

Cabinet 18<sup>th</sup> December 2017

Item 3(b)

Appendix 1

# Murton Gap Engagement Statement

---

December 2017

## Contents

Engagement Process .....	1
Summary of Key Issues .....	2
Amendments to Masterplan .....	3
General Masterplan Comments .....	7
Development Layout and Principles .....	32
Road Improvements and Transport .....	47
Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage .....	105
Schools, Health and Community Facilities .....	117
Open Space and Recreation .....	128
Wildlife and Ecology .....	139
Historic Environment .....	152

## Engagement Process

As part of the Masterplan preparation, a four week public Engagement was undertaken from the 23<sup>rd</sup> October – 20<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

During the public engagement three ‘drop in’ events were held with the local community at the following locations:

- Wednesday, November 1, 2017, 2pm to 7pm – Monkseaton High School, Seatonville Road, NE25 9EQ
- Monday, November 6, 2017, 4.30pm to 8pm – Shiremoor Library, Shiremoor Centre, Earsdon Road, Shiremoor, NE27 0QU
- Thursday, November 9, 2017, 3pm to 8pm – St Aidan’s Church Hall, Billy Mill Lane, North Shields, NE29 8BZ

The engagement was advertised through the following methods:

- A press release to publicise the engagement.
- Posters displayed at local libraries.
- Leaflets delivered to local residents, providing details of the drop in events, the engagement period and how to comment of the draft Masterplan.
- An email was sent to everyone on the Local Plan engagement database which includes statutory consultees, stakeholders, residents and anybody else who has requested to be kept informed of any future engagement relating to planning policy.
- The draft Masterplan was made available to view on the Council’s planning website and local libraries, Customer Service Centres and Quadrant reception.

Following the public engagement, this Engagement Statement has been produced which summarises the main issues raised by representations and the subsequent changes to the Masterplan.

175 responses were received during the Engagement (including 64 signatories to a petition regarding a Pedestrian and Cycle access at Arcot Drive, Monkseaton).

The number of comments received for each topic area is shown below:

<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>Number of comments received</b>
Road and Transport Improvements	156
General Masterplan Comments	81
Development layout principles	50
Open space and recreation	49
Wildlife and ecology	49
Flood prevention and sustainable drainage	46
Schools, health and community facilities	40

## Summary of Key Issues

- Road traffic, congestion and air quality concerns.
- More information sought on details of designs of road junctions and pedestrian / cycling crossing.
- Greater thought for horse riders / bridleways.
- General issues regarding schools, health capacity, provision of community services.
- Surface water flood risk and sewerage capacity.
- Concern over the loss of fields and impact upon character and identity of communities.
- No traffic or construction traffic should access site east or west through existing communities
- Impact upon New York from the new through road at Westminster Avenue and potential closure of access to Norham Road Roundabout.
- Buffers to existing homes including width and nature of development in them. Particular concerns raised about the buffer around New York.
- Disappointment at the loss of The Forge and some areas of rig and furrow.
- Concern that new pedestrian and cycle links will attract anti-social behaviour along Arcot Drive.
- Concerns about the width of the wildlife corridor to the south east corner.

## Amendments to Masterplan

### South East Wildlife Corridor

The wildlife corridor to the south east corner has been increased in size. The wildlife corridor in the consultation layout was approximately 24 – 27 metres to the rear of Rake House Farm. This corridor has now been increased to approximately 50 – 70 metres behind Rake House Farm. The wildlife corridor along Rake Lane (opposite the hospital) has also been increased from approximately 27 metres to approximately 45 metres.



**Draft Masterplan**



**Proposed final Masterplan**




### Arcot Drive Pedestrian Link

The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route shown on the Engagement draft has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has been removed.



**Draft Masterplan**



**Proposed final Masterplan**



### **New York Buffer**

The buffer to the rear of the existing properties on New York Road and Rake Lane has been increased from 5 metres to 7 metres with the existing vegetation retained and widened to provide additional visual screening to the rear of the existing properties. This increase is not easily visible on the Masterplan Layout, however an additional reference to this buffer has been added to the Masterplan Guidance. The buffer would be managed and maintained by the site management company to a specification agreed with the Council. Access to the buffer could be restricted if so desired by the residents. Assuming a back to back relationship between existing and new this would achieve separation of around 28m-31.5m.

### **Murton Nurseries**

This area of the Masterplan has been reviewed and revised. The plan now shows a wider buffer with space for suitable landscape mitigation to fit with this single story building. The existing hedge will be retained to further protect amenity.



**Draft Masterplan**



**Proposed final Masterplan**



## **Movement Plan**

A movement plan has been produced for the whole site to show a network of safe and attractive links within and through the new development and adjacent areas. The plan includes new linkages to the south west corner of the site and a network of bridleways.



**Draft Masterplan**



**Proposed final Masterplan**

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM83	CPRE Northumberland	CPRE Northumberland is pleased to see that both sites seem to be provided with sizeable amounts of green space, though it is unclear whether all such spaces have free public access. We would also like to see guarantees that these spaces will not be built on at some time in the future, and that they will be managed and where appropriate improved by a programme of tree planting, wildflower seeding and other ways of enhancing their natural appeal.	Comment noted. Open space and natural areas provided as part of the proposed development would require long term management plans to ensure they are safeguarded and maintained.	
MGDM189	Highways England	In response to the LP a Joint Position Statement between Highways England and NTC was established. The JPT outline the need for the following improvements, in light of the A19 Expressways Study, when considering the forecast flows: · interventions at the Killingworth junction; · merge and diverge enhancements at the south facing slips; allied with · the provision of an additional lane northbound and southbound between the A19's Killingworth and Holystone junctions; associated · merge and diverge enhancements at Holystone's north facing slips; and · interventions at the Holystone junction. There was a previous review of the Killingworth Masterplan Visioning Document, the Murton Delivery Document and the Killingworth Environmental Impact Assessment Screening and Scoping Opinion for Highways England. This review of the Masterplans documents is in relation to previous commentary provided by our advisers.	Comment noted.	
MGDM41	Local Methodist Churches	There is a large number of housing units needed. Current and future population trends indicate a substantial need for single persons accommodation, and these are not likely just to be from poorer people. It is well established that loneliness and isolation curtail life expectancy (they are a killer in fact). There is likely to be an increase in diversity of cultural and spiritual needs/demands. I notice there seems to be no provision for a community meeting place other than perhaps a pub, or perhaps a school. I'd suggest this might be linked to an "educational" facility indicated as part of the outdoor parkland space.	This Masterplan aims to provide a framework for future development. Alongside this the Council is supportive of proposals and initiatives to build community life and integration.	
MGDM81	Murton Action Group	Our group was promised that we would be involved in the compilation of the Masterplan but despite several requests these current documents were produced without any community input. We accept the difficulty in timing regarding external input but it seems to us that several contentious issues may well have been avoided with some form of engagement e.g. the siting of the Primary School.	Comments noted and the	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM11	National Grid	We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.	Comment noted.	
MGDM104	Ward Councillor	Numerous residents have contacted me with concerns about the plans for the Murton Gap site.	Comment noted.	
MGDM103	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Murton Gap and Killingworth Moor Draft Masterplans. Northumbrian Water welcomes that the Masterplan documents have been produced on behalf of all interested developers in line with the requirements of the Local Plan. This integrated approach will facilitate the coordinated and sustainable development of the strategic development areas of Murton Gap and Killingworth Moor. We support the vision identified to create sustainable communities in the development areas, and welcome references to green infrastructure and integrated sustainable drainage systems within the objectives identified for the delivery of each site. The early master planning of each site presents the opportunity to design communities that are structured around and incorporated within a network of blue and green infrastructure that provides multi-faceted benefits to new and existing communities, including ecological and amenity value, and sustainable surface water management functions.	Comment noted.	
MGDM118	NTB Green Party	<p>Development of this size provides an opportunity to create an environmentally sustainable area which can contribute to the overall sustainability objectives of the borough in terms of mitigation of the impact of climate change and the reduction of carbon emissions through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contributing to energy generation by building into the site energy generation facilities e.g. all homes with solar panels, small wind turbines on site etc.</li> <li>Contributing to carbon emissions reduction (and flood reduction) through planned-in areas of trees</li> <li>Built in waste food processing facility (could be composting facility or collection to contribute to a borough anaerobic digester)</li> </ul>	<p>Micro renewables do not currently feature as part of the energy generation on the site, although all homes will be built to energy efficiency standards in building regulations.</p> <p>Existing tree groups, copses and field boundaries will be retained where possible and supported by new landscaping across the whole site.</p> <p>The site waste strategy will be</p>	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			developed at a more detailed design stage.	
MGDM188	The British Horse Society	Two major consultations within 2 weeks - makes it difficult to review the plans. Connectivity of the bridleway network can be greatly improved through the development areas.	The consultation ran for 4 weeks between the 23 <sup>rd</sup> October and 20 <sup>th</sup> November.  Changes have been made to the Masterplan Guidance and associated movement plans to acknowledge the importance of bridleways and plan for appropriate crossing points.	Changes to Masterplan Guidance and updated movement plan.
MGDM184	Whitley Bay and District Churches Together	Whitley Bay and District Churches Together wish it to be known that we consider the plans for Murton Gap a poor offering for this new community.	Comment noted.	
MGDM3	Resident	I am 100% opposed to the development plans. The rapid rate of development since I moved here in 2003. Most fields from between West Monkseaton and Benton have been built over and is turning the area into one vast urban sprawl with very few pockets reserved for countryside and wildlife, and the disintegration of distinct community identity. Three thousand new buildings is a LOT and does that mean we will face disruption up until 2032? I hope you pay close attention to these multiple valid points and not merely pay lip-service. Remember, you may not live here, but this is our home.	The indicative construction period is over the next 15 years. Conditions will be attached to planning applications to minimise disturbance from noise, dust and mud.	
MGDM4	Resident	I am dismayed at the plan to build 3000 new homes over this beautiful landscape. I often walk there for quiet reflection and, when I'm standing in the middle of the fields and see Earsdon church in the distance and listen to the sounds of nature, I really feel like I'm in the middle of the countryside - not in the suburbs. These green spaces should	Long distances views of Earsdon church will be retained within the new parkland area.	



## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		be treasured, not seen merely as an opportunity to fill in with buildings. They are vital pockets of tranquillity amidst the mass of estates in the surrounding areas. Once these places are gone, they are gone, and that would be such a terrible shame!		
MGDM5	Resident	Why build on green fields when there are numerous other options, also where is the demand? The recent report noting that 95% of council areas have negative equity on properties indicates a lack of demand for housing.	North Tyneside is a growing borough. To manage this growth there is a need for 16,593 new homes by 2032.	
MGDM6	Resident	I am concerned to receive the leaflet concerning the draft Masterplan for about 3,000 houses. Finally I note that the leaflet has the names of Bellway, Northumberland Estates and Persimmon on it. To me it indicates that the Council has already agreed a deal with these developers. Please explain!	The Council produced the draft Masterplan in coordination with the developer consortia for the site. This ensures that the Masterplan we produce is deliverable and viable. No planning applications have been approved and any application submitted will need to be in accordance with the agreed Masterplan.	
MGDM7	Resident	Is there a need for new housing in this area. How many empty properties are already in the area around Shiremoor? The North East has the highest amount of empty properties in the country. Do we need any more older properties sitting empty? How much is an affordable home? All these new estates seem to be at the higher end of the market.	North Tyneside is a growing borough. To manage this growth there is a need for 16,593 new homes by 2032. The Council seeks 25% of new homes to be affordable. This includes new council housing and homes managed by Registered Providers that are provided at a controlled cost either as affordable or social rented, shared ownership or	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			Discount Market Value.	
MGDM8	Resident	Regarding the planned housing at Murton and Killingworth. According to the media housing is in negative equity so building more would make the situation worse. Where are all the buyers coming from? Maybe from the houses that sunk through mine workings at West Allotment. The area was after all predominantly mining. I hope the council will re-think the policy of building on every available piece of green fields. What happens when there are no green sites left? Whitley Bay and surrounding area was once a lovely place to live but if it is up to the council it will become an urban sprawl.	North Tyneside is a growing borough. To manage this growth there is a need for 16,593 new homes by 2032. The Council seeks 25% of new homes to be affordable. This includes new council housing and homes managed by Registered Providers that are provided at a controlled cost either as affordable or social rented, shared ownership or Discount Market Value.	
MGDM10	Resident	Before I respond formally to the proposed 'consultation' document, I would like to register that I am disgusted with how North Tyneside Council Members and Officers have acted throughout this process. The whole consultation process has been a joke, and has clearly been stacked in favour of the developers, without any cognisance of the views of existing residents. North Tyneside Council must already be rubbing their hands with glee while counting the profits from the future increase in council tax revenue.	Comment noted.	
MGDM12	Resident	I have received an email this week from Martin Craddock Planning Officer for North Tyneside inviting my response to the Murton and Killingworth housing development proposals featured in the North Tyneside 'Local Plan' 2017. Firstly this Council email refers to building of 2,000 houses up to 2032 on these two sites. The correct proposed housing numbers in the 'Local Plan' are 2,000 houses at Killingworth Moor and 3,000 in Murton Gap, a total of 5,000 houses up to 2032. To begin with can this error be cleared up with an urgent reply? My public response is to the proposed Murton Gap estate, a development and construction phase disrupting local residents due to noise, pollution and congestion due to construction works especially those around New York village over many years from 2018 to 2032. The Circular issued by North Tyneside Council 'Our North Tyneside' Autumn 2017 to all residents. Page 17 the document	The initial email did include an error with housing numbers, this was addressed with everyone who raised this issue. All of the other consultation material included the correct housing numbers.  Conditions will be attached to planning applications to minimise disturbance from	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		states 'What about Murton and Killingworth Moor?':- It will quote 'Deliver new link roads and enough public transport to help reduce the traffic congestion already there, manage new traffic and protect air quality. Create two primary schools and a secondary school. Page 17 'How we have consulted with residents' Please explain how the feedback has helped shape and inform the 'Local Plan' In my view the Council have totally ignored all public suggestions. If you did agree please list all public suggestions that have been accepted by the Council and implemented and incorporated into the 'Local Plan'? The proposals outlined in the above paragraphs embody the comments made by local voters and taxpayers via your requested response to the Local Plan. Unfortunately public response has been largely overlooked and avoided to date by both planners and the Council. I urge you to look again at the current plans. Public response to the 'Local Plan' after invitation by North Tyneside Council has been repeatedly and utterly ignored. Time and effort spent by the North Tyneside Public has been wasted by the stand off by North Tyneside Council Officers and Councillors democratically appointed to represent public views. I put to you, list any public proposals put forward after Public Consultation after November 2015 which have been adopted by the Council and included in the 'amended' Local Plan? I suggest none. As is consistent with other responses by the public, besides my own, to the 'local Plan' the public have again been ignored Examples are:- Comment ID LPMM20 Comment ID LPMM21 Comment ID LPMM23 Comment ID LPMM 27	noise, dust and mud.  Impacts on the highway network will require mitigation through improvements or upgrades alongside sustainable travel plan for new residents.  There has been an ongoing process of wider engagement with the local community through the preparation of the Local Plan which has been taken into account in the preparation of the Masterplan	
MGDM13	Resident	In my view the Masterplan is far too large and will spoil the character of North Tyneside never mind create even more traffic problems than there already are.	Comment noted.	
MGDM14	Resident	I must object in the strongest possible terms to the suggested destruction of countryside in this area. The idea of building another 3000 houses is despicable. The area is already over populated. This may be a great scheme for the pockets of a few unprincipled people who do not even live in the area, but would be disaster for the majority of the residents.	Comment noted.	
MGDM16	Resident	I live right next to the old forge in New York and have no issues (you are probably glad to hear) about the building as I see this as positive and good for the area.	Comment noted.	
MGDM17	Resident	I'm writing to express my concern at the number of homes envisaged for the above development. 3,000 seems rather a lot and I feel that the loss of the green space will be	The site will be development in accordance with a	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		very detrimental to the residents, both in the locality and in Whitley Bay, North Shields and Tynemouth as a whole. The fields around Earsdon are used by dog walkers, runners, horse riders and cyclists. They provided a green lung for the area and a short cut to New York away from traffic fumes. I also worry that the infrastructure (road, drainage, electricity and gas supplies) cannot sustain this. The schools in the area are already oversubscribed and there will be additional strain on GP and medical practices. Will there be provision for new schools and medical facilities in the plan? I know that North Tyneside has to provide a local plan to the government of land that CAN be built on. But that is not the same as actually earmarking it for building. Meanwhile, there are several run down areas in Whitley Bay town centre, some of which have been derelict for years that ought to be the priority as far as new builds are concerned, I feel. More imagination is called for. I realise that undoubtedly at least of Murton Gap will be filled with new housing. However North Tyneside have an opportunity to develop there derelict sites in Whitley Bay particularly. Why not invite the building companies to not only tender for the new build Murton Gap land but also "adopt" specific sites in Whitley Bay for redevelopment as a condition of being given the Murton Gap contracts? I have attached details of some of these sites (highlighted areas on map). There may well be others.	comprehensive Landscape and Drainage Strategy for the whole site.  New infrastructure will be delivered to support new housing in line with the phasing plan.  56 of the 70 housing allocation in the Local Plan are brownfield sites.	
MGDM18	Resident	Although I would prefer no development, I will not join protest groups if the developers start enhancing the environment by planting buffer zones with trees before work commences. I would like the buffer zones to be wider and to see ponds and meadow areas provided.	Buffer zones and sensitive edges are a key part of the Masterplan design. Indicative designs of these areas were included in the consultation material. The detailed design of these areas would be subject to a planning application.	
MGDM20	Resident	Not as bad as what we envisaged in regards to timings of development and the access to this.	Comment noted.	
MGDM21	Resident	I did not agree with this proposal and still do not after seeing the draft plan which shows the proposed roads and estates. The aerial view shows land which has already been cleared and upon which building has yet to take place. These are areas where	56 of the 70 housing allocation in the Local Plan are brownfield sites.	



## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		affordable housing COULD have been built. In addition to this I urge the council to look at brownfield sites before demolishing the greenfield areas.		
MGDM22	Resident	The following are my views and concerns relating to the latest phase of the proposals for the land between Murton and Monkseaton. I have strongly opposed this development due to the number of homes, which I do not believe are necessary, and due to the concentration of these properties in such a small area which will change the nature of the land and environment forever. My views are more in the form of questions than opinion which I would be grateful for clarity around: 1. The proposals suggest that 25% of the homes will be affordable homes. Is this social housing or subsidised housing? There is little in this proposal to meet the concerns of residents who will be most impacted by this development. You say little about the traffic during construction or thereafter but clearly this will be a significant issue. Also, the main problem is that local residents do not want this development and it is being imposed - of the consultation exercises undertaken what were the proportion of positive feedback returns from residents compared to negative? Also, how much do you anticipate Council Tax revenue increasing with these new homes? What compensation would you make available to current residents for flooding etc. should your development plans impact on them? I appreciate that this is more a list of questions yet it is my view that these questions are still not thought about in any meaningful manner and the key issues for current residents are not considered.	The Council seeks 25% of new homes to be affordable. This includes new council housing and homes managed by Registered Providers that are provided at a controlled cost either as affordable or social rented, shared ownership or Discount Market Value.	
MGDM23	Resident	I'm a Wellfield resident. I'm very disappointed with the plans for Murton Gap: The infrastructure of the area can't really cope as it is, and the influx of residents is going to cause further strain on roads and education. Again, I'd like to register my disappointment with these plans. They feel like a cynical money grab.	New infrastructure will need to be provided to support new homes. This includes drainage, roads, education facilities, open space as well as financial contributions towards improve some existing services.	
MGDM24	Resident	Having read the council plans for yet more houses in the county, I am dismayed by how stupid they sound. On another note after looking at the other 'affordable homes' you claim to build in North Tyneside all I can say is they aren't affordable, who out there can afford £170,000 (after the governments help to buy scheme) my partner and I	The Council seeks 25% of new homes to be affordable. This includes new council housing and homes managed by	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		can't and we are on the average household income. I can't believe you as a council are even considering this. If you can't tell I am dead set against this stupid moronic idea, build a power station or a factory or a block offices so people can actually work there instead of having to drive to Newcastle.	Registered Providers that are provided at a controlled cost either as affordable or social rented, shared ownership or Discount Market Value.	
MGDM25	Resident	No objection to proposed development but 1) Absolutely no footpath/cycle access from or to Arcot Drive/St. Anne's Court. Road safety and security issues. Alternative round or through school playing fields. 2) Flood issues - see later.	The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has been removed.	Pedestrian links amended
MGDM26	Resident	I wish to register my concern about this development. There are very few spaces left in North Tyneside which haven't been built on so it is awful that another is being destroyed forever.	The Masterplan includes a new large area of Parkland that will be an accessible community resource.	
MGDM27	Resident	I received an email on 23rd October 2017 from Martin Craddock Planning Officer for North Tyneside inviting my response to the Murton and Killingworth housing development proposals featured in the North Tyneside 'Master Plan' 2017. There are still many issues in this draft Master Plan 2017 of great concern to the public living in the environs of Murton Gap especially residents in New York Village whose concerns have been conveniently and seriously ignored. It appears to me that the full Council and its Officers continue to hide behind the 'secure' coat tails of the broad brush London Inspector rejecting every public concern, ignoring their suggestions, instead of acting upon the knowledgeable fine pen of the Public and local residents who live there and have meaningful and serious lifestyle issues. 10. There needs to be much more all round innovation, imagination and flair by the planners to these schemes working with the Consortia for those communities and residents living on the other side of the red line of Murton Gap boundary. For example referring to Master Plan clause 8.1.1 the question arises, will New York village be a character area? Or clause 8.1.2 will New York have an attractive new Hub, a Wildlife Corridor or a village green, or structural planting	The initial email did include an error with housing numbers, this was addressed with everyone who raised this issue. All of the other consultation material included the correct housing numbers.  The southern Character area of the Masterplan includes a number of design principles to ensure there is a sensitive treatment of development next to New York and appropriate pedestrian and	New York and Rake Lane Buffer amended.

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		with native species? Total inward emphasis by the planners in developing their Master Plan trying to impress both the reader and future Murton Gap residents does nothing to uplift those communities living alongside. New York village residents are offered only the back end of the project, no consideration, no improvements, only untold traffic congestion and neglect! These comments and suggestions should be included in the register of public engagement to this Draft Master Plan October 2017, acted upon and responded to by North Tyneside Planning Department!	<p>cycle links to connect existing and new areas of development.</p> <p>The edge to New York is different in character to other edges around the Murton site. Elsewhere the settlement edge is more linear and constant and well screened by mature vegetation in the most-part. This allows for a wide pedestrian-permeable buffer with active outward-looking frontage in these areas. In contrast the edge to New York Road is inconsistent in use and distinctly non-linear. The arrangement of existing land uses and varied edge along this stretch along with land ownership constraints does not lend itself to achieving pedestrian permeability along its length which limits potential for useable buffers to be established. Here the edge has a more intimate character and requires a specific rather than generalised 'distance-based'</p>	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			<p>approach to achieving separation, privacy and visual amenity for existing residents.</p> <p>The buffer to the rear of the existing properties on New York Road and Rake Lane has been increased from 5 metres to 7 metres with the existing vegetation retained and widened to provide additional visual screening to the rear of the existing properties. The buffer would be managed and maintained by the site management company to a specification agreed with the Council. Access to the buffer could be restricted if so desired by the residents. Assuming a back to back relationship between existing and new this would achieve separation of around 28m-31.5m.</p>	
MGDM28	Resident	We live in a town not in the country side so expansion of the town is a given, although why development hasn't been given right up to the Earsdon bypass seems odd, to allow development and then mid-way through, the field is given "green belt" status seems odd, the natural stop would have been Earsdon bypass, thus allowing the same number of houses in order to assist NTC reach the house number target but giving more green space and larger buffer zones.	Comment noted.	



## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM29	Resident	The Masterplan and guidance document do not conform with the principles of the Concept Plans, delivery strategy, transport strategy within the local plan and require substantial modification. Commitments made by the council in the local plan to delivering a more sustainable pattern of development are not being met.	The Masterplan has had regard to the Concept Plan for the site that forms part of the Local Plan Policies Map. The Masterplan has been developed in accordance with the policy requirements of the Local Plan and the requirement to ensure a comprehensive approach is adopted towards the development of the strategic sites.	
MGDM30	Resident	We have been resident at our address since 1988 and the land has always been earmarked for housing in the North Tyneside Plan. Therefore the development comes as no surprise. Programme of works Could we have some detailed idea as to when works will start and when phase 3 in particular construction phase will affect us. We would appreciate a response promptly.	The phasing will see the development delivered across 3 approximate phases over a 15 year period. The phasing plan allows for development occurring from multiple outlets simultaneously. Phase 3 is planned to start in around 10 years time, however as planning applications come forward more detailed phasing plans will be available.	
MGDM31	Resident	The plan shows a disproportionate amount of houses will be built in one area. Is there even a need for this amount of new houses? Some houses in the West Park development remain unsold, this new development could have the same issues. There has already been a lot of house building in and around West Allotment/Northumberland park/Benton/Earsdon View and there is precious little	North Tyneside is a growing borough. To manage this growth there is a need for 16,593 new homes by 2032. The new homes are supported	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		green space left in North Tyneside. The roads and Metro system can't cope with the amount of traffic and passengers currently, building thousands of new houses will just add to the congestion and overcrowding.	by public transport improvements and upgrades to the road network in order to accommodate the additional growth.	
MGDM37	Resident	I believe that these new housing estates will first need to be built along the western boundary of the Murton Gap development site and time will then be required to enable the 'Traffic Planners' to fine tune their traffic movement assumptions as the present ones I believe are incorrect. I see that just one First School is envisaged in the Plan. I would have thought that a Middle School would also be required.	The Council's Education Service has reviewed school needs based on future population projections.	
MGDM38	Resident	I strongly object to Murton Gap Masterplan because there are no bungalows going to be built and your opening context for growth highlights 'A greater proportion of residents aged over 65'. The greedy builders are only interested in building 3/4/5 bedroom houses which the younger generation can't afford. You have stated more jobs that's only until the houses are all built then what? Social housing this is a huge problem around Earsdon Grange flats (these were for old people originally but now you let the social problem people in them). It is a disgrace. You should be building houses for the younger generation (affordable housing) and bungalows. There is enough 3/4/5 bedroomed houses being built around this area at the moment.	Bungalows will be encouraged as part of the housing mix on the site. The Council seeks 25% of new homes to be affordable. This includes new council housing and homes managed by Registered Providers that are provided at a controlled cost either as affordable or social rented, shared ownership or Discount Market Value.	
MGDM39	Resident	In the pdf version of the Masterplan paragraph 6.8 refers to 25 % affordable housing but that given by the printed version provided at the Monkseaton High School consultation event refers to 'up to 25 % affordable homes'. It needs to be clarified about how much is proposed, although there may be a question of trade off between affordable housing and other infrastructure funded by the prospective developers. Programme of works Section 9 of the pdf version of the Masterplan covers DELIVERY and subsection 8.3 (should be numbered 9.3) summarises the intended delivery of the on-site infrastructure. Off-site infrastructure covered by section 6 under the heading, INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS does not include that required by flood risk and associated environmental damage to those parks/nature reserves downstream of the	The Council seeks 25% of new homes to be affordable. This includes new council housing and homes managed by Registered Providers that are provided at a controlled cost either as affordable or social rented, shared ownership or Discount Market Value. Where the planning authority	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		drainage routes to the north east (NE) and south east (SE) of the site.	require off site works, they will be secured by Section 106 contributions.	
MGDM40	Resident	Why build on the only remaining fields that are left in this area, when there is more space to build on the land alongside the 'Shiremoor bypass' that is hardly used? This would be a much cheaper option as the road alterations and traffic disruptions would be less? After suffering years of mismanagement of the project on the Holystone roundabout and roads to the Cobalt we in the Shiremoor area deserve a break!	Murton Gap is an allocated site in the Local Plan. It will help deliver local housing needs over the next 15 years.	
MGDM45	Resident	It remains very concerning that 3000 new houses are going to be built in our already congested coastal area. The grid lock which we currently have on our main roads at peak times will only get worse with this plan. Also the already stretched local services are highly likely to be under further stress. This surge of development should have been spread over more of the Borough!	The site will be development in accordance with new infrastructure to support new housing.	
MGDM46	Resident	Roundabout 4 A191 New York Rd Norham Road. Access to village to be blocked leaving residents to drive to Rake Lane roundabout to doing a full circle to go north.	An alternative route will be available for residents of New York to take through the new site infrastructure. The closure of the access to the Murton Village from New York Rd will assist in providing a well planned highway network with minimum congestion. Continued bus access from this route will be considered.	
MGDM47	Resident	Why so many houses destroying green belt land??	No green belt land has been allocated for housing in North Tyneside.	
MGDM48	Resident	Will it all be completed? If not what bits have priority. Could section munity facilities. As secretary of Whitley Bay and district Churches Together - the ecumenical body would welcome land to build a church and community centre.	The phasing will see the development delivered across 3 approximate phases over a 15 year period. All application	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			will need to demonstrate how the respond to the Masterplan and the delivery of site wide infrastructure.	
MGDM49	Resident	Pleased! Housing is now given a priority. Worry! We seem to be encouraging families; however, we are not providing community meeting places. Pleased! Drainage is being given careful consideration. Worry! All the extra cars, vans, etc. will soon fill to capacity the road network.	Community meeting places will be part of the open space strategy across the site. The site will be development in accordance with new infrastructure to support new housing.	Additional reference to Community meeting places added to Masterplan Guidance.
MGDM51	Resident	The road going north across the Metro to Earsdon will be crossed by 2 rights of way from Wellfield/Earsdon Grange to Shiremoor. What safety measures will be put in for me to walk these rights of way?	Crossings points will be included, where required, as part of the detailed design process.	
MGDM52	Resident	I object to entrance opposite entrance to Earsdon Village as this will create even more traffic on an already extremely fast flowing road. Earsdon Village is already teetering on the edge of busy crowded developments and the rural aspect will be lost by even more encroaching traffic and noise. Noise level is already high owing to situation of village within triangle of main thoroughfares.	The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.	
MGDM54	Resident	I attended the Engagement session at St Aiden's on the 9th November. It is quite clear that all this is a "done deal" despite being told by the Agent that the planning application is yet to be submitted, and that therefore we were pretty much wasting our breath. The attitude from "the Agent" and in particular the Council representative for Highways was one of sheer arrogance and rudeness choosing to talk down to the residents and to dismiss what we had to say - they know it all don't they? There are many significant uncertainties associated with this plan which they chose not to answer or explain what planning/risk assumptions have been built in - it all seems based on the past - what has already happened at Great Park (of no comparative value for this proposal as was built completely rural ground with less impact on existing conurbations	Comments about wider issues noted. Murton Gap is an allocated site in the Local Plan. It will help deliver local housing needs over the next 15 years. No planning applications have been approved yet but will need to be in conformity with the agreed Masterplan.	



## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		i.e. on the other side of the A1!). 1. Only this week we have witnessed the first of what are likely to be more interest rate rises which will have a direct impact on the demand for housing. 2. The apparent demand for housing in this area is based on historical demographic movement/ migration - these are all an irrelevance as we move towards Brexit and the many uncertainties that this brings; and only increases the risk of this type of development being started only then to be moth balled ( as happened with the Willington Quay development which took nearly 15 years to complete post the 2008 financial crash) It was disappointing that senior members of the Council did not avail themselves to be present at these engagement sessions to listen first hand to people's concerns e.g. Chief Exec or his Deputy but then this is classic NIMBY - not in my back yard. There is still time to stop this development and give time to think rather than driving full tilt over the cliff edge - once this land has been built on there is no going back. the heritage and green space is lost for ever only to be replaced by concrete and high levels of pollution		
MGDM61	Resident	For far to long North Tyneside has accommodated businesses and building for far to many houses. It is now high time the residents were considered and there wants listened to. I myself have lived in this area all my life and now no longer fully enjoy the situation created.	Comments noted.	
MGDM62	Resident	Was unable to understand maps and diagrams. One young lady did try to explain and did her best to identify landmarks.	Comments noted. Staff available during Planning Reception opening hours for any further assistance.	
MGDM65	Resident	The title of this Masterplan suggests, to me, that the plans have been proposed with consideration of the opposition to the development by residents of Murton village only and have not taken into account the views of the residents in the wider local area. What makes Murton village a special case? As this massive development progresses there will remain a considerable green buffer surrounding the village keeping it distant and apart from the new housing, ensuring the village retains it's "identity" whilst adding the new large housing estates to the already densely populated local areas. There will only be a narrow buffer/corridor between existing housing and the new housing. Residents in Murton village will be able to easily access and enjoy the open spaces of the surrounding Parkland while residents in the existing areas will need to	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		navigate through or round the new developments in order to similarly enjoy the large open space. My suggestion therefore is for consideration be given to considerably widening the buffers between the new developments and existing housing thus enabling all local residents to enjoy easily accessible green space,		
MGDM67	Resident	You are trying to merge all the villages left into one big housing estate that there is going to be no green belt left. We are already densely over populated in this area.	All green belt land is protected through the Local Plan Housing allocation. On Murton Gap 50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	
MGDM69	Resident	One word .... pollutions of Wellfield estate on three sides from fast moving traffic, plus noise level to nearby housing.	Planning applications for the site will need to undertake air quality monitoring and plan for appropriate mitigation. In addition, planning applications will need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM70	Resident	The Planning Team's creativity, sensitivity and facilitation of the plan is to be commended. Well done! Many of our fears have been overcome and we are supportive of the presented plan except for the items given below.	Comments noted.	
MGDM74	Resident	Three thousand homes mean six thousand cars. At present the roads are totally inadequate for coping with rush hour traffic and Whitley Bay is totally grid locked in the rush hour. We were told that the traffic lights at West Park would work together but this has proved to be a lie causing further queues. On grounds of health and safety this development should be stopped as Emergency vehicles will be stuck in the gridlock with the rest of the traffic. The planning department have not got a clue what is going	The site will be developed in accordance with new infrastructure to support new housing. This includes improvements local highway and public transport.	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		on a few miles from where they work.		
MGDM75	Resident	North Tyneside - Murton Gap Masterplan Report October 2017 Extract from the Report with Contradictions by the Public delineated in blue colour. I see from your recent brochure NT Council state 'Following public consultation , a Consultation Statement will be produced to set out a summary of the main issues raised and how they will be addressed' Please let me have a copy of this statement in good time before approval by the Council of the Masterplan in December 2017	Comment noted. This document will be published online.	
MGDM76	Resident	I agree that more housing is needed, though this should be to the benefit of the local population - therefore affordable! Affordable? Though this will never happen. It appears that local communities will be sacrificed to ensure certain peoples vision of the future comes true. Transparency and accountability.	The Council seeks 25% of new homes to be affordable. This includes new council housing and homes managed by Registered Providers that are provided at a controlled cost either as affordable or social rented, shared ownership or Discount Market Value.	
MGDM77	Resident	While I agree with the need for more housing a higher percentage should be social and affordable housing - otherwise this development will end up as a dormitory community. More thought should be given to the detrimental effect the infrastructure will have on the existing communities adjoining this development. The new road connecting Earsdon with New York Road will have to have noise reduction elements designed into the layout as it will be raised in certain areas.	The Masterplan includes the necessary infrastructure to support new housing and will be delivered in accordance with infrastructure delivery plan.  The bypass road will include landscaping along the full length. To the north of the metro line the landscaping will be more natural in form with native species chosen.	
MGDM78	Resident	The plan for housing next to our property "MURTON NURSERIES" is of great concern, as	This area of the Masterplan	Masterplan Layout

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		the new houses appear to back up to our property. This will cause lack of privacy, noise, pollution, poor air quality. This will lower the value and totally blight our home. We bought this house 25 years ago for it's position, view, tranquillity, and wildlife. All this will be lost and our quality of life ruined. Is this fair?	has been reviewed and revised. The plan now shows a wider buffer with space for suitable landscape mitigation to fit with this single story building. The existing hedge will be retained to further protect amenity.	updated.
MGDM79	Resident	Not only is the project itself of a very high standard, the site presentation paperwork explains the elements of work needed, to anyone who cares to study it, it a clear and quite comprehensive way. If the "actual works" when completed are anywhere near as well thought out as the present promotional literature, it will be an excellent contribution to North Tyneside's needs.	Comments noted.	
MGDM82	Resident	Whilst I am supportive of some development in this area the number of dwellings in proportion to the available capacity of the existing transport network is out of proportion. This is one of the last areas of fields in the areas of North Shields, Whitley Bay and Monkseaton and believe some green space and fields should remain in this area undeveloped. I also have concerns relating to previous mining that has occurred in the area, we have already seen new build homes in West Allotment and those closer to the development site in Kelso Drive suffering from subsidence and having to be demolished or demolished in the very near future as they have been built on land previously used for mining.	The Masterplan includes the necessary infrastructure to support new housing and will be delivered in accordance with infrastructure delivery plan.  Relevant coal and mining risks assessment will be undertaken along with site investigations which will inform the detailed layout.	
MGDM84	Resident	Having viewed the proposals also I wish to submit an objection to the proposed building of 3000 houses between Monkseaton, Shiremoor, Murton Village, New York village and Earsdon village. This a gross over development and will lead to loss of open space, green space, green corridors and areas for wildlife. It will lead to the loss of identity of 3 villages and lead to urban sprawl. There has been no thought given to the existing residents of any of the neighbouring areas or their views against this gross over	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		development.		
MGDM85	Resident	The consultation process has been helpful but I would like to think feedback at this stage is still incorporated.	Comments noted.	
MGDM86	Resident	Social housing must be pepperpotted throughout the entire development and concentrated in small areas.	Comments noted. The layout of affordable housing will be looked at during the detailed application stage.	
MGDM87	Resident	Whilst accepting the need for additional housing in accordance with Government strategy, and that the Murton Gap site makes sense within that context, I have major concerns about the current proposals for the siting of the new link road (too far to the east of the available land, and far too close to the adjacent houses in Wellfield). As the North East corner of the site is lower than the rest of the site, I have grave concerns over the flood risk, and in particular the inter-relationship between the proposed new link road and the flood mitigation works promised for the fields that the link road is proposed to be built on. The proposed road is also far too close to a public playing field at Wellfield, and indeed the school playing field. I also have a number of environmental concerns, particularly in relation to the bats that occupy the corner of Wellfield adjacent to the proposed new road.	The bypass road has been designed in order to meet an acceptable highway standard for safety and function. The alignment of the road may be pushed further west as shown on the Masterplan but this is subject to further work. The road will include landscaping along the full length. To the north of the metro line the landscaping will be more natural in form with native species chosen.	
MGDM88	Resident	I object to the significant number of house proposed on the Murton Gap site. This area is currently open green fields, and the concentration of new homes proposed in this area is excessive, given the strain that already exists on the local infrastructure and amenities; I object to the proximity of the south east proposed area of housing to West Monkseaton (ie adjacent to Briar Vale / Arcot Drive / Grindon Close area). Much has been made of the so-called 'buffer zones' around the rest of the development, and it would appear that the same consideration has NOT been given to this portion of the development. I would ask that this is reviewed and reconsidered;	In this area, the Masterplan includes a buffer of approximately 60 meters behind Briarvale. A playing field of approximately 90 meters in width is between new development and Glindon Close.	
MGDM89	Resident	I write to formally object to the current draft of the Murton Gap Masterplan for North Tyneside which closes on the 20th November, 2017.	Comments noted.	



## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM91	Resident	We moved here 2 years ago [address removed by officer] and are very disappointed about your plan for houses that takes away so much land space from our areas. I know land owners and builders will make millions of pounds out of it so my opinion is negative and will get no response. However I make my point as a voter. The reasons are obviously clear to us who live here and enjoy the open spaces around us. Please do not turn us into another concrete populated place connected to more roads and whatever, that you few planners decide to do next from a safe distance no doubt.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	
MGDM92	Resident	This must be my final plea to the Planning Department, responsible for the Murton Gap housing proposals.	Comments noted.	
MGDM93	Resident	Having attended the consultation event held at Monkseaton High School I still have very serious concerns regarding this development.	Comments noted.	
MGDM99	Resident	I have concerns about the number of houses being built in an already congested area that is quickly being stripped of all green/wildlife areas and becoming a built up town where areas are losing their identity. After going to the Shiremoor meeting I am even more unhappy with the proposed plans and some of the reason for this is because of the North Tyneside representatives at the meeting, in particular Highway Network Manager whose unwillingness to hear opinions or listen to reasoning I found very rude and arrogant and a grave concern that his statistics which he believes are facts about an area that is not yet built will determine the plans (his words). The current proposal has left me very concerned about the future of the area I live in with over population and very busy unsafe roads. Too many houses are being built in already busy areas and no consideration has been given to any area other than Murton Village. A major concern for me was the statistics provided by Highway Network Manager and the attitude he had. He had inability to be able to communicate in a positive manner and talked over people, would not listen to objection and was argumentative and unhelpful. As he confirmed the statistics that he provides determines what plans and development will take place and considering this man seems to think a statistic is a fact I find it a major concern. With an already congested area being improved on the basis of unrealistic statistical information I can not see that the problems will be alleviated in any way. I asked what had been put in place to stop noise and air pollution and he told me it would checked after the estate is finished. So nothing has been researched before the build? I think before anything else goes ahead NTC need to give people the correct	<p>Impacts from road noise and air quality of the new bypass through the site will be assessed during the planning application and may require mitigation if there is adverse effects.</p> <p>The Masterplan has been based on an extensive evidence base of studies and has directed the preferred approach, however the Masterplan consultation was an opportunity for residents to have a real input into the design of the Masterplan and changes have been made following the consultation.</p> <p>50 % of the site will remain as</p>	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		information with some evidence and facts rather than statistics and hearsay from a group of people who lacked in knowledge or in some cases people skills. I will add that there were some very nice members of NTC but the knowledge was vague and varied from whoever you spoke to. I have lived in the area for 16 years and I chose the estate as it was where I wanted to live and the surrounding area was a major part of my choice. I feel that I'm being told that I have to accept these changes without any input or consideration by people who do not care about the existing residents because statistics say it will be alright.	open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	
MGDM105	Resident	I am very disappointed that such a large development has been allowed in an already oversaturated new housing area. This will undoubtedly lead to congestion in our roads, regardless of road improvements. I also have grave concerns about the proposed junction of the new road no 6 in your Masterplan.	Comments noted.	
MGDM106	Resident	I question the forecast for demand. I was advised that current levels of business activity on Cobalt alone supports the project 3000 new-home demand figure. I was told that once these homes are built, those currently working on the Cobalt who commute will all flock to these new homes - I would challenge that mindset, very few are likely to move for that reason. Even if the projected requirement in terms of numbers is correct, the location simply doesn't make sense for all of the reasons documented in the other comments/objections made on the web-site the biggest in my opinion being traffic levels. I was told at the public meeting that the three members of my household who drive to work have made a grave lifestyle choice as far as the environment is concerned and we should reconsider walking, cycling and using public transport - quite how my wife's 36000 mile yearly driving tally is going to be achieved within normal working hours on foot or on a push-bike is beyond me - use of the outdated filthy Metro trains is obviously also out of the question. It simply isn't realistic to assume that there is going to be anything other than a growth in the number of journeys made by car and you are proposing to have too many people concentrated within an area served by too few roads. Lets face it, the biggest attraction here is 3000 more council tax receipts. There are countless areas throughout the region where developing or more likely redeveloping 'brown field' sites would be possibly more challenging and expensive but would save what precious greenbelt is still existing.	Comments noted. Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM107	Resident	I feel that insufficient planning is in place for outdoor for recreational play areas and parkland, there are not sufficient community halls and religious halls. There are not enough plans for environmental protection, wildlife areas, grass land, woodland and wildflower areas, green corridors are too small and not enough trees are being planted to protect topsoil from rapid flooding and maintain air quality with respect to potential roadway pollution.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.  The Council have assessed the requirement for community facilities and have consulted that we do not require new facilities but do require a contribution toward improving and maintaining existing facilities to help deal with the increased demand arising from the development.	
MGDM109	Resident	It is a shame that NTC have decided to lose this valuable green space what you are doing is going to ruin the borough for future generations, loss of habitat and green space cannot be replaced	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	
MGDM110	Resident	I would first make clear that I am strongly in opposition to any development on the Murton Gap site, like the great majority of other local residents, and I fed back this viewpoint throughout the North Tyneside Local Plan consultation process. My objections to development on this site fall broadly into the following categories; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detrimental impact to wildlife</li> <li>• Increased flood risk</li> <li>• Increased traffic congestion</li> </ul> The Council must commit to further public engagement in respect of plans for the	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland. This will provide areas for wildlife and sustainable drainage systems.  Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		undeveloped heart of the site. Engagement should take the form of a public meeting or series of public meetings to ensure that the Masterplan delivers the best outcomes for wildlife within this area and across the development site as a whole.	from new development.	
MGDM116	Resident	Another comment is down to subsidence. The area had changed over the years due to mining structures underneath, and building houses on the top will result to subsidence just like the housing estate next to West Allotment which has resulted in some houses being demolished.	Relevant coal and mining risks assessment will be undertaken along with site investigations which will inform the detailed layout.	
MGDM134	Resident	From the outset we were opposed to the building of houses on what has long been considered green belt. The guise of building affordable housing is bordering on fraudulent; as we believe only a small number of houses will be under £15000 which is still out of reach for most young people wanting to buy their first house.	Affordable housing will include a mixture of social rented, shared ownership and market discount.	
MGDM170	Resident	Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the emerging proposals for the future development of ‘~Murton Gap’. As residents of North Tyneside, we have reviewed the public engagement literature and attended the drop-in event in early November in order to develop an informed view of the Council’s proposals. As a starting point, we understand the reasoning behind choosing this area as a housing allocation site, not least to meet the demands of central Government. We also appreciate that part of the allocation decision reflected the area’s classification as ‘~brown field’ and is a more desirable option to developing on greenbelt and other areas of high public value. However, based on the information produced as part of the consultation period and from discussions had with Council Officers during the drop-in session, we have the following concerns that we feel need to be properly addressed. As a side note, the material provided for the public engagement is conflicted between what seems like overly simplified bodies of text which lack detail on key elements, and overly complex diagrams that detract from the underlying concepts, strategy and part of the development. We look forward to understanding more about how North Tyneside Council intends to address these issues, respond to the recognised constraints, and ensure that this housing allocation is well planned.	Comments noted.	
MGDM186	Resident	Thank you for arranging ‘~engagement events’ and for encouraging residents to comment. Local Plan: context. I’m not looking for answers from you, just pointing out	Comments noted.	

## General Masterplan Comments

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>concerns. ‘Registered Providers’ are presumably the landowners / developers on p.2. Is this clear? ‘Housing allocations on brownfield land’. 56 out of 70 looks good but when so much green field is about to be concreted / tarmacked / bricked over by 3000 houses at Murton, it would be helpful to know the ‘dimensions’ of each ‘housing allocation’. Is Murton one of the 14 housing allocations on green fields? Are any of the brownfield sites for 100 houses (never mind 3000)? ‘Without delivery of the Local Plan, open space and green belt land will be at risk of development’. I’m sure that as planners you understand that what you’re proposing for Murton Gap is development. I think you must mean ‘uncontrolled development’; unless you mean what is implied, that the Local Plan will prevent the risk of development ‘up to 25% affordable homes’ so could be anywhere between 1% and 25%. What is ‘affordable? Who decides? National housing policy is a mess, dominated by land bankers and government fear of upsetting existing home owners re property values so no-one is looking at needs of future generations as incomes stall and house prices continue to rise. So the ‘principles’ haven’t been thought through at any level. The Local Plan is something you ‘must do’. Doing it looks better if you present it in a glossy brochure. You might improve the chances of local acceptance if you hold ‘consultations’ and ask for feedback. But I hope you’ll forgive me for believing that Murton Gap will be built over; that you will be a party to an unfortunate national housing ‘policy; and that the careless presentation detailed above is evidence of something you ‘must do’ and so what.</p>	Registered providers include local authority landlords and private registered providers (such as not-for-profit housing associations and for-profit organisations).	
MGDM187	Resident	The Planning Team's creativity, sensitivity and facilitation of the plan is to be commended. Well done! Many of my fears have been overcome and we are supportive of the presented plan except for the items given below.	Comments noted.	



## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM83	CPRE Northumberland	We commend the Council on the principles guiding this aspect of the layout.	Comments noted.	
MGDM41	Local Methodist Churches	It seems a lot of careful thought and listening has gone into the layout in general.	Comments noted.	
MGDM81	Murton Action Group	The Development Layout Principles appear to have held true to the ‘~Concept Plan’ in the main however there is little detail regarding the provision of community facilities. The individual pods of development are too big to expect them to be catered for from within existing communities. Other issues include: Safeguards regarding the level of affordable housing. Charging points for electric vehicles. The lack of any substantive buffer zone at the pinch point on Murton Lane next to Murton Cattery.	The Council have assessed the requirement for community facilities and have consulted that we do not require new facilities but do require a contribution toward improving and maintaining existing facilities to help deal with the increased demand arising from the development.	
MGDM94	The Coal Authority	The site identified as Murton Gap has significant coal mining legacy issues which include; 19 mine entries, within or within 20m of the site boundary, recorded and likely unrecorded coal mine workings at shallow depth and areas which may have been subject to past surface mining activity. The site is also in an area of surface coal resource. The Coal Authority is pleased to see that the Murton Gap Masterplan Engagement Draft, dated October 2017, identifies that past coal mining legacy poses a potential risk to the development and past mining activity needs to be fully considered. As previously noted there are a significant number of mine entries on the site, the exact location and condition of which are not known to the Coal Authority. We would therefore expect the exact location of these features to be established prior to any layout being designed for the site in order to ensure that adequate separation can be provided between these features and any buildings proposed. The Coal Authority is of the opinion that building over the top of, or in close proximity to, mine entries should be avoided wherever possible, even after they have been capped, in line with our adopted policy: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/building-on-or-within-the-influencing-distance-of-mine-entries">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/building-on-or-within-the-influencing-distance-of-mine-entries</a> The Coal Authority is also pleased to see that Section 8.1 of the Engagement Draft, which sets out details of the planning requirements, includes the submission of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment and	Changes made to section 9.4 planning application requirements.	Changes made to section 9.4 planning application requirements.

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		Mineral Safeguarding Report. We note that the document states that this information should support all types of planning applications including full. For clarity we would reiterate that planning submissions for anything other than an outline in principle will need to be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment which has been informed by intrusive site investigations to locate the mine entries and establish any necessary no build zones around these features, in order that this information can inform any layout proposed.		
MGDM118	NTB Green Party	Development Layout and principles The chosen layout has been to add to existing communities rather than creating a new one. The danger of this approach is that the new homes will be just ‘‘housing estates’ with no identity of their own. There will be a very large number of new homes in this area and it is important that people living there feel part of a community otherwise they won’t look after the area. Action required: each of the housing blocks need a focus of activity such as at least a local shop which people can walk easily to get provisions; and within the area as a whole some community facilities including a centre where everyone in the development can get together ‘‘ this will be necessary in order to keep people engaged in the maintenance of the green space which they will all share	The layout is divided into 6 different character areas. Each area has focal green spaces and creates distinct areas with a new identity while providing good pedestrian and cycle links into existing areas.	
MGDM13	Resident	The amount of houses is far too large and should be hugely cut to ensure the small village type feel of Murton is retained.	A large area of parkland surrounds Murton Village which will ensure that the open setting is maintained.	
MGDM20	Resident	Pleased to see green parkland areas.	Comments noted.	
MGDM21	Resident	In actual fact this will do the exact opposite. Before long there will be additional housing as the roads will already be in place if the plan is approved. There is not enough open space now. In addition, it is not clear what type of school is within the education provision, and as yet it is not known if it will ACTUALLY be needed.	The school within the Masterplan is a primary school. This is needed based on population projections.	
MGDM22	Resident	Protecting the character of local communities seems a trite and offensive term given the Council's desire to change the nature of the existing communities irreversibly by imposing 3000 homes next to them which are unwanted, as well as the additional impact on roads on other infrastructure. How is this to be achieved?	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site	

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			adjacent to existing communities.  The Masterplan includes the necessary infrastructure to support new housing and will be delivered in accordance with infrastructure delivery plan.	
MGDM25	Resident	No comment		
MGDM28	Resident	It seems from a resident on the Monkseaton side of the development Murton has been protected but Monkseaton has less so, one of the closest points of the whole proposed new houses is at Monks Road, however the gap to Murton is disproportionate to that at Monks Road - I am aware that there is a "Wildlife Corridor" however currently there is little wildlife in the middle of a field but actually much more wildlife on the edges, so reducing the buffer gap to Murton and allowing a slightly larger buffer zone bordering Monks Road would in fact keep wildlife which is already at the edges with the hedgerow and current trees. So in fact having two smaller wildlife corridors, thus would also achieve a better link to the pond which is being created. I am sure the animals won't mind two much which route is used from Rake Lane to Earsdon! "Splitting the difference" if you like with the buffer zones would be a fairer way of planning this without sacrificing the routes for wildlife.	There is a buffer of approximately 30 – 40 metres behind Monks Road and New Development.	
MGDM29	Resident	Policy S4.4 Murton Strategic Allocation Concept Plan shows two mixed use zones within the site, located so as to ensure that shops, services and employment opportunities were within 800 metres of homes. Although far from ideal from a walking perspective this requirement at least ensured that reasonably attractive trip chains would be possible for residents travelling by bike or public transport. The removal of these centres to be replaced by a retail centre on the edge of the site means that for the vast majority of new residents there will be no retail or employment space within walking distance and cycling will not operate as an attractive mode for local utility trips. The approach adopted by Capita in compiling	Comments noted. The retail facility is located close to the potential new metro station which together creates a community hub character area within the Masterplan.	

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		their retail assessment failed to take into account the impact of local retail in facilitating walking and cycling, both of which require a mixed use land use pattern in order to thrive. Under provision of retail on the Murton site is unlikely to result in the regeneration benefits claimed for Whitley Bay, when no other practical mode will be available to access facilities other than private car and other competing retail sites such as Silverlink Retail Park are designed to accommodate car use. The study also incorrectly interpreted the mixed use zones identified in S4.4 as being alternative options, assessed in the study as Options 1 & 3, when both are required to achieve the objectives identified in the local plan. The relocation of retail provision to the edge of the site does not meet the place making objectives outlined in the concept plan and will result in negative motor traffic impacts both within the site and in surrounding areas. The primary street through the Masterplan area is shown as a traffic dominated corridor with large roundabouts and building lines at junctions over 100 metres apart. The land allocated to serve the needs of through car traffic is far in excess of that required. Insufficient consideration has been given to the need to encourage walking, land is not being used efficiently.		
MGDM30	Resident	We are broadly in agreement with the proposal.	Comments noted.	
MGDM31	Resident	Building a road between Earsdon and the new development suggestions that the long-term plan is to merge Shiremoor and Monkseaton. In South Wellfield, we'll be surrounded by busy roads which have speeding problems.	The road is required as part of the delivery of the Masterplan.	
MGDM37	Resident	The Link Road junction onto the A186 Earsdon bypass road is in the wrong place "" See below.	Comments noted.	
MGDM38	Resident	I understand protecting the character of Murton but why should Wellfield Estate have to have a dual carriageway built not far from Wellfield. You have got it far to close to Wellfield. You have put it close to Wellfield because later on you will build on the land not far from Shiremoor allotments.	The bypass road has been designed in order to meet an acceptable highway standard for safety and function. The alignment of the road may be pushed further west as shown on the Masterplan but this is subject to further work. The road will include landscaping	

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			along the full length. To the north of the metro line the landscaping will be more natural in form with native species chosen.	
MGDM39	Resident	The wildlife corridor is shown as being very narrow towards the SE and does not appear to join up with that off-site further to the SE. The flood risk appraisal carried out by Capita for North Tyneside Council (NTC) for the north west (NW) and SE areas of the site for the dry storage basins currently under construction suggests a broader corridor "" see <a href="http://www.rlsnortheast.co.uk/temp4/MurtonGapFloodPrevention.htm">http://www.rlsnortheast.co.uk/temp4/MurtonGapFloodPrevention.htm</a> (This also provides links to the two relevant NTC planning applications.) At the stage of the planning applications for the Murton Gap site it needs to be clear how the housing accommodates drainage ditches that lead the surface water to both the NE and SE to water courses off-site.	The wildlife corridor to the south east corner has been increased in size. A stand-off of approximately 50m has been included from Rake House Farm, with a buffer of around 100m from Rake Lane. The open space wildlife corridor may include a swale as part of the overall drainage strategy, which will also enhance wildlife connectivity.  All planning applications will be required to show how they fit into a site wide drainage and landscape strategy.	The wildlife corridor to the south east corner has been increased in size.
MGDM45	Resident	The housing plan except for the objection about its scale looks reasonable and avoids simply filling fields with houses!	Comments noted	
MGDM48	Resident	No comments - but would like to know proposed names.	The site is currently called Murton Gap. There are no other names are proposed at present.	
MGDM49	Resident	We own on behalf of the Scout Association a piece of land in West Monkseaton & the development of our hall into a large double storied building would help the 2 Scout Groups who have to share (Beaver Scout Colonies x 2 6 to 8 year olds, Cub packs x2 8	Comments noted.	



## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		to 10 1/2 year olds, Scout troops x2 10 1/2 to 14 year olds) due to lack of meeting facilities.		
MGDM50	Resident	My main area of concern is the public walkway behind Boundary Mill Stores, as it comes out next to my house on Angerton Avenue. It is currently unmarked at the entry point from the corner of the triangular plot marked for allotments (south west corner of the site), which is more desirable for residents and neighbours on my street. On one of your plans, the route is marked as "M12", designated as a 4m wide surfaced cycle route going right through to the new development. This concerns me for a few reasons: 1) The current walkway is not wide enough for this, and would spread the resurfacing work right up to the side of my house and garden. It will also majorly affect the privacy of my back garden. 2) Advertising the currently hidden entrance to the walkway/creating a marked pathway to it will lead to it being used as a cut-through to an from the Spar/corner shops on Park Lane - I worry this will lead to possible loitering/youths using the cut to drink/crime would be a concern for me. 3) This would be the same or even worse if a corner shop, pub or small supermarket was planned for the new estate at the other end of the walkway. For these reasons, please could I request/strongly recommend that the public access route around the back of Boundary Mill Stores to Angerton Avenue keep its hidden entry point (ie unsurfaced, unmarked). It will also minimise any crime/vandalism on the new allotments planned there. The points further north to Angerton Ave and Park Ave from the east would be more suitable for this. I would also strongly suggest planning a corner shop or two within the new estate (close to the main roads rather than surrounding existing housing areas). This would help to contain the extra 20K population rather than only having facilities at the northern tip of the site. Just please not near the aforementioned walkway.	Alternative connections will exist to support increased footfall however this route is the most logical connection given its present status as a legal right of way. The proposals to upgrade this route to make it suitable and fit for its upgraded purpose. Improved connections will provide wider benefits to existing and new residents.	
MGDM54	Resident	This size of development is far too big for the area - the existing infrastructure cannot cope now and the changes being put forward will not arrest this situation. There will be an increase in traffic moving east and west along Rake Lane which will impact directly the residents of specifically Abbot Way and the Devon Road area as well as Preston Grange in terms of accessing their homes. The open space buffers are small and the suggestion of play areas are lip service to what will be a concrete jungle. The	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		existing residents are clearly being forgotten about - the island that is Abbots Way, the Devon Road estate, Preston Grange and the Priors bordered by rake Lane, Billy Mill Lane/ Lynn Road, Preston Rd North and Beach Road has NO play areas at all and this should be addressed before any future developments are made and our views of field and countryside are destroyed for ever.	The Masterplan includes the necessary infrastructure to support new housing and will be delivered in accordance with infrastructure delivery plan.  The Masterplan includes 2 new play areas.	
MGDM61	Resident	Behind Rake Lane houses many years ago a drift mine was sited which closed in the 1960s. This drift went under fields behind New York got level with the Wheatsheaf and stopped, is this known? As this could have problems on foundations. For example the housing opposite the Northumberland Arms where new housing had to be demolished.	Relevant coal and mining risks assessment will be undertaken along with site investigations which will inform the detailed layout.	
MGDM62	Resident	Didn't really understand them.	Comment noted.	
MGDM63	Resident	There does not appear to be much benefit to a new metro station as only the bottom end of one housing development will access it. No-one will walk through field paths from Wellfield or Earsdon to use it.	Higher density housing to the south of the metro will assist in making this metro station available to a lot of residents. In addition easy pedestrian access routes will be provided from all development parcels.	
MGDM65	Resident	I repeat , why is Murton village viewed as a special case ? Backworth, West Allotment and New York were also villages not that long ago. All villages and small townships are gradually being merged into one enormous, densely populated region.	The buffer around Murton also functions as parkland which will include leisure and amenity space, areas for wildlife and sustainable drainage systems. Sensitively designed buffers are included around the housing to the edges of the site.	

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM67	Resident	We live at the end of a cul-de-sac and we are worried that builders will be opening this up to bring in all of their machinery. Our street is nice and quiet at the moment and with you taking about 3000 houses being built this will no longer be the case.	Construction traffic will be directed onto main roads. No cul-de-sacs will be affected.	
MGDM68	Resident	There are too many houses being built in this area causing traffic congestion and pollution and urban sprawl.	Comments noted.	
MGDM69	Resident	Planned layout has a huge impact on Wellfield, surrounded by dual carriageways, the noise levels along will beggar belief.	Comments noted.	
MGDM74	Resident	The key principle is making is making 9 million pounds extra in council tax without a care for the disruption it will cause. How can building three thousand houses preserve the character of Murton village?	The open setting around Murton Village will be maintained.	
MGDM75	Resident	Extract 8.1.5 Character Area 5: Southern Edge This character area is located close to the existing area of New York. These areas will have strong connections with pedestrian routes and shared use of open space and local facilities. An existing area of amenity green space separates part of this character area from New York. The character area has a key frontage to the secondary road and a number of important features are located in this area including the Primary School and Allotments Contradiction. Why does this character area need to be separated from New York? Is there a degree of elitism here? Explain this separation in detail and why it is needed?) 'c Where appropriate, properties should have a positive frontage onto existing properties in New York around new areas of open space. On some streets a landscaped buffer may be a more appropriate option. Is this buffer zone option the best Capita and the Planners can think of to segregate New York village from the occupants of Murton Gap estate yet use the village as a rat run for use by Murton gap traffic. Explain why this is acceptable by the planners?	The edge to New York is different in character to other edges around the Murton site. Elsewhere the settlement edge is more linear and constant and well screened by mature vegetation in the most-part. This allows for a wide pedestrian-permeable buffer with active outward-looking frontage in these areas. In contrast the edge to New York Road is inconsistent in use and distinctly non-linear. The arrangement of existing land uses and varied edge along this stretch along with land ownership constraints does not lend itself to achieving pedestrian permeability along its length which limits potential for useable buffers to be established. Here the edge has a	New York and Rake Lane Buffer Increased.

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			<p>more intimate character and requires a specific rather than generalised 'distance-based' approach to achieving separation, privacy and visual amenity for existing residents.</p> <p>The buffer to the rear of the existing properties on New York Road and Rake Lane has been increased from 5 metres to 7 metres with the existing vegetation retained and widened to provide additional visual screening to the rear of the existing properties. The buffer would be managed and maintained by the site management company to a specification agreed with the Council. Access to the buffer could be restricted if so desired by the residents. Assuming a back to back relationship between existing and new this would achieve separation of around 28m-31.5m.</p>	
MGDM77	Resident	The New York Road - new road access will have the effect of cutting New York in half. New York East and New York West. There being a considerable number of elderly people in the area - this will cause certain people to be isolated. Your access arrangement shows 2 x 40 articulated lorry's leaving the new development in a southerly direction. is this artistic license? Upon being informed that access from new	Access to New York Village from Norham road roundabout will be closed off from traffic but is likely to stay open for busses.	

