary.
LP0780	William Harvey	Agrees with Policy SP25. Infrastructure to be delivered prior to development	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP1109	Andrew Rose	Disagrees with Policy SP25. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) highlights that the Strategic Road Network has been identified as inadequate, these are mainly junctions on the A19 north of the Testos Junction, but also include the A194(M)/A184/White Mare Pool junction. Washington Meadows is included within the assessment with 200 homes, which is only a small proportion of the homes to be delivered on the site. Washington Meadows is safeguarded in the adopted Sunderland Core Strategy and Development	Appendix A of the Local Plan Traffic Modelling Report included the wrong iteration of the map. In actual fact 1250 dwellings were factored into the modelling for the Washington Meadows site. Plans to re-open the Leamside Line remain under consideration.

		Plan and is an allocation in the draft Allocations and Designations Plan. The site has on overall capacity of 1,500 homes, a local centre and primary school and is critical to the delivery of the Sunderland Plan. The entirety of Washington Meadows should be included within the Traffic Assessment and IDP. The IDP also references plans to re-open the Leamside Line, however funding to explore this further has been rejected by Government.	
LP1132	Northumbrian Water	Agrees with Policy SP25. Infrastructure is supported, and we will continue to work with South Tyneside Council to share information relating to our capital investment programme which will help inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP1149	Banks Group	Agrees with Policy SP25. Banks Property support SP25 particularly to ensure that infrastructure required to support new development is delivered; at appropriate stage. It is important that Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and background assessments that have informed its content are discussed with site promoters to allow all parties to understand the provision of new infrastructure required; must distinguish between existing infrastructure problems that are required to be addressed regardless of new development and those directly attributable to new development e.g. the A183 Coast Road realignment which is necessitated by coastal erosion and not highways capacity. Traffic Assessment is considered effective.	Support for policy SP25 welcomed
LP1242	Lichfields	Objection to Policy SP25. Part 2 of the policy would conflict with the tests for planning obligations. It is requested that this text is deleted from the policy. Part 4 of the policy is ambiguous and should be deleted.	Development can exacerbate the impact of existing deficiencies in provision. Therefore the policy text referred to is consistent with the tests for planning obligations. 'World class digital infrastructure' has been amended to 'Working with operators to maximise telecommunications coverage throughout the Borough subject to other relevant considerations'.

LP1409	Jean Eckert	<p>Disagrees with Policy SP25. The consultation documents do not inform the public that most of the infrastructure has already been awarded funding. The Council continues to misinform the public in relation to the funding of Bus Corridor Improvement Schemes. The infrastructure is not sustainable and will not prevent congestion or air pollution and will not improve the health of the public (and so does not meet the objectives of the Transforming Cities Fund funding programme). The Council have also deliberately deceived the public by stating that the flyover scheme is in abeyance but information given in the 'Economic Recovery Plan' shows the commitment to delivering the flyover. Everything that has been done since September 2020, has been to prevent risks to the funding proposals being delivered. Policy should be withdrawn until the public have been fully and honestly informed of proposals which are at a formative stage, not where the decisions have already been made and not disclosed.</p>	<p>Objection to policy SP25 noted. It is understood that the points made have already been raised through separate process to Legal Services and the Council's Monitoring Officer and have been dealt with separately through this process.</p>
LP1446	Gillian and Gilbert Johnston	<p>Disagrees with Policy SP25. The "Economic Recovery Plan' should not be used as the basis for the Draft Local Plan. Policy SP25 needs to be amended as a matter of urgency so that development and infrastructure are both sustainable. This means that all planned infrastructure contained within the Draft Local Plan that is part of the funding programme of the "Economic Recovery Plan' must be removed until it is legally consulted upon. The Council are withholding information, vital to both consultations, from the public, this needs to be addresses as a matter of urgency. The proposal for South Tyneside contained in this Plan could only be identified on a map, therefore hidden from public scrutiny. The 'North East Transport Plan' was not promoted in South Tyneside nor the plans for South Tyneside in this Plan explained to the public. As all other local authorities</p>	<p>Objection to policy SP25 noted. It is understood that the points made have already been raised through separate process to Legal Services and the Council's Monitoring Officer and have been dealt with separately through this process. The IDP has been updated for the Regulation 19 consultation.</p>

		<p>who form NECA promoted the 'North East Transport Plan' , this can only be a deliberate act to hide relevant information from the public by the Council. This matter needs urgent attention if the current consultation is to be legitimate. Detailed explanation needs to be given about the 'range of infrastructure solutions' so that the public can give "intelligent consideration" to Policy SP25 as well as the supporting documents like the IDP. We believe that the Council is trying to mislead the public in not directly mentioning the flyover to replace Boldon and Tiledsheds level crossings. The Council must clarify if the Boldon and Tiledshed Level Crossing Scheme is part of the IDP of the Draft Local Plan if this current Regulation 18 Consultation is to be legitimate. The Council cannot hide behind the statement "it is a live document, subject to change", in an attempt to hide controversial and contentious projects. The Council must consult on the Local Walking And Cycling Infrastructure Plan before it applies for or receives any funding. The respondent has also made a number of detailed comments on the IDP.</p>	
LP1499	South Tyneside Environmental Protection Group (STEP)	<p>Disagrees with Policy SP25. The "Economic Recovery Plan' is certainly not a plan for the benefit of the people of South Tyneside and should not be used as the basis for the Draft Local Plan. Policy SP25 needs to be amended as a matter of urgency so that development and infrastructure are both sustainable. This means that all planned infrastructure contained within the Draft Local Plan that is part of the funding programme of the "Economic Recovery Plan' must be removed until it is legally consulted upon. We note the Council have a poor track record in conducting legitimate public consultations. The Council are withholding information, vital to both consultations, from the public, this needs to be addresses as a matter of urgency. The</p>	<p>Objection to policy SP25 noted. It is understood that the points made have already been raised through separate process to Legal Services and the Council's Monitoring Officer and have been dealt with separately through this process.</p>