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		York Road (Village) to the Norham Road/New York Bypass/New York Road roundabout will be closed. Pray tell how public transport will leave or access New York. Leaving this open will result in New York becoming a rat run. Therefore this access will have to be controlled for the benefit of existing residents. The well-being and safety of the existing community should not be sacrificed in the headlong rush to build housing.		
MGDM78	Resident	The houses are coming too close to our property. Murton Village has been granted a buffer zone and that should apply to Murton Nurseries and Moorlands.	This area of the plan has now been changed to provide additional buffering and landscaping surrounding this property.	Masterplan Layout revised.
MGDM79	Resident	What is particularly impressive is that substantial areas within the centre of the site are to be open green spaces, and not just buildings over every square metre. The preservation of Murton Village within open space should be seen by possible objectors as a major contribution to the village's environment. The project is of course subject to the details of the residences, which appear to vary from substantial town houses, to single or two person households, these hopefully actually "affordable", that word meaning something different to developers, to that of a buyer. It is assumed that all residences will be provided with "off-street" parking from the beginning, and garages as necessary. Larger premises now and in the future have to provide for multi-vehicle households, and on-street parking should be tightly controlled. Grass verges and cycle ways must not become random parking places for residents and visitors alike, as seen at present on the Marden Estate and on Tynemouth Broadway - and I am told by Councillors "elsewhere".	Comments noted.	
MGDM82	Resident	3000 homes is a large number to be placing in such a site, the use of cul-de-sacs and curved "mini estates" means that there is often only one entrance and exit point to several streets. I would much prefer that North Tyneside continued a traditional grid style street layout within its new developments.	All streets will be designed to be permeable for pedestrians and cyclists and easy to navigate.	
MGDM84	Resident	Gross over development, loss of open space, loss of green space, loss of identity of existing villages and small towns, loss of green corridors and areas for wildlife. The house builders behind this gross development have a very poor standard of design which is very evident by their poor standard houses around Northumberland Park and	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes generous parkland. The housing will include a mixture of type and	



## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		Wallsend - no imagination but grossly overpriced. Too much emphasis on overpriced executive type housing and too little emphasis on well designed good quality affordable housing.	sizes.	
MGDM85	Resident	I am supportive of the need for housing but also feel that new estates and existing roads still do not manage well enough the # of cars that increase with large scale development and will hit Rake Lane. The park is a welcomed space that can be used for existing residence of Abbots Way who have no provision today. However this would require pedestrian crossing improvements to and within the park to ensure safety.	The parkland area will include informal pedestrian routes throughout which will link into the existing and proposed development areas.	
MGDM86	Resident	New metro station must be installed and operational when the new main road from Earsdon to Shiremoor is complete.	The potential new Metro Station is planned for phase 2 for the development.	
MGDM87	Resident	It would appear that far more attention has been devoted to buffers between existing and new housing, than to the buffer between the existing housing at Wellfield and the proposed new link road. When looking at the available fields between Wellfield and Shiremoor, the road should be positioned much further to the west than currently proposed. The public right of way to the very eastern edge of the site boundary for the fields in the north east where the link road is to be sited backs onto my house in Collingwood Road, and the existing hedge is not being well maintained by the landowner. Retaining that right of way between my property and woodland will make my property vulnerable, and require significant maintenance expense from the council, so it should be rerouted to be adjacent to the new road, and dense woodland inserted between the road and our property line, to ensure both privacy and noise abatement. There also does not seem to be enough consideration of the heights involved, as the fields are higher than our properties.	The road beside Wellfield is a minimum of 30 meters away from any houses.	
MGDM88	Resident	1. I object to the proposed cycle / pedestrian path currently indicated as going into the head of the existing Arcot Drive / St Anne's Court cul-de-sac in West Monkseaton: a) As an existing cul-de-sac of over 50 years, to introduce this access where there is no current right of way would destroy the existing character and quiet nature of this street; b) There is a recent precedent to block new access into the head of Arcot Drive	The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has	Pedestrian links amended.

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		/ St Anne's Court: a proposal to create a new access into Arcot Drive / St Anne's Court was put forward as part of the (now) Briar Vale planning application, which was blocked at the time, and the streets are separated by a c.6ft high fenceline as a result; c) It is my belief that the proposed location for this proposed cycle / pedestrian path will create a hazard, due to poor visibility at the various existing junctions which would have to be navigated to reach the main thoroughfare of Seatonville Road. I also consider that this risk will be significantly increased during the particularly busy periods during school drop off / pick up at Star of the Sea RC VA Primary School; d) From a cycling perspective, the route currently proposed has obviously been suggested by someone who is not a cyclist, as it comes out in the middle of an estate, and does not provide a direct line of access to the main thoroughfare of Seatonville Road. A more appropriate location would be to improve the existing right of way that currently runs to the rear / the west of Briar Vale, and meets Drumoyne Gardens, opposite the end of Athol Gardens. Athol Gardens is already an existing thoroughfare	been removed.	
MGDM97	Resident	I have attended the consultation event and read the master plan. I object to the proposal of a new pedestrian/cycle path in Arcot Drive. Arcot Drive is a cul de sac and there is no existing right of way.	The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has been removed.	Pedestrian links amended.
MGDM99	Resident	I think little consideration has been given to the residents affected by these plans apart from Murton Village which seems to have been favoured. I will now have houses overlooking my home. I have a dormer window and extension and have major concerns that light will be blocked into my house and garden and my privacy encroached upon by the invasion of various designed homes - put trees/fence as a barrier and I'll still have an issue with light. Not only will houses be overlooking my property but I'll also have to deal with noise and road pollution, loss of wildlife and green area, walks and a rare bit of nature that I rapidly disappearing in our area. I would like to add that the meeting that I attended at Shiremoor Library has made me feel even more concerned about the development plans than I was before. The lack of knowledge from some	Sensitive edges are buffers are included all around the site with different design solutions in different areas. Indicative widths and designs for some example areas were included in the consultation material.	

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		members of NTC was very concerning and disappointing. No one could tell me how far away houses would be from my home, what type of housing, what would be done for noise/air pollution or if sunlight would be blocked from my garden from the new estate. If the information was not available why bother to have the meeting?		
MGDM105	Resident	Plus - Distinct boundaries to existing communities. What appears to be provision of green areas allotments and play areas.	111 new allotments will be provided and 2 new play sites.	
MGDM106	Resident	Protecting the character of Murton village, preventing the merger of Shiremoor and Monkseaton and offering a reduced open space buffer are all damage limitation measures.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	
MGDM107	Resident	Maintaining of Merton villages character with a need for a significant open space buffer larger than currently proposed . Maintaining separation of Shiremoor and Monkseaton should not be a priority . Linking environmental, flood prevention recreational spaces and transport links better should be more important	A large parkland area surrounds Murton Village.	
MGDM109	Resident	Too many houses the area is already over stretched in terms of road capacity, nhs, schools etc	Comment noted.	
MGDM113	Resident	My final point is just a passing one as I didn't get a chance to discuss this at the session and am only going by the examples in your brochure. In the cross sections of borders between existing and new housing, why is there a clear defined area in all examples except rear of New York Road it looks very close compared to the others?	The edge to New York is different in character to other edges around the Murton site. Elsewhere the settlement edge is more linear and constant and well screened by mature vegetation in the most-part. This allows for a wide pedestrian-permeable buffer with active outward-looking frontage in these areas. In contrast the edge to New York Road is inconsistent in use and distinctly non-linear. The arrangement of existing land uses	

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			<p>and varied edge along this stretch along with land ownership constraints does not lend itself to achieving pedestrian permeability along its length which limits potential for useable buffers to be established. Here the edge has a more intimate character and requires a specific rather than generalised 'distance-based' approach to achieving separation, privacy and visual amenity for existing residents.</p> <p>The buffer to the rear of the existing properties on New York Road has been increased from 5 metres to 7 metres with the existing vegetation retained and widened to provide additional visual screening to the rear of the existing properties. The buffer would be managed and maintained by the site management company to a specification agreed with the Council. Access to the buffer could be restricted if so desired by the residents. Assuming a back to back relationship between existing and new this would achieve separation</p>	

## Development Layout and Principles

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			of around 28m-31.5m.	
MGDM134	Resident	Although some green belt remains we believe this status will change in approximately 15 years. What are the future plans for this land? With road access already in situ are we to expect to be fully built up. What was once quite rural, living in Wellfield by choice for this reason, is soon to be extremely urban.	The local plan identifies the land to the north of the metro as Green Belt. The local plan was adopted July 2017 and plans for development up to 2032.	
MGDM170	Resident	1) The Development Principles of the scheme declares that the layout of the development has been designed to protect the character and identify of Murton Village and 'existing communities'. We do not agree that this development serves existing settlements in terms of enhancement or in terms of sympathetic planning. The proposals offer no assessment of how introducing a major roundabout and associated road access will impact on the character of Earsdon Village Conservation Area and as an extension, the values of the people who live there. When asked how this road infrastructure would impact the Conservation Area, the Council Officer we approached agreed that it 'definitely would' and as residents we deserve a more detailed assessment of what the harm will be to this rural setting and at least some consideration of the proposals in line with the 2011 Character Appraisal, where the rural atmosphere and green surroundings are highlighted as a key feature. Understandably, the character of the surrounding area has indeed altered since the changes to the A192, but it cannot be denied that two major roundabouts (leading immediately into each other) on the cusp of a distinguishably rural settlement is not just a drastic alteration, but also insensibly planned and aesthetically poor.	A large parkland area surrounds Murton Village.  The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia. The road will be designed with native landscaping to reduce any visual impact.	
MGDM186	Resident	"Protect the character and identity of Murton village and existing communities 'I.. "Think about what you're saying here. You're being dishonest with yourselves ! You're equally airy about the impact of the needs of another 10,000 people on health and education. Do you think if it's "planned' it will happen and we'll all be happy citizens ?	A large parkland area surrounds Murton Village. Other comments noted.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM41	Local Methodist Churches	In my view, the more people can be incentivised to use public transport and cycle the better.	Comments noted.	
MGDM81	Murton Action Group	The increase in new pedestrian and cycle ways is welcomed but again it is imperative that the local community has an opportunity to help plan their number and routes. Our main concern regarding the highways improvements is one of rising air pollution. The provision of new Metro Stations appears paramount in mitigating for this and other issues and yet seems no nearer approval??	Pedestrian and cycle links are key aspect for connectivity and movement in the Masterplan.	
MGDM95	Nexus	Nexus is the Passenger Transport Executive for Tyne and Wear, acting on behalf of the North East Combined Authority (NECA). It is in this context that Nexus submits these comments. 'C Nexus welcomes the opportunity to comment on the draft Murton Gap Masterplan document, and recognises the work undertaken by North Tyneside Council to develop the plans to this stage. 'C Nexus has previously been consulted informally by North Tyneside Council and developers to discuss the potential public transport provision the proposed development. It has always been Nexus' position that the best way to deliver high levels of accessibility would be through a combination of conventional public transport as well as looking to emerging future mobility trends. For Murton Gap this includes investigating the potential for new bus and Metro services. 'C Replacing the current aging fleet of Metro trains is one of Nexus' core business objectives with the most recent estimate for a new fleet of trains entering service being the end of 2021. Until this time, Nexus will be unable to provide guarantees that serving stations at both sites will be feasible. 'C For developments of the size proposed for Murton Gap, it is necessary to ensure that a sufficient level of public transport provision is planned and delivered to support an increase in patronage and to reduce levels of car ownership and congestion. The existing public transport network may not be able to accommodate the forecast increase in patronage therefore it is expected that developers should liaise with bus operators and investigate future mobility trends to ensure that this development deliver high levels of transport accessibility. 'C Nexus is pleased to see within the Masterplan the inclusion of a commitment to make provision for bus access throughout the development. 'C Nexus has been working to investigate future	Comments noted and will be considered as the detailed design of Murton Gap.	



## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>mobility trends and is keen to explore the possibility of securing funding to extend Newcastle University's living lab to trial alternative modes of public transportation including Connected and Autonomous Vehicles and 'on demand' transport services. This development presents an excellent opportunity to incorporate future mobility at the Masterplan stage so that the sites can be developed around a sustainable transport network, rather than trying to address accessibility concerns once the plans for the development have been finalised. This will also future-proof the transport aspects of the design which is currently a significant issue for the DfT. '¢ It has to be noted that there are a number of dependencies that need to be acknowledged before the benefits of a new station for the development at Murton Gap can be realised. A new fleet of trains could deliver an increase in the available passenger capacity which, due to the overcrowding currently experienced on this section of the network during the peak periods, would be necessary to accommodate any potential demand increase produced by this development. The improved performance and reliability that is anticipated from a new fleet of trains could enable more flexibility in the timetable to allow services to stop at a new station through more efficient utilisation of the fleet. '¢ The results of work undertaken by Nexus into the replacement of the current rolling stock with new trains has revealed that there may only be enough capacity in the timetable based on the existing service pattern for one additional station. This is based on the proposed number of trains to be ordered. Additional trains would be needed to accommodate two or more new stations on the current network. North Tyneside Council could Nexus to run the timetable model to include stations at Murton Gap and Killingworth Moor to determine the number of additional trains required. Nexus would charge for this work to be undertaken. '¢ This should not rule out a new Metro station at each site as if additional funding can be secured from the development to cover the cost of additional rolling stock then this would still be possible; however, cognisance must be taken of the potential impact to existing passengers that use the service from stations further east of these locations. '¢ Nexus is pleased to note that in the Masterplan, North Tyneside Council has acknowledged that it may not be achievable to deliver Metro stations at both developments and in section 6.3 of the Killingworth Moor Masterplan has stated that 'If a Metro [station] were not included as part of development proposals at Killingworth Moor, an</p>		

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>equivalent level of public transport provision would be required through an enhanced bus service.’ As there is no guarantee of a new Metro station at either development, Nexus would request that North Tyneside Council amends the Masterplan for Murton Gap to include the same condition for that site. ‘ Nexus wishes to take this opportunity to point out that it would only be able to support the construction of a new station if there were no potential negative impacts, either financial or operational, that have a significant adverse impact on Metro operations or existing passengers. ‘ If an agreement is reached between Nexus, North Tyneside Council and the developers for a new Metro station at Murton Gap, Nexus would require the developer to fund a contract that Nexus lets for the design and construction of the station and that Nexus manages that aspect of the development. Any new station would require the consent of the NECA or successor body. ‘ It is Nexus’ view that the new station should act as focal points for the local neighbourhood and it is hoped that this would encourage sustainable behaviours, and prevent any potential antisocial behaviour from occurring. For example, by incorporating retail, leisure or community space, the station and its surroundings will feel safer and more secure for passengers travelling by Metro. ‘ The financial responsibility for the delivery of public transport services must be placed with the developer. The Nexus Planning Liaison Policy requires that new transport services are pump-primed for a period of at least five years, or two years following final completion of the site (whichever is greater) or until they become commercially sustainable (if this happens sooner), to ensure that public transport use is encouraged from the early stages of occupation. The cost of construction of new Metro stations must also be met by the developers. ‘ For large scale developments, The Nexus Planning Liaison Policy requires that the developer funds methods to incentivise the use of sustainable transport including covering the cost of travel for a period of at least four weeks. Currently this is through the provision of two four-weekly Network One travel passes per dwelling. ‘ The Nexus Planning Liaison Policy has recently been refreshed and can be found at <a href="https://www.nexus.org.uk/planning-liaison-policy">https://www.nexus.org.uk/planning-liaison-policy</a>. ‘ Nexus is keen to be involved in the continued development of these plans to ensure the best possible transport offering is in place for the future residents at these sites. The single point of contact for discussion on new Metro stations for Nexus is Roger Gill.</p>		

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM96	Sport England	The Masterplan makes good provision for a network of footpath and cycle routes within the development, but also for good links to networks outside of the site.	Comments noted.	
MGDM102	Tyne & Wear Local Access Forum	I am writing on behalf of the Tyne and Wear Joint Local Access Forum to offer our advice and comments on the above proposals. The forum notes the numerous existing access routes and Public Rights of Way within and across both sites. We believe that in principle, access routes should not be closed, made less attractive or rendered more difficult to use as a result of development. We would expect more people of all abilities to be using the routes as a result of the proposed developments, added to the very significant amounts of house building to date in this part of North Tyneside. The forum expects that the opportunity should be taken to improve the quality, quantity and connectivity of access routes as far as possible as part of the development. In particular we would advise that the existing footpaths should: 'c be upgraded to multi-user routes, 'c be designed to allow use and enjoyment by as wide a range of people and abilities as possible 'c have safe road crossings and 'c retained or diverted paths should be located conveniently in an attractive green space setting that allows safe (off-road) access, retaining local countryside character. We very much welcome proposals for new recreational access links but would strongly advise that these should be dedicated and/or adopted as Public Rights of Way. A planning agreement (S106) should include a section whereby this is secured. We are particularly keen to see footpaths upgraded to Public Bridleways where possible, for use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. We note that the Outline Development Framework (June 2016) refers mainly to pedestrians and cyclists and fails to look at needs of horse riders and other non-motorised users. We would refer you to the following documents. 'c The Tyne & Wear Rights of Way Improvement Plan, and its appendices, , as endorsed in the current North Tyneside Local Plan, adopted July 2017. 'c 'Public Rights of Way and Development. Planning Guidance Note for Major Applications' (See copy attached) 'c The 2005 former Countryside Agency (now Natural England) publication 'By All reasonable Means'. We would be keen to see details of all new paths, links and improvements to existing paths and advise further. Given the scale of development proposed, the forum suggests that North Tyneside Council establish a working group involving representatives of other access organisations, disability organisations, and possibly wildlife and	Pedestrian and cycle links are key aspect for connectivity and movement in the Masterplan.  Other comments noted.	Updated movement plan in the Masterplan to show all existing and proposed routes and how they integrated into existing connections around the site.

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		landscape/greenspace interests, as well as council officers and developer representatives If you would like to discuss the matters we have raised or need more information, please contact me using the details above or via our administrator. (Email tyneandwearlaf@newcastle.gov.uk ) As a final point we are usually required to report on our performance each year to Natural England & DEFRA. Please let us know what action will be or has been taken on the advice provided. If none please supply reasons.		
MGDM104	St Mary's Ward Councillor	In brief, it is felt that this site is unsuited to so much development. Local roads are already very busy , and the addition of thousands of new homes will make this problem worse. The proposed roundabout at the north of the site, near Garden Terrace, Earsdon, will be very close to the existing roundabout at the Red Lion junction with the A192 dual carriageway, and it is feared that queues will stretch between them, causing grid lock. The plans on public display do not seem to show clearly the proximity of these two roundabouts. There is no guarantee that even one new Metro station will be built, to take traffic from the roads: funding is uncertain, and in any event, work would not start on the station until many hundreds of properties had been built.	<p>Comments noted. The principle of development at Murton Gap of approximately 3,000 homes to meet the evidence based need for development in North Tyneside is established through the Local Plan allocation, adopted following consideration of the advice and recommendations of an independent Planning Inspector acting on behalf of Government.</p> <p>The general gap identified between the two roundabouts is expected to be sufficient for safe operation and management of traffic. Further details of the precise arrangement of the roundabouts would require development as part of future planning applications.</p>	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM118	NTB Green Party	Road and Transport Improvements Air pollution concerns “ Friends of the Earth monitoring has shown that traffic along Rake Lane already at times exceeds permissible levels of NO2. Allowing additional 250 homes to exit onto Rake Lane from the new development “ opp. Rake Lane hospital - will exacerbate the problem, increasing CO2 levels as well. This is not just an issue for patients going to and from the hospital but is a more general public health issue since the FoE monitoring indicates there is a similar problem in other parts of the borough. The Council has a duty now to put in place plans to improve air quality across the borough. Action required: air pollution monitoring of the traffic flow plans with action to mitigate issues arising; electric charging points in all new homes + in street parking areas to encourage use of non-polluting cars; electric trolley buses introduced to circulate around the entire site to link up with transport interchanges in order to eliminate the use of current buses.	An Air Quality Assessment will be undertaken on the site in order to consider the air pollutant concentrations in the area.	Reference to electric charging points added to Masterplan guidance.
MGDM119	Sustrans	Sustrans wishes to raise concerns regarding the transport plans for the Murton Gap Masterplan. North Tyneside Council’s Local Plan, adopted in July 2017 states in section 10.48 ‘North Tyneside’s Cycling Strategy includes a “2030 Vision’ to make North Tyneside the North East’s cycling borough by 2030. There has been a significant increase in cycling activity in the Borough in recent years, with journey numbers increasing by 270% between 2005 and 2015, the most significant level of growth in Tyne and Wear. Indeed, Department for Transport statistics show that the proportion of North Tyneside residents who cycled at least five times a week is the highest across the North East’. North Tyneside Council’s own Supplementary Planning Document, Local Development Document 12 (LDD12), for Transport and Highways states ‘Developers will be required to provide direct, well lit and safe links to the cycling network including priority crossings at internal junctions where appropriate and for larger developments, to provide extensions to or enhancement of the existing cycling network so as to create a strategic network of cycle routes. Unless suitable separate corridors can be justified, these routes will be included as high quality dedicated cycling provision within the street environment. Parallel routes should ideally be separated by no more than 250m’ (section 2.3.3). It also states ‘Developers will be required to provide direct, well lit and safe links to the walking network, including priority crossings at internal junctions where appropriate and for larger	Pedestrian and cycle links are key aspect for connectivity and movement in the Masterplan.  The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council’s policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Updated movement plan in the Masterplan to show all existing and proposed routes and how they integrated into existing connections around the site.  Update cross sections to reflect the emerging Cycle Design Guide.  Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>developments, to provide extensions to or enhancement of the existing walking network' (section 2.2.2). LDD12 also states the Council's ambition for 'all new development achieving a high level of sustainable transport use in line with best practice examples in the region'. As the plans currently stand, it is hard to see how best practice examples, as well as the Council's own guidance, is being followed. A number of ambitions are expressed in the broader document, such as encouraging multi-modal journeys via a new metro station, and connectivity for cycling across the site. However, the proposed plans do not seem to address these aspirations and in fact contradict them in a number of key areas. In the Masterplan Guidance, section 8.2.1 (Primary Feature Street) states the road design will include cycle lanes. The Design Principles then states 'A 4 metre shared pedestrian and cycle paths to be located to one side of the road'. Highways England Interim Advice Notice 195/16 (IAN 195) states that where motor traffic flow exceeds 5,000 vehicles daily, cycle tracks are the minimum provision to be built in 30mph zones. Shared footways are not recommended for this context. Where average annual daily traffic is below 5,000 vehicles daily, cycle lanes should be built, not shared pedestrian cycle paths as detailed in the Masterplan. The Masterplan states that the speed limit will increase from 30 mph to 40 mph to the north of the Metro line. IAN 195 states that in 40 mph zones, regardless of the number of vehicles, the minimum provision should be cycle tracks. Similarly, the 'Secondary Feature Street' outlines cycle lanes, then in the Design Principles shared use footway and cycle ways are referred to. It is important that the design for all streets takes into account the guidance contained within IAN 195/16. The Masterplan states that all materials will be dense bitumin including on footways, be it a link road or secondary street. We believe this is a very poor choice for residential streets and lacks a change of materiality which will not uphold road hierarchy (i.e. residential streets will look and therefore be treated the same as link roads which will encourage speed, discourage cycling or street activity). If a different material is used on residential streets, speed control is designed in, aiding the sense of place making and creating informal features to reduce speeds. Cycling priority needs to be given across side roads from the Primary Feature Street, to the same design standard as the Broadway in Tynemouth. It is disappointing that this award-winning design cannot be incorporated into the designs for Murton Gap. If North</p>		<p>design of pedestrian and cycle links.</p>



## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		Tyneside Council are serious about fulfilling their ambition of using best practice designs in the region, they should be recommending using best practice designs from within their own authority. We also have concern that under section 8.3.1 it is stated that 'Drop off and pick up points should be located outside of the school and minimise potential traffic impacts for nearby residents'. Parking around a school should not be included within the design. The surroundings should be conducive to children walking, cycling or scooting to school, not being driven from a short distance. Referring back to the type of cycle infrastructure contained within IAN 195/16, if an entrance to Murton Gap is from Rake Lane, a cycle track should be built, not the current cycle lane contained on the highway. This is already evident on the A186 to the north of the site, which will also act as an entrance onto the site. The Masterplan lacks details concerning the roundabouts within the development. We believe that this development provides an opportunity to design roundabouts which contain cycle priority, by using peripheral cycle tracks and "a compact or normal roundabout with a separate cycle track around the outside of the junction and with cycle crossings" (section 2.6.1 of IAN 195/16). Sustrans believe that the current Murton Gap Masterplan does not adequately cater for cyclists or walkers in its current form. It is recommended that the developers are required to follow the Council's own design guidance and that of Highways England as laid out above.		
MGDM137	St Mary's Ward Councillor	1. The layout is unacceptable. It must be changed to meet the requirements in LDD12 (Transport and Highways SPD) to create a 'connected, safe, attractive and convenient network' for cycling and walking (LDD12 2.1.2); provide enhancement of the existing cycling network to create a strategic network of cycle routes (LDD12 2.3.3); with parallel routes normally separated by no more than 250m (LDD12 2.3.3). 2. In line with this, the layout must be amended so that all areas of the development are part of a grid of direct cycling and walking routes. (To give one example, the north-south street at the west side of the development would be an obvious route to Metro station, yet the draft Masterplan shows it being blocked at one point by a proposed building and terminated at the north end before it reaches the Metro station: this should be changed to provide a direct route.) 3. Cycling and walking routes through the site must provide direct, legible, and attractive routes to main destinations. This includes those within the development (Metro station and community hub, school,	Pedestrian and cycle links are key aspect for connectivity and movement in the Masterplan.  The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Updated movement plan in the Masterplan to show all existing and proposed routes and how they integrated into existing connections around the site.  Update cross sections to reflect the emerging Cycle

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>etc.) and likely destinations outside the development e.g. Northumberland Park; Monkseaton Front Street; and local schools. 4. All areas of the site must have direct cycling and walking routes to the proposed community hub, without the need to divert round the perimeter of the site. The community hub should be integrated as far as possible with the Metro station, and include high-quality cycle parking provision. 5. The standard of cycling and walking provision proposed is unacceptable. It must be amended to meet best practice. Specifically: a. Primary Feature Street (sec 8.2.1) “ Provision on all of this route should consist of wide cycle track with adjacent footway (proposed shared use is unacceptable) along both sides of the road with priority over accesses/side roads, in accordance with the emerging Cycling Design Guide. South of the Metro bridge, both west and east sides should have: 0.5m buffer, 3.5m two-way cycle track, 2.0m footway (contrasting surface treatments). North of the Metro bridge, continued provision on both sides would be preferable, but if provision is to be only on one side this should be: verge on western side; eastern side 0.5m buffer, 3.5m two-way cycle track, 2.0m footway. The standard of provision North of the bridge should continue over the Metro bridge and there should be a convenient single-stage crossing south of the Metro bridge. b. Secondary Feature Street (sec 8.2.2) “ Whilst there is a limited need for extra width (0.5m), the cross-section of the cycleway/footway needs to be changed to be in accordance with the emerging Cycling Design Guide. In brief, provision on all of this route should consist of hybrid cycle tracks (2.0m width) adjacent to carriageway on both sides, with priority over accesses/side roads, and separate footway (2.0m width) on both sides. (Contrasting surface treatments should be used for cycle track and footway.) c. Area of Murton Lane to be upgraded (sec 8.2.3) “ Proposed cycling and walking provision is far below the expected standard. Queries: i. Why is carriageway proposed to be 6.7m: could this be reduced to 5.5m? ii. On the western side, why is only a wide verge (2.0m) proposed rather than any cycling or walking provision? iii. Cycling and walking provision is required to the maximum extent possible within the width. Could the width be utilised more efficiently to improve cycling and walking provision? (Separate cycling and walking provision is preferable.) d. Area of Murton Lane to be ‘downgraded’ (sec 8.2.3) “ Please provide details of the cross-section: it is not possible to read the detail on the version reproduced in the document. This</p>		<p>Design Guide.</p> <p>Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.</p>

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>route should be a high quality segregated cycleway and footway. e. Residential Streets (sec 8.2.4) “ Provision should be good quality and “quiet street’ / “home zone’ standard to create a street environment which is conducive to both cycling and walking (not standard carriageway and pavement). The “evenly’ distributed visitor car parking should be carefully located to minimise inconvenience for cycling and walking. Where carriageway material is “broken up’ at key junctions this should provide maximum permeability and visibility for walking and cycling. 6. It would be useful to see detailed cross-sections of the proposed street layouts. 7. It would also be useful to have an overall plan of cycling and walking routes, which showed all proposed routes and whether they were hard-surfaced, lit “all-year’ routes or unsurfaced rights of way (which are likely to serve more as leisure routes). 8. Access point at north end of development: there is a strategic cycling route running west-east along the south side of the A186. The design of the new junction must include high quality crossing provision (e.g. single stage priority crossing) both for cycling/walking on the route alongside the A186, and for the proposed new cycling/walking route to join this route. 9. Access point at south end of development: i. There is a desire line for cycling and walking running west-east along the south side of the A191. The design of the new junction must include high quality crossing provision (e.g. single stage priority crossing) both for cycling/walking on the route alongside the A191, and for the proposed new cycling/walking route to join this route, and to cross the A191 for access to destinations e.g. Cobalt Business Park. ii. Improvements to the existing cycling-walking network alongside the A191 are required to link the development to local destinations and into the wider cycling and walking network. iii. In addition, streets within the development could be extended to have cycling-walking provision joining the A191 (e.g. near the south-west corner of the development), to help create a connected network. 10. Buses “ i. The Metro station and community hub should be designed with through access for buses, to allow commercial services to serve these facilities. ii. It appears that no bus priority measures are proposed: if this is the case, the text should explain how the site design will encourage operators to run commercial bus routes through the site and residents to use them. iii. Bus stops should be designed as “floating’ bus stops, in accordance with the emerging Cycling Design Guide, so as to maintain the continuity of cycling</p>		

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		and walking routes.		
MGDM188	The British Horse Society	New roads need safe Xing points for horse riders where appropriate. New bridges need higher parapets for the safety of horse riders using the roads. The 3 new roads proposed will completely obstruct movement of horse riders boxing them into compartments unless the above points are addressed.	The Masterplan will promote a network provided for equestrian users via the Public Rights of Way. This will be encouraged and promoted to give a comprehensive route network. Route continuity is essential together with clear signing. The introduction of Signalised Equestrian crossings (Pegasus Crossings) will be installed if and where necessary.	Additional text added to the Masterplan Guidance.
MGDM189	Highways England	Murton Masterplan Document Our previous response in relation to Murton stated that: The Murton Delivery Document contains no technical content or appendices seeking to quantify and assess the traffic impacts and associated mitigation. Therefore, there is no transport evidence to comments upon other than that associated with the Plan's evidence base. Given the distance, and the lack of interventions likely to impact directly on the SRN it is not considered that the Strategic Allocation at Murton will have a significant impact to the SRN. As such, going forward it is recommended that Highways England seeks involvement during the Scoping of the assessments. Summary and Recommendations In light of the above review, it is considered that the Masterplan documentation for Killingworth does not sufficiently identify the intervention schemes as proposed in the JPS. As such, it is recommended that Highways England should seek continued involvement in the sites' delivery, specifically in the relation to the scoping of the sites' assessments in accordance with the Plan. In addition, the following should be requested within the Killingworth Masterplan document: · The scheme put forward in relation to the improvements should be further considered in terms of assessment, design suitability and safety. It is recommended that these include: “ The microsimulation assessment	Comments noted and will be considered as the detailed design of Murton Gap.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		of the whole system; “ Consultation with AD, Major Projects and SES; and “ An initial design review and subsequent Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review and a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit. · The earthworks necessary for the anticipated A19 improvements (specifically the widening) should be considered and referenced within the Killington Masterplan Document. · The noise mapping should take the future growth of traffic demand on the A19 and any future merge / diverge and mainline enhancements (including widening) into account. This will ensure that the assessment will accurately reflect the future situation and extent of screening and / or mitigation. · In the design of the underpass, AD should be consulted and the plans should take the A19 widening and future improvements into consideration. Highways England would like to be involved in the scoping of the assessments responding to Murton.		
MGDM2	Resident	The road infrastructure is already at breaking point. Bearing mind since the new housing estates at Earsdon infrastructure has not been increased and yet traffic thoroughfare has almost tripled. At the same time during vacation times all visitors to the coast are diverted at the foxhunters round about along Earsdon road in order to reach the coast and not through the town Centre. This has resulted in myself having to alight my vehicle and press the pedestrian crossing outside the Hunting Lodge pub in order to stop traffic for me leave the court yard I live in; as there has been times waiting has exceeded 15 minutes to join the flow of traffic. Also I am having to turn left out of the courtyard and go via shire moor and back along Rake Lane in essence doubling back on myself in order to reach Whitley Bay town Centre due to the excessive and speeding traffic which now flows along Earsdon Road.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM3	Resident	What guarantees can you make that my small children will be safe from any increased traffic flow? Our road currently is quiet due to it not being a main thoroughfare, but this could change.	New road will be designed to meet highway standards to ensure they are safe and fit for purpose.	
MGDM5	Resident	I would like to view the traffic plan and road improvement scheme, as currently living in Earsdon Village the traffic is a nightmare now. Please visit at any commuter period when the schools are in term and try and exit from Earsdon, this is without you're current proposal for the new housing. New metro stations, currently the metro is	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		failing given a lack of investment, new stations and housing will severely overload an already failing service. The current set of ill planned road improvements will barely keep pace with current traffic , you have already allowed building at several choke points, holystone, station road, Backworth, are you blind to the commuter misery? What was the cost of Sandy lane road scheme?, zero improvement in road congestion and footpaths and cycle paths added that are never used to any level that justified the spending and chaos created during the works. The amount of time taken to complete the Holystone and Sandylane projects was also staggering, does anyone actually monitor Keir's performance?	Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM6	Resident	More houses mean more cars and subsequently more pollution which will ultimately lead to health risks. More roads which are already reaching saturation point with traffic will be needed.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM7	Resident	Roads are blocked all around Shiremoor and not just at rush hour. The quality of life in this area is getting lower with each new estate. Enough is enough.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			for people to use cars.	
MGDM8	Resident	I feel that more housing would be detrimental to the area. It would mean increased traffic on the roads which cannot cope at present. The proposed round about at the entrance to Earsdon will cause havoc. As a resident of Earsdon I have trouble leaving the village at peak times now.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM9	Resident	The original ‘consultation’ document did not make any indication of a potential connection into the existing cul-de-sac of Arcot Drive. This suddenly appeared in the second or third iteration, and was almost presented as a fait accompli. At no point in the "process" before it appeared on your proposed ‘Masterplan’ have the residents on Arcot Drive, St Anne's Court or Arcot Avenue been specifically consulted about a possible cycle/pedestrian path which would turn these streets from a quiet cul-de-sac environment, to a busy thoroughfare. I would like to emphasise again (both my wife and I have mentioned it in our previous formal consultation responses, although it appears to have been ignored) that when Briar Vale was built, the original proposals included a pedestrian connection through to St Anne's Court / Arcot Drive ‘‘ this was subsequently removed from the final development proposals following objections from the local residents and Northumbria Police. I don't see why this proposed cycle path should be any different, when there is already a precedent set by a previous planning application to maintain St Anne's Court / Arcot Drive as a cul-de-sac. There are already alternative pedestrian and cycle access from Murton Village onto one end of Monks Road, which is surely enough to link the new proposed development. If	The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has been removed.	Pedestrian links amended.



## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		another access route is deemed to be needed, then, surely a less disruptive site of the leisure playing field opposite Woodlawn Primary School would be better? This doesn't run right past the drive of residential houses and would be less likely to provide quick escape routes for criminals, which we understand was a concern of the local Police in the past.		
MGDM10	Resident	The elected members in Monkseaton South have betrayed the residents of the ward, and specific comments made on a number of occasions (including every opportunity to formally respond) regarding valid concerns over the proposed cycle access into the existing cul-de-sac of Arcot Drive have been completely ignored and disregarded throughout the 'process'. In fact I now note that the proposal is for a 4m wide segregated pedestrian / cycle route!	The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has been removed.	Pedestrian links amended.
MGDM12	Resident	The existing road system in Shiremoor, Cobalt Business Park, New York Road, Silver Link, Foxhunters, Billy Mill and Norham Road is currently seriously congested due to traffic flows especially at peak times and this existing situation is well known and acknowledged by residents and Councillors alike. Current congestion at the four roundabouts on the A191 from the traffic lights at Park Lane to the roundabout at Foxhunters demonstrates this dilemma for the Council. Even now changes at Billy Mill road junction with the coast road or the new road bridge recently installed at Norham road at Formica have not offered any improvement to the endless problems of traffic congestion. The location of North Tyneside Council offices in Cobalt Business Park is at the very seat of traffic causations generated from this industrial area yet it demonstrates NT Council and staff's inability to resolve the issues of traffic congestion here on its very doorstep! The Masterplan Key to the road layout on the Murton Gap plan designates the strategic link road -in blue, Internal loop road"" in purple, existing roads "" in brown and service roads with no through route serving only the housing frontages and cul-de- sacs "" in a magnolia colour. The final length of Murton Lane from the roundabout on the loop road (in blue) to where it enters New York Village at Westminster Avenue is also designated 'magnolia' colour "" indicating a no through route restricted service road into New York Village for local traffic only. Should this section be designated brown an existing road? If not please explain its designation clearly, its vehicle use and frequency, junction plan details with New York	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>road and amend the Masterplan as its designation and proposed usage is currently unclear? The Murton Gap housing cluster near Monkseaton High School has bus gates restricting vehicle exit to or from the estate by cars to/from Murton Gap to enter via the NT Hospital roundabout restricted to those few proposed houses in its immediate locality. d. I suggest you consult your November 2015 Local Plan map to decide how residents departing Murton Gap northbound for southern destinations e.g. Newcastle, North Shields etc. using the A192 Earsdon road via the extensive Shiremoor bypass to the A19 will be a route of choice? Will these residents instead choose to use the southerly link road to the New York A191 despite having to face traffic lights at Park Lane with resulting major congestion at Norham Road roundabout? Note that 3,300 vehicles exiting Murton Gap each taking 10 seconds to exit or enter Murton Gap estate at peak periods twice a day using these two junctions will take more than 4.5 hours per junction. Destinations to Newcastle, Whitley bay, North Shields, Tyne Tunnel and Silver Lind will put unimaginable pressure on the southern link road with the A191 New York Road, the four A191 roundabouts and traffic lights at Park Lane. Should additional junctions between Park Lane and Foxhunters on the A191 connecting Murton Gap on its southerly aspect be explored? This could prevent stationary traffic congestion at peak periods from a housing estate setting restricted northbound by the metro line and on its east and west boundaries by extensive and existing housing estates? This will result in there being only two strategic link exits for vehicular traffic from the Murton Gap estate - north using the strategic link road to Earsdon A192 and south using the same link road to New York Road the A191 near to Park Lane. Please explain with only two strategic exits from a 3,000 capacity housing estate with 3,300 cars regular usage how residents will be able to move freely to their job of work or other destinations within a realistic timeline am and pm to meet a sensible work ethic or work contract? Will Murton Gap Metro station be built? If so up when will this occur prior to 2032? Explain the car parking arrangements propose here since the metro stations at Shiremoor and West Monkseaton have limited capacity for such a project as Murton Gap? Monkseaton Councillors have ensured that there will be no vehicular access to/from Murton Gap to Seatonville Road or Earsdon Road to disturb their local residents.. Will this N T Council concession to Monkseaton residents be equally applied to New York Village</p>		

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		residents with its junction with Murton Lane and Westminster Avenue? Please explain this partisan concession to Monkseaton residents but not afforded to those living in New York village? Please explain how traffic generation from 3,000 houses in Murton Gap superimposed on the existing local traffic congestion problems will be managed or solved? How will 360 secondary age school children be transported each day from Murton Gap to/from Killingworth High School twice a day? Action should be taken by North Tyneside Council as follows in response to Public demands: Relocate the Murton Lane junction with Westminster Avenue not into New York village but through Murton House farm stackyard to the Rake Lane/New York roundabout, or elsewhere on the A191 now that Murton House has been vacated and planning permission has been granted by NTC for a two home residence. Delete any vehicle access from Murton Gap housing estate into New York village and provide funding for another option avoiding the village.		
MGDM13	Resident	The transport solution you propose is not enough to manage the huge numbers of additional cars which will be on the roads surrounding this development. If you haven't already done so please visit Rake Lane and Cobalt at peak traffic times, the traffic is unmanageable now therefore the additional road traffic due to this huge development will cause traffic gridlock as well as high amounts of air pollution.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM14	Resident	The amenities are already overstretched and the road network totally unsuitable for purpose with the current number of houses. The daily gridlock on the roads will become a total nightmare if these houses are built. It will be intolerable for residents, causing both physical and mental health problems. It will also greatly increase pollution both due to probably 6000 to 10000 extra cars on the roads sitting in even longer traffic jams combined with the loss of vegetation which absorbs some of the pollution.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM16	Resident	I am wanting to know what the plans are for the forge and the rumoured T junction that will created outside of where I live? The forge is nothing but a nuisance to me and I have made numerous complaints to environmental health about the forge and the large tree at the back of the forge - so as you can imagine I am very keen to find out when the forge is possibly going. New York road and Brookland terrace are dangerous and to be fair the sooner work is done to help reduce the danger from this road the better and from what I have heard the plan to build a road through where the forge is and create a junction is welcome news - though would like more detail.	Indicative highway plans for this area were included in the consultation material. It is proposed to demolish the forge in order to facilitate a highway design that is safe and fit for purpose.	
MGDM18	Resident	A cycle path direct from Shiremoor to Monkseaton please.	The detailed layout is required to provide direct, well lit and safe links to the existing pedestrian and cycling network including priority crossings at internal junctions where appropriate.	
MGDM19	Resident	Vehicle access is good but vehicle capacity will still be high.	Comment noted.	
MGDM20	Resident	Only the traffic congestion that may occur on Rake Lane.	Comment noted	
MGDM21	Resident	If the plan were to go ahead then the addition of the Metro station would be welcome. However the 'buffer road' which runs parallel with Earsdon Road and virtually through the Grey Horse pub is not welcomed. A roundabout, and then another roundabout almost immediately afterwards is a recipe for disaster and congestion. Who thought of that?	The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.	
MGDM22	Resident	3. The proposed bypass round between Monkseaton and Shiremoor - who is paying	The road would be funded for	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		for this? How is this envisaged to alleviate the traffic to current residents given, anecdotally, that the roads in Monkseaton are significantly over-used at present. 4. Potential Metro station - where will this be based? Given the well-publicised financial woes of Nexus / Metro how and who will fund this?	by the house builders who bring forward development on the site.  The indicative location of the metro is shown on the Masterplan layout. This would also be funded by the house builders who bring forward development on the site.	
MGDM23	Resident	The entrance to the development from Earsdon is much closer to The Red Lion roundabout than I expected. I can see this causing slow traffic and confusion in the area, especially at peak times. This access road also passes too close to South Wellfield and the back of the Middle & first school. There should be a wider buffer to reduce noise and allow for recreational space behind the estate.	The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.  The road beside Wellfield is a minimum of 30 meters away from any houses.	
MGDM24	Resident	The most important factor is infrastructure the roads already can't cope with the flow of traffic specially since the i competence of road planning at four lane ends. Why don't you build factories for people to work in or encourage employment growth by putting together better public & general transport links. No company will want to move into the area where their staff are always going to be late due to YOUR road planning and they certainly won't want to move into the area where their goods can't be moved out of the area. Just when I thought our council couldn't do anything worse you go and decide to build houses on a piece of land where people will drive to work in Newcastle clogging up the roads even more (because the public transport is shockingly [edited by officers]). Surely anyone who has driven round North Tyneside would know the roads are [edited by officers] there's not enough room in our infrastructure for new homes. It doesn't matter what you do about public transport	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		people will always drive to work, public transport is unreliable, takes forever, and will never work if North Tyneside Council has anything to do with it.		
MGDM25	Resident	Absolutely no vehicular access from or to site from Seatonville Road and Earsdon Road.	No access is proposed from Seatonville Road or Earsdon road.	
MGDM26	Resident	To add to this, the roads around the area are also very, very busy and struggle at times to cope with the volume of traffic. There may be plans to improve the junctions around the development but will be effective? I hope they don't include traffic lights as they usually make matters worse! Lastly, the metro system is incredibly busy at peak times. The addition of thousands of houses and another metro station will further stretch this ageing system. Though they have replaced some older trains, they have not been replaced by longer trains or ones with more capacity or with more frequent trains, so many trains at peak time are very over crowded. One might argue that metro introduced trains that terminate at Monkseaton but this doesn't help people getting on at, or going to, Whitley Bay or Cullercoats. Have Metro been encouraged to terminate at Tynemouth instead as few passengers would take a train from Newcastle via the coast past Tynemouth but many do take it to Tynemouth.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.  A new fleet of metro trains will facilitate faster and more efficient travel on the system.	
MGDM27	Resident	Explain why a major link road, from an imposed Murton Gap Estate of 3,000 houses, should exit into the centre of New York village only to cause stationary vehicle pollution and lock jam for its residents? Traffic flows in New York village is already restricted today by local road curb side parking for the public and those local resident shoppers without the introduction of the Murton Gap brigade entering the village! Using Murton Lane, an otherwise country Lane, at Westminster avenue as a rat run into the centre of New York village from this new Murton Gap estate is totally unacceptable to residents. Would be Murton Gap traffic entering New York at this junction has three choices, turn left and face Murton House roundabout and be held up having to give way to traffic from the right, turn right through New York to Norham road roundabout and be held up like wise. Cross over New York road into	All access points have been assessed as being of a suitable Highways design. Further detail will be available when planning applications are submitted. Other comments noted.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>Westminster Avenue only to be faced with the tee junction at congested Norham Road with further hold up especially due to the traffic lights at Middle Engine Lane. New York will become a parking lot for stationary traffic, restricting free movement by local residents with unacceptable vehicle exhaust emissions and unjustified consequences on health. Consideration should be given to the following. 1. Provide adequate parking in New York village for the visiting public who prefer short time convenience shopping. 2. What is not known is, will access to/from the A191 at Norham road roundabout at the west end of New York village remain open to allow vehicle access to the village and to support the local businesses and the Wheatsheaf Inn, avoiding the use of the village as a through route or be closed off? 3. Murton Gap access into the centre of New York village with Murton Gap traffic crossing New York road into Westminster Avenue should not be allowed. New York village and Westminster Avenue are totally unsuited to through traffic in the knowledge of the future size of the proposed Murton Gap estate. 4. I recommend, relocate the footpath proposed from Murton Gap Loop road to New York road exiting at the Wheatsheaf Inn transferring it to the east Loop road roundabout on Murton Lane to enter New York at Westminster Avenue. 5. The proposed new road from the eastern section of Murton Lane Loop road to where it enters New York road at Westminster Avenue will therefore become a pedestrian footpath and cycleway and the NTC proposed road to enter at Westminster Avenue, will be relocated to enter Norham Road roundabout east or west of the Wheatsheaf Inn. This will allow local access to the Wheatsheaf Inn which has recently been improved by the owners. Traffic congestion in New York village will be avoided. 6. Retain New York Forge and provide convenient off street parking for local traffic at the end of Murton Lane in the centre of the village near the Forge offering the public ease of access to the local shops, chemist and post office. 7. During the Hearings of the Inspector in November 2016 whilst discussing Murton Gap Strategic site Matter 8f, a question was put to him, could Murton House stackyard be used for a roadway instead of Murton Lane? The Inspector was conveniently told NO! The official answer he received from NTC was that a secondary access road through Murton House old stackyard to join Rake Lane at the Murton House roundabout could not be provided due to insufficient width for such a road. There the matter rested. I see from the latest Murton Gap Masterplan</p>		



## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		that Murton Lane will be upgraded to enter New York village at Westminster Avenue having road dimensions of 6.7 metres, plus 2 metres for a footway and 2metres for a verge, total width 10.7 metres. Measurements at Murton House redundant stack yard measured width from the stone stable bock on the west side across the stackyard to the stone wall on the east side of the stackyard is 36 metres, clearly more width that is needed. The facts indicate that the Inspector was mislead. I suggest, this optional route is correctly surveyed and simple plans drawn up to Indicate how this could be carried out, with the option to retain New York Forge, then a decision can be made knowing the true facts in the interests of the residents of New York village. This would offer an alternative solution to the Murton Lane/Westminster Avenue junction and retain the historic New York Forge as Tyne and Wear Historical Environmental Register HER 2149. See addendum at the end of this email. 8. Failing all else, is it beyond the capability of North Tyneside Council and its Officers together with the lucrative Murton Gap Consortia if they can summon the will, and with assistance from the National Lottery Fund and Beamish Museum, to rebuild the existing or just build a replica of the New York Forge on land on Murton Lane as a token of Council respect for those living in New York and Murton villages? Murton Lane, even with New York Forge in position the width available is 16 metres for a new road, still sufficient width for a 10.7 metres access road including verge and footpath, with an additional 2.5 metres each side for curved kerbside entry into the village. Again a junction plan should be prepared to demonstrate this and optional plans be prepared by the Planners and put to a full Council meeting for finalisation. 9. Much more thought needs to be applied to New York village in the knowledge that Monkseaton Action Group and Councillors have conveniently avoided vehicle access into Monkseaton using Seatonville or Earsdon roads from Murton Gap estate, but this privilege is not afforded to New York village. The question to the Council and Planners is 'Why, responding with a full explanation'?		
MGDM28	Resident	The current public foot path from the top of Cauldwell Ave is already busy with bikes etc and will obviously get busier - also not sure if its been made aware but the public foot path on one side stops at Number 56 Cauldwell Ave, and already people walk on the road or on the gardens of 58 and 60 Cauldwell Ave. I know there are plans to put a small fence up to stop people walking on the gardens as the problem will just get	This footpath will be upgraded, as shown on the revised movement plan.	Revise footpath in this area.

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		worse, but people don't have anywhere to go, they need to be advised to cross the road or an alternative solution sought.		
MGDM29	Resident	The southern gateway into the site has again been designed as a larger gyratory, rather than a more pedestrian friendly signalised crossroads. This is a retrograde step and will inevitably result in fewer walking and cycling trips towards Cobalt and Silverlink. Typically Tyne & Wear Metro Stations attract high patronage up to a distance of 400 metres beyond which usage declines dramatically. The Masterplan creates a car dominated environment in the vicinity of the Metro Station where too much land is given over to car parking and highway use. Failure to build sufficient housing within its catchment calls in to question the viability of the station. Street profiles included within the guidance document do not meet the requirements of Policy DM6.1 and LDD12. The council has failed to produce it's own walking and cycling design guidance, in this situation designers should revert to the nationally endorsed standards contained in Highways England's DMRB (IAN195) and the DfT endorsed London Cycle Design Standards. These standards make it clear that separate provision is required for pedestrians and cyclists in an urban context. The guidance document fails to demonstrate high and consistent design standards (DM6.1) in that it repeatedly makes reference to 'shared pedestrian and cycle paths', these have no place on new streets in an urban area. The profile for the secondary bus loop has particular problems in that it is only 15 metres wide, it is not possible to fit footways and cycleways designed to modern standards within a profile of this width. The guidance document implies low standard facilities which will put cyclists into conflict with pedestrians and bus passengers. There has clearly been a complete failure to communicate new standards for walking and cycling to the design team and ensure they are reflected in the document.	The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.
MGDM30	Resident	Very necessary as the current road network cannot cope with existing let alone increased traffic demand.	Comment noted.	
MGDM31	Resident	Why build a connecting road to Earsdon Road, unless the plan is to join Shiremoor and West Monkseaton by building more houses between them? In South Wellfield we already have busy roads to the north and east, building another road will add to the noise and pollution. The proposed road runs very close to South Wellfield school. Earsdon Road has a problem with speeding vehicles, this new road could very well	The road beside Wellfield is a minimum of 30 meters away from any houses.  Plans are in place to renew the	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		have the same issues. What will the proposed speed limit for this bypass be? The Metro system and its 40-year-old trains need upgrading before more stations and passengers can be added.	metro trains.	
MGDM32	Resident	I am very concerned about the effect this development will have on the already very busy roads and metro around this development. The metro has become increasingly busy with the creation of the Northumberland Park metro station. Metro may have some newer trains, but it is still common to have a train go out of service. The new trains don't have a larger capacity, though many stations are long enough to accommodate a third carriage, or run more frequently. Passengers who travel from Whitley Bay, Cullercoats and Tynemouth around the northern part of the Metro system are less well served as metro decided to have trains which terminate at Monkseaton rather than Tynemouth, where it is also possible to turn around. The creation of a new station and the building of thousands of houses will put further pressure on the Metro system. Please try to encourage metro to run more frequent trains at rush hour which terminate at Tynemouth rather than Monkseaton and to consider if three-carriage trains or slightly bigger carriages are possible.	Plans are in place to renew the metro trains which will facilitate a faster and more efficient service.	
MGDM33	Resident	Please revisit both Masterplans and work with the developers to bring the walking and cycling infrastructure up to standard. It is unacceptable in 2017 to be designing streets with shared use footways in new neighbourhoods. The local plan requires good design which can be met by providing separate footways and cycleways and modern designs which eliminate conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers.	The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Update movement plan.  Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.
MGDM34	Resident	I have found that you intend to put a footpath leading into the end of Arcot Drive from the proposed new housing development my partner and i moved into Arcot Drive as the only access was from the main road this gives us peace of mind as we can see all cars and pedestrians coming into the road and its safe a new footpath would make an ideal getaway for anybody wanting to break into any houses on our street day or night when the street lights are turned down to save money please rethink your plans as if this goes ahead i will be moving immediately from the area as will a	The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has been removed.	Pedestrian links amended.

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		lot of my neighbours		
MGDM35	Resident	Please revisit both Masterplans and work with the developers to bring the walking and cycling infrastructure up to standard. It is unacceptable in 2017 to be designing streets with shared use footways in new neighbourhoods. The local plan requires good design which can be met by providing separate footways and cycleways and modern designs which eliminate conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers.	The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Update movement plan.  Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.
MGDM36	Resident	Please revisit both Masterplans and work with the developers to bring the walking and cycling infrastructure up to standard. It is unacceptable in 2017 to be designing streets with shared use footways in new neighbourhoods. The local plan requires good design which can be met by providing separate footways and cycleways and modern designs which eliminate conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers.	The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Update movement plan.  Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.
MGDM37	Resident	1. a) The Road from the Red Lion roundabout at Earsdon along to the roundabout just east of the Foxhunters pub is extremely congested at peak times, particularly at the Foxhunters pub end creating driver severe frustration and seriously high traffic exhaust pollution. These two linked roads, Earsdon Road and Seatonville Road, would benefit greatly from a relief road running from the west end of Cauldwell Avenue, which is already set up as open-ended to facilitate this anticipated route extension, to meet up with the link road running between the A191 New York Road and the A186 Earsdon bypass road. This relief road would greatly reduce the congestion and exhaust fume pollution on the 1.8 mile stretch of Earsdon and Seatonville Roads, particularly at the Foxhunters roundabout end. It has been claimed that the link road within the new housing estates between the A191 New York Road and the A186 Earsdon bypass road will alleviate the afore mentioned traffic congestion but I believe	The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.  Other comments noted.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>this would not be the case. I believe that this link road will only serve the new estates internal traffic movement and reduce the traversing traffic that currently passes along the length of Park Lane in Shiremoor and would have little or no effect on the congestion on Earsdon Road and/or Seatonville Road. b) There needs to be a drive through lane painted onto the roads round the following three roundabouts: i. to allow uninterrupted passage where the Whitley Bay Shields Road meets the eastern Foxhunters roundabout round to its exit onto the start of Rake Lane between the two Foxhunters roundabouts. ii. to allow uninterrupted passage northwards along Earsdon Road at its junction with the west end of Monkseaton Drive. iii. to allow uninterrupted passage of the west side lane traversing from the north end of Earsdon Road at the Red Lion pub roundabout onto the west bound A186 Earsdon bypass road. c) There needs to be an additional westbound lane created on the road between the two roundabouts by the Foxhunters pub and the Pelican/Puffin pedestrian crossing there will need to be relocated away from this section of road. 2. The proposed junction of the new link road onto the A186 Earsdon bypass road is in the wrong place. It would seem sensible to me to move the position of this junction to where the road from Earsdon village joins the Earsdon road bypass thus solving the problem of right turning vehicles exiting Earsdon having to cross the two-lane carriageway. This new position would also reduce the proposed three very closely situated junctions down to two reasonably separated roundabout junctions. Looking back to the fiasco associated with the recent West Park development concerning that estate's traffic lights controlled entrance position where the Council tried to change it (correctly) to be at a roundabout to be situated at the Hesleyside Road junction with Earsdon Road and failed because of 'Third Party Land Issues'. Is this link road junction a repeat of that exercise?? As I understand it the above 'Third Party Land Issues' amounted to just a few square metres of land at the east side of Earsdon Road containing a sewage drainage marshalling point leased to the Northumbria Water Authority but owned by a 'Third Party'. So, why is the land where the Car Boot Sales are held which is immediately opposite the Earsdon Road junction with the A186 Earsdon bypass not available to allow for the proper positioning of the new link road roundabout junction?? Could this be a compulsory purchase situation? Like the West Park development, this situation could have all been sorted out at the pre-Planning</p>		

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>advice stage when the Council Planning Officer should have stated where this important junction needed to be positioned! 3. Bearing in mind all the building development that is expected to be put in place in and around Whitley Bay and the extra traffic movement that will be created it would be prudent to prepare to accommodate this increase instead of closing our eyes and ears and hoping this increase will go away. There needs to be a plan prepared to build another entrance road into Whitley Bay taking a route from the Earsdon Red Lion pub roundabout, along Hartley Lane past the Beehive pub, over the cinder track bridge along to the next left hand bend and would then run across just 1,000 metres of farmland to meet the A193 road at the bend by the north west corner of the Whitley Bay cemetery. Surely the builders of new developments in the area around Whitley Bay should make a significant contribution to the building of this new road in the way of a ‘Community Infrastructure Levy: A levy allowing local authorities to raise funds from owners or developers of land undertaking new building projects in their area’. It has been stated that the building of this road is not possible because the farmland to be crossed is part of the ‘Green Belt’. N.B. It is interesting to note that in the 2012 ‘National Planning Policy Framework’, Annex 2 ‘Glossary of Terms’, giving the definition of the terms used within the document, the term ‘Green Belt’ is not defined or even mentioned. However within the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework document it is featured as follows: 9. Protecting Green Belt land Paragraphs 79 to 92 79. The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. 80. Green Belt serves five purposes: ‘to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas ‘to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another ‘to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment ‘to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns ‘to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.’ none of which would prevent the building of this new entrance road into Whitley Bay. Furthermore, with particular reference to the building of roads, there is further reference in Paragraph 90 of the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework document as follows: 90. Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they</p>		

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These are: '£ mineral extraction '£ engineering operations '£ local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location '£ the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction '£ development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order '£. which does seem to allow such '£local transport infrastructure' to be built. I believe it was in accordance with the above mentioned considerations that the new Earsdon View estate and the Shiremoor bypass road were allowed to be built. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY EMAIL ON 19th NOVEMBER After having been to your '£Local Plan Consultation' at Monkseaton High School on Wednesday 1st November I have now had time to study your proposals in more depth and have come across a rather worrying aspect. I have already submitted my feedback (third item of five) into your system on Thursday 7th November but I have just noticed a further point that has made me most concerned. In my 7th November feedback I concluded that you had missed an opportunity to solve a problem regarding the A186 Earsdon bypass road junction into Earsdon village that could be incorporated into the new roundabout to be built at the north end of the new link road. Now that I have had the chance to do some further investigation I have found that the eastern entry at the new proposed roundabout is just 72 metres from the Earsdon Red Lion roundabout exit, and from its west bound exit another junction just 105 metres away at a right turn across what will be two busy traffic lanes before entering the road leading into Earsdon village. Apart from the fact that the present road layout proposal will create three busy junctions in very close proximity, which in itself is unacceptable, the last of which is a right hand turn and passage across two lanes of traffic into Earsdon village. When the new estates' 3,000 houses are built I believe these roadway junction positions will prove to be totally unacceptable and in the case of the right turn across two busy Earsdon bypass lanes positively dangerous, an accident blackspot waiting to happen. I notice in the '£Murton Gap Masterplan' glossy pamphlet that I picked up at the consultation event, on the page headed '£Road Improvements' and then looking at the map showing the A186 proposed roundabout position I see that it is shown to be almost at the Earsdon village access road. The way it has been drawn is not natural and looks as though it has been</p>		



## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>artificially cranked to the left to give the impression of plenty of road space back to the Red Lion roundabout. On the following page showing the actual junction roundabout drawing the larger scale of it then manages to miss out the very close proximity of the Red Lion roundabout -- How misleading!!! As I recorded in my feedback I can only surmise that the owner of the land opposite the Earsdon village junction is not willing to sell the land to enable the link road junction roundabout to be properly positioned. To that end I would suggest a ‘Compulsory Purchase Order’ be used to obtain just sufficient land to achieve the purpose of moving the proposed roundabout to be at the A186 Earsdon bypass road entry into Earsdon village thus avoiding the traffic turmoil caused by the proximity of the junctions and the danger of vehicles endeavouring to cross two busy lanes of traffic. Please see below (the underlined + bold type is mine) Considering: Although land may be acquired by consent, and conduct which raises another party's reasonable expectations, these private methods of acquiring land are often insufficient for adequate public regulation. Building national infrastructure, such as railways, housing, and sewerage, as well as democratically determined planning rules, either by national or local government, typically requires compulsory purchase, because private owners might not give up land required for public works except at an extortionate price. Highways England - Your property and compulsory purchase (2017) The purpose for which compulsory acquisition is sought Compelling case in the public interest 12. In addition to establishing the purpose for which compulsory acquisition is sought, section 122 requires the Secretary of State to be satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the land to be acquired compulsorily. 13. For this condition to be met, the Secretary of State will need to be persuaded that there is compelling evidence that the public benefits that would be derived from the compulsory acquisition will outweigh the private loss that would be suffered by those whose land is to be acquired. Parliament has always taken the view that land should only be taken compulsorily where there is clear evidence that the public benefit will outweigh the private loss. Balancing public interest against private loss 14. In determining where the balance of public interest lies, the Secretary of State will weigh up the public benefits that a scheme will bring against any private loss to those affected by compulsory acquisition. 15. In practice, there is likely to be some overlap between the</p>		

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		factors that the Secretary of State must have regard to when considering whether to grant development consent, and the factors that must be taken into account when considering whether to authorise any proposed compulsory acquisition of land.		
MGDM38	Resident	The roads surrounding the area you propose to build can't cope with the traffic that is on the roads at the moment so you can imagine how bad it will be if this goes ahead. You cannot get the surrounding roads right now e.g. Cobalt - how much more money are you going to waste and still no improvement (it is a joke). By building roads/dual carriageway (Wellfield) is going to make the surrounding roads even worse. I am all in favour of buses and metros. But bus companies are reducing bus services as it is very expensive to get buses. The Metro services also need to spend money to make people use this service as there is often delays.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM43	Resident	'Please revisit both Masterplans and work with the developers to bring the walking and cycling infrastructure up to standard. It is unacceptable in 2017 to be designing streets with shared use footways in new neighbourhoods. The local plan requires good design which can be met by providing separate footways and cycleways and modern designs which eliminate conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers.' Please encourage friends and colleagues to respond as well, getting housing growth on this scale wrong impacts on all of us.	The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Update movement plan.  Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.
MGDM45	Resident	As someone living on Monkseaton Drive I am very concerned about the plan to drive a road through green belt land that will mean having a second large roundabout directly beside the current one at Earsdon. This is a poor plan that will make journeys from the north part of Whitley even more difficult. At minimum the new roundabout should be located at the currently existing T-junction leading to Earsdon. That would at least eliminate this dangerous junction. As mentioned before there seems to be a real potential at peak times for back up and congestion between the new proposed	The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		roundabout on A186 Earsdon Road and the existing roundabout at the junction of the A186 and Seatonville Road. A factor which will make this congestion likely is that there is currently a pedestrian crossing (controlled by traffic lights) located between the proposed and existing roundabouts. This already causes back up into Seatonville Road when it is in use. If it were to remain in place it seems clear that this area will be subject to congestion that could prove dangerous. However this is an important crossing point for pedestrians and it is difficult to see how the crossing can be moved to avoid this issue. It is another reason why it is not right to locate this new roundabout at its proposed site. One further point. If the link road between Rake Lane and Earsdon Rd goes ahead and the new roundabout has to be built the process must be managed in a way that avoids the horrendous delays that have been caused over the last year by the work at the Holystone roundabout. Over the last year residents of Whitley Bay have been subjected to terrible disruption and delays due to works at Holystone, Billymill, Silverlink, Norham Rd and Sandy Lane. How much more are we expected to take??	Other comments noted.	
MGDM46	Resident	New York Road - new road access. Westminster Ave to be main road splitting Brookland Tce accident waiting to happen.	Comment noted.	
MGDM47	Resident	Why is the link rd from Earsdon dual carriageway and only going to be single this needs to be built 1st and not as the development progresses Transport rep at Shiremoor not listening to local views his views/plans will work	The link road will be designed to meet highway safety requirements and to be fit for purpose.	
MGDM48	Resident	Are there plans to increase cycle secure parking at local transport hubs?	Cycle parking will be part of the potential new metro station.	
MGDM49	Resident	Very slow to bring about changes. Once these have been completed I feel they will still be insufficient. Metro system cannot handle the number of passengers at present, I cannot see how this can be improved.	A new fleet of metro trains will facilitate faster and more efficient travel on the system.	
MGDM53	Resident	As a resident of Wyndham Way I use the 310 bus service into Newcastle. I would like to see what provision is being made for pedestrian access to the Northbound Bus Stop between Cumberland Road and Westminster Avenue? Trying to cross the road at peak times (When the Bridge reopens) is difficult without the addition of traffic	Appropriate pedestrian and cycle crossing points will be included in the detailed design of the site.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		from the planned development. i have frequently missed the bus as I have been unable to cross the road due to the volume of traffic in both directions. This is at the access point from Wyndham Way opposite the Northbound Bus Stop.		
MGDM54	Resident	<p>Living on Abbots Way, it is already very difficult to exit onto Rake Lane at peak times i.e. 8am to 930am - hospital shift change over times, school and work start time and then getting in at night as the traffic backs up Rake Lane. The roundabout which provides access into Abbots Way is dangerous - when there is less traffic on Rake Lane, cars going east drive in excess of the 40mph speed limit when going straight on and choose to forget there is actually a roundabout there - on many occasions I have found myself on the roundabout having turned right out of Abbots Way to find a car almost in the rear end or side of my car. The speed limit on Rake Lane is confusing and should be 30 mph end to end - cars exiting the hospital come racing out thinking they are entering a 40mph stretch of road with complete right of way, choosing not to stop, on turning right off the roundabout to enter Abbots way there are many occasions when I have encountered car or ambulance coming straight out in front of me. The proposal to make the 2nd roundabout on rake Lane bigger for the new development and the new housing development being built on the hospital site it not welcomed or helpful as will increase the volume of traffic travelling westbound up Rake Lane only compounding the difficulties the residents of Abbots Way already face. I will now also mention the increased traffic flow that chooses to use Whitehouse Lane and Devon Road to cut through and avoid the queues down Rake Lane - this further makes it difficult for Abbots Way before any of these new changes are brought in. The recent changes at Billy Mill with the introduction of traffic lights has increased this traffic flow also. All of the proposed changes in the immediate Rake Lane area are not helped by the new Billy Mill lay out. I have particular concerns about the levels of pollution in the air along Rake Lane already with the idling traffic and also on Lynn Road as cars queue right back to the Rake Lane roundabout - none of this is good for the children who are St Thomas More High School and also the elderly residents in the council owned care home and Anchor Housing - again any increase in housing to the extent being proposed in this area with possibly an additional 9000 cars is not good. I have not seen any attempt to record what the current levels of pollution are in Rake Lane/ Lynn Road or any attempt to measure the</p>	<p>Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.</p> <p>Planning applications for the site will need to undertake air quality monitoring and plan for appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.</p>	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		numbers of cars. - these numbers need to be published under freedom of information to the existing residents of this area.		
MGDM55	Resident	Having viewed your plans on the above proposed developments I would implore you to revisit both Masterplans and work with the developers to bring the walking and cycling infrastructure up to standard. Having recently won a national award for the excellent Broadway cycle path I find it incredibly disappointing that North Tyneside council appear to be going backwards and designing streets with shared use footways in new neighbourhoods which are of a far lower standard and well below the bar you have set. The local plan requires good design which can be met by providing separate footways and cycleways and modern designs which eliminate conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers. I look forward to hearing from you on this regard and hope that you are able to revisit these plans sooner rather than later.	The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.
MGDM56	Resident	Please revisit both Masterplans and work with the developers to bring the walking and cycling infrastructure up to standard. It is unacceptable in 2017 to be designing streets with shared use footways in new neighbourhoods. The local plan requires good design which can be met by providing separate footways and cycleways and modern designs which eliminate conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers.	The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Update movement plan.  Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.
MGDM57	Resident	Please revisit both Masterplans and work with the developers to bring the walking and cycling infrastructure up to standard. It is unacceptable in 2017 to be designing streets with shared use footways in new neighbourhoods. The local plan requires good design which can be met by providing separate footways and cycleways and modern designs which eliminate conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers.	The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Update movement plan.  Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.
MGDM58	Resident	As we live in the top part of Otterburn Avenue we are concerned about the impact	Comments noted. Wildlife	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		the road will have re noise and air pollution on our street and the impact it will have on present access to the land which is used by wildlife and has pathways for members of the public up to Murton and Shiremoor. The plan shows intentions for these issues to be addressed and we hope that this turns out to be the case and that any plans are implemented with sensitivity and importance.	corridors and an accessible network of pedestrian and cycle links is a fundamental aspect of the Masterplan.	
MGDM61	Resident	Obvious to any person not a surveyor or engineer that any future infrastructure will not cope with extra housing. Housing today has a minimum of 2 vehicles per household.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM62	Resident	Not sure that the increased traffic brought about by the increased density of housing constitutes "improvement". It is hard enough trying to cross the roads in the wake of the latest building projects as it is.	Comments noted.	
MGDM63	Resident	New York Road past Park Lane and Cobalt is already a bottle neck. Improvements need to be made to small road bridge to make both ways 2 lanes so people in Shiremoor can get back to Shiremoor. Chequered markings on roundabout outside Cobalt would help traffic flow that currently clogs up.	Comments noted.	
MGDM64	Resident	My concern is it will increase the traffic flow on "Park Lane" in "Shiremoor", especially in peak times. At the moment we have great difficulty existing our estate between 08.30-09.15. It is used as rat-run by people who don't live in Shiremoor, they won't use the by-pass. may I suggest you or the Highways dept. think of restricting "Park Lane" to residents and access only. Also may I suggest you install "speed cameras" on Earsdon Road, very few people stick to the speed limit of "40" (there is a lot of money to be made here). Now I have vented my spleen, I do agree we need more housing.	The new bypass road will reduce current traffic levels on Park Lane.  Other comments noted.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		Thank you.		
MGDM66	Resident	I am concerned about the proposal to have another roundabout so close to the Red Lion roundabout on Earsdon Road. The roundabout should be moved further down the dual carriageway. Or could it not be solved. By putting in a slip road to accommodate the new Phase 1 road. When this road is built it will cut across public right of ways. Where it runs alongside the Wellfield Village Green it will be a danger to all the children and dog walker who use this daily. A fence with gates in should be installed so that the right of ways can be maintained. Children from Shiremoor walk across these fields to attend Wellfield schools.	The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.	
MGDM67	Resident	Park Lane in Shiremoor is terrible between the times of 8.15am and 9.40am everyone is cutting through the estate to go to work and you cannot exit your own street during these times it should be for residents only to use., no one seems to use the by pass that was built to stop this happening traffic is all the way back down to Wellfield in the morning . If you are going to be building more homes and the traffic is like this what impact is it going to have on the whole of Shiremoor. The pollution in the mornings is terrible I have school children where it takes ten minutes to cross the road just to get onto the metro. And they are breathing in all of this pollution.	The new bypass road will reduce current traffic levels on Park Lane.  Planning applications for the site will need to undertake air quality monitoring and plan for appropriate mitigation.	
MGDM68	Resident	The widening of the Holystone bypass must be completed before any new housing development is started as traffic congestion in this area is already a huge problem. This would fit in with the development principals of protecting the character and identity of existing communities, namely Holystone Village where the traffic is currently either speeding through or at a standstill at peak times.	This work is planned for 2018 which is likely to be before any development starts on Murton Gap or Killingworth Moor.	
MGDM69	Resident	Planned new roundabout too close to existing housing needs to be placed on exit road out of Earsdon village, opposite field, in order to save also well used pedestrian crossing. Village has two pubs, two churches, two community venues, school children to Wellfield etc... However, pedestrian crossing used only for bus access, you would still have to cross three on fast roads to get to Earsdon village, at roundabout (Red Lion Pub).	The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.	
MGDM70	Resident	Our biggest objection to the current plan is to the straightness of the proposed road line through the (flattened) spoil heaps at the back of Wellfield First and Middle Schools, and the consequent loss of its elevated viewpoint and heritage. Our	The bypass road has been designed in order to meet an acceptable highway standard	



## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>understanding is that this link road will be a wide single carriageway with a 40 mph speed limit. The 3 roundabouts in the Phase 1 development will calm the traffic to the south of the Metro line. However to the north, the ground dips down from the proposed bridge, to the stream by the playing field, and then up to Earsdon. With a straight road (the plan's principal suggestion), there will be a strong temptation by many to exceed the speed limit, some will view to overtake. This is true both for traffic that is Murton or Earsdon bound. We already hear unacceptable noise from accelerating motorbikes along the Earsdon section of the A186. Designing out this obvious temptation would be desirable for obvious reasons! A dotted line in the plans shows an alternative layout with the road diverted to the west around the spoilt heap. This would be some improvement, however we propose that the road be diverted as far westwards as possible, so leaving the spoil heap intact. Ideally it should be diverted, even further over to just into the field. The existence of a footpath to the west of the heap seem to indicate a useful extent of level ground. Our reasons are: - It would introduce a bend into an otherwise Very straight road, so naturally reducing the temptation to exceed the speed limit. - The vertical rise of the spoilt heap would interrupt the line of sight from Murton Station to Earsdon which would be needed for overtaking. - Although we strongly welcome the extensive planting to the east of the road, we feel sure the schools would appreciate the least possible traffic noise when supervising outdoor sports activities with young children on the school fields. The presence of a spoil heap and the maximum possible separation will assist with this noise reduction. - The spoil heap provides a vertical design element which is otherwise mainly lacking from the master plan. - From the top of the spoil heap one can see Harewood Forest and the Cheviots on a clear day, and of course, Northumberlandia. It would be a shame to lose these views if this height was lost. Additionally, it would offer a good viewpoint to look along the length of the Murton wildlife corridor as well as to Earsdon village. Some seating at the top would be advantageous. - It is clear from tracks that the heap has been used for some informal off-road bicycle riding. Possibly some landscaping of the heap could better manage this need, which has been demonstrated, to everyone's mutual advantage. - The former green lane to the north of the heap has a lovely character with its avenue of mature trees. We often detour via this lane for its scenic tranquillity - there's</p>	<p>for safety and function. The alignment of the road may be pushed further west as shown on the Masterplan but this is subject to further work. The road will include landscaping along the full length. To the north of the metro line the landscaping will be more natural in form with native species chosen.</p>	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>nothing quite like it in the immediate vicinity. It would be a great shame if this was lost. See photos. - We welcome the extensive planting along the northern section of the link road. It would be good if this included new hedgerows on the roadsides from the Metro bridge to the new A186 roundabout. - It would be good to retain some link to the neighbourhood's early mining heritage. The heap and concreted shaft covers achieve this. This is the more sanguine given the heap is less than 1 km from the Hartley Pit Memorial in Earsdon church yard. - Though many will not wish to be reminded of it, it is poignant to be reminded that part of this site was used as the Grange Isolation Hospital in the 1950's. - Pedestrian (and equine) controlled traffic lights should be provided to facilitate crossing the link road at the Wellfield spoil heap. The road crosses an existing public footpath and is extensively used. Metro Pedestrian Crossing The graphic on the cover of the Masterplan Drop-in Handout has some thin beige lines around the Murton Station Metro bridge. These imply an "At level pedestrian rail crossing" (a "Stop, Look and Listen") on the eastern side the bridge's ramp. We understand from discussions with drop-in staff these lines are erroneous and only a bridge crossing is proposed. We support this removal of both the existing and (erroneously) proposed "At Level Pedestrian Crossings" as: -Metro trains are an obvious hazard to pedestrians - Irresponsible youths sometime lay piles of stone on the rails hoping to crack them - however we fear derailment. - It will remove the requirement for Metro trains to sound their horns every time they approach the crossing which will make for a quieter neighbourhood. We welcome the relocation of the Metro crossing from NGR NZ 3265 7158 (existing At Level) to NZ 3250 7157 (proposed bridge). We would strongly oppose the siting of the new bridge to exactly the same place as the existing At Level crossing. Murton Metro Station The layout around Murton Metro station implies no platform for the northern track (east bound). Clearly one will need to be provided! We would be against any platform being built on the northern side of the existing track as it would be on green belt land and outside of the development area. Furthermore there would have to be additional bridgework needed to support an independent platform and "ticket office" space - all of which would be on green belt. We suggest that the southern track (west bound) is realigned southwards so as to accommodate a central island platform arrangement-like at Northumberland Park Metro Station. Equine access It should be recognised</p>		

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		that: - Stables have long existed in Murton and at Church Farm, Earsdon. - Development around Murton will decrease the length of available rides. - The presence of horses in the wildlife corridor will add to its rural feel. We suggest that: Equine access is considered for some crossings in the wildlife corridor. - The footpath from the existing Shiremoor allotments by the Grey Horse Public House could be upgraded to being a bridleway so as to link with the rides around Church Farm. - That discussions are held with Northern Powergrid such that permissive equine access is agreed along their private road to Merlin Way, and then along the scrubland along their fence to and along Silver Fox Way and the Silverlink Wagonway/Park so that a loop can be achieved along the Wagonway and Earsdon View.		
MGDM71	Resident	Having looked at the plans. I see no mention of how much extra traffic will be generated by the new houses. I can see plans for new roads etc but nothing how the existing roads will handle the estimated 3000 to 6000 extra cars for the new estates. My main concern being the traffic flow hitting the roundabout at Lynn Road and along Rake lane which at present struggles most of the day to cope with the traffic volume as it is now. Are there plans to upgrade these parts of the network.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM72	Resident	On your many plans and drawings of the proposed link road from Murton Gap to Earsdon, the position seems to be somewhat mobile in the fact that it keeps sliding across the page depending on who is drawing it! On The Murton Gap Draft Masterplan - Road Improvements - Junction 6. Earsdon. The road appears to be on the west side of the field and with the new proposed roundabout in line with Garden Terrace at Earsdon. Then on your Proposed Access Road on your Draft Master Plan shows this road slid over to the EAST side of the field for no apparent reason. This brings the proposed road within 50 metres of most of the edge of Wellfield Estate and within 25 metres of my own home! If the proposed Link Road is vital to this plan and MUST be built, why can it not be built as far away from the houses of Wellfield as	The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.  The road beside Wellfield is a minimum of 30 meters away from any houses.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		the site constraints will allow? The proposed roundabout needs to be positioned in such a way as to incorporate access from Garden Terrace at Earsdon. From the roundabout at the top of Monkseaton Drive heading towards Shiremoor, there already exists a set of traffic lights and pedestrian controlled lights into Westfield Park. Then another set of traffic lights and pedestrian controlled lights into Wellfield Estate. Then a useless and hardly used set of pedestrian controlled lights. Then Earsdon Roundabout, (Which should have a left filter lane on it to improve traffic flow). Then the very well used pedestrian controlled crossing from Earsdon to Wellfield. And after all of this, in your planning wisdom, you are proposing to stop the flow of traffic once again with your new roundabout less than 200 metres from the existing Earsdon Roundabout! Call yourself planners!		
MGDM74	Resident	Seatonville Road is at a standstill in the rush hour, how will diverting more traffic onto it help -traffic goes both ways !	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM75	Resident	Extract 4.8 Heritage and Archaeology Heritage Earsdon and Monkseaton conservation areas lie in close proximity of the site; including a number of listed buildings. Murton farmhouse and the war memorial adjacent to the site are listed. Generally, views from listed buildings are screened from view by existing development. At the centre of the site is Murton Village. Although the village is early in its origins it is now almost all completely modern in fabric. Contradiction Your attempt at trying to conserve Murton village by centering it in the "Wildlife Corridor" Murton Village residents travelling by car will still be caught up in serious traffic congestion by 3,000 - 4,000 or more cars generated by the households of this Murton Gap estate. I don't believe you	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>have grasped the gravity of traffic congestion that will ensue by use of one principal link road with one northern and one southern junction located to the west of the site by this additional layer of traffic congestion superimposed on the existing congested infrastructure. The New York and NT hospital junctions have restricted use, the former due to existing traffic congestion at its junctions and the latter restricted by bus gates. Further consideration needs to be given to additional road junctions around the site to reach the A19, A191, A192, A186, A1058 and B1316 and this is essential. Extract 6.3 Highways and Transport Primary Highways There is a requirement for primary road infrastructure including a strategic north-south highway link and access junctions at the A186 and the A191. This is to relieve congestion in the wider network, providing a ‘preferred route’ for vehicles currently passing through Shiremoor and Monkseaton and is essential if the road network is to accommodate the additional traffic arising through development at Murton. To the north, access is proposed from the A186, south of the village of Earsdon, close to the existing roundabout of the A186 and A192. To the south, access is proposed from the A191, to the west of New York village, avoiding the existing rural lanes to Murton village. The link road will require a bridge to be constructed over the Metro line. Secondary Highways A secondary highway network will allow for the parallel delivery of separate development parcels. This network is proposed to ensure the internal linkages compliment the primary highway link road and access and enables a flexible approach to phasing ‘‘ maximising the number of potential development parcels that can be supported. Two secondary access points are preferred: ‘C A junction that connects with the existing A191 underpass in New York; and, ‘C A junction at the existing roundabout on Rake Lane, opposite the North Tyneside General Hospital. Off-site Works A range of off-site works are required through section 278 agreements with the Council as Highway Authority, or through section 106 contributions. These include the following improvements at the following roads and junctions: ‘C A186 Earsdon Road Roundabout (Not an exit by choice as it leads to no principal destinations unless as a last resort use is made of the lengthy Shiremoor bypass to reach the A19. Use of the junction at New York would be shorter and preferred.) ‘C A191 Roundabout New York Road (This will be the major exit from the Murton Gap Estate being the choice exit to principal destinations. traffic congestion will pursue with vehicles being faced</p>	<p>need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.</p> <p>The metro remains a strong option on Murton Gap for both the Council and Nexus and work is underway and should continue to establish the feasibility of metro provision Murton Gap.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>with traffic lights at Park Lane resulting in congestion at Norham road roundabout. Explain how traffic flows can be improved?) 'c Norham Road / Westminster Avenue (Vehicle entry/exit at this junction will compound the existing congestion on Norham Road and traffic will back up into the village. Explain how this will be overcome?) 'c New York Road (This junction needs a clear explanation of its benefits, what is proposed and how traffic build up at Murton House and Norham Road roundabouts, Westminster Avenue and serious congestion in the village will be avoided) 'c Foxhunters corridor access improvements ( This roundabout is already over its design capacity with Murton Gap estate offering even more congestion) Extract Public Transport Provision Provision will be made for bus access throughout the primary and secondary highway network with the inclusion of bus only access at certain points where access for car users will be limited to manage traffic impacts. The potential of a Metro station at Murton Gap has support in principle from Nexus. The precise costs of delivery of the Metro station are subject to further work, however the location of this is shown on the Masterplan to the north of the site. The Metro should be located to be accessible from the proposed road bridge spanning the Metro and with direct connections to adjacent new development. This will allow all houses to be within a 15 minute walk of the Metro station. One hectare of land will be made available for the Metro station within the Masterplan. Contradiction It is not enough to say bus access will be provided throughout. By 2032, 7,000 residents or more could be living in Murton Gap. The provision of public transport available to Murton Gap residents needs to be explained. The envisaged destinations and regularity of services needs a full explanation. The repeated use of the word "potential" in the context of the Murton Gap Metro station is unacceptable. Planning permission should be held back until such times as a new metro station has been approved by Nexus and others. This Metro Station is the only means by which there could ever be a modal shift from the use of the car, petrol and diesel vehicles, control of air pollution and alleviation of unsustainable traffic congestion. Extract 8.3.3 Buildings at Entrance Points into the Site Buildings at the access points to the site have an important function through creating a welcoming entrance and also proving an indication of the design ideals for the wider site. The key gateways into Murton Gap are from: 'c Metro to the north Contradiction 'c Link road to the south from Shiremoor ( a route of choice with</p>		

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		Murton Gap destinations to Newcastle, North Shields, Whitley Bay, Tynemouth, Wallsend, Tyne Tunnel and the south, Silver Link, Cobalt Business Park.) 'C Link road to the north from Earsdon (Not a route of choice with Murton Gap destinations to Newcastle, North Shields, Whitley Bay, Tynemouth, Wallsend, Tyne Tunnel and the south, Silver Link, Cobalt Business Park.) 'C Murton Lane to the south from New York (Not a route of choice having to negotiate New York village, kerbside parking, local congestion especially due to car journey four times a day to New York primary school and traffic delays due to roundabouts at each end of the village and traffic lights in Norham road. ) 'C Rake Lane to the south (Restricting access/egress at NT Hospital roundabout by Murton Gap residents due to Bus Gates allowing only a few local residents of Murton Gap to use this junction.)		
MGDM76	Resident	The access point from New York Road could have serious implications to the safety and well being of the existing community residents. Cutting the village in half not to mention having to cross this junction on foot. It is now likely that New York will become a rat run and short cut into these proposed developments. The main road through New York is liable to flooding in heavy rainfall. This should be recorded in your files going back several years. This road has at certain times of the day severe restrictions due to heavy vehicles and motor vehicles inappropriately parking whilst using the small businesses on this road. The infrastructure - roads and footpaths are in an atrocious condition. Whilst the local population park their vehicles to try and keep the road passable - the customers to these local shops, lorry's, vans, cars, etc. park where they like.	Comments noted. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the existing highway infrastructure.	
MGDM78	Resident	The new road from New York Road to Earsdon to ease traffic congestion will not be finished until a much later date. Once the houses are built, there will be more congestion on New York Road and surrounding roads. We all know that with all these extra houses, the roads will be unable to cope. It is bad enough now and North Tyneside will become a congested, polluted undesirable place to live.	The road will be complete towards the end of phase 1 (year 5).	
MGDM79	Resident	Existing bus services operate around the perimeter roads to the project, and I have not been able to see if buses will be allowed to have cross links through the site, which I suggest would be of great value to all residents, avoiding too much car use.	Bus routes are planned to run through the site.	
MGDM80	Resident	3,000 houses with 2 cars per household amounts to 6000 more cars. Assuming some	Comment noted.	



## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		of those will wish to travel towards the Coast Road, it will increase the traffic on Westminster Ave. and Norham Rd" which are already busy roads. A191 New York Road The wide grass verge and footpath is used by walkers and horse riders. The new road and roundabout (3) will sever this route and these users should be considered in your plans.		
MGDM82	Resident	<p>I am extremely worried that by the end of phase 3 there will be 3000 new homes which will equate to roughly 4000-6000 extra cars on the roads surrounding the site. Currently the A191 and A192 suffer with extreme congestion at peak times with users unable to go over 15 miles per hour, I fear that many of the occupants of these new homes would use these existing roads rather than take a lengthy diversion along the new proposed link road to use the A186. North Tyneside Council need to perform a proper impact assessment of a substantial increase in the number of vehicles on our roads, for those who already live in the Whitley Bay / Monkseaton area there is bound to be an impact in journey times. The new metro station is only a proposal and is not guaranteed to happen and even so it is only planned for phase 2 or 3 of the project. For those living closer to the A191 (South side of the development) a proposed new metro station would still be some distance from their homes. The council also need to understand that for many use of public transport is not a viable option to commute to work, I would suggest the council check the latest report of the 200 top north east employers by turnover</p> <p><a href="http://www.chroniclelive.co.uk/business/business-news/who-north-easts-largest-200-13912009">http://www.chroniclelive.co.uk/business/business-news/who-north-easts-largest-200-13912009</a> and look at the commuting options to these businesses, for example North Tyneside to Nissan or Arriva is roughly 30 minutes by car but over 90 minutes on public transport. The metro is currently not a reliable method of transportation due to the lack of investment, regularly at peak times metro trains are broken down and withdrawn from service, even when operating to full capacity the journey from Monkseaton into Newcastle via Northumberland Park is uncomfortable due to the large number of passengers using the service. It is also not made clear if buses will enter the new estate or if they will simply continue along existing routes to cover the new homes being built.</p>	<p>Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.</p>	
MGDM84	Resident	There has been no consideration given to the existing highway networks and how they could be improved. Rake Lane at peak times is more often that not at a crawl -	Improvements will be made to the road network around the	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		this can be anytime from 3.30pm week days, mornings can be just as bad. Billy Mill to Tynemouth Pool roundabout - traffic at 1.15pm on Saturday was from Billy Mill all the way back to the swimming pool, further down Beach Road towards Tynemouth and along Preston North Road to Morrisons roundabout! Every morning Foxhunters roundabout back to Cauldwell Lane and often stretches back towards Monkseaton Metro. Going from West Monkseaton towards Earsdon village is very busy and more often than not at a standstill, Earsdon down to Shiremoor is very busy and through Park Estate towards Boundary Milks is more often than not at a standstill back to the Grey Horse pub! The new proposed houses will add to this unbearable congestion, the roads can't cope with the traffic now without additional cars being added which will bring well in excess of 3000 + additional cars! We will be at a standstill and unable to get anywhere! New cycle routes won't get used - just look at what has recently been put in at great expense! The existing highways are already unable to cope with the huge number of cars on these roads, this proposal will just bring more cars and no improvements - the buses travel on the same roads so they will ( and already do) get caught up in existing travel problems.	site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM85	Resident	I would like all new and busy roundabouts to have keep clear areas as today many ignorant drivers follow the traffic flows and block traffic crossing the peak flow. I would like to see a through road from fox hunters to Earsdon without going through estates to enable quick access to A19 and reduce cars on rake lane. Why not the proposed road plan? Weaving through new estates will likely require significant traffic calming for safety so roads do not becoming rat runs which means more cars will choose rake lane on top of existing traffic. Access out of Abbots way onto rake lane is problematic during peak times due to traffic flow if no hospital traffic to break the flow so this is a major concern. The opportunity will only exist once. I'd like to see a safe crossing (traffic light or zebra) implemented on rake lane just north of the hospital and ideally linked to park access. Today crossing at the roundabout or the bus stop is a lottery having to wait some 10 mins for a gap in traffic at peak times. A new park will increase people wishing to cross the road. I'd like to see all new N. Tyneside estates account for 2 parking spaces for each home. Recent housing development sites in N Tyneside do not do this resulting in a lot of 2nd cars on roads risking pedestrians. E.g. Shiremoor Bellway estate. I'd like to ensure at least one of	Comments noted.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		the bus routes to Newcastle e.g. 308 is maintained and not diverted to the new estates, losing the provision. Finally, I'd like to see good lighting and obvious crossing points in the park to maximise safety.		
MGDM86	Resident	The new roads associated with this development are being used as an opportunity to direct traffic away from Earsdon rd and Seatonville rd through the new Murton gap development and onto Norham rd. Norham rd cannot facilitate this volume of traffic from the new development and areas north of Whitley bay. This entire traffic strategy is reliant upon the new Norham rd fly over dealing with all this traffic onto the coast rd. Directing all this traffic onto the new traffic light controlled fly over junction will not work and motorists will turn off along middle engine lane which will clog Addington drive roundabout coming out of Hadrian park which regularly backs up to Canterbury avenue in the mornings. Traffic from cobalt regularly clogs top of Silverlink roundabout. Also Norham rd is a residential street on one side with on street parking and driveways backing onto the road this is not safe for high volumes of traffic. The junctions at new York forge and Westminster ave need to be improved far beyond the current proposals in order to deal with the proposed traffic volumes and flows. If these proposals go ahead it will be impossible to turn right from Westminster avenue onto Norham rd due to traffic volume. No improvements are being proposed for the Shiremoor junction on Norham rd. Westminster ave will have to deal with much greater traffic flow and volumes which will make it more dangerous for children attending new York primary which will be one of the preferred schools by new residents until the development is sufficiently larger enough to support its own proposed school. Also this will make the road more dangerous for the residents of the new Phoenix court development.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM87	Resident	The proposed position of the new link road entrance from the north of the site is ridiculously close to the Earsdon roundabout, and completely misses the opportunity to line it up with the road to/from Earsdon further west along the dual carriageway. The proposed road is also far too close to the western extremities of Wellfield, and will cause significant road noise and poor air quality to both the houses and the schools. The fields to the west of the site should be compulsorily purchased so that the road can run equidistantly between the Shiremoor properties and the Wellfield properties. This will also allow more space to do the very necessary flood mitigation	The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		works that had already been planned for the fields behind Wellfield. Whilst walking routes, and preservation of rights of way are necessary, care needs to be taken to protect community safety, and not create dark and unlit walkways in between woodland and private property boundaries. I'm also not convinced that sufficient attention has been paid to the potential risk of road subsidence from all the old mineshafts in the area. The proposals for a new metro station do appear to make sense however.		
MGDM89	Resident	Firstly I object to the proposed cycle / pedestrian path which has been shown entering Arcot Drive and St Anne's Court cul-de-sac. This will completely change the nature of the existing, long established, cul-de-sac. There are real concerns by residents that an access path of any kind, never mind a 4-metre wide expanse, will in time be turned into a road access, despite assurances to the contrary by developers at present. Road safety on the street of Arcot Drive in particular would also be a concern for me if the pedestrian / cycle path went ahead into this street, as there are poor lines of sight at junctions, particularly coming around the corner from Arcot Avenue into Arcot Drive. This corner is an oblique angle, which does not provide easy access for either cyclist or pedestrians, which is why I feel that no one with knowledge of cycling has considered this proposed location. Surely there is enough argument for relocation of this proposed pedestrian / cycle path to an existing right-of-way, and not along a private track into an existing cul-de-sac (where there is no current right of way) which will be effectively turned into a thoroughfare. Historically we are aware that a proposed access into Arcot Drive / St Anne's Court from the recently developed Briar Vale was blocked through the planning process, and would ask that this existing precedent is taken into account, rather than effectively reversing an existing planning decision.	The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has been removed.	Pedestrian links amended.
MGDM99	Resident	Improvements have already been made to Cobalt and surrounding roads and whilst some congestion has been eliminated the new road plan will not make cars stop going through Shiremoor or along New York Road and the addition of 3,000 homes with potentially more than 1 car per household will not only make the road situation worse but will create noise pollution, air pollution and endanger wildlife. A metro station will not make people leave their car at home as not many people can afford to pay for their cars and pay for a metro ticket! I certainly can't and I've lived near a	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		metro for 16 years and used it about 10 times during that time. Also will people be parking in the streets instead of paying for the car park or if the car park full/has vandalism as currently happens in Northumberland Park and Shiremoor. The road around Shiremoor that was built to alleviate traffic is generally empty and cars still go up Park Lane, how will you make cars use the new layout as your representative said they would have to even though they will still have access? I asked the Highway Network Manager about cars going along New York Road instead of going in the new direction created behind the Cobalt Business Park and he advised me that they would not be allowed to go that way. I asked if there would be no access that way and he said no we will just tell them that they cannot go that way!! He also advised that there would be no more than 1700 cars in the new estate and people would get the metro. I find his statistics that to be quite unrealistic that 3000 houses will only generate 1700. In the street where I live in I don't know any residents that don't have a car and a few have more than one so I think this figure, that the Highway Network Manager assures me is actually a fact, he knows how many cars there will be before the estate is even built, is an underestimate. I asked what if there are more cars and the roads are still congested as they haven't gone the way they are supposed to and he could not give me an answer.	highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM100	Resident	I'm writing to express my concerns about the above Masterplans. I moved to Holywell during the summer and everyday I experience problems with traffic. I work in Newcastle and cycle from Holywell to Shiremoor, West Monkseaton, or Northumberland Park metro station before getting on the metro. I tried to cycle all the way to Newcastle (it takes approximately 50min) and I eventually gave up because it is so unpleasant and extremely unsafe. There are no protected cycleways on main roads and I had to mix with heavy fast traffic while cycling through North Tyneside. The roundabouts and junctions have no provision for cycling which is convenient, direct and safe. Building another 5,000 houses in an already car-dominated congested area without a clear and solid mobility plan which does not solely rely on additional roads is a recipe for disaster. You need to plan for sustainable urban development not for additional motorised traffic. Please build development with quality infrastructure for cycling, walking and public transport. Please revisit both Masterplans and work with the developers to bring the walking and cycling	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		infrastructure up to standard. It is unacceptable in 2017 to be designing streets with shared use footways in new neighbourhoods. The local plan requires good design which can be met by providing separate footways and cycleways and modern designs which eliminate conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers. A complete rethink about transport and mobility is required for the entire borough - Investment should be focused on sustainable transport infrastructure and network that can get people to switch from car to public transport, cycling or multi-modal options. If you continue to build roads for cars, people will continue to drive, congestion will get worse and you will run out of space.	The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	
MGDM101	Resident	The proposed road linking the new development with the dual carriageway between Earsdon and Shiremoor is in my view much too far east of where it needs to be. Surely if millions are to be spent on a new roundabout it should serve a useful purpose to the existing community of Earsdon village by being located at the existing junction. To squander this opportunity to kill two birds with one stone and improve a difficult and dangerous junction would be a tragic waste. Please use this one off chance wisely, and consider the money needed to procure the extra land needed as a very wise investment indeed! Also the new road as indicated on the plan is far too close to the existing houses in Wellfield and also the Schools, as well as the recreation ground which is used by adults and children of all ages. If this road is to become the primary route I imagine it will handle a large volume of traffic, bringing noise and pollution to an otherwise peaceful community. As currently proposed there is virtually no room between the road and the recreation ground for planting of trees to screen the road. The prevailing winds are usually from the south west and will carry fumes and noise straight towards Wellfield. Please keep the road as far west as possible. You'll only get one shot at this, please don't ruin it. A new Metro station would benefit us at Wellfield and be welcome as long as there was a suitable connecting footpath and the existing footpaths were upgraded. A muddy track may be ok for wellies and walking the dog but not going to town in your best shoes.	<p>The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.</p> <p>The road will include native landscape planting to both sides.</p> <p>The road beside Wellfield is a minimum of 30 meters away from any houses.</p>	
MGDM105	Resident	I am pleased to see some proposed, much needed road provision. I would hope that this is in place at the start of the house building. Otherwise we will only swap one long long delay in travel as we have endured at Billy Mill and the Holystone roundabout. My main concern is no.6 where 2 roundabouts are so close together,	Comments noted. The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		along with controlled crossing either side of them, plus an exit and entrance to Earsdon Village. Total shambles.	located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.	
MGDM106	Resident	Despite several conversations with the representatives at the St. Aidan's Church hall public meeting, I still fail to see how any of the proposed changes - all solely aimed in my opinion at handling the 'new' traffic can possibly described as improvements. I wholeheartedly agree with the majority of the comments raised already in that the road network is already unable to cope with the traffic, 6000 additional cars is only going to take the congestion to complete gridlock. If the situation at Billy Mill is a measure of the council's grasp on road-traffic improvements then god help us.	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM107	Resident	Linking cycle ways to other networks and creating separate cycle routes should be a priority not just an afterthought. Don't fit cycle plan around motor roads plan. Think of encouraging/increasing cycling by a separate, connected and safe cycle provision.	The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.
MGDM108	Resident	We, the undersigned, would like to register our objections to the proposals currently indicated on the Murton Gap Draft Masterplan consultation documents, which show a 4m wide surfaced pedestrian I cycle path from the proposed Murton Gap development into the head of the existing Arcot Drive I St Anne's Court cul-de-sac. We object on the following grounds: 'C Arcot Drive I St Anne's Court is an existing cul-de-sac, with no existing form of general access I right of way at the head of the cul-de-sac: to introduce a new pedestrian I cycle access into a street that has been established for over 50 years would significantly change the existing character of what is currently a quiet street; 'C It is considered that the location for this proposed	The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has been removed.	Pedestrian links amended.



## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		pedestrian I cycle path will create a potential health and safety hazard, due to poor visibility at the various existing junctions which would have to be navigated to reach the main thoroughfare of Seatonville Road; and will create a further issue during the already busy school run at star of the sea Primary; 'Ç It is considered that the proposals would have a negative impact for local wildlife, due to the existing wild area at the head of the cul-de-sac being cleared to make way for the proposed access; 'Ç There is a concern that providing a surfaced (impermeable) 4m wide access would provide a more direct route for surface water runoff to reach St Anne's Court I Arcot Drive, rather than the current permeable surface that may impede some of the existing flows, and may therefore increase the risk of localised surface water flooding; and 'Ç It is considered that this location is not appropriate from a cycling perspective, due to the indirect route to negotiate to reach Seatonville Road, rather than a direct straight line. An alternative location which would address this would be to enhance the existing right of way that runs behind the houses on Briar Vale to meet Drumoyne Gardens- the cycle route could then be directed in a straight line down Athol Gardens (which is already an existing thoroughfare) towards Seatonville Road. We therefore ask that the plans are reconsidered, to remove this proposed connection into Arcot Drive I St Anne's Court.		
MGDM109	Resident	Rake lane needs dueling from one wnd to the other already grid locked	Comment noted.	
MGDM111	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Comment noted.	
MGDM112	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Comment noted.	
MGDM113	Resident	I live in Locksley Close in New York and recently attended one of your drop in sessions with my husband at St Aidans Church Hall to clarify some details on the proposed housing at Murton Gap and concerns that we have. We spoke to one of your representatives from the council as our main concern is the "road improvements" and how that will effect New York residents who can currently drive through the village with relative ease. New York Road - New Road into new estate. ----- ----- This is quite a concern for us as the plans currently show priority to traffic from new estate. We have been assured that you have done your predictions and that there will not be hold ups with traffic from New York Road. We feel that you must be predicting more of traffic into and out of the estate to make it a priority to	Improvements will be made to the road network around the site to mitigate the impact from new development. Planning applications will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the highway infrastructure. Planning applications will also need to include a sustainable	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>them and to remove the forge to make this junction. Also I raised the point as to why the school has be placed in the position it is in the new estate? New York Primary is very close to the proposed location so why not further into the new estate? We think that having the school in that location near to the new junction is why the road plans give priory to the new estate, your representative tried to say that the new school would only be for that estate, but we see that as soon as parents in the surrounding area get wind of a new primary school they will be applying from everywhere - thus more traffic! We also sometimes have drivers going through the estate very fast at night so have concerns about an accident at this junction, and how are pedestrians supposed to cross there if walking along Brookland Terrace? Your representative specifically told us to email you with this final point about the new access road which is, the current state of Westminster Ave (which will be taking some of this volume of traffic). This road currently has traffic calming - the only two speed bumps which are decent are the two near the top of the proposed junction and I believe that is because they were rebuilt last year when housing was put on the previously grassed area at the back of housing on Brookland Terrace. We feel that the road will need attention - whilst we were at the session another couple from our area commented that the pedestrian crossing further down that road is broken - I can only comment on this as I haven't seen it myself. Closure of junction to cars (buses only) at roundabout on A191 - top end of New York. -----</p> <p>----- I have to say that this is not clearly identified on the road plans, I highlighted this at your session, as I feel that many residents in New York will not even know this is happening!! I currently have to re-route for my journey to work anyway as Norham Road Bridge is closed but feel that anyone trying to leave New York estate will have to make bigger journeys - most of them probably sitting in traffic at your new roundabouts nearer Shiremoor, in the new estate, or negotiating your "new junction" on Brookland Terrace. What a journey we're going to have to make to just pop the to garage "around the corner" for fuel etc!! I think many residents in New York will feel we have had a raw deal - blocking off one junction at the roundabout to make our journeys longer and making the other access into the estate a junction - models may have been done with regard to the new traffic on the new estate, but what about the current road users and residents in New York?</p>	<p>travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.</p> <p>Other comments raised are noted.</p>	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM114	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM115	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM116	Resident	I believe the road infrastructure already cannot cope with the amount of traffic in the area, and building 3000+ houses will not help that.	Comment noted.	
MGDM117	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM120	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM121	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM122	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM123	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM124	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM126	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM127	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM128	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM129	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM130	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM131	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM132	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM133	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM134	Resident	See enclosed road proposal. We understand a roundabout is being proposed close to the existing Red Lion Roundabout potentially 25 from a hedgerow of Blackberry bushes and back gardens. The most logical place for the new roundabout would be the Earsdon exit, however believe private land ownership has overruled this. We would have thought that a compulsory purchase order could be used. Our other query would be whether it has been considered to take the road to the other side of this land (still green belt) leaving the maximum amount of land on both sides of the road.	The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia.	
MGDM135	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM136	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM138	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM139	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM140	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM141	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM142	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM144	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM145	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM146	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM147	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM148	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM149	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM151	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM152	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM153	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM154	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM155	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM156	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM157	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM158	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM159	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM160	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM161	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM162	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM163	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM164	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM165	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM166	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM167	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM168	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM169	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM170	Resident	2) Further to our concerns over the introduction of the roundabout, we expect North Tyneside Council to advise what mitigation will be put into place to ensure the preservation of green belt in the surrounding area: although advertising that the development area is “brownfield”, the Masterplan literature clearly indicates that the Council intend to run a road directly through greenbelt, and we are not convinced that this is not a strategic move to justify further development on this land in future years. Additionally, when asked how the decision had been informed by advice from a Highways consultant, the Council Officer we spoke to admitted that the view on the proposed road structure was ‘not ideal but will work’. We do not pay Council Tax to support ill-thoughtout traffic infrastructure. 4) The development indicates a location for a “potential new Metro station”: given the level of detail that has been provided for the road improvements that form part of the proposal, a potential station indicates a lack of commitment to a key part of Newcastle-Upon-Tyne’s infrastructure. A new metro station should form a cornerstone to the development and be integrated into the Masterplan from this early stage. A development of this scale should have a carefully considered and thought out approach to an integrated travel hub -this should not been seen as a bolt on to the development.	The access beside Earsdon Village has been assessed as a suitable Highways Solution and is located on area of land that is within the control of the Murton Consortia. The road will include native landscape planting to both sides.  The final decision on the metro lies with Nexus. Discussions are on-going.	
MGDM172	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM173	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM174	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM175	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM176	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM177	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM178	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM179	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM180	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM181	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM182	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM183	Resident	Signatory to petition - please see response MGDM108.	Petition noted.	
MGDM186	Resident	Transport. Have you thought of applying any principles such as actually improving public transport and reducing the use of motor cars ? Seatonville Road is regularly congealed now. Difficult to see how construction traffic and then the vehicles of 3000 families will improve movement in the area. Shouldn't you do a proper transport assessment and then tell us about the results ? Do you actually see a bypass and a metro station as 'development principles'.	Planning applications will need to include a sustainable travel plan to reduce the need for people to use cars.	
MGDM187	Resident	My biggest objection to the current plan is to the straightness of the proposed road line through the (flattened) spoil heaps at the back of Wellfield First and Middle Schools, and the consequent loss of its elevated viewpoint and heritage. My understanding is that this link road will be a wide single carriageway with a 40 mph speed limit. The 3 roundabouts in the Phase 1 development will calm the traffic to the south of the Metro line. However to the north, the ground dips down from the proposed bridge, to the stream by the playing field, and then up to Earsdon. With a straight road (the plan's principal suggestion), there will be a strong temptation by many to exceed the speed limit, some will view to overtaking. This is true both for traffic that is Murton or Earsdon bound. We already hear unacceptable noise from accelerating motorbikes along the Earsdon section of the A186. Designing out this obvious temptation would be desirable for obvious reasons! A dotted line in the plans shows an alternative layout with the road diverted to the west around the spoilt heap. This would be some improvement, however I propose that the road be diverted as far westwards as possible, so leaving the spoil heap intact. Ideally it should be diverted, even further over to just into the field. The existence of a footpath to the west of the heap seem to indicate a useful extent of level ground. My reasons are: - It	<p>The bypass road has been designed in order to meet an acceptable highway standard for safety and function. The alignment of the road may be pushed further west as shown on the Masterplan but this is subject to further work. The road will include landscaping along the full length. To the north of the metro line the landscaping will be more natural in form with native species chosen.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>	

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>would introduce a bend into an otherwise very straight road, so naturally reducing the temptation to exceed the speed limit. - The vertical rise of the spoil heap would interrupt the line of sight from Murton Station to Earsdon which would be needed for overtaking. - Although I strongly welcome the extensive planting to the east of the road, I feel sure the schools would appreciate the least possible traffic noise when supervising outdoor sports activities with young children on the school fields. The presence of a spoil heap and the maximum possible separation will assist with this noise reduction. - The spoil heap provides a vertical design element which is otherwise mainly lacking from the master plan. - From the top of the spoil heap one can see Harewood Forest and the Cheviots on a clear day, and of course, Northumberlandia. It would be a shame to lose these views if this height was lost. Additionally, it would offer a good viewpoint to look along the length of the Murton wildlife corridor as well as to Earsdon village. Some seating at the top would be advantageous. - It is clear from tracks that the heap has been used for some informal off-road bicycle riding. Possibly some landscaping of the heap could better manage this need, which has been demonstrated, to everyone's mutual advantage. - The former green lane to the north of the heap has a lovely character with its avenue of mature trees. I often detour via this lane while walking the dog for its scenic tranquillity - there's nothing quite like it in the immediate vicinity. It would be a great shame if this was lost. See photos. - I welcome the extensive planting along the northern section of the link road. It would be good if this included new hedgerows on the roadsides from the Metro bridge to the new A186 roundabout. - It would be good to retain some link to the neighbourhood's early mining heritage. The heap and concreted shaft covers achieve this. This is the more sanguine given the heap is less than 1 km from the Hartley Pit Memorial in Earsdon church yard. - Though many will not wish to be reminded of it, it is poignant to be reminded that part of this site was used as the Grange Isolation Hospital in the 1950's. - Pedestrian (and equine) controlled traffic lights should be provided to facilitate crossing the link road at the Wellfield spoil heap. The road crosses an existing public footpath and is extensively used. Metro Pedestrian Crossing The graphic on the cover of the Masterplan Drop-in Handout has some thin beige lines around the Murton Station Metro bridge. These imply an "At level pedestrian rail crossing" (a "Stop, Look and Listen") on the eastern</p>		

## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		side the bridge's ramp. I understand from discussions with drop-in staff these lines are erroneous and only a bridge crossing is proposed. I support this removal of both the existing and (erroneously) proposed "At Level Pedestrian Crossings" as: -Metro trains are an obvious hazard to pedestrians - Irresponsible youths sometime lay piles of stone on the rails hoping to crack them - I fear derailment. - It will remove the requirement for Metro trains to sound their horns every time they approach the crossing which will make for a quieter neighbourhood. I welcome the relocation of the Metro crossing from NGR NZ 3265 7158 (existing At Level) to NZ 3250 7157 (proposed bridge). I would strongly oppose the siting of the new bridge to exactly the same place as the existing At Level crossing. Murton Metro Station The layout around Murton Metro station implies no platform for the northern track (east bound). Clearly one will need to be provided! We would be against any platform being built on the northern side of the existing track as it would be on green belt land and outside of the development area. Furthermore there would have to be additional bridgework needed to support an independent platform and "ticket office" space - all of which would be on green belt. I suggest that the southern track (west bound) is realigned southwards so as to accommodate a central island platform arrangement- like at Northumberland Park Metro Station. Equine access It should be recognised that: - Stables have long existed in Murton and at Church Farm, Earsdon. - Development around Murton will decrease the length of available rides. - The presence of horses in the wildlife corridor will add to its rural feel. I suggest that: - Equine access is considered for some crossings in the wildlife corridor. - The footpath from the existing Shiremoor allotments by the Grey Horse Public House could be upgraded to being a bridleway so as to link with the rides around Church Farm. - That discussions are held with Northern Powergrid such that permissive equine access is agreed along their private road to Merlin Way, and then along the scrubland along their fence to and along Silver Fox Way and the Silverlink Wagonway/Park so that a loop can be achieved along the Wagonway and Earsdon View.		
MGDM191	Monkseaton South Ward Councillors	We do not support the proposal to have a public right of way/pedestrian/cycle access from any new housing development, to the junction of St Anne's Court/Arcot Drive. This is not currently a public right of way and should not become one. When Briar Vale Estate was built, a similar proposal came forward which was ultimately refused	The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal	Pedestrian links amended.



## Road Improvements and Transport

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		by the Planning Committee. We believe this sets a precedent and this access should be withdrawn. The cycle and pedestrian access would only take people into another housing estate, rather than providing access to another area.	footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has been removed.	

## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM41	Local Methodist Churches	Vital.		
MGDM81	Murton Action Group	NWA did much to allay fears regarding drainage IF all of the planned works are carried out. However it is not encouraging to see that planned works at South Wellfield and Lesbury Avenue, that the Council are responsible for, are two years behind programme with no indication that these are due to start in the near future. Failure to provide adequate drainage infrastructure on time will jeopardise the existing drainage and this is particularly worrying for Murton Village with its history of flooding at it's lower levels.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM104	St Mary's Ward Councillor	There is also concern about increased risk of flooding. Residents of Wellfield note that the council officers have refused to pave over areas of grass verge which have been turned into mud in narrow streets where motorists park on the verge to avoid blocking the road: the reason for refusing to pave is that the grass verges provide an important soak-away for rainfall, to reduce flooding, yet thousands of houses are proposed just a short distance away.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM103	Northumbrian Water Ltd	We further welcome the consideration of blue-green infrastructure, drainage and flood risk within Chapters 4, 5 and 6 of each document. Consistent references throughout each document to the need for integrated and multifunctional approaches to flood risk and water management across the whole site are strongly supported. We are pleased to note that the importance of surface water separation is recognised within both documents, in terms of capacity for foul flows from the new developments, flood risk and sewage treatment works capacity. We are particularly supportive that the strategic drainage scheme for Murton Gap is recognised within paragraph 6.5, however we would clarify that the culvert referenced adjacent to North Tyneside General Hospital and linking the site with the North Sea is a surface water sewer rather than a culvert. Furthermore, we suggest that the Murton Gap Draft Masterplan should include reference to the Statement of Common Ground "“ Drainage that was prepared to support the Local Plan	The site will be development in accordance with a comprehensive Landscape and Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	Reference in planning application requirements.

## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		examination, as this document includes further detail regarding the strategic drainage principles that will facilitate the delivery of the site. I trust these comments are useful to you, and we look forward to opportunities for future consultation and involvement as they arise. If you have any queries, we will be happy to elaborate on the content of our response.		
MGDM118	NTB Green Party	Flood Prevention and sustainable drainage The plan needs to indicate the location of the SUDS	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM3	Resident	How much in terms of compensation and insurance contributions will we receive if our properties flood due the natural drainage of the fields being removed? Increasing instances of flooding nationally due to global warming make this an inevitability, rather than a possibility.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM18	Resident	Could you dig balancing ponds a bit deeper to provide pond water all year round as wildlife habitats.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	

## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM19	Resident	Flooding is still a concern onto Langley Field.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM20	Resident	Hopefully all has been completed.	Comment noted.	
MGDM21	Resident	Excess of housing will reduce the natural drainage of the area and contribute to potential flooding not reduce it.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM22	Resident	Drainage ponds - it seems that this is something which may be required in any event as the area is prone to flooding with local residents reporting that they dread winter due to the risk of flooding in their homes. Can the Council GUARANTEE no flooding to existing homes if the 3000 houses are built? It seems very unlikely.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM25	Resident	See our letters dated 1st December 2016 and 17th March 2017. Essential that dry storage basin behind Briar Vale Estate with connecting ditch across to Water Board existing culvert under Rake Lane must be constructed as a matter of urgency (already talked about for 3/4 years) and certainly before any development of site commences.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will	

## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM28	Resident	Langley field floods every time with heavy rain, normally takes a few hours to "fill up" after the rain has hit, so that water which currently runs into that field will need to be managed, but I am sure NTC and NWL have a solution to this.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM30	Resident	The recent flood alleviation work has been long overdue and appreciated. Except for reduced security behind our home because the site access has not been restored. A mound and fence prevented unauthorised access prior. Now we have motorbikes, cars and even vans on the field a potential security risk as the street has suffered spates of burglaries in the past. Please block off ASAP!!!	Comment noted.	
MGDM31	Resident	The improvements to drainage are long overdue but where the houses are proposed to be built regularly has standing water in winter. Building more roads and houses will increase the risk of flooding.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM38	Resident	This needs to be high on the agenda as once you start disrupting the surrounding area of trees/landscape and you start building on it there is more chance of flooding. Wellfield has a Stream running through it and it worries me that this could be affected. Also the Council needs to go back to basics and get the drains cleaned out and cleared of leaves and debris so the drains can cope with excess water.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of	

## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			flooding.	
MGDM39	Resident	<p>Section 6.6 on Surface Water Management begins 'A drainage strategy is required for the whole site based on the Murton Gap Broad Area Flood Risk Assessment. ' The reference given in Appendix 1 is to 'Murton Gap Broad Scale Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, Capita, August 2015'. This was submitted on behalf of NTC for the current planning application on dry storage basins now undergoing construction work. These storage basins (undergoing construction) are illustrated in <a href="http://www.rlsnortheast.co.uk/temp4/MurtonGapFloodPrevention.htm">http://www.rlsnortheast.co.uk/temp4/MurtonGapFloodPrevention.htm</a> . The calculations of the capacity of the storage basins are given in an appendix to the referenced document and are for a storm lasting 6 hours with a 100 year return period plus 30 % allowance for climate change. The capacities of the storage basins currently under construction are much smaller than calculated and are believed to be intended to reduce the risk of flooding to the immediate surrounding homes from the greenfield site prior to any housing development. A revised Flood Risk Assessment ## for the whole of the development site is needed that describes in detail the application of SuDs and must take into account risks to Marden Quarry and Briardene that are downstream of the storage basins. The topic was raised in an NTC Environment Committee meeting on 9 July, 2014 and summarised: -"Members sought clarification on the consideration given by the partners # to the impact that remedial schemes could have on properties and land further down the line. An example was given related to the scheme in the Shiremoor area and its possible effect on areas nearer the coast". "Reference was also made to the possibility of diverting more water into the balancing ponds (sic) at Marden Quarry and the impact that this could have on the green space in the area. It was suggested that consideration could be given to undertaking works to provide additional storage capacity at Marden Quarry." # SWDP "' Surface Water and Drainage Partnership Additional surface water flow from the north of the Murton Gap site is envisaged to flow to the North Sea via Briardene; and from the south of Murton Gap site to the North Sea via the balancing pond in Marden Quarry. Both Briardene and Marden Quarry are valued green spaces. The Briardene is a wildlife area maintained by the Friends of Briardene and has obtained the Green Flag 2017/18 award. Marden Quarry is both a park and a nature reserve for which NTC are responsible for its development and maintenance. It has also</p>	Comments noted. The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site.	

## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		obtained a Green Flag award for 2017/18. Both Briardene and Marden Quarry are parts of the green infrastructure network as referred to in the Local Plan and both continue to experience flooding incidents subsequent to measures carried out by Northumbrian Water to alleviate the risk of flooding to areas upstream following the severe flooding that occurred in North Tyneside in June 2012. One obvious factor in the flooding of Briardene is the restriction of flow to the outlet of the stream to be beach due to large boulders and vegetation there. The lake in Marden Quarry is fed via Northumbrian Water's underground pipes from Rake Lane and beyond and is viewed as a 'balancing pond' that is still prone to cause flooding of its perimeter subsequent to the diversion of its drainage to the North Sea. This is largely due to the difficulty of keeping the outlet clear of lake debris; 'blanket weed' that forms in the Spring and Summer, and leaves and twigs fallen from the trees and bushes on the islands and surrounding vegetation during Autumn and Winter. The lake area is 1.26 ha (3.1 ac) and the maximum change in depth from its minimum to overflowing is 18 cm. In practice the minimum rarely occurs so the current balancing bond capacity is much less than 2.3 million L (2300 cu. m). To cope with the additional surface water flow from the SE of the Murton Gap site it is suggested that the lake surround is raised by some 30 cm from the minimum by a wall, backfilled with earth, thus increasing the maximum capacity to over 6 million L (6000 cu. m). (A greater average depth of the lake also has other advantages.) ## The revised Flood Risk Assessment should be the subject of independent review prior to acceptance. Some improvements to the design/operation of the outlet from the Marden Quarry lake are envisaged in the current work associated with the Briar Vale flood prevention scheme but have not yet been described by NTC. In the meantime its current operation is illustrated in a short video sequence - <a href="http://www.rlsnortheast.co.uk/temp4/MardenPark6.htm">http://www.rlsnortheast.co.uk/temp4/MardenPark6.htm</a> .		
MGDM47	Resident	Not enough information drawings not for uneducated minds	Further detail will be available when planning applications are submitted.	
MGDM48	Resident	Need to be convinced this will work.	Comment noted.	
MGDM49	Resident	If we are planning "balancing" ponds is it possible to make these into lakes with the possibility of activities being taken place such as water sports for children, fishing, etc.	The site will be developed in accordance with a	

## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. Further detail will be available when planning applications are submitted	
MGDM54	Resident	Building on this farm land is very concerning - there has been recent cases of severe flooding close to Langley School and this will be made worse if built upon.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM58	Resident	There has also been flooding in our street in recent years after very heavy rainfall and as far as we know, the work which was promised to be undertaken on the land to the South and West of the street has not occurred so hopefully this will be incorporated in to the future work or prior to it and any worries that we and our neighbours have of any reoccurrence will be reduced.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM60	Resident	Very important as I was flooded.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM61	Resident	Fields opposite Park Lane/New York Road flood with a normal rain fall. Flood prevention will not cope.	The site will be developed in accordance with a	



## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM62	Resident	That would be most welcome, but rather a tall order given the area under discussion.	Comment noted.	
MGDM66	Resident	I am concerned that the drainage culvert from Shiremoor to Wellfield will not be able to cope if we have heavy rainfall. The road could be flooded and the houses in Wellfield.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM67	Resident	Our street has flooded a few times due to bad drainage and you built the big drains to hold water which has stopped us from flooding, this will not be the case when you build the new houses as our drainages in Shiremoor will not be able to cope with an extra 3000 homes tapping into the old drains.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM69	Resident	In 55 years in Collingwood Road we have been flooded three times, notably Thunder Thursday the worst, as yet no prevention has been made, although we were promised a storage basin in a naturally occurring flood plain in 2015, 2016, 2017 on fields where now dual carriageway would pass through. What happens then? Our road culvert too small to take additional surface water from past experience.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	

## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM72	Resident	The field at the bottom of the field to the west of Wellfield floods every time we have heavy rain. We have been promised flood works from North Tyneside Council and Capita since 2015 and again in 2016 and again earlier this year. On Capita's own website it states the works will be started late 2017. I queried this with both Capita representatives at the meeting and both denied knowing anything about it, despite me showing them a screen shot of their website I had taken 30 minutes earlier showing the works planned for late 2017. Disgusting!	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM74	Resident	Monkseaton has already flooded once this will not help. You were even told that West Park was at risk of flooding by the water board and you still gave planning permission to build.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM76	Resident	The fields at the rear of my property are liable to flooding - large pools collecting in wet weather.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM77	Resident	The land from Park Lane Shiremoor slopes down to Murton/New York, levels off then continues to slope down to Monkseaton. At several places at the western end large bodies of water collect in inclement weather these areas are highly viable as crops etc. will not grow in waterlogged areas. Therefore drainage could be a severe problem.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	

## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM82	Resident	I don't think there is enough work being done to prevent flooding to existing and new homes, many homes in the area were flooded on Thunder Thursday and there is not enough mitigation provided.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM84	Resident	The proposed development of this open space will put additional strain on areas where there has been flooding, the fields help keep this under control - Shiremoor housing near Boundary Mills has had flooding, Preston Grange has had flooding as well as parts of Monkseaton near this proposed development.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM85	Resident	This is important and welcomed, but I'd like to see these set up with safety measures (i.e. Fencing or planting) to discourage children and dogs using them, the to ensure safety but still sensitively managed to encourage wildlife.	Further detail will be available when planning applications are submitted	
MGDM86	Resident	New driveways need to be broken up with soft landscaping to reduce flash flood water runoff and not be continuous runs of hard landscaping. Proposed suds and lakes must be installed before works commence on the houses.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. The suds will be delivered in accordance with the Infrastructure delivery schedule.	
MGDM87	Resident	Having been flooded in Thunder Thursday, and still not had the promised flood alleviation works at Wellfield, I am extremely concerned to see the road being proposed for the site where our flood protection was meant to be. If the road is built on a bund it will be far too high and overlook our property, and add to the flood risk. Given that this	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site.	

## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		north east corner is at a lower level than the rest of the Murton Gap site, I am not satisfied that sufficient attention has been paid to the flood risk. It was very concerning that officers at the consultation event did not seem to know about or understand the flooding issues and proposed flood alleviation proposals for Wellfield.	No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM88	Resident	e) I have significant concerns that mitigation of surface water flood risk in St Anne's Court / Arcot Drive will be very much dependent upon the adequacy of the drainage infrastructure put in as part of the proposed development, and that clearing of the existing soft landscaped area at the head of Arcot Drive / St Anne's Court to create a surfaced cycle / pedestrian access would create an easy route for excess surface water to flow into St Anne's Court / Arcot Drive;	The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has been removed.	Pedestrian links amended.
MGDM89	Resident	In 2012 (and on a number of other occasions since), Arcot Drive and St Anne's Court have suffered surface water flooding. Runoff from the school field of Monkseaton High and the culvert (picking up the so-called 'Murton Gap' area) have been contributing factors but the undergrowth which runs alongside the culvert and at the bottom of the school field into the head of Arcot Drive and St Anne's Court has been a natural line of defence in stemming the flow of flood water. If a surfaced 4-metre wide pedestrian / cycle path is instituted over this wild growth, I have significant doubts that upstream drainage installations would prevent excess surface water from travelling along this smoothed out path, which naturally falls down into Arcot Drive and St Anne's Court.	The surfaced pedestrian and cycle route has been moved to link onto Athol Avenue where there is already an informal footpath. The proposed link at Arcot Drive has been removed.	Pedestrian links amended.
MGDM99	Resident	As you are more than aware drainage and flooding is already an issue, the field near to my house constantly has a small pond in the winter, what guarantees do we have that flooding will not occur with thousands of houses being added?	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. No planning permission will be given where there is an increase to the risk of flooding.	
MGDM101	Resident	Recent developments in the area such as Earsdon View have had a substantial impact on the quantity of water draining into the existing drainage ditches between Shiremoor and	The site will be developed in accordance with a	

## Flood Prevention and Sustainable Drainage

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		Earsdon. As a victim of flooding in 2012 we've watched works to prevent a repeat go on in other areas, yet the work for a wetland we were promise has not happened. The new road will only add to the problem. how will this be dealt with?	comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. This will include a system of SUDS across the site.	
MGDM107	Resident	This should be more closely linked to the transport, wildlife and flood prevention parts of the plan. Please leave maximum topsoil in place plant or leave up as many trees as possible and tarmac as little as possible.	Comments noted.	
MGDM109	Resident	suds ponds going in behind briar vale what guarantee will the council make that these will be sufficient and not over flow my property, who will deal with on-going maintenance ??	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site. This will include a system of SUDS across the site.	
MGDM116	Resident	The fields help when it comes to a lot of rain & flooding. Residents of Shiremoor already complain about their streets flooding as some of the fields that have been built on, do not absorb the rain water.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site.	
MGDM134	Resident	More houses and concrete creating less drainage and more flooding. Wellfield has never been the same since Northumberland Park was built.	The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site.	

## Schools, Health and Community Facilities

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM81	Murton Action Group	As previously mentioned the Primary School site has been relocated onto an area with heritage significance with no explanation? Have other sites been explored? What was wrong with the original site? All questions that could have been addressed through a little consultation. With regard to other community facilities there are none shown? Amongst other things where are the GP's surgeries, shops, libraries etc. If residents are to be expected to access these in existing communities then many will be faced with a daunting walk.	The school has been moved to a site which is more accessible to residents across the whole site. T	
MGDM96	Sport England	In an ideal world the Primary School, shops / community facilities and secondary school would be co-located. Given that the latter facility already exists, full co-location might be problematic, but we would still wish to see the respective facilities better located relative to one another.	The community facilities are located next to the metro station, while the primary school is located in the middle of the site to make it accessible to all residents.	
MGDM104	St Mary's Ward Councillor	Similarly it is feared that scale of the development will put health and education facilities under pressure. Schooling is a particular concern. Construction of a junior school, rather than first and middle schools, is likely to cause difficulties as this will not fit with the current three tier system. There is also concern that new residents will wish their children to attend high school at Whitley Bay, rather than in the north west of the borough, and this will cause further pressure on school places. Finally, on the site there is no proposal for any community facilities, where residents of all ages could meet and events be held.	Comments noted.	
MGDM118	NTB Green Party	Schools, health and community facilities All these are needed but apart from the school are not indicated on the Masterplan. Some community facilities need to be built in to each block of housing in order to give a focus for the individual housing estates. The proposed facilities by the proposed new metro station are inadequate because (a) the metro station may never be built; (b) there needs to be provision in the short term for the homes to be built in the first 5 years; (c) some areas e.g. that opposite Rake Lane Hospital are a long way from shops now and will be a long way from the new metro as well. Re the School "" presently located in an area which has historic value (a ridge and furrow field) so should be moved elsewhere. Community facility for the whole area "" this could be included in the school, or in a library/council information building or similar, but must be big enough to hold meetings for the whole area since those living in the new homes will	The Council have assessed the requirement for community facilities and have consulted that we do not require new facilities but do require a contribution toward improving and maintaining existing facilities to help deal with the increased demand arising from the	

## Schools, Health and Community Facilities

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		be paying for the upkeep of the green areas and will therefore want a say in them.	development.	
MGDM184	Whitley Bay and District Churches Together	We are surprised there are NO PLANS to designate land or indeed construct a meeting place for the community, which could also be used for Religious Observance. As providers of community centres and church halls around the Murton Gap area we have no wish to see our facilities overwhelmed by new people coming to us. This displacement also displaces other local people who are already using our facilities. Our youth groups, luncheon clubs and toddler groups are very much full to capacity. We would much prefer, to be a partner in providing new opportunities for the new Murton Gap Community in the Murton Gap development. Please provide community facilities which are not classed as retail.	The Council have assessed the requirement for community facilities and have consulted that we do not require new facilities but do require a contribution toward improving and maintaining existing facilities to help deal with the increased demand arising from the development.	
MGDM6	Resident	Where is the infrastructure for schools, doctors surgeries etc?	<p>A primary school is included within the Masterplan. It is located towards the middle of the site to make it accessible to all residents.</p> <p>The development would require a contribution equivalent to 438 m2 of additional floor space due to the increase in patients. However, there is unlikely to be a requirement for a new GP surgery on the site but rather for a contribution to enhance existing facilities elsewhere.</p>	
MGDM7	Resident	What is classed as a play area? A climbing frame?	There are 2 play areas	

## Schools, Health and Community Facilities

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			proposed on the site; one in the south east corner and one in the north west corner.	
MGDM12	Resident	Earlier NTC Local Plans, the 'Policies Map' shows the proposed Murton Gap Primary School north of the Wheatsheaf in New York Village but it is excluded from the above Murton Masterplan. Where will Murton Gap Primary school be built? Please advise.	A primary school is included within the Masterplan. It is located towards the middle of the site. This location has changed from the policies map concept plan to make the school more accessible to all residents.	
MGDM17	Resident	The schools in the area are already oversubscribed and there will be additional strain on GP and medical practices. Will there be provision for new schools and medical facilities in the plan?	<p>A primary school is included within the Masterplan. It is located towards the middle of the site to make it accessible to all residents.</p> <p>The development would require a contribution equivalent to 438 m2 of additional floor space due to the increase in patients. However, there is unlikely to be a requirement for a new GP surgery on the site but rather for a contribution to enhance existing facilities elsewhere.</p>	
MGDM21	Resident	If the plan were to go ahead then these would be needed, but refer to my comment about the school in an earlier point.	A primary school is included within the Masterplan. It is located towards the middle	



## Schools, Health and Community Facilities

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			of the site to make it accessible to all residents.	
MGDM22	Resident	2. Where will the local centre be based and has there been offers made by commercial vendors to invest in this development? If so, who? Is this a case of 'built it and they will come'? There is already a significantly developed retail culture in Whitley Bay and North Shields which I am concerned will be impacted by this suggestion. 8. New primary school and increased health service capacity - again, who is funding this? Has the DoE and DoH agreed to provide extra services? Also, only one primary school for 3000 new homes - what about a new high school? The current provision is overcrowded so how does the Council plan to meet this need or do teenagers have to go further afield?	The local centre is located next to the potential metro station.	
MGDM25	Resident	No comment		
MGDM28	Resident	Seems fine	Comment noted.	
MGDM30	Resident	No comment		
MGDM31	Resident	Need more details on these.	Further detailed plans will come during the planning applications.	
MGDM37	Resident	I believe there will be a requirement for the addition of a Middle School to be sited somewhere within these housing estates.	All education needs have been reviewed by the School Organisation and Investment Team within the Council.	
MGDM38	Resident	It is a 3 tier schooling in North Tyneside. You propose to build a new primary school but that will not be adequate for the proposed housing bearing in mind you propose to build 3/4/5 bedroom houses. Parents prefer the 3 tier schooling for their children that's why our schools are over subscribed. The North Tyneside Hospital is under closure as there are wards being closed and the fact that there is a hospital on our doorstep but we have to drive in the opposite direction to go to the new Cramlington hospital (which is not working so why you think it will cope with an extra 3000 houses).	All education needs have been reviewed by the School Organisation and Investment Team within the Council.	
MGDM47	Resident	What and where only proposals	Comment noted.	