		<p>proposal for South Tyneside contained in this Plan could only be identified on a map, therefore hidden from public scrutiny. Furthermore the 'North East Transport Plan' was not promoted in South Tyneside nor the plans for South Tyneside in this Plan explained to the public. As all other local authorities who form NECA promoted the 'North East Transport Plan', this can only be a deliberate act to hide relevant information from the public by the Council. This matter needs urgent attention if the current consultation is to be legitimate. Detailed explanation needs to be given about the 'range of infrastructure solutions' so that the public can give "intelligent consideration" to Policy SP25 as well as the supporting documents like the IDP. The Council must make it very clear in Regulation 18 Consultation if bids were transferred to this scheme, which ones and why they were transferred and indeed if BTLC scheme was one of those bids. We believe that the Council is trying to mislead the public in not directly mentioning the flyover to replace Boldon and Tilesheds level crossings. The Council must clarify if then BTLC scheme is part of the IDP of the Draft Local Plan if this current Regulation 18 Consultation is to be legitimate. All information must be made public, the Council cannot hide behind the statement "it is a live document, subject to change", in an attempt to hide controversial and contentious projects. The Council must consult on the LCWIP before it applies for or receives any funding, otherwise this will cause more problems as it did when the Council attempted to impose this scheme on Moor Lane in Cleadon, without the required public mandate. This led to four unsatisfactory consultations and unacceptable behaviour by the Local Ward Labour Party and East Boldon Forum, who were supported by Deputy Leader of the Council and local ward Cllr Joan Atkinson.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>SuDS are only for attenuation to hold back water in either ponds or tanks. Ponds on new housing developments are not safe. When dealing with the design of public amenity space, it is important to weigh up the risk of harm against the benefits of provision, i.e. with the objective of balancing positive attributes against the inevitable risk of injury which any public activity generates. Green infrastructure is made up of natural assets such as beaches, rivers, natural and semi- natural green spaces, and recreational spaces, including allotments, playing pitches and cycleways.” Yet the Council are planning to destroy much of this green infrastructure by proposing to build on many hectares of these assets. Legally the Council must ensure there is sufficient information to give "intelligent consideration to the current Regulation 18 Consultation by providing information that must be available, accessible, and easily interpretable for the public to provide an informed response.</p>	
LP1501	Lichfields	<p>Disagrees with Policy SP25. Part 2 of policy to be deleted & Part 4 too ambiguous it should be deleted</p>	<p>Development can exacerbate the impact of existing deficiencies in provision. Therefore the policy text referred to is consistent with the tests for planning obligations. ‘World class digital infrastructure’ has been amended to ‘Working with operators to maximise telecommunications coverage throughout the Borough subject to other relevant considerations’.</p>
LP1867	Barton Willmore	<p>Unsure Policy SP25. First section unclear in terms of the policy tests to be applied at the decision making stage, e.g. Crit. 1 reads like a statement not a policy. Noted that paragraph 34 of the Framework which states that policies setting out contributions expected from development must not undermine the delivery of the plan. We wish to state that whilst we are in general agreement with the Viability Study (2021) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2022),</p>	<p>The first part of Policy SP25 has been deleted.</p>

		policy SP25 is not clear in terms of the requirements to be funded on an individual planning application basis.	
--	--	---	--

Policy 51: Social and Community Infrastructure			
LP Ref no.	Name	Policy 51 Comments Summary	Council Response
LP0012	William Pack	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0029	Neil Parker	Disagrees with Policy 51. Information overload on consultation & registration page. Considers that consultation is not open and fair, thinks this method of consultation alienates those from lower socio economic backgrounds. Considers that consultation is in breach of equality act as members protected by the act are more likely to fall in lower socio economic groups.	The draft Local Plan public consultation was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the councils adopted Statement of Community involvement (SCI). The council engaged in an 8-week consultation which included face to face events and extensive use of publicity materials and online information. Details on how the council consulted is set out in the Regulation 19 Consultation Statement. The council strives to make sure the document is accessible to all; however, there are elements of the Local Plan and its supporting evidence base which are unavoidably technical.
LP0037	June Blythman	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0043	John McDonald	Disagrees with Policy 51. Refer to comments in Intro. Chapter	Objection to Policy 51 noted.
LP0045	Joanne Wilson	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for policy 51 welcomed
LP0052	Lorna Bavage	Agrees with Policy 51. No comments	Support for policy 51 welcomed
LP0056	RISE	Agrees with Policy 51. No comments.	Support for policy 51 welcomed
LP0076	Deborah Smiles	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for policy 51 welcomed
LP0101	Charlotte Allison	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for policy 51 welcomed
LP0112	Lynne Jones	Agrees with Policy 51.	Support for policy 51 welcomed
LP0140	Michael Home	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0147	Stewart Miller	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0155	Zilla Rees	Unsure about Policy 51	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 51.

LP0162	Ms Jane Mills	Disagrees with Policy 51. It is grossly deprived area with massive unemployment. Building houses will generate a small income but it is not sustainable. We need the infrastructure of shops, employment, healthcare prior to housing development.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan summarises the Council's evidence regarding the impact of the development proposed in the draft Local Plan on the highway network, opportunities to travel by public transport and other sustainable travel modes, air quality, water and sewerage utilities, health, education and other infrastructure and the options for mitigating these impacts where necessary.
LP0164	Sport England	Agrees with Policy 51. Support for section 3 (iv).	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0225	Brian Ronald	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0253	John Bainbridge	Disagrees with Policy 51. Grange Terrace and North Lane cannot take any more traffic. If the school is enlarged or rebuilt including the infants a new road will have to be put in from the bottom fields from Boker Lane or the new road.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan summarises the Council's evidence regarding the impact of the development proposed in the draft Local Plan on the highway network, opportunities to travel by public transport and other sustainable travel modes, air quality, water and sewerage utilities, health, education and other infrastructure and the options for mitigating these impacts where necessary.
LP0278	Lynne Ireland	Unsure about Policy 51	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 51.
LP0516	Ian Plant	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0517	Marilyn Morgan	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0579	Katharine Berbuto	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0581	Amy Rutherford	Unsure about Policy 51	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 51.
LP0584	Barry Mulhatton	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0595	Lichfields	Disagrees with Policy 51	Objection to Policy 51 noted.
LP0600	Sylvia Wilson	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0625	Robert Rowell	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0641	William Walton	Unsure about Policy 51	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 51.
LP0655	Persimmon Homes	Disagrees with Policy 51	Objection to Policy 51 noted.
LP0656	Andrew Dorrian	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0676	Darius Seago	Unsure about Policy 51	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 51.
LP0749	Peter Youll	Unsure about Policy 51	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 51.

LP0756	Kirstin Lisa Richardson	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0764	Irene Lavender	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0767	Jordan Hatch	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP0771	Elaine Bennett	Unsure about Policy 51	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 51
LP0772	Danielle Pattison	Unsure about Policy 51	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 51.
LP0774	James Palmer	Unsure about Policy 51. The respondent has doubts about the Council's sincerity with the policy as Ocean Road community centre is totally self-funding.	The policy supports the provision of social and community infrastructure and this is supported by the Council.
LP0780	William Harvey	Unsure about Policy 51	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 51.
LP0790	Ann Best	Agrees with Policy 51	Support for Policy 51 welcomed
LP0879	Whitburn Neighbourhood Forum	Disagrees with Policy 51. Present education infrastructure in Whitburn is inadequate and cannot accommodate an increase in capacity. The Council should request the developer to provide the land and construct and equip a new school. Build such a new school on the 'Charley Hurley' site and transfer the school population from Whitburn Primary to the new, larger school. This would free up the land that Whitburn Primary presently occupies for development.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan summarises the Council's evidence regarding the impact of the development proposed in the draft Local Plan on the highway network, opportunities to travel by public transport and other sustainable travel modes, air quality, water and sewerage utilities, health, education and other infrastructure and the options for mitigating these impacts where necessary.
LP1126	Department for Education	Agrees with Policy 51. The department supports P51, point 3 (i) of this policy which states that development proposals will be required to set land aside for the provision of social and community infrastructure. South Tyneside Borough should also have regard to the Joint Policy Statement from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Education on Planning for Schools Development (2011). Please add the department to your list of relevant organisations with which you engage in preparation of the plan.	Support for Policy 51 welcomed.
LP1242	Lichfields	Disagrees with Policy 51. amendments to be made: “(i) Set land aside for the provision of social and	The text referenced by the respondent has been amended to 'Require developers to set land aside for the provision of social and community infrastructure and