## Schools, Health and Community Facilities

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM48	Resident	What community facilities? I have not seen any allocation of land for a community centre, youth centre or church centre - community seems to be retail which I question is needed - nothing regarding where people meet. If nothing is provided this puts huge pressure on existing community centres - meaning less localised people can access.	The Council have assessed the requirement for community facilities and have consulted that we do not require new facilities but do require a contribution toward improving and maintaining existing facilities to help deal with the increased demand arising from the development.	
MGDM49	Resident	The Scout Association are aware of the lack of meeting places such as the cost of hiring school premises being out of reach of Scout Groups and Churches closing along with their halls. Where can all these children meet.	The Council have assessed the requirement for community facilities and have consulted that we do not require new facilities but do require a contribution toward improving and maintaining existing facilities to help deal with the increased demand arising from the development.	
MGDM54	Resident	An additional 3000 houses will put further strain on an already strained NHS in this area with Cramlington already being unable to cope and the Walk in centre being removed from N. Tyneside General. The NHS is unable to provide sufficient GPs due to funding constraints and a supply demand gap between those retiring/ leaving and the numbers of GPs being trained. The plan includes a new primary school but no proposal for and additional secondary school - how will this additional demand need be met? Other comments to this plan talk about a three tier system in North Tyneside - this is not factually accurate as there is a mixed 2 and 3 tier system and this development straddles	The development would require a contribution equivalent to 438 m2 of additional floor space due to the increase in patients. However, there is unlikely to be a requirement for a new GP surgery on the site but	

## Schools, Health and Community Facilities

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		both systems - how do the council propose to address this disparity.	rather for a contribution to enhance existing facilities elsewhere.	
MGDM66	Resident	The 1st and middle schools in Wellfield are usually full. When is the primary school going to be built to accommodate all the children who will be moving into the houses that are going to be built.	Start of phase 2 – after the completion of 1021 units.	
MGDM67	Resident	We cannot get an appointment now. We have to wait 3 weeks for an appointment, the doctors cannot cope and this will be putting ours surgeries under so much extra pressure. Cramlington Hospital cannot cope with everyone using the hospital you are put out into a corridor with your gown on waiting for treatment as there are no consultations rooms left. Schools are already oversubscribed in the area so when and how many children will the new school hold.	Comments noted.  The new primary school will accommodate up to 420 pupils.	
MGDM69	Resident	Wellfield school full to capacity, new residents, two children, have to travel to old school at Kingston Park, no room at Wellfield, although they live within view of it. All community facilities etc in Earsdon village old pedestrian crossing needed and well used by all.	New primary school is included in the Masterplan.	
MGDM74	Resident	I doubt this will happen -look at all the promises for West Park - nothing there.	Comments noted.	
MGDM75	Resident	Extract 6.4 Local Centre and Community Facilities A local centre is required to support the development and provide the day to day facilities to support the new communities. The local centre will provide a range of shops (e.g. convenience store) as well as opportunities for other neighbourhood and community facilities. The Retail Requirements Assessment provides an outline of the scale of retail provision that may be appropriate at Murton indicating the site could support provision of approximately 1,000 sqm of convenience retail by 2032. Contradiction The Phasing indicates that the Local Centre or Hub will not be complete for use by residents until the end of Phase 3 in 2032. Explain what facilities will be available for 1100 households occupied in phase 1 complete in 2022 and a further 1100 households occupied in phase 2 in 2027 before the Hub is built? The Masterplan should include the following new clauses prepared by Capita in conjunction with NT planning Department. The Masterplan should include the following clauses:- 6.12 New Clause - Predicted residential car ownership and its effects upon existing traffic flow on existing and new infrastructure. Include explanation by traffic modelling. 6.13 New Clause “ Movements of junior and senior children of school age across the site to the local junior	The infrastructure delivery plan in the Masterplan Guidance sets out what infrastructure will be delivered in each phase of development.	

## Schools, Health and Community Facilities

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		school and to senior schools outside the development. Explain how this will be carried out, the numbers of buses required and the additional car journeys predicted. 6.14 New clause - Effects of residents' pet ownership, numbers predicted, their welfare and needs. 6.15 New Clause - Upgrading existing residential areas located alongside the Murton Gap Boundary to the standards set out in the Masterplan and proposed at the new Murton Gap Hub, community facilities and convenience retail.		
MGDM78	Resident	Health facilities are very important, as all doctors surgeries in the area are over subscribed. Good well-staffed health and community centres are vital.	The development would require a contribution equivalent to 438 m2 of additional floor space due to the increase in patients. However, there is unlikely to be a requirement for a new GP surgery on the site but rather for a contribution to enhance existing facilities elsewhere.	
MGDM82	Resident	With regards to health facilities it is expected that existing facilities will be able to accommodate all of the extra residents, assuming an average of 3 persons per dwelling I am finding it difficult to imagine an extra 9000 people accommodated at existing GPs surgeries especially with the increasing age of many residents in north tyneside. I did not see any plans for any leisure facilities such as a new sports centre, football pitches etc, I feel that in a development of this size there should be locally accessible facilities available. Will there be a new police base built? Existing facilities are in Middle Engine Lane and Park View in Whitley Bay. There should be a new station with front office available to the public in this area, even if it is just a Mon-Fri 9-5 front office like in Whitley Bay. I also worry regarding the increased capacity of housing that the police are expected to support, the new developments at Wallsend (station road) will be expected to be supported alongside Murton Gap and Killingworth Moor.	The development would require a contribution equivalent to 438 m2 of additional floor space due to the increase in patients. However, there is unlikely to be a requirement for a new GP surgery on the site but rather for a contribution to enhance existing facilities elsewhere.	
MGDM84	Resident	The facilities proposed bring nothing to existing communities. Nothing for us at all.	The Council have assessed the requirement for community facilities and	

## Schools, Health and Community Facilities

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			have consulted that we do not require new facilities but do require a contribution toward improving and maintaining existing facilities to help deal with the increased demand arising from the development.	
MGDM85	Resident	It would be lovely to see a cafe linked or in close proximity to the children's park in the open space close walking distance to Abbots Way and not hidden in a new estate as this could act as a community hub to multiple estates, similar to that of Northumberland Park. It would be useful to have a doctors in the hospital in addition to a walk in centre for existing and new residents so removing the need to build more buildings and drive. If a new Primary school is being built I would like to ensure this does not effect the provision /funding of Preston Grange which requires more funding or it's accessible in catchment to Abbots Way. A very nice to have would be a restaurant (not pub chain) close to existing residence and in walking distance of other amenities.	The Council have assessed the requirement for community facilities and have consulted that we do not require new facilities but do require a contribution toward improving and maintaining existing facilities to help deal with the increased demand arising from the development.	
MGDM86	Resident	Much higher levels of air and noise pollution for existing residents in new York, Murton and norham rd with no details of acoustic fencing for existing residents suffering higher traffic volumes on rake lane, a191 or norham rd.	Planning applications for the site will need to undertake air quality monitoring and plan for appropriate mitigation.	
MGDM87	Resident	Proper long term school place planning needs to take place and any new schools incorporated into the proposals need to have appropriate drop off and pick up facilities to alleviate traffic congestion and parking issues around the school(s). Similarly any new health and community facilities need a decent amount of parking, with sensible entrances to the car parks, as well as public transport links.	Comments noted.	

## Schools, Health and Community Facilities

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM92	Resident	New York Village is a village where residents often face huge problems, related to drugs and alcohol abuse.	Comments noted.	
MGDM93	Resident	As proposed, this development will eventually consist of 3,300 houses, a primary school with maybe a few shops and some form of medical centre with doubt about the proposed Metro Station. As the current plans show the shops being near to the Metro Line, without a Station, I cannot see many retailers being happy to take on a business there. I can foresee this becoming a problem development. The plans show the houses being placed at each corner of the site supposedly with access to the wider community. As I see it only nearby supermarkets and pubs will benefit. There is no way the residents on this development can possibly know what is happening round about them. Homes are for living in not just somewhere to come back to - to go to bed and get up next morning and go to work. From what I saw of the current arrangements these houses are always going to be changing hands as there is no life there. By its very size there will be young families there. There is provision for play parks but mothers and very young children need something like Mothers and Toddlers groups where small children can learn to socialise with one another and their mothers have someone and somewhere where they can meet and talk to other people. There is no community centre where this can happen and where organisations around the development can display flyers showing the many and varied activities taking place. Also a community centre will provide a place where the residents can organise their own social events such as quiz nights and be somewhere they can hire for family parties etc. We do not yet live in a completely secular society and I am sure the ecumenical clergy from the surrounding churches would welcome the opportunity to have somewhere where they can meet with the residents and a community centre would allow for this. I have not changed my mind about this proposal being a complete over-development of the site. It is just not feasible to think we need x number of houses and then put them all in one place without thinking about the infrastructure to support such a large development. Doctors, Dentists, Teachers where are they all going to come from there are already shortages in the surrounding area, as well as a lifestyle for future residents to enjoy.	As noted the site is proposed to include a local centre, primary school and potential metro station. The site also includes a large area of open space, cycle paths and pedestrian links that will provide opportunities for recreation and leisure as well as sustainable travel. A new equipped play area is required to the south east of the site with a smaller play area also required to the north of the site.	None
MGDM99	Resident	I understand the need for these facilities for 3000 new homes but you won't need to spend the money building them if you don't build the houses. Also by building these more cars will be coming into the area to use the new facilities, more visitors to residents so	Comments noted.	

## Schools, Health and Community Facilities

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		3000 houses could bring a lot more than 1700 cars into the area as your representative states is a factual figure!		
MGDM105	Resident	Schools - do we have adequate senior places in existing schools? At present we operate a 3 tier system. Will additional schools cope with a change to infant/junior- high school if needed. Health - this must be provided with GP services. It also seems ironic that NTGH is being downgraded only to add so many more local inhabitants.	<p>A secondary school will be constructed on the Killingworth Moor site.</p> <p>The development would require a contribution equivalent to 438 m2 of additional floor space due to the increase in patients. However, there is unlikely to be a requirement for a new GP surgery on the site but rather for a contribution to enhance existing facilities elsewhere.</p>	
MGDM106	Resident	Schooling and health care provision seems way short of what would be required - especially given the demographic of the likely home buyers.	<p>Health care provision has been assessed nu the Clinical Commissioning Group.</p> <p>All education needs have been reviewed by the School Organisation and Investment Team within the Council.</p>	
MGDM107	Resident	New high school and middle school provision should be planned ,community centres and religious centres should be planned in. Facilities that are appropriate for a diversity of faiths either separate buildings or multipurpose buildings should be planned in n .Some faiths would require separate buildings . A community centre building which would allow	A secondary school will be constructed on the Killingworth Moor site.	

## Schools, Health and Community Facilities

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		voluntary, social and charitable groups to support the neighbourhood with activities that will enhance community cohesion.	The Council have assessed the requirement for community facilities and have consulted that we do not require new facilities but do require a contribution toward improving and maintaining existing facilities to help deal with the increased demand arising from the development.	
MGDM109	Resident	Much needed	Comment noted.	
MGDM134	Resident	With increased traffic and a new roundabout, has the pedestrian crossing been considered for safety. Wellfield and Earsdon are entwined in several ways “ WI, Church, Allotments, Schools, Play Area, Community Centre to name a few. With two roundabouts on either side of crossing will this be safe?	Comment noted.	



## Open Space and Recreation

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM83	CPRE Northumberland	Again we commend the Council for following these principles.	Comment noted.	
MGDM41	Local Methodist Churches	See general comments above		
MGDM81	Murton Action Group	The Green Infrastructure Plan is perhaps the most important in terms of further community involvement. It is our understanding that the current plan is to be revised and that should afford a perfect opportunity for meaningful engagement. The way in which this area is developed and managed in future will be key to determining an overall feel for the environment in which all residents will live. We look forward to being part of the process. There is a particular question regarding dog walkers in the area (highlighted by our own survey), and the development of a 'Charter' and necessary infrastructure should form part of the overall Plan.	The final Masterplan guidance will include a revised green infrastructure plan. As detailed planning applications come forward for this area they will be subject to further community consultation.	
MGDM96	Sport England	'ç Once again it is noted that the Masterplan provides a good range and mix of facilities and spaces which provide opportunities for activity for all age groups. Unlike the site above there is no provision of a secondary school proposed at Murton, so formal sports facilities are limited to those provided at the proposed Primary School. We note however, the close proximity of Monkseaton High School and Foxhunters Field to the east which both provide formal indoor and outdoor sports facilities which will be available for new residents. We wonder whether thought could be given within the network of open space paths to create a 3-2-1 running route, or even a loop that might be capable of hosting a Park-run event. 'ç The Murton site doesn't contain the range of land-uses that Killingworth does. Given its scale and the way development is arranged around the gap, we are concerned that walking distances might be greater than the nominal threshold of 800m, meaning that there will be a greater propensity for journeys to be undertaken in the car rather than on foot. Consideration must be given as whether it is possible to create footpath / cycleway routes through the open space that are as direct as possible. 'ç Our single strongest criticism of the development comes in respect of the lack of any co-location of facilities. Unlike Killingworth Moor, shops / community facilities are located separately from both the proposed Primary School and the existing secondary school (which is outside of the site). We are concerned (given our	The school is the middle of the site to make it accessible to all residents. The retail area is located next to the potential new metro station at the north of the site. To ensure that all facilities are accessible we have added in new text added to the Masterplan Guidance - All areas of the site must have direct cycling and walking routes to the proposed school and community hub, without the need to divert round the perimeter of the site. Cycling and walking routes should be high quality and designed in line with the North Tyneside	Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.

## Open Space and Recreation

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		previous comments about distances for pedestrians) that residents making a trip to the shop then school are more likely to use the car, rather than walk and this would un-do what in so many other aspects an Active Design compliant proposal.	Cycling Design Guide (to be adopted in 2018).	
MGDM102	Tyne & Wear Local Access Forum	We welcome the green corridors and spaces that are indicated as strong features of these development areas, but we would like to see a more formal commitment from the developer(s) and or the planning authority (via a S106 agreement or conditions).	Planning applications will need to reflect the agreed Masterplan which shows open space and green corridors.	
MGDM118	NTB Green Party	Open space and recreation Since the green space has not yet been planned in detail, a public consultation should take place before further decisions are made so that the people who currently live adjacent to and use the area can put forward their ideas about how and where opportunities for play and recreation, allotments, bio-diversity areas etc should go. There needs to be a plan for dogs indicating where they can be walked on or off the lead, since so many are already walked in the area and because of the SANGS requirements.	Play areas and allotments were identified on the consultation detail. The detailed landscape plan will be subject to further public consultation during the planning application stage. The open space with include a SANG area.	
MGDM188	The British Horse Society	Horseriding is a healthy outdoor recreation; but there is no mention of improvements to be made to facilitate movement or links to connect through the developing area only acknowledgement of the needs of pedestrians and cyclists!	The Masterplan will promote a network provided for equestrian users via the Public Rights of Way. This will be encouraged and promoted to give a comprehensive route network. Route continuity is essential together with clear signing. The introduction of Signalised Equestrian crossings (Pegasus Crossings) will be installed if and where necessary.	Additional text added to the Masterplan Guidance.
MGDM3	Resident	What will be offered in terms of mental health support once the countryside has	50 % of the site will remain as	

## Open Space and Recreation

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		been removed? The government are continually stressing the importance of trying to improve mental and physical health and it has been proven that walking in the countryside, surrounded by nature and fresh air, has a significant positive impact on our mental well-being. Being surrounded by concrete and cars has a detrimental effect - especially due to increased air pollution, as was clearly stated on the news just yesterday. What provisions will be put in place to combat this?	open space which includes a generous parkland with leisure and amenity space.	
MGDM6	Resident	This will be a loss of valuable green space. People walk on this area for health reasons - where will then be able to walk? Also I find it good to show my grandchildren the countryside and introduce them to such pursuits as BlackBerryng. Soon there will be no green spaces in North Tyneside.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland with leisure and amenity space.	
MGDM20	Resident	Good idea.	Comment noted.	
MGDM21	Resident	These are not shown on the plan so how can we possibly comment???	Comment noted.	
MGDM22	Resident	7. Green edges - how big? What are they to include (wildlife areas, walks etc.)? You say 50% to be as open space with allotments and play areas - has this been scoped? Where will they be? Is this for current residents or new residents?	Indicative cross sections of green edges were included in the consultation material which showed approximate widths and design of landscaping and footpaths. Allotment sites are shown on the phasing plan which was part of the consultation material.	Include allotments on main Masterplan.
MGDM23	Resident	I note there is a substantial buffer around Murton, presumably to keep the residents happy. A generous buffer should be apply to the existing houses around the edge of the gap.	The buffer around Murton also functions as a parkland which will include leisure and amenity space, areas for wildlife and sustainable drainage systems. Sensitively designed buffers are includes around the housing to the edges of the site.	

## Open Space and Recreation

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM24	Resident	Is there going to be any actual grass land for children to play or people to walk their dogs, no because the council will keep taking bribes off the construction companies. It's the only thing that makes any sense of this decision.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland with leisure and amenity space.	
MGDM25	Resident	Open spaces essential and buffer zones between development site and Murton and development site and West Monkseaton including Briar Vale, St. Anne's Court and Arcot Drive.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	
MGDM28	Resident	Seems fine	Comment noted.	
MGDM30	Resident	We appreciate the open space behind Monks Road in the proposal so please ensure this is maintained in the detailed plans. Again can the field site access be restricted to dog walkers ASAP to reduce potential burglaries at the back of Monks Road homes.	All areas of open space will be maintained by a management company.	
MGDM31	Resident	"New open space" is a misnomer when the plan is to build thousands of houses on open fields. Open space will be lost. Need more detail on the play areas and parkland.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.  A detailed plan of this area will be progressed at a planning application stage.	
MGDM32	Resident	I'm very disappointed that this development removes some of the few open spaces left in the borough	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing	

## Open Space and Recreation

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			communities.	
MGDM38	Resident	I don't have any objection to new equipped areas for play, new allotment provisions, parkland and recreation across the site but the existing cycle paths don't get used now so why is so much money being spent on this.	New and enhanced pedestrian and cycle links will provide facilities for new and existing residents.	
MGDM39	Resident	Both Marden Quarry and Briardene are open spaces designed for recreation and leisure, part of North Tyneside's green infrastructure provision, and subject to the following policies in the Local Plan - S51.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure, DM5.2 Protection of Green Infrastructure, DM5.3 Green Space Provision and Standards, S5.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity, DM5.5 managing effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity, DM5.12 Development and Flood Risk, DM5.13 Flood Reduction Works, DM5.14 Surface Water Runoff and DM5.15 Sustainable Drainage "" all of which must be accounted for in the planning applications for the Murton Gap site development.	Comments noted.	
MGDM46	Resident	Green edges at New York where?	The edge to New York is different in character to other edges around the Murton site. Elsewhere the settlement edge is more linear and constant and well screened by mature vegetation in the most-part. This allows for a wide pedestrian-permeable buffer with active outward-looking frontage in these areas. In contrast the edge to New York Road is inconsistent in use and distinctly non-linear. The arrangement of existing land uses and varied edge along this stretch along with land ownership constraints does not	New York and Rake Lane buffer Increased.

## Open Space and Recreation

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			<p>lend itself to achieving pedestrian permeability along its length which limits potential for useable buffers to be established. Here the edge has a more intimate character and requires a specific rather than generalised 'distance-based' approach to achieving separation, privacy and visual amenity for existing residents.</p> <p>The buffer to the rear of the existing properties on New York Road and Rake Lane has been increased from 5 metres to 7 metres with the existing vegetation retained and widened to provide additional visual screening to the rear of the existing properties. The buffer would be managed and maintained by the site management company to a specification agreed with the Council. Access to the buffer could be restricted if so desired by the residents. Assuming a back to back relationship between existing and new this would achieve separation of around 28m-31.5m.</p>	

## Open Space and Recreation

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM47	Resident	Gone. Have now	Comment noted.	
MGDM48	Resident	Generally ok - be nice to have a scout campsite.	Comments noted/	
MGDM49	Resident	With the number of families coming into the area children will have no outdoor space.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities	
MGDM54	Resident	I suggest that the proposals included are no more than lip service -as creating these will reduce any return to the Agent/ developers and the Council. This will put increased pressure on sports facilities in the area - do the council propose to build a Waves 2 for this area. I am concerned about the loss of green space and the killing off wild life - foxes and deer reside in these fields and removing their natural habitat will only move them into urban area where people will see them as "vermin". the plan does not quantify anywhere how many new trees will be planted to negate the increased green house gases , carbon monoxide and dioxide being created. This needs to be clarified to the residents	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland.  The Council have assessed the requirement for community facilities and have consulted that we do not require new facilities but do require a contribution toward improving and maintaining existing facilities to help deal with the increased demand arising from the development.	
MGDM60	Resident	I am glad that green belt will still be retained around the village, that was my main concern.	Comments noted.	
MGDM61	Resident	The open space/fields we have now is of the last in the area and should be preserved at all costs. Please listen to the residents for once and not the fat cat building companies.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities	
MGDM62	Resident	Disaffecting at the minute. Adequate and well used at the present. Footpaths and	New and enhanced pedestrian	

## Open Space and Recreation

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		right of way. At the moment the proposed road to Earsdon crosses several paths and rights of way.	and cycle links will provide facilities for new and existing residents.	
MGDM65	Resident	This I think should be made more easily accessible to all local residents.	A vision objective of the Masterplan is accessibility and permeability of the site layout.	
MGDM66	Resident	There are right of ways across this land and some other paths have been in regular use for over 50 years. These should be protected with crossing put in to enable safe crossing of the new road -phase 1.	Comments noted.	
MGDM67	Resident	I don't believe this for one minute about recreation provision North Tyneside Council has fenced off all the lovely fields so no children can play football. There is nowhere for teenagers to go in the area and if bringing in more families what is your plan, as Shiremoor Adventure ground is only open certain times after school and is closed on a Sunday.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland. 2 are included on the Masterplan.	
MGDM68	Resident	Green spaces need to be protected and the principal of enhancing biodiversity is very welcome together with the retention of trees and hedgerows and I hope this is carried out wherever possible.	The landscape framework will aim to retain, protect and enhance existing landscaping and field boundaries.	
MGDM69	Resident	Local footpaths are well used, Earsdon, Wellfield and Shiremoor. Open green belt needs protection for wildlife but is being encroached upon, with increasing measure, were you end up in a concrete jungle, no less. Their habitats narrowed and destroyed.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland. This will provide areas for wildlife, sustainable drainage systems and leisure and recreation.	
MGDM74	Resident	Only proposals - will it happen.	The Masterplan sets the framework which planning applications will need to be in conformity with.	
MGDM75	Resident	Extract 8.1.1 Character Reference 'c Existing site features including trees, hedgerows and ridge and furrows. Contradiction The difference between the wildlife corridor	Wildlife corridors and buffer areas are interlinked and	



## Open Space and Recreation

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		and the buffer zones requires some explanation by the planners. Is for example the Wild Life corridor a permanent feature of Murton Gap whereas the buffer zones are temporary and just parcels of land set aside for future housing development? How will the Council prevent planning applications being made for house building on the buffer zones?	function together. These areas will be protected from future development.	
MGDM76	Resident	Will have to wait and see what is planned actually happens!	Comment noted.	
MGDM77	Resident	This at the moment is irrelevant as the plan has not been approved and can be altered.	Comment noted.	
MGDM78	Resident	We need plenty of space to exercise dogs, as dog walkers are the main users of Murton fields. We need plenty green spaces, parks and woodland and habitat for wildlife.	Comment noted.	
MGDM80	Resident	The existing 3 metre bridleway should have a soft service ie not tarmac. Cyclists travel at speed on a hard surface causing accidents to horse and rider if there is limited space. All 5 metre leisure routes to accommodate horses. Safety features at all points where a road crosses a non-vehicular route.	The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.
MGDM82	Resident	Not enough space for recreation facilities, no football fields or sports centres or swimming pools etc. Residents would therefore most likely drive to existing facilities nearby at Tynemouth Pool or Waves Leisure Centre.	The Council have assessed the requirement for community facilities and have consulted that we do not require new facilities but do require a contribution toward improving and maintaining existing facilities to help deal with the increased demand arising from the development.  Schools will be designed with playing fields which have	Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.

## Open Space and Recreation

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			community use agreements.	
MGDM84	Resident	The fields provide good open space, opportunities for recreation and maintain village identity. The huge number of recently installed cycle paths around Rake Lane, Beach Road etc are a vast waste of money - hardly anyone uses them! This development is not need and it's not wanted - listen to the residents!	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland. The cycling provision required on site will be sought in accordance with the Council's policy in LDD12 Transport and Highways SPD and the emerging Cycle Design Guide.	Additional informational added to the Masterplan Guidance about the design of pedestrian and cycle links.
MGDM85	Resident	We would like to see the children's play park not in the middle of a new estate encouraging people to drive to it, but in the park close to abbots way so it can be accessed by existing residence via a walk as this is lacking currently. As a mother of a young child and dog owner I would like dogs to have separate walk areas and access off leads away from main open areas where children might play. I'd like to see areas well managed, bins (dog bins, recycle and rubbish bins) regularly emptied and extra bins at key entrances. I'd like to see woodland areas to attract birds and enable children to play. Also I'd like to see a management plan as lakes on cobalt park are full of rubbish and glass, easy to access and look attractive to children when iced over and easy to fall in to. Northumberland park works well.	2 are included on the Masterplan; one to the south east and the other to the north west. A management company would maintain and manage all open space.	
MGDM87	Resident	Open space and recreation provision is to be welcomed, so long as it is not positioned too close to housing to present a noise nuisance, and is properly planned from a community safety perspective.	Comment noted.	
MGDM99	Resident	What open space? You've moved it all to Murton and haven't given any consideration to any area in particular Shiremoor. I don't just have to deal with houses behind me but also a new road - open space is not provided behind my home or recreation - why not move the road/houses nearer to Murton to give Shiremoor area a bit of this??	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	
MGDM105	Resident	This must be treated seriously for the health of future generations. Provide safe and	Comment noted.	

## Open Space and Recreation

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		attractive places for all ages.		
MGDM107	Resident	Play areas need to be planned into the housing areas with is open green spaces for team sports.	2 are included on the Masterplan; one to the south east and the other to the north west.	
MGDM109	Resident	Paths need to be multi user paths and take into account cyclist and horse riders as well as pedestrians with adequate crossings	Comment noted.	
MGDM134	Resident	Free roam will be lost between Shiremoor and Wellfield. Dogs will be on leads and children will not be allowed on for side of playing field which will be close the primary road, implying heavy traffic is expected. Ring fenced dog areas is not the same as farmland and open access.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland. This will provide areas for wildlife, sustainable drainage systems and leisure and recreation.	

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM41	Local Methodist Churches	Important to preserve diverse habitats.	Comments noted.	
MGDM59	Northumberland Wildlife Trust	<p>We welcome the recognition in the Masterplan vision that the site will ‘surround a Parkland’; that provides valuable habitat for wildlife’; within a green natural environment’. We also welcome Masterplan objective b: “‘ delivery of a healthy natural environment benefiting communities, wildlife and biodiversity’. In the Masterplan ecology section, we are pleased to see four considerations highlighting the need to improve habitat value, maintain and create suitable wildlife corridors, provide mitigation (including for golden plover) and have consideration for existing trees. The vision and objectives of the scheme are consistent with the strategic planning approach recommended by the Town and Country Planning Association and the Wildlife Trusts in their July 2012 guidance ‘Planning for a healthy environment “‘ good practice guidance for green infrastructure and biodiversity’. These guiding principles of the Masterplan must then be carried robustly through in to the physical design of the Masterplan. The Masterplan maps do highlight much open, green space will be retained in the development scheme, recognising to a degree the value of such green space for community health and wildlife. However, here we have four major concerns: 1. Murton Gap, as is recognised in the Masterplan, is currently a largely agricultural open aspect landscape. Many of the plants and animals using the site are species of such open agricultural landscapes. The Masterplan design will radically impact on the character of this landscape and must ensure that open landscape habitats are created and well managed to ensure both maintenance and enhancement of the landscape for people and nature. The detail of this design is currently not present in the Masterplan and must be more clearly defined. We would urge site planners to respect that Murton sits adjacent to one of the national ‘B-Lines’ designed by Buglife to address enormous losses of flower-rich grasslands and associated wildlife. Using the Murton scheme to assure the creation and future management of a large and coherent ribbon of flower-rich grassland could make a substantial contribution to wildlife conservation in North Tyneside, including maintenance of habitat space for some of the sites existing plants, birds and mammals, while enabling some efficiencies in ongoing management (rather than managing a range of small-scale habitats). Such flower-rich open grasslands can also accommodate SUDS provision and community access. 2. The new roads linking</p>	<p>The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Landscape Strategy for the whole site.</p> <p>The wildlife corridor to the south east corner has been increased in size. A stand-off of approximately 50m has been included from Rake House Farm, with a buffer of around 100m from Rake Lane. The open space wildlife corridor may include a swale as part of the overall drainage strategy, which will also enhance wildlife connectivity.</p>	<p>The wildlife corridor to the south east corner has been increased in size.</p>

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		sections of the development have the potential to fragment and dislocate open spaces for nature. These roads should be recognised in the Masterplan as potential barriers to achieving the site vision and objectives for wildlife and must be designed to ensure permeability for wildlife. 3. Open green space currently appears unequally designed and zoned across the site. This is particularly obvious in the south-east of the site, where green corridors between the development allocations narrow and also potentially occlude nature connections between the main site green corridor and fields around Monkseaton High School. Relying on site landscaping buffer strips (often constructed from non-native shrubs) to maintain connections for open-landscape wildlife will not be effective and is not appropriate. We would recommend and expect a redesign of the south-eastern Masterplan layout to rebalance space for nature and people, giving the site a better chance to achieve the stated vision. 4. There is no recognition in the Masterplan that new housing and other build development can also provide space for nature as well as people by including build design features like swift bricks, house sparrow boxes and boundary fence gaps (for species like hedgehog). Such an approach (as per the Kingsbrook development in Aylesbury highlighted by the media this weekend) would make a strong contribution to overall site distinctiveness and character, making the site richer for both residents and wildlife. Tackling these challenges is essential to ensure that Masterplan respects North Tyneside's commitment to maintaining and enhancing wildlife-rich spaces. We would be happy to discuss these comments and concerns in more detail.		
MGDM81	Murton Action Group	The Green Infrastructure Plan in its current form displayed an encouraging mix of habitat to support wildlife and ecological issues. As previously mentioned, the fact that it is to be revised provides the ideal opportunity to involve the local community in something which will be very important to many of them.	Detailed plans at a planning application stage will be subject to public consultation.	
MGDM83	CPRE Northumberland	We agree, but would like to see assurances that funding will be earmarked for this.	Comments noted.	
MGDM90	Natural England	Natural England is aware that the Murton Gap is allocated in the Local Plan. The main modifications included a requirement for SANGS (Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace) to prevent recreational disturbance impacts on Northumbria Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, in combination with avoidance and mitigation measures outlined in the Local Plan's Habitats Regulations Assessment and within the	SANGS will form part of the Landscape Strategy for the site and the requirement is detailed in the Masterplan Guidance.	