		community infrastructure, where there is an identified need or, where appropriate, provide an equivalent financial contribution (taking into account development viability)”	deliver the infrastructure, where there is an identified need or, where appropriate, provide an equivalent financial contribution’. The amendment requested by the respondent has not been made as it is considered that the viability of development is a material consideration rather than part of a policy criterion.
LP1501	Lichfields	Disagrees with Policy 51. amendments to be made: “(i) Set land aside for the provision of social and community infrastructure, where there is an identified need or, where appropriate, provide an equivalent financial contribution (taking into account development viability)”	The text referenced by the respondent has been amended to ‘Require developers to set land aside for the provision of social and community infrastructure and deliver the infrastructure, where there is an identified need or, where appropriate, provide an equivalent financial contribution’. The amendment requested by the respondent has not been made as it is considered that the viability of development is a material consideration rather than part of a policy criterion.
LP1867	Barton Willmore	Unsure about Policy 51	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 51. Policy 51 has been renumbered Policy 50.

Policy 52: Telecommunications			
LP Ref no.	Name	Policy 52 Comments Summary	Council Response
LP0012	William Pack	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0029	Neil Parker	Disagrees with Policy 52. Information overload on consultation & registration page. Considers that consultation is not open and fair, thinks this method of consultation alienates those from lower socio economic backgrounds. Considers that consultation is in breach of equality act as members protected by the act are more likely to fall in lower socio economic groups.	The draft Local Plan public consultation was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the councils adopted Statement of Community involvement (SCI). The council engaged in an 8-week consultation which included face to face events and extensive use of publicity materials and online information. Details on how the council consulted is set out in the Regulation 19 Consultation Statement. The

			council strives to make sure the document is accessible to all; however, there are elements of the Local Plan and its supporting evidence base which are unavoidably technical.
LP0037	June Blythman	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0043	John McDonald	Disagrees with Policy 52. Refer to comments in Intro chapter	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0045	Joanne Wilson	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0052	Lorna Bavage	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0056	RISE	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0076	Deborah Smiles	Agrees with Policy 52. Good use of budget.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0098	Nicola Peat	Disagrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0101	Charlotte Allison	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0112	Lynne Jones	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.

LP0140	Michael Home	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0147	Stewart Miller	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0155	Zilla Rees	Unsure about Policy 52. Against housing development in East Boldon.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0162	Ms Jane Mills	Unsure about Policy 52. Area at capacity of masts. The Cleadon Water Tower is an example being a huge aerial and the telecommunications system is still dreadful.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0225	Brian Ronald	Agrees with Policy 52. Check wording "...all major development involving the will be required to provide..."	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0278	Lynne Ireland	Disagrees with Policy 52. Preserve existing greenbelt; against mast development.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations. Policy 41 seeks to protect the Green Belt in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
LP0326	Alan Cummings	Unsure about Policy 52. High fibre capacity long overdue. Is fearful of 5G. Requests in-depth investigation of 5G uses and data collection principles.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0516	Ian Plant	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0517	Marilyn Morgan	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0579	Katharine Berbuto	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.

LP0581	Amy Rutherford	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0584	Barry Mulhatton	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0600	Sylvia Wilson	Agrees with Policy 52. Preserve existing Green Belt.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations. Policy 41 seeks to protect the Green Belt in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
LP0625	Robert Rowell	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0641	William Walton	Disagrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0655	Persimmon Homes	Disagrees with Policy 52. Policy wording to be reviewed and reworded; wording is incomplete	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0656	Andrew Dorrian	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0676	Darius Seago	Unsure about Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0749	Peter Youll	Agrees with Policy 52. Common sense.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0756	Kirstin Lisa Richardson	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.

LP0764	Irene Lavender	Agrees with Policy 52. Against mobile mast; however reception is patchy in coastal area.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0767	Jordan Hatch	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0769	F L Jones	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0771	Elaine Bennett	Unsure about Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0772	Danielle Pattison	Unsure about Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0774	James Palmer	Agrees with Policy 52. As long as it doesn't impact on current networks.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0780	William Harvey	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.
LP0784	Margaret Baylis	Agrees with Policy 52.	The Telecommunications Policy has been removed from the Local Plan as the infrastructure for electronic communications is covered by the Building Regulations.

Policy 53: Accessible and Sustainable Travel			
LP Ref no.	Name	Policy 53 Comments Summary	Council Response
LP0012	William Pack	Agrees with Policy 53.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have

			not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0029	Neil Parker	Disagrees with Policy 53. Information overload on consultation & registration page. Considers that consultation is not open and fair, thinks this method of consultation alienates those from lower socio economic backgrounds. Considers that consultation is in breach of equality act as members protected by the act are more likely to fall in lower socio economic groups.	The draft Local Plan public consultation was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the councils adopted Statement of Community involvement (SCI). The council engaged in an 8-week consultation which included face to face events and extensive use of publicity materials and online information. Details on how the council consulted is set out in the Regulation 19 Consultation Statement. The council strives to make sure the document is accessible to all; however, there are elements of the Local Plan and its supporting evidence base which are unavoidably technical.
LP0037	June Blythman	Agrees with Policy 53	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0043	John McDonald	Disagrees with Policy 53. Please refer to Introduction Chapter	Objection to policy 53 noted
LP0045	Joanne Wilson	Agrees with Policy 53	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0052	Lorna Bavage	Agrees with Policy 53. Council should ensure transport providers do not cut services due to high public usage.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering

			sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. The Council liaises with public transport providers but ultimately decisions regarding the provision of public services are commercial decisions for the operators.
LP0056	RISE	Agrees with Policy 53	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0076	Deborah Smiles	Agrees with Policy 53. improvements of Bridleways to link up more of the borough would be advantageous. Cyclepaths are good use of the budget.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0101	Charlotte Allison	Agrees with Policy 53	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0112	Lynne Jones	Agrees with Policy 53. Any improvements to existing cycle paths will also be welcomed.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro

			and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0140	Michael Home	Agrees with Policy 53. Cycleways should be enhanced and improved on.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0147	Stewart Miller	Agrees with Policy 53. The ticket prices on our public transport make it an unattractive option for most journeys. Park and Ride expansion at East Boldon should only be permitted if it makes use of brownfield land.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. This includes the expansion of East Boldon Metro Station. Ticket prices are outside of the remit of the Local Plan.
LP0155	Zilla Rees	Agrees with Policy 53. More Bus services for East Boldon, South Shields, Seaburn, etc.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. The Council liaises with public transport providers but ultimately decisions regarding the provision of public services are commercial decisions for the operators.
LP0162	Ms Jane Mills	Unsure about Policy 53	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 53

LP0181	Simon Wareham	Agrees with Policy 53. Supports a new metro station at Mill Lane. The new metro station will support local growth, provide quicker connections and encourage commuting.	Support for a new metro station at Mill Lane, Hebburn welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0221	Dale Forster	Disagrees with Policy 53. Objects to location of safeguarded land for Hebburn metro in such close proximity to existing housing.	A detailed proposal to develop the land for a metro station will need to take into account the potential impact on residential amenity.
LP0225	Brian Ronald	Agrees with Policy 53: Check wording 3, .iii, "Land for rail connections sp6 for the reinstatement..."	The wording has been amended to 'Land for rail connections for the reinstatement of the Leamside Line within the administrative boundary of South Tyneside'.
LP0257	Nexus	Unsure about Policy 53. Nexus will work with South Tyneside Council and other partners across Tyne and Wear in supporting and securing investment opportunity to ensure the delivery of accessible and sustainable public transport networks, that are evermore integrated. New fleet will improve the frequency and reliability of Metro services for residents in South Tyneside. Further improvements to the Tyne and Wear Metro Network would enhance connectivity between communities of South Tyneside and Sunderland. Metro Flow project is set to increase the capacity, resilience, and frequency of Metro services. This will include a 10-minute frequency system wide, decreasing the overall customer journey time, and enabling the network for further Metro stations and expansion. Nexus would like to see broader considerations for this to be implemented across other Metro stations within South Tyneside; healthier Metros scheme. Park & Ride schemes at Jarrow and would like to see consideration at other Metro Stations where applicable. Nexus to	Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. The Metro Flow and the Heathier Metros projects will be complete before the Local Plan is adopted and have therefore been deleted from the Local Plan. The other suggested amendments are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.

		broaden the appeal of cycle parking and EV charging infrastructure provision at these park and ride locations. Nexus is keen to invest funding into improving the sustainability of the Shields Ferry via the ongoing CLEANFERRY Project. It may be appropriate to include several schemes that are currently being proposed or ones that are a high priority for Nexus and South Tyneside Council, to align our high-level priorities for a longer-term time frame.	
LP0278	Lynne Ireland	Disagrees with Policy 53: The extension of metro lines e.g. to connect South Shields and Sunderland will inevitably compromise green belt and 'rewilded' areas e.g. old railway line.	The NPPF states that local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location is not an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt provided the openness of the Green Belt is preserved and it does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
LP0323	Sunderland City Council	Agrees with Policy 53. Will help to create increased connectivity between South Tyneside and Sunderland and SCC looks forward to engaging with South Tyneside Council and other stakeholders in the future to help secure these initiatives.	Support for the re-opening of the Leamside Line welcomed.
LP0406	Susan Shilling	Unsure about Policy 53	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 53
LP0516	Ian Plant	Agrees with Policy 53.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0517	Marilyn Morgan	Agrees with Policy 53	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have

			not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0579	Katharine Berbuto	Agrees with Policy 53	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0581	Amy Rutherford	Agrees with Policy 53	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0584	Barry Mulhatton	Agrees with Policy 53	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0600	Sylvia Wilson	Agrees with Policy 53. Preserve existing Green Belt.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. Policy 41 seeks to protect the Green Belt in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

LP0604	Network Rail	We are supportive of Policy SP25, Policy 53 and 61 in particular.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. Policy 41 seeks to protect the Green Belt in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
LP0625	Robert Rowell	Agrees with Policy 53	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0641	William Walton	Disagrees with Policy 53. Extra traffic on Lizard Lane will lead to more accidents.	All development proposals will need to satisfy the STC Transport team that they meet the relevant highways safety considerations.
LP0655	Persimmon Homes	Unsure about Policy 53. Welcome flexibility in policy wording	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 53
LP0656	Andrew Dorrian	Agrees with Policy 53. Perhaps points (i) and (ii) under section 1 could be omitted as they will be delivered by the time this plan is adopted.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. Parts (i) and (ii) have not been carried forward.
LP0676	Darius Seago	Agrees with Policy 53. The respondent agrees with expansion on and around the curve but not along Harton mineral line.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro

			and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. Harton Mineral Line is no longer identified as a potential Metro extension.
LP0703	Mervyn Butler	Agrees with Policy 53. Park and Ride expansion at East Boldon Metro Station is proposed but without any specific land allocation. The current car park has returned to pre-Covid capacity use.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. Nexus are investigating the options for car park expansions across the metro network and the Council continues to liaise with Nexus. Reference to park and ride expansion at East Boldon Station has not been carried forward in the Local Plan.
LP0749	Peter Youll	Agrees with Policy 53. Common sense.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0756	Kirstin Lisa Richardson	Agrees with Policy 53. The respondent endorses all of the comments made in this section by East Boldon Forum.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0764	Irene Lavender	Agrees with Policy 53. Breakdowns on the metro system are far too frequent.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering

			sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0767	Jordan Hatch	Agrees with Policy 53	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0771	Elaine Bennett	Disagrees with Policy 53. Fellgate Park and Ride expansion will increase congestion and increase pollution.	Reference to park and ride expansion at Fellgate Station has not been carried forward in the Local Plan.
LP0772	Danielle Pattison	Unsure about Policy 53.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 53
LP0774	James Palmer	Disagrees with Policy 53. Nationalise Metro.	Ownership of the Metro is outside of the remit of the Local Plan.
LP0780	William Harvey	Agrees with Policy 53	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.
LP0901	Natural England	Unsure about Policy 53. Recommend that additional wording is added to highlight the potential for new travel infrastructure or improvements to existing travel infrastructure should include habitat creation or enhancement. This policy should include reference to protecting and enhancing the Rights of Way network and the England Coast Path. Additionally, it should be specified that all	Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. It is not considered that that additional wording should be added to Policy SP26 to highlight the potential for new travel infrastructure to include habitat

		significant infrastructure development should consider impacts on natural environment.	creation or enhancement. Nor is it considered that the policy should state that all significant infrastructure development should consider impacts on natural environment. There are other policies in the Plan which deal with biodiversity and the natural environment. The effect of a proposed development on a right of way is a material planning consideration. This does not need to be stated in the Local Plan.
LP0938	Andrew Parkes	Unsure about Policy 53. Expansion of the Metro is welcome, but not at the cost of a more sustainable form of transport. The Policy Map shows that the public cycle/footpath running from Tiledsheds to Tyne Dock is marked as "safeguarded for potential Metro extension and track duelling". This is a high quality route for pedestrians and cyclists. There are designated cycle routes in South Tyneside that are part of the national network. The Local Plan should seek to have more routes recognised on the national cycle network.	Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. Comments regarding pedestrian and cycle routes noted and considered.
LP1149	Banks Group	Unsure about Policy 53. Banks Property would welcome sight of the Council's Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which is not in the public domain.	The Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan is a publicly available document.
LP1164	Gateshead Council	Agrees with Policy 53. The Council would seek to be involved in discussions around the proposed new Metro station at Mill Lane, outlined on the Policy, particularly related to access to the station from adjacent residential areas in Gateshead.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. The STC Transport Officers are committed to engaging with Gateshead Council regarding the proposed new Metro Station at Mill Lane.