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		Plan under DM5.6 (as included in the Habitats Regulations Assessment addendum for the main modifications). The Masterplan shows that a large area of green space is included, but it is unclear how much of this will serve as green space to mitigate impacts on the SPA. In addition, the Masterplan does not include details of other mitigation measures. For the competent authority to fulfil their duties of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the 'Habitats Regulations') a more detailed assessment will be required of potential impacts on the SPA taking any mitigation into account. It is uncertain if a Habitats Regulations Assessment has been completed for the Masterplan. We would be happy to provide advice on this Habitats Regulations Assessment.		
MGDM104	St Mary's Ward Councillor	The zones of trees and other planting need to be very wide, to prevent an endless built up vista, and also to protect the current residents. Very wide zones would also protect wildlife : part of the site is already supposed to be compensating for loss of wild life habitat elsewhere.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	
MGDM118	NTB Green Party	Wildlife and ecology Provision for hedgehogs and bats needs to be written in to the building requirements. The green areas need to take into consideration in particular the hedgehogs and bats whose habitats will be destroyed in the process of development and care taken in making sure that they will be able to transfer to the new green environment. There is no indication as yet about provision for golden plover "" this needs to be made public. There are currently quite a lot of birds who are rapidly in decline but use the Murton site, e.g. skylark. What provision will be made for these? Bio-diversity areas need to provide ample habitat for the 16 species of butterflies which currently breed on the site (list can be provided).	Habitats will be included within the Parkland areas for Skylark. Golden Plover mitigation is likely to be off site and is still being considered.	
MGDM188	The British Horse Society	Wildlife corridors are important - bridleways benefit wildlife.	Comment noted.	
MGDM3	Resident	The threat to declining species such as hedgehogs and skylarks. Any destruction of fields also destroys the skylarks' habitat, to the point where the population disappear	Habitats will be included within the Parkland areas	

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		completely from the area. This was the case following the development near Backworth. In addition, new builds offer very little access for hedgehogs due to the division of land into multiple small fully fenced box-like gardens. The hedgehog is already an endangered species and this will further accelerate its decline.	for Skylark. Golden Plover mitigation is likely to be off site and is still being considered.	
MGDM18	Resident	I feel 20m buffer zone against my house is too short and would prefer if you could give me a bigger garden so I can garden for wildlife.	Comments noted.	
MGDM20	Resident	Really encouraging that it is just not about houses.	Comments noted.	
MGDM21	Resident	How can you manage a building site to be attractive for wildlife let alone increase valuable plant species in a reduced area? We already read of the declining natural habitat for a variety of species due to the apparent 'progress'. I do not see how this management will be achieved and would like to have an explanation from the Council about this.	50 % of the site will remain as open space. The site will be developed over 15 years with new habitat areas to be created alongside new house building. A management company will be responsible for maintaining all areas of open space.	
MGDM25	Resident	Wildlife corridors essential - with hedgerows not tall trees such as sycamore.	Comments noted.	
MGDM28	Resident	See comments above.		
MGDM30	Resident	Yes please as [comment illegible] is a profusion on the fields at present.	Comments noted.	
MGDM31	Resident	This amount of new houses and roads will be damaging for the environment and wildlife.	Comments noted.	
MGDM32	Resident	I'm very disappointed that this development removes some of the few open spaces left in the borough	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland. This will provide areas for wildlife, sustainable drainage systems and leisure and recreation.	

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM38	Resident	There won't be any wildlife near the carriageway behind Wellfield.	A large wildlife corridor will remain in this area. The link road will include native planting to both sides of it.	
MGDM47	Resident	Destroyed.	Comments noted.	
MGDM48	Resident	Not sure any trees will grow high due to mining land.	Comments noted.	
MGDM49	Resident	Obviously this will effect the wild geese that arrive each year to feed off the fields in Murton. The horse routes will be effected.	The Masterplan will promote a network provided for equestrian users via the Public Rights of Way. This will be encouraged and promoted to give a comprehensive route network. Route continuity is essential together with clear signing. The introduction of Signalised Equestrian crossings (Pegasus Crossings) will be installed if and where necessary.	
MGDM54	Resident	as mentioned I am sceptical that any proposals in the plan to maintain green space will be met. It is not just Green Plover but the foxes deer and the other wildlife that feed off the fields. the children of this area will lose sight of agriculture on their doorstep - no more combine harvesters no more wheat growing in the fields - the children will soon be no better off than those in inner city London	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland. This will provide areas for wildlife, sustainable drainage systems and leisure and recreation.	



## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM60	Resident	Also that this will be protected.	Comment noted.	
MGDM61	Resident	Wildlife on this scale of building will no longer exist.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes habitat areas and wildlife corridors.	
MGDM62	Resident	Rather a lost cause I'm afraid. Bird life and small mammals will be unlikely to survive.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes habitat areas and wildlife corridors.	
MGDM65	Resident	Widening the buffer between existing housing and new developments and reducing the buffer between Murton village and the new development will not, I suggest, have a detrimental effect on wildlife.	The buffer around Murton Village includes new parkland for leisure and amenity use, wildlife and drainage.  Sensitive edges and green buffers area planned to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities.	
MGDM66	Resident	There are many mature trees on the land between Wellfield and Shiremoor and these should be protected. If the phase 1 road goes through what was the 'red hospital ' then the wildlife that inhabit this land will be ousted.	The alignment of the road may be pushed further west as shown on the Masterplan but this is subject to further work. The road will include landscaping along the full length.	
MGDM67	Resident	We have a lot of wildlife in the fields between Shiremoor and Murton, there is a family of foxes that live in the field and during the night they have been seen walking down the	50 % of the site will remain as open space which	

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		street. We have badgers as well as many birds that nest in the trees and hedges. You will destroy the natural area for wildlife to live.	includes habitat areas and wildlife corridors.	
MGDM69	Resident	Environmental pollution to wildlife and the ecology of Wellfield, totally surrounded by dual carriageway will be quite harmful and have an adverse effect on health and wellbeing of residents.	The road will include landscaping along the full length. The road beside Wellfield is a minimum of 30 meters away from any houses.	
MGDM70	Resident	Wildlife Corridor Access a) We understand the link road and Murton Metro station will, of necessity, be constructed in an early phase of the development. However once the bridge and road are built, we would like to see the prompt planting of trees and shrubs as there will be no further development north of the Metro line. It would be all too tempting to leave this important "greening" to the end of the last phase of development! b) Extensive use is made by many walkers of the footpath accessed at the apex of the right angled corner of Otterburn Avenue (by Wellfield First School). Observing those using the existing public footpath from Shiremoor (which is visible from the back of our house), a significant number seem to be school children in addition to the many dog walkers. We suspect many of these would appreciate using the new bridge to walk direct to the apex of Otterburn Avenue, either to go to school, or to complete walking the dog in green space. Consequently some kind of all weather path should be provided from the new Metro crossing to the apex of Otterburn Avenue to avoid muddy clothing and shoes. c) There is a grassed plot of land to the north of No 32 Otterburn Ave which is adjacent to the existing footpath and field. Currently it seems to contain access to various water pipes. Possibly access to this space could be incorporated into the plan? d) With improved access to the apex of Otterburn Avenue and the removal of the "At Level Metro Pedestrian Crossing", the footpath between Nos 44 and 46 Otterburn Ave might be deprecated by not laying an all weather surface from the proposed bridge to paved footpath by the sink of the small stream. The existing fences and walls adjoining the existing footpath are subject to repeated episodes of graffiti. It seems pointless providing two high quality access quality points so close together, so the deprecation of the southern one would reduce the footfall and hence	<p>To the north of the metro line, the bypass road will include native landscape planting to both sides.</p> <p>Informal parkland paths have been included in this section to follow the informal routes currently crossing this land. As there are no legal rights of way these will be made more formal and provide new crossing facilities of the new link road where appropriate.</p> <p>The proposal also includes significant walking and cycling facilities which new and existing residents will benefit from.</p>	Movement plan updated with a connected network of pedestrian and cycle links.

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		minimise the advertising potential for any graffiti tagging. e) Pedestrian access should be possible on along the boundary of the site area from Dickies Holm behind Phase 3a (Westward and Monks Road) and Phase 2c (Briar Vale area) and Monkseaton High School to Rake Lane. We note that the indicative road and housing layout implies a series of small cui-de-sacs which could easily be linked by footpaths like in the nearby North Ridge I The Ridings I Westgate Close estate. This would facilitate more recreational walking loops. (It gets very boring having to retrace one's own steps on a linear walk- a loop is far preferable.)		
MGDM74	Resident	The councils excuse for not maintaining the land.	Comment noted.	
MGDM76	Resident	A lot of wildlife congregates at the ponds and fields at the rear of my property, geese, moorhens, ducks, heron, various small and large birds, newts, foxes and occasionally deer. A large collection of wild flowers and a large populations of rats. No doubt due to the siting of the stables nearby. These resemble a post apocalyptic landscape - cannot see the new neighbours being enamoured with this.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes habitat areas and wildlife corridors.	
MGDM77	Resident	God help them!	Comment noted.	
MGDM78	Resident	Murton has an abundance of wildlife, foxes, hedgehogs, partridge, pheasant, migrating geese, etc. Where will they go when their habitat is destroyed. Does anyone care about them?	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes habitat areas and wildlife corridors.	
MGDM82	Resident	The removal of a large portion of fields like this will have a huge impact to wildlife, I do not believe enough is going to be done to mitigate this.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland. This will provide areas for wildlife and sustainable drainage systems	
MGDM84	Resident	The fields already provide good space for ecology and wildlife - these proposals will grossly reduce it! That's not an improvement at all!	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland. This will provide	

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			areas for specific wildlife and habitat areas.	
MGDM87	Resident	I have particular concerns about the bats that live in the north east area of the site, close to where the new link road is planned (at Wellfield). The consultation document seems to suggest that they just pass through, but we see them nightly and believe that they live within the development site. As protected species more research needs to be done into this before the plans are finalised.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes habitat areas and wildlife corridors.	
MGDM88	Resident	I object to the development as a whole due to the negative impact that this will have on local wildlife / ecology. Species witnessed to be present in the Murton Gap area include foxes, bats, amphibians, and various bird species	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes habitat areas and wildlife corridors.	
MGDM89	Resident	In terms of wildlife, we have observed both in our street and using the existing wild area adjacent to the culvert, foxes, birds of prey, bats and amphibians, and I believe this area to be part of a natural path that these wild animals use. Surfacing and removing the undergrowth, particularly here, would take away this regular route used by this wildlife.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes habitat areas and wildlife corridors.	
MGDM93	Resident	I am concerned at just how wide the buffer zone will be from the gardens backing onto the development, particularly from Westward Green and Monks Road. I am pleased there has been some consideration given to the wildlife who presently enjoy this wide open space but I hope they understand the severe restrictions being made to their environment.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes a generous parkland and green buffers to the edges of the site adjacent to existing communities. These areas will be designed for wildlife as well as people.	
MGDM99	Resident	All of this will be destroyed and the idea of a wildlife corridor is laughable as they will all be run over on your new road infrastructure. No thought for wildlife has been given as that won't make NT Council money.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which includes habitat areas and wildlife corridors.	
MGDM105	Resident	Very sad that so much open land is being used for houses. Imperative that landscaping gets it right. Not just stick in some "wild flower beds" that are ok for 2-3 months.	50 % of the site will remain as open space which	

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
			includes habitat areas and wildlife corridors.	
MGDM107	Resident	Wildlife and ecology are going to be destroyed by the building programme . An active wildlife preservation policy should be planned in with environmental stakeholders. Tree planting needs to be planned , flower planting, ponds protected or rebuilt. There also needs to be no use of weed killers by building contractors	50 % of the site will remain as open space. The site will be developed over 15 years with new habitat areas to be created alongside new house building.	
MGDM109	Resident	The plans do attempt to increase biodiversity with a mixture of habitats but total loss of habitat and the increase in the population, traffic and loss of open space for farmland birds (skylark/curlew etc) can't be mitigated, who will manage the habitats ?	Habitats will be included within the Parkland areas for Skylark. Golden Plover mitigation is likely to be off site and is still being considered.	
MGDM110	Resident	‘Ç Within the draft Masterplan, the Council must guarantee the provision of off-site mitigation for Golden Plover and other farmland birds which was previously promised on the Murton Gap site. In the draft Masterplan this is currently only a ‘~consideration’ but should be a firm commitment to set aside another location of similar size, in perpetuity for the benefit of these birds and other wildlife. This is essential, given it was a planning condition of a previously agreed development; otherwise there will be a net loss to wildlife before any development has occurred on the Murton Gap site. Wording in the draft Masterplan should therefore be amended to reflect this commitment. ‘Ç Within the draft Masterplan the Council must guarantee additional off-site mitigation specifically for Skylark and other farmland birds impacted as a result of the development of Murton Gap. Again this should represent a firm commitment to set aside an additional suitable location offsite, in perpetuity, to mitigate the loss of habitat at Murton Gap. Development on the Murton Gap site will have a detrimental impact on the assemblage of farmland bird species which use the site. This impact will be particularly pronounced for populations of Skylark and Grey Partridge, both of which are Red Listed bird species of conservation concern, UK BAP priority species and Newcastle and North Tyneside BAP priority species (note that a number of the other bird species using the site are Red or Amber Listed also). Both Skylark and Grey Partridge are likely	Habitats will be included within the Parkland areas for Skylark. Golden Plover mitigation is likely to be off site and is still being considered.  Appropriate types of lighting to support pedestrian safety and wildlife has been considered as part of the Masterplan.  Other comments noted.	

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>to suffer a significant loss of habitat on Murton Gap, through house building and also as a result of changes in the ecological character of the undeveloped wildlife corridor. Whilst it is preferential to have mitigation for the loss habitat on-site wherever possible, in the case of the Skylark and probably the Grey Partridge population also, on-site mitigation for loss of habitat will not suffice. Wording in the draft Masterplan should therefore be amended to reflect a firm commitment to off-site mitigation for Skylark, Grey Partridge and other farmland birds making clear that this is in addition to that which has already been committed in respect of the Station Road development. ‘ç Within or outside of the draft Masterplan the Council must insist that the developer use the proposed alternative route for the A186 access road, ensuring that the majority of mature trees beside Wellfield are left standing. This may be a more expensive option for the developer given the location of the mine shaft but the Council has strong grounds to compel the developer to comply. After all, it is the developer that stands to gain the most financially from the development of the site. Failure to protect these trees would be contrary to policy DM5.9 of the North Tyneside Local Plan, which states that “‘where it would not degrade other important habitats the Council will support strategies and proposals that protect and enhance the overall condition and extent of trees, woodland and hedgerows in the Borough.’” This would also be contrary to policy DM5.5 of the North Tyneside Local Plan which states that ‘applications should protect the biodiversity and geodiversity value of land, protected and priority species and minimise fragmentation of habitats and wildlife links. They should also maximise opportunities for creation, restoration, enhancement, management and connection of natural habitat and incorporate beneficial biodiversity and geodiversity conservation features providing net gains to biodiversity’ ‘‘ç The Council must ensure that the Masterplan provides for no lighting or at worst, low level solar-powered lighting along the tracks which bisect the undeveloped wildlife corridor so that wildlife is not negatively impacted. At present the draft Masterplan is not definitive on this. If the heart of the site is to be left undeveloped, to function as a wildlife corridor and to enhance the biodiversity value of the site, then it is important that this area is as suitable as possible. The Masterplan should commit that lighting within this area be no more intrusive than the low level solar-powered lighting mentioned. If at all possible lighting should not be used at all along some or all of the relevant paths or tracks. This</p>		

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		would be no different to the current situation on the track which connects West Monkseaton and Murton at present. Wording in the draft Masterplan should be amended to reflect this. 'Ç The Council must ensure that the Masterplan includes specific requirements for buildings across the development to include wildlife friendly features such as Swift bricks, nest boxes, bat boxes etc. where appropriate. This would go a long way to enhancing the biodiversity value of the site but is easy for developers to neglect without a firm requirement to do so. Dependent on the density and orientation of housing, it would not be appropriate to include such features on every building. However, the Masterplan should contain the requirement that a suitable proportion of buildings across the development site include these features. Wording in the Masterplan should be included to reflect these requirements, within the relevant sections of the 'Design Code' chapter of the plan.		
MGDM116	Resident	We are losing natural countryside and greenland in the area, and with many areas already being built on we believe this area will be destroyed, losing vital homeland for animals and views.	Comments noted.	
MGDM125	Resident	I would be grateful if you would take in to consideration the following concerns that I have regarding this development. I am concerned about the Golden Plover and Skylark mitigation provided for this development. Murton Gap was supposed to be mitigation for the Station Road development, but is itself now being developed. Where is the mitigation for Murton Gap, and for how long will that remain undeveloped? The Murton Gap area is currently open farmland, and it would be great to see this character maintained in the new development with native wildflower grassland, which is currently in such steep decline in the UK, continuing to play a key part in this landscape. There is a massive opportunity here to incorporate nature in to the housing stock, with consequent benefits for mental health, as well as benefiting wildlife. Nest boxes could be provided for birds such as sparrows. Swift bricks can be built in to walls at very little cost. Fences can be designed to allow hedgehogs access through gardens. The roads should be designed to be less of a barrier to wildlife with native species used in planting schemes. Roundabouts should not be planted up with some low maintenance thorny exotic species, but instead plants that are of use to wildlife should be used. For such a small amount of effort on the part of a developer, these things can have a significant benefit for the wildlife and really improve the lives of the people living in the	Habitats will be included within the Parkland areas for Skylark. Golden Plover mitigation is likely to be off site and is still being considered.  Other comments noted.	

## Wildlife and Ecology

Comment Reference	Respondent Type / Name	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		development.		
MGDM134	Resident	Rabbits, foxes and deer can be seen when out walking. Various birds nesting in mature trees and hedgerows. Blackberry bushes which for generations have made jams and pies or our WI, church fairs, flower shows etc. Landscaping cannot give you this.	Comments noted.	
MGDM187	Resident	Wildlife Corridor Access a) I understand the link road and Murton Metro station will, of necessity, be constructed in an early phase of the development. However once the bridge and road are built, I would like to see the prompt planting of trees and shrubs as there will be no further development north of the Metro line. It would be all too tempting to leave this important "greening" to the end of the last phase of development! b) Extensive use is made by many walkers of the footpath accessed at the apex of the right angled corner of Otterburn Avenue (by Wellfield First School). Observing those using the existing public footpath from Shiremoor, a significant number seem to be school children in addition to the many dog walkers. I suspect many of these would appreciate using the new bridge to walk direct to the apex of Otterburn Avenue, either to go to school, or to complete walking the dog in green space. Consequently some kind of all-weather path should be provided from the new Metro crossing to the apex of Otterburn Avenue to avoid muddy clothing and shoes. c) There is a grassed plot of land to the north of No 32 Otterburn Ave which is adjacent to the existing footpath and field. Currently it seems to contain access to various water pipes. Possibly access to this space could be incorporated into the plan? d) Pedestrian access should be possible on along the boundary of the site area from Dickies Holm behind Phase 3a (Westward and Monks Road) and Phase 2c (Briar Vale area) and Monkseaton High School to Rake Lane. I note that the indicative road and housing layout implies a series of small cui-de-sacs which could easily be linked by footpaths like in the nearby North Ridge / The Ridings / Westgate Close estate. This would facilitate more recreational walking loops. (It gets very boring having to retrace one's own steps on a linear walk- a loop is far preferable.)		



## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM41	Local Methodist Churches	It looks as though Murton village will retain its individuality.	Comment noted.	
MGDM81	Murton Action Group	Despite the Inspector's views that areas with specific heritage interest should remain untouched, the re-siting of the school onto a rig and furrow field seems at odds with his directions? We would like an explanation.	The school is the middle of the site to make it accessible to all residents.  Areas of rig and furrow are still retained as landscape features on the Masterplan.	
MGDM83	CPRE Northumberland	Fully in agreement with this principle also.	Comment noted.	
MGDM118	NTB Green Party	Historic environment and heritage There is concern from a local historian that medieval ridge and furrow fields will be built on (the primary school). Confirmation is needed from the archaeological service that this is not so, but if it is then the school needs to be located elsewhere. Included in the plan should be a public information board of some sort indicating the relevant fields and history of Murton and their importance in relation to being a rare example of medieval field systems within an urban environment.	Areas of rig and furrow are still retained as landscape features on the Masterplan.  The Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer has commented on the Masterplan and has not objected to the school location.	
MGDM150	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	The proposed road which links Earsdon to Murton Gap may destroy archaeological remains. This route is not included in the archaeological desk based assessment for Murton Gap. There is a presumed prehistoric enclosed settlement in the field immediately south of the proposed roundabout. The road route will require geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching. If archaeological remains are present, full archaeological excavation would be required before the road could be built. I am pleased that most of the ridge and furrow earthworks around Murton village. The earthworks which will be lost need	Comments noted and Development Consortia made aware of requirements.	

## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		to be subject to topographical recording. Another prehistoric enclosure behind Westward Green will be lost to housing, but this can be mitigated against through archaeological excavation. I am awaiting the results of the geophysical survey for the housing sites. Once I have this, the evaluation trenching can be organised. The following archaeological reports will be required with the planning application: 'Ç Geophysical survey (road and housing sites) 'Ç Evaluation trenching (road and housing sites) 'Ç Field walking		
MGDM171	Historic England	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above draft Masterplan. As the government's statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment in England, we are pleased to offer our comments. Following our engagement on this site in October 2016 (draft Masterplan), November 2016 (SEA screening report), August 2017 (draft Masterplan) and September 2017 (EIA scoping opinion), we remain concerned that the historic environment is not being fully planned for in accordance with the NPPF. Although the draft Masterplan identifies heritage assets in the area, it provides insufficient assessment of their significance (including that derived from their setting) or the impact of the proposals on it. It does not fully plan positively for them, including exploring opportunities to maximise the benefits that development might bring to them. For example, p15 of the Masterplan highlights just two considerations to take into account when addressing development affecting the heritage assets identified. One of these mainly addresses screening, suggesting the Masterplan is content to plan around heritage assets rather than positively incorporate them. The proposed layouts shown in the Masterplan suggests only partial attention has been paid to the significance of ridge and furrow around Murton; no analysis is given as to why some parts of this asset are to be built over and others are not. Despite the stated opportunity to enhance the setting of heritage assets, the impact of proposed character area 4 appears to pay no attention to the setting of Rake House Farm, and other assets including the forge at New York are not addressed at all (and any historical significance this asset might have, e.g.. through rarity, is ignored on page 14). For the historic environment, there is little clear train of thought from analysis of evidence to the Masterplans proposals.</p>	<p>The Masterplan Guidance has been revised to add a greater emphasis to heritage assets throughout the document.</p> <p>The character area design principles specifically include further guidance to require development to positively incorporate assets.</p> <p>The buffer around Rake House Farm has been increased to retain the open setting around the farm.</p>	Changes to the Masterplan Guidance.

## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		The NPPF requires positive planning for the historic environment, including looking for opportunities to draw on its contribution to the character of place (para 126). It also requires the significance of heritage assets affected to be described sufficiently to understand potential impact (para 128). In our view more needs to be done to understand the significance of heritage assets (particularly significance derived from their setting), the impact the proposals would have on that significance, and how opportunities to maximise benefit and minimise harm should be planned for. I hope that the above advice is useful to you. If you have any queries or would like to discuss this further, please get in touch.		
MGDM12	Resident	Action should be taken by North Tyneside Council as follows in response to Public demands:- Restore the historic New York Forge, a Tyne and Wear Heritage Asset HER 2149 to a standard in keeping with its design in the mid 19th century for use as an educational tool for local children. To do so finance should be raised from the Murton Consortium who will develop the site, from a vastly improved order book and National Lottery funds.	<p>The land where the forge site is needed to achieve a safe and fit for purpose highway design.</p> <p>The architectural and historic interest of the building was considered by Historic England for listing but it was considered that the criteria for listing were not fulfilled.</p>	

## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM15	Resident	<p>Extract below from Murton Gap Masterplan: Engagement Draft:- '8.2.3 Murton Lane Part of Murton Lane will be downgraded to a footpath. This relates to the area shown below from the A191 to the Secondary Road. In this area, traffic will be diverted to use the new link road. An alternative access to Murton Village is from the existing access from New York Road where the road and the junction with New York Road and Westminster Avenue is proposed to be upgraded. This will require the demolition of New York Forge. 4.8 Heritage and Archaeology</p> <p>Heritage assets on or surrounding the site includes: New York Forge: The New York Forge is located just to the south of the development site's boundary, within New York. It is non-designated and not on the local register. Although not a building high in external architectural quality, it has some attraction in its character and charm in its small-scale. Let me say, to begin with, your Heritage statement above is incorrect, New York Forge is included on the Tyne and Wear Community Asset Register HER 2149. Consequently, as pointed out many times and in various places, New York Forge is of utmost importance to the character, history and culture of New York village, and for these reasons ought to be preserved for use by succeeding generations. The current forge is the successor of an earlier structure, built a few hundred yards west of the present building. Both buildings and therefore the farrier and blacksmith business passed through generations of the Wandless/Wardhaugh/Rochester family (see my article in Tyne and Tweed, Vol. 69, 2005, pp 44/54). Cited in this article are various sources about the building, including one produced by Newcastle University (by Gould and Gould) which describes in detail the importance of this vernacular architecture, a rare survival of its kind. As a local person who knows the road layout of the area in detail, I must emphasize that to demolish the forge "" see para. 8.2.3 below - and create a junction in the middle of New York village would be a disaster for both for local people, the vast majority of whom look upon the forge as a focus for community and as a heritage asset, and for the fabric of New York. In fact, this proposed junction is about the worst proposal possible, and I am astounded that the Council is even considering going ahead with it "" see above "" quoted from the Council website "" ""It has some character and charm in its small scale'. Why demolish a rare survival such as the forge, when there exist</p>	<p>The land where the forge site is needed to achieve a safe and fit for purpose highway design.</p> <p>The architectural and historic interest of the building was considered by Historic England for listing but it was considered that the criteria for listing were not fulfilled.</p> <p>The school is the middle of the site to make it accessible to all residents.</p> <p>Areas of rig and furrow are still retained as landscape features on the Masterplan.</p>	
		<p>several alternatives for the junction "" e.g. a junction using the redundant stackyard at Murton House to enter Rake Lane round-a-bout to the east avoiding New York village altogether, or to the west of New York village, extend Murton Lane at the Wheatsheaf to join the Norham Road roundabout, again avoiding New York village. To demolish the forge would effectively lower morale in the</p>		155   Page

## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
MGDM21	Resident	Well.....we have regularly read in the papers about 'accidents' where listed or historical buildings have been 'accidentally' knocked down or damaged beyond repair during building works. None of these are shown on the map as far as I can see, so how do we know how you propose to 'respect' them?	Existing buildings are shown on the Masterplan Layout.	
MGDM25	Resident	No comment		
MGDM28	Resident	None		
MGDM30	Resident	No comment		
MGDM44	Resident	<p>Yesterday I was in conversation at St. Aidan's Church Hall, North Shields, with a Planning Officer. Subsequently, I realised there could be some confusion regarding the site of the ridge and furrow marked fields on Murton Lane, largely because of the orientation of the lane itself! Given the extreme importance of this point, I thought I would send a map, showing exactly which fields I am so concerned about - see, too, previous comments posted by me on this site. The fields in question are situated on the eastern section of Murton Lane, leading from New York towards Murton, with the New York Forge on the right hand side. Proceed down the lane, turn a slight bend and the fields in question are behind a hawthorn hedge to the left - currently pasture. This historically important land stretches along the left hand side of the lane, around a sharp bend and ends opposite a field path leading to Monkseaton - there are sycamore trees growing by earthworks where the significant field system ends. It is on these very fields that developers now propose building a school and housing - the most significant medieval landscape features of the area which have survived, and which are documented in numerous sources. The important point I stress is the fields outlined on the attached map are the only ones of historic importance, because all of the other land around has been heavily ploughed over decades, or used for open cast mining, including the fields shown on Council maps to be preserved as a wildlife corridor. I plead with the developers to reconsider this plan, and to leave the outlined fields undisturbed. They are such an important landscape feature, as well as being a most unusual survival within an urban conurbation that they deserve preservation. I stress again development on any other field around</p>	<p>The school is the middle of the site to make it accessible to all residents.</p> <p>Areas of rig and furrow are still retained as landscape features on the Masterplan.</p>	

## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		Murton Village would not destroy anything of great historical value, so PLEASE can the plans be adjusted to preserve these valuable landscape features. I have published about them in 'Tyne and Tweed'.		
MGDM47	Resident	Lost farming	Comment noted.	
MGDM48	Resident	Be nice to discover the misplaced Backworth gold hoard.	Comment noted.	
MGDM49	Resident	Worry! These areas are on old mines an quarries. Worry! Flooding is a regular occurrence.	Relevant coal and mining risks assessment will be undertaken along with site investigations which will inform the detailed layout. The site will be developed in accordance with a comprehensive Drainage Strategy for the whole site.	
MGDM54	Resident	It is unforgivable that New York Forge will be demolished - this is an important part of the local heritage and must be preserved.	The land where the forge site is needed to achieve a safe and fit for purpose highway design.	
MGDM61	Resident	The Blacksmiths building is again being bull dozed over with only consideration to the financial pie being considered.	The land where the forge site is needed to achieve a safe and fit for purpose highway design.	
MGDM62	Resident	Do you really know where the mine shafts are!?	Relevant coal and mining risks assessment will be undertaken along with site investigations which will inform the detailed layout.	
MGDM72	Resident	I also consider the Public Footpath running from opposite The Red Lion at Earsdon to Murton to be an Ancient Right of Way. I have heard mention that the	Comment noted.	

## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		field west of Wellfield that you propose to build your road on was donated to the Parish of Earsdon hundreds of years ago and if this is the case then that particular field may will be Common Land. If this is true, then that will bring into question how the present owners of the field came about ownership and what gives them, or anyone else for that matter, the right to build on Common Land.	The Masterplan will protect and enhance existing Public Rights of Way.	
MGDM73	Resident	I also consider the Public Footpath running from opposite The Red Lion at Earsdon to Murton to be an Ancient Right of Way. I have heard mention that the field west of Wellfield that you propose to build your road on was donated to the Parish of Earsdon hundreds of years ago and if this is the case then that particular field may will be Common Land. If this is true, then that will bring into question how the present owners of the field came about ownership and what gives them, or anyone else for that matter, the right to build on Common Land.	Rights of way will be protected and included within the Masterplan.	
MGDM74	Resident	Their is nothing worthy of consideration -***** [expletive deleted].	Comment noted.	
MGDM75	Resident	Extract Heritage assets on or surrounding the site includes: New York War Memorial: The grade II listed New York War Memorial sits just outside the southern boundary of the Murton site. The Wheatsheaf Public House: The Wheatsheaf Public House sits just outside the southern boundary of the Murton site. It is not designated or locally registered. The Pub will have some communal and historical value but on balance is of low heritage significance. 6.3 Highways and Transport M14 Downgrading of Murton Lane (West) to Pedestrian and Cycle route linking main distributor road to the Wheatsheaf Inn and New York Village Contradiction The short length of footpath proposed to enter the west end of New York Village at the Wheatsheaf Inn serves little purpose as it leads no where of interest other than the Wheatsheaf Inn itself. It is not at all a direct route to New York convenience stores. Please explain the purpose and benefit of this footpath in its location? NT Council indicate that western traffic access to the Village from Norham roundabout will be closed off. Murton Lane West entering New York Village at the Wheatsheaf Inn from Murton Village in the Murton Masterplan will be closed to traffic and be downgraded to a footpath. This will isolate the Wheatsheaf Inn from passing trade, in both directions resulting in not	<p>The proposed closure of access into new york from the Norham Road roundabout is needed to ensure a safe and efficient highway network in this area.</p> <p>The architectural and historic interest of the building was considered by Historic England for listing but it was considered that the criteria for listing were not fulfilled.</p> <p>Areas