LP1402	Cleadon and East Boldon Labour Party	Agrees with Policy 53. Park and Ride expansion at East Boldon Metro Station is proposed but without any specific land allocation. The current car park has returned to capacity.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. Nexus are investigating the options for car park expansions across the metro network and the Council continues to liaise with Nexus. Reference to park and ride expansion at East Boldon Station has not been carried forward in the Local Plan.
LP1409	Jean Eckert	Disagrees with Policy 53. Rail traffic increase will cause pollution & noise increase; will impact on the green corridor area. Flyover will cause a devastating impact of loss of habitat and biodiversity across the area. Council has ignored all of these impacts on both the public's health and the environment and chosen to follow their economic strategy instead. This cannot be sustainable development. (LCWIP) but this is not a Plan which has been presented to the public or consulted on and there has been no information given about proposed cycle routes although funding of these has been claimed. Policy 53 should be cancelled.	Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. Council Officers undertook several public drop-in sessions across South Tyneside in 2019/2020 (pre-covid) to help inform the formulation of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. Further to this, the evidence base was further complimented through using an online consultation tool whereby interested parties were requested to provide comments on where infrastructure improvements are required.
LP1644	East Boldon Forum	Disagrees with Policy 53. EBNF concerned that in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2022, the indicative phasing of the proposed new metro station at Boldon North is not until 2030; East Boldon Pedestrian Enhancements with an indicative phasing of 2030. EBNF considers that this should be brought forward.	Nexus are investigating the options for car park expansions across the metro network and the Council continues to liaise with Nexus. Reference to park and ride expansion at East Boldon Station has not been carried forward in the Local Plan.

LP1733	Paul Buie	Agrees with Policy 53. (iv) fails to propose any specific land allocation.	Support for the policy welcomed. Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications. Land has been safeguarded for a new metro station at Mill Lane, Hebburn in Policy 52.
LP1851	Anne Cunningham	Unsure about Policy 53. The respondent states that the Council is increasing traffic and making cycle/walking routes less accessible at the same time. Bus routes have been eroded over the years. Newer 'infill' housing estates in Boldon have been built without sensible cuts for pedestrians - forcing people to walk long curving drives to get to local shops/schools. Better bus services and walking corridors are necessary.	The Council works with transport providers and seeks to ensure that services are not reduced but ultimately these are commercial decisions. Policy SP26 promotes walking and cycling.
LP1867	Barton Willmore	Disagrees with Policy 53. Policy 53 not drafted correctly, unclear how development proposals judged against policy. Merit in some criteria contained within this policy, such as references to “upgrading the metro fleet and continuing to invest in the Metro Renewals Programme” and “Expanding the engine specification of the Bus and Taxi Fleets to reduce emissions and improve local air quality”, the policy wording requires reconsideration.	Parts of the policy have been assimilated into Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport and some parts have been assimilated into Policy 52 Safeguarding Land for Metro and Rail development. Some parts of the policy have not been carried forward in Policy SP26 as they are not relevant to the determination of planning applications

Policy 54: Improving Capacity on the Road Network			
LP Ref no.	Name	Policy 54 Comments Summary	Council Response
LP0002	Quintin Smith	Disagrees with Policy 54	Objection to Policy 54 noted.
LP0012	William Pack	Agrees with Policy 54. 'Traffic Signal Upgrades throughout the network using intelligent transport solutions at key	Support for Policy 54 welcomed. The scheme referred to by the respondent was brought in at the request of bus operators following changes to the bus routes within

		junctions.' Intelligent solutions. ASDA/Customs House roundabout nonsense.	South Shields Town Centre. When it became evident that the traffic signals were not required, these have been relocated within the borough.
LP0029	Neil Parker	Disagrees with Policy 54. Information overload on consultation & registration page. Considers that consultation is not open and fair, thinks this method of consultation alienates those from lower socio economic backgrounds. Considers that consultation is in breach of equality act as members protected by the act are more likely to fall in lower socio economic groups.	The draft Local Plan public consultation was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the councils adopted Statement of Community involvement (SCI). The council engaged in an 8-week consultation which included face to face events and extensive use of publicity materials and online information. Details on how the council consulted is set out in the Regulation 19 Consultation Statement. The council strives to make sure the document is accessible to all; however, there are elements of the Local Plan and its supporting evidence base which are unavoidably technical.
LP0037	June Blythman	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0043	John McDonald	Disagrees with Policy 54. Refer to Introduction chapter comments.	Objection to Policy 54 noted.
LP0045	Joanne Wilson	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0052	Lorna Bavage	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0056	RISE	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0067	Daniel Barton	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0076	Deborah Smiles	Agrees with Policy 54. Routes used for diverting traffic during A183 coast road relation, Lizard Lane & Moor Lane, do not have the capacity or design of mass traffic increase. Motorists more likely to avoid and use residential roads, Wheatall Dr and Kitchener Rd, which may put children and residents at risk. Village roads currently at capacity during peak hours; residents only through-fayre may be solution during roadworks.	Support for Policy 54 welcomed. Reference to the A183 Coast Road realignment has been removed as this has been completed.

LP0101	Charlotte Allison	Unsure about Policy 54. Respondent is very concerned about the Tiledsheds and Boldon crossings. Currently working efficiently. Against the flyover proposal.	The Council will continue to work with Network Rail to appraise the options for improving the existing half-barrier level crossings.
LP0112	Lynne Jones	Agrees with Policy 54.	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0140	Michael Home	Disagrees with Policy 54. The priority for investment should be local cycle tracks and ways. This would encourage bike use on short journeys and relieve main routes.	Policy SP26: Delivering sustainable transport, is supportive of investment in cycle routes.
LP0147	Stewart Miller	Unsure about Policy 54. Road expansion is in conflict with climate change goals, detrimental to environment and public health. Different methods should be used to relieve congestion wherever possible.	Road capacity improvements are necessary in order to mitigate the impact of increases in road traffic but the Plan needs to be read as a whole. Policy SP26 in the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan seeks to ensure the delivery of sustainable transport thereby providing alternatives to the private motor car.
LP0155	Zilla Rees	Unsure about Policy 54. Roads at capacity; extra housing will increase traffic. Against housing development in East Boldon.	Road capacity improvements are necessary in order to mitigate the impact of increases in road traffic but the Plan needs to be read as a whole. Policy SP26 in the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan seeks to ensure the delivery of sustainable transport thereby providing alternatives to the private motor car.
LP0162	Ms Jane Mills	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0165	Graham Johnson	Unsure about Policy 54. Tiledshed Crossing already has unacceptable delays, more housing will cause a gridlock.	The Council will continue to work with Network Rail to appraise the options for improving the existing half-barrier level crossings.
LP0181	Simon Wareham	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0225	Brian Ronald	Disagrees with Policy 54. Any "improvement" to capacity on the road network will induce demand.	Road capacity improvements are necessary in order to mitigate the impact of increases in road traffic but the Plan needs to be read as a whole. Policy SP26 in the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan seeks to ensure the delivery of sustainable transport thereby providing alternatives to the private motor car.
LP0278	Lynne Ireland	Unsure about Policy 54. Current road system seems functional.	Road capacity improvements are necessary in order to mitigate the impact of increases in road traffic but the Plan needs to be read as a whole. Policy SP26 in the

			Regulation 19 draft Local Plan seeks to ensure the delivery of sustainable transport thereby providing alternatives to the private motor car.
LP0406	Susan Shilling	Unsure about Policy 54	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 54.
LP0516	Ian Plant	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0517	Marilyn Morgan	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0520	Alex Air	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0579	Katharine Berbuto	Unsure about Policy 54	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 54.
LP0581	Amy Rutherford	Unsure about Policy 54	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 54.
LP0584	Barry Mulhatton	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for policy 54 welcomed
LP0600	Sylvia Wilson	Agrees with Policy 54. Preserve existing Green Belt.	Support for Policy 54 welcomed. Policy 41 seeks to protect the Green Belt in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
LP0625	Robert Rowell	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0641	William Walton	Disagrees with Policy 54. No mention of development of extra capacity for Lizard Lane.	The policy reflects the road capacity improvements that have been identified by the STC Transport team.
LP0655	Persimmon Homes	Unsure about Policy 54. Welcome flexibility in policy wording.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 54.
LP0656	Andrew Dorrian	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0676	Darius Seago	Unsure about Policy 54. Public transport promoted over private car use.	Road capacity improvements are necessary in order to mitigate the impact of increases in road traffic but the Plan needs to be read as a whole. Policy SP26 in the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan seeks to ensure the delivery of sustainable transport thereby providing alternatives to the private motor car.
LP0737	Mr R H Smith	Agrees with Policy 54. Full barrier improvement not a fly-over.	Support for Policy 54 welcomed. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail to appraise the options for improving the existing half-barrier level crossings.
LP0740	Graham Johnson	Unsure about Policy 54. Tiled Crossing already has unacceptable delays, more housing will cause a gridlock.	Support for Policy 54 welcomed. The Council will continue to work with Network Rail to appraise the

			options for improving the existing half-barrier level crossings.
LP0749	Peter Youll	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0756	Kirstin Lisa Richardson	Disagrees with Policy 54. Refer to East Boldon Forum's response on this section.	The Council will continue to work with Network Rail to appraise the options for improving the existing half-barrier level crossings. The Traffic Capacity Assessment is considered to be robust.
LP0764	Irene Lavender	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0767	Jordan Hatch	Agrees with Policy 54. Supportive, should improve pothole repairs.	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0769	F L Jones	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0771	Elaine Bennett	Unsure about Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0772	Danielle Pattison	Unsure about Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0774	James Palmer	Respondent asserts that road maintenance is currently poor; John Reid Rd and Price Edward Rd roundabout are cited as examples.	Traffic Lights at Mill Dam were installed in respect to the wider regeneration proposals for the Town Centre at the time. This project has now ceased and the traffic lights have been relocated elsewhere in the Borough. In terms of maintaining the Highway Asset, the Council has a Highway Asset Management Plan which assesses the carriageway condition and determines the need for improvement. Prince Edward Road roundabout is part of a strategic bus corridor and measures to improve it are being investigated.
LP0780	William Harvey	Agrees with Policy 54. Proposed works in place prior to new housing development.	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0784	Margaret Baylis	Agrees with Policy 54	Support for Policy 54 welcomed.
LP0901	Natural England	Unsure about Policy 54. Recommend that this policy specifies that all significant infrastructure development should consider impacts on natural environment and, where possible, deliver environmental enhancements.	It is not considered necessary that the policy should state that all significant infrastructure development should consider impacts on natural environment. There are other policies in the Plan which deal with biodiversity and the natural environment.
LP0938	Andrew Parkes	Unsure about Policy 54. Concerned point viii may include flyover/road bridge, half barriers not as efficient as they	The Council will continue to work with Network Rail to appraise the options for improving the existing half-

		could be. The possibility of a flyover / road bridge at Boldon and Tiledsheds should be suspended for the duration of the Local Plan. The half-barriers are often down for longer than is necessary. The current scenario is evolving, and it may transition through a phase of increased traffic in the short term, as new dwellings are built, but then ultimately drop as other trends continue. The price of electric cars will remain relatively high. Other technologies such as light-weight personal transport and ICT will dovetail with this, making cars less of a necessity for everyday use.	barrier level crossings. Regarding the assertion that the half-barriers at the Boldon level crossing are often down for longer than is necessary, this would be the responsibility of Network Rail and any concerns with the reliability of the crossing should be raised with them to investigate. Comments regarding electric vehicles and other technologies such as light-weight personal transport noted.
LP1050	Charlotte Connor	Agrees with Policy 54. Client of respondent aware of Councils desire to improve rail crossings for safety and traffic management reasons; full barrier operation at Tiledshed and Boldon level crossings. Work undertaken by the client shows that development of their land interest at North Farm would be entirely compatible with this improvement and can be integrated into these proposals.	The Council will continue to work with Network Rail to appraise the options for improving the existing half-barrier level crossings.
LP1164	Gateshead Council	Agrees with Policy 54. Gateshead Council will seek to act as a Partner to South Tyneside, consistent with Policy 54. A particular focus for Gateshead will be the Whitemare Pool Junction (A194M / A194 / A184).	Support for Policy 54 welcomed. South Tyneside Council welcomes the commitment of Gateshead Council to collaborative working regarding transport impacts.
LP1242	Lichfields	Story Homes has a Traffic Impact Assessment undertaken for both their Cleadon Lane and Lizard Lane sites. Through both these assessments, the only location that was confirmed would require a mitigation scheme identified in the Systra study, as a result of either development, is the A1018/Cleadon Lane, Cleadon junction. The traffic impact of the proposals is likely to be able to be accommodated on the existing highway network with minimal impact at key junctions in the area or a contribution to an already agreed level of mitigation.	The sites referenced have been considered through the Site Selection Topic Paper, Employment Land Technical Paper, Green Belt papers and the Sustainability Appraisal and are not considered to be a suitable and sustainable site.
LP1644	East Boldon Forum	Disagrees with Policy 54. EBNF is supportive of new technology to reduce the barrier closure time at these	The Council will continue to work with Network Rail to appraise the options for improving the existing half-

		<p>crossings and is against any proposal of a bridge crossing at Tiledsheds. The environmental impact of a bridge is unacceptable on the area which includes a SSSI, Local Nature Reserve and Local Wildlife Site and is part of the Wildlife Corridor Network. The Traffic Capacity Assessment includes a range of mitigation measures to be implemented along the A184 in an attempt to discourage extraneous vehicles passing through the village. EBNF have provided a separate commentary on the impact of traffic on the A184 junctions 21 and 22. Not convinced that measures will have the desired effect and will also rely on further upgrades to the A1231 corridor to provide a suitable alternative route to and from Sunderland.</p>	<p>barrier level crossings. The Traffic Capacity Assessment is considered to be robust.</p>
--	--	--	---

Policy SP26: New Development			
LP Ref no.	Name	SP26 Comments Summary	Council Response
LP0012	William Pack	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Cyclists should make use of available facilities before further investment made	The NPPF requires that opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued (Paragraph 104).
LP0022	Phil Smith	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Do not approve of building on the green belt when there are plenty of other areas to build on. The area is prone to flooding and this will just increase the risk.	Objection to Policy SP26 noted. Policy 41 seeks to protect the Green Belt in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
LP0029	Neil Parker	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Information overload on consultation & registration page. Considers that consultation is not open and fair, thinks this method of consultation alienates those from lower socio economic backgrounds. Considers that consultation is in breach of equality act as members protected by the act are more likely to fall in lower socio economic groups.	The draft Local Plan public consultation was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the councils adopted Statement of Community involvement (SCI). The council engaged in an 8-week consultation which included face to face events and extensive use of publicity materials and online information. Details on how the council consulted is set out in the Regulation 19 Consultation Statement. The

			council strives to make sure the document is accessible to all; however, there are elements of the Local Plan and its supporting evidence base which are unavoidably technical.
LP0037	June Blythman	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0043	John McDonald	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Refer to comment in Intro regarding all comments	Objection to Policy SP26 noted
LP0045	Joanne Wilson	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0052	Lorna Bavage	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0056	RISE	Agrees with Policy SP26. Supportive of priority for pedestrian and cyclist movement and connectivity of public transport within proposed developments and adjoining areas.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0075	Scott Duncan	Agrees Policy SP26 but does not wish to see GA2 Green Belt destroyed.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed. Comments regarding GA2: Land west of Sunnyside Farm have been taken into account and following a review of the Local Plan evidence these sites have been removed from further consideration in this Local Plan.
LP0076	Deborah Smiles	Agrees with Policy SP26. Against housing development, and associated traffic flow through Whitburn.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed. The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP summarises the Council's evidence regarding the impact of the development proposed in the draft Local Plan on the highway network, opportunities to travel by public transport and other sustainable travel modes, air quality, water and sewerage utilities, health, education and other infrastructure and the options for mitigating these impacts where necessary.
LP0077	Margaret Watson	Agrees with Policy SP26. Agree in theory, however, area is already congested with traffic flow and area is at risk of urban sprawl. Antagonistic to good development.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed. The Local Plan is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP summarises the Council's evidence regarding the impact of the development proposed in the draft Local Plan on the highway network, opportunities to travel by public transport and other sustainable travel modes, air

			quality, water and sewerage utilities, health, education and other infrastructure and the options for mitigating these impacts where necessary.
LP0078	Peter O'Neil	Disagrees with Policy SP26.	Objection to Policy SP26 noted.
LP0098	Nicola Peat	Disagrees with Policy SP26.	Objection to Policy SP26 noted.
LP0101	Charlotte Allison	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed.
LP0112	Lynne Jones	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed.
LP0140	Michael Home	Agrees with Policy SP26. More cycle ways and good footpaths	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed.
LP0147	Stewart Miller	Agrees with Policy SP26. Text requires edit.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed.
LP0155	Zilla Rees	Unsure about Policy SP26. Against housing development in East Boldon	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP26
LP0162	Ms Jane Mills	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Against development on GA2 - land west of Sunnyside Farm, as it's in the heritage and pilgrimage walk between the two mine statues in Jarrow and Monkwearmouth and currently is a safe walkway for all.; development will make walkway route less viable and adversely affect flora and fauna. Against development	Comments regarding GA2: Land west of Sunnyside Farm have been taken into account and following a review of the Local Plan evidence this site has been removed from further consideration in this Local Plan.
LP0164	Sport England	Agrees with Policy SP26. Supports points v, vi, vii, viii, and x	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed.
LP0225	Brian Ronald	Agrees with Policy SP26. Map 48 shows a piecemeal approach to cycle routes; requires more ambition.	It is considered that the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan is demonstrative that the Council is ambitious in its planning to encourage cycling
LP0275	Leon Sexton	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Disregard for East Boldon residents.	Objection to Policy SP26 noted.
LP0278	Lynne Ireland	Unsure about Policy SP26.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP26
LP0406	Susan Shilling	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0516	Ian Plant	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy 26 welcomed
LP0517	Marilyn Morgan	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy 26 welcomed
LP0520	Alex Air	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy 26 welcomed
LP0579	Katharine Berbuto	Unsure about Policy SP26.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP26

LP0581	Amy Rutherford	Unsure about Policy SP26.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP26
LP0584	Barry Mulhatton	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0600	Sylvia Wilson	Agrees with Policy SP26. Preserve existing Green Belt	Support for SP26 welcomed. Policy 41 seeks to protect the Green Belt in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
LP0625	Robert Rowell	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0641	William Walton	Disagrees with Policy SP26.	Objection to Policy SP26 noted.
LP0655	Persimmon Homes	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Rewording of the following paras of the policy. Para 1 (i) amended to include, 'where considered necessary'. Paragraph 1 (iv) needs to be made clearer in that it is not just where there is a cumulative increase in car based trips but where is a significant cumulative increase, travel infrastructure should be provided. Para 2 (i) not needed already set out in Building Regulations 'Infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles'. Para 3 (i) reworded as not all new roads will be bus routes.	Paragraph 1 (i) has been deleted. Paragraph 1 (vi) has been renumbered 3 (iii) and amended to read 'Provide or contribute towards the provision of new and/or improved sustainable travel infrastructure where the predicated number of additional trips will lead to a significant cumulative increase in car-based trips'. It is acknowledged that Part S of the building regulations sets out the requirements for the numbers of EV charging points required and applies to new residential and non-residential buildings. It has been deleted from the policy. Paragraph 3(i) has been renumbered 4(i) and the wording retained. If it is clearly demonstrable that a new road will not be a bus route then that will be a material consideration.
LP0656	Andrew Dorrian	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0676	Darius Seago	Agrees with Policy SP26. Greater public transport integration would decrease need and use of cars	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0737	Mr R H Smith	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0745	Kenneth Mitchell	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0749	Peter Youll	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0756	Kirstin Lisa Richardson	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Refer to East Boldon Forum's response on this section.	Objection to Policy SP26 noted.
LP0764	Irene Lavender	Agrees with Policy SP26. The recent introduction of the hard rubberised speed humps may help reduce car speeds, but those who speed 'for fun' don't care. Damage to cars is	Decisions around speed camera enforcement are made by Northumbria Police rather than the Council. However, we work actively with them on potential sites for

		unavoidable at anything over 5mph. Why can't speed cameras and average speed cameras be used on main roads?	enforcement. There are also set criteria as to when a permanent speed camera can be considered which again is determined by the Police. Traffic Calming is considered to be the most appropriate mechanism to reduce speeds that the Council can implement (subject to the appropriate consultations and evidence base)
LP0767	Jordan Hatch	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0769	F L Jones	Unsure about Policy SP26.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP26
LP0771	Elaine Bennett	Unsure about Policy SP26.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP26
LP0772	Danielle Pattison	Unsure about Policy SP26.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy SP26
LP0774	James Palmer	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Promote active travel; more bus and cycle lanes, less priority for cars	Policy SP26 does promote sustainable transport and accessibility. There is limited scope for bus only areas due to residential bound carriageways, but the Council works with Nexus and public transport providers to make public transport more accessible.
LP0780	William Harvey	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0790	Ann Best	Agrees with Policy SP26.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP0879	Whitburn Neighbourhood Forum	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Due to increase traffic in Whitburn, a comprehensive Transport Assessment and Travel Plan unique for Whitburn be prepared prior to any development	Any development would need to provide a Transport Assessment / Travel Plan depending on the scale of development as part of the planning application process.
LP0963	Hedley Planning	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Criterion 2 should be removed due to Part S of the building regulations	It is acknowledged that Part S of the building regulations sets out the requirements for the numbers of EV charging points required and applies to new residential and non-residential buildings. It has been deleted from the policy.
LP1050	Charlotte Connor	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Criterion 2 should be removed due to Part S of the building regulations.	It is acknowledged that Part S of the building regulations sets out the requirements for the numbers of EV charging points required and applies to new residential

			and non-residential buildings. It has been deleted from the policy.
LP1138	Home Builders Federation	Disagrees with Policy SP26. 'to incorporate charging infrastructure for ultra-low emission vehicles and for minor developments to incorporate charging infrastructure for ultra-low emission vehicles where it is practicable to do so.' HBF does not consider this policy requirement is needed	It is acknowledged that Part S of the building regulations sets out the requirements for the numbers of EV charging points required and applies to new residential and non-residential buildings. It has been deleted from the policy.
LP1149	Banks Group	Agrees with Policy SP26. Section 3 (iii) New development should be no further than 400 metres from a bus stop, which suggests a maximum distance. This point needs to be more flexible with a recommended distance rather than a maximum distance. Frequency and quality of facilities are key considerations.	This standard is set by the Department for Transport
LP1164	Gateshead Council	Agrees with Policy SP26. Support and note the assessment of the potential impact of development should extend to neighbouring authorities where appropriate.	Support for Policy SP26 welcomed
LP1242	Lichfields	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Rewording and amendments requested to confirm that a range of factors will be taken into account when determining whether new developments are accessible. With regard to an appropriate distance to a bus- stop this should include up-to-date evidence of how far people are willing to walk to a bus-stop; delivery of efficient bus services; necessary number of homes within 400m of bus services; viability of re-routing bus services for the development; travel plan financial feasibility; availability of other services; and quality of the walking route. Respondent proposes "iii. Where appropriate and necessary, all new homes and commercial development is located no more than 400m from a bus stop should have good access to available bus services."	Walking distances are determined by the UK Department for Transport. The proposed amendment to the policy is not considered to be necessary.

LP1501	Lichfields	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Rewording and amendments requested to confirm that a range of factors will be taken into account when determining whether new developments are accessible. With regard to an appropriate distance to a bus- stop this should include up-to-date evidence of how far people are willing to walk to a bus-stop; delivery of efficient bus services; necessary number of homes within 400m of bus services; viability of re-routing bus services for the development; travel plan financial feasibility; availability of other services; and quality of the walking route. Respondent proposes “iii. Where appropriate and necessary, all new homes and commercial development is located no more than 400m from a bus stop should have good access to available bus services.”	Walking distances are determined by the UK Department for Transport. The proposed amendment to the policy is not considered to be necessary.
LP1644	East Boldon Forum	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Should be more aligned with Policy EB18 of the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan	It is unclear as to specifically what amendments to the policy are requested by the respondent
LP1665	Howard and Susan Lawrence	Unsure about Policy SP26. 1 (xii) should refer to both off-street & visitor parking	The reference to parking standards is considered to be sufficient.
LP1840	John Horne	Unsure about Policy SP26. Distance to bus services may be excessive for elderly; result in heavy reliance on private transport.	The document ‘Guidelines for Planning for Public Transport in Developments’ published in 1999 by the Institute of Highways and Transportation recommended 400m as a guideline for the distance from a bus stop for developments.
LP1867	Barton Willmore	Disagrees with Policy SP26. Respondent concerned over inclusion of part 3 (v), suggests that the criteria specified in part v) is a starting point for assessing development proposals. However, it is not the case. Considers it inappropriate to impose this requirement throughout the Authority boundary, nor is it justified. Therefore, respondent objects to Policy SP26 on this point and propose part 3) v. is removed from the policy.	The policy will be applied with an appropriate degree of flexibility i.e. where it is clearly not practicable to improve accessibility to Metro stations, then this will be taken into account.

Policy 55: Airport and Aircraft Safety			
LP Ref no.	Name	Policy 55 Comments Summary	Council Response
LP0029	Neil Parker	Disagrees with Policy 55. Information overload on consultation & registration page. Considers that consultation is not open and fair, thinks this method of consultation alienates those from lower socio economic backgrounds. Considers that consultation is in breach of equality act as members protected by the act are more likely to fall in lower socio economic groups.	The draft Local Plan public consultation was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the councils adopted Statement of Community involvement (SCI). The council engaged in an 8-week consultation which included face to face events and extensive use of publicity materials and online information. Details on how the council consulted is set out in the Regulation 19 Consultation Statement. The council strives to make sure the document is accessible to all; however, there are elements of the Local Plan and its supporting evidence base which are unavoidably technical.
LP0037	June Blythman	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0043	John McDonald	Disagrees with Policy 55. Refer to comments in Intro chapter	Objection to policy 55 noted
LP0045	Joanne Wilson	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0052	Lorna Bavage	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0056	RISE	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0067	Daniel Barton	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0075	Scott Duncan	Agrees with Policy 55. sensible	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0076	Deborah Smiles	Agrees with Policy 55. good use of budget	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0098	Nicola Peat	Disagrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0101	Charlotte Allison	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0140	Michael Home	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0147	Stewart Miller	Unsure about Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0155	Zilla Rees	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0162	Ms Jane Mills	Unsure about Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0165	Graham Johnson	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.

LP0225	Brian Ronald	Agrees with Policy 55. Supportive but polluting air travel was de-prioritised to the extent that this wasn't required.	Support for policy 55 welcomed. Comments about air travel noted but this is outside the scope of the Local Plan.
LP0278	Lynne Ireland	Unsure about Policy 55.	Comments noted. Policy 55 has been renumbered Policy 53.
LP0516	Ian Plant	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0517	Marilyn Morgan	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0581	Amy Rutherford	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0584	Barry Mulhatton	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0600	Sylvia Wilson	Agrees with Policy 55. Preserve existing Green Belt	Support for Policy 55 welcomed. Policy 41 seeks to protect the Green Belt in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
LP0625	Robert Rowell	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0641	William Walton	Unsure about Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0655	Persimmon Homes	Unsure about Policy 55. welcome flexibility in policy wording	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0656	Andrew Dorrian	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0676	Darius Seago	Unsure about Policy 55.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 55
LP0749	Peter Youll	Agrees with Policy 55. common sense	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0756	Kirstin Lisa Richardson	Unsure about Policy 55.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 55
LP0764	Irene Lavender	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0767	Jordan Hatch	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0771	Elaine Bennett	Unsure about Policy 55.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 55
LP0772	Danielle Pattison	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.
LP0774	James Palmer	Unsure about Policy 55.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 55
LP0780	William Harvey	Unsure about Policy 55.	It is noted that the respondent is unsure about Policy 55
LP0784	Margaret Baylis	Agrees with Policy 55.	Support for Policy 55 welcomed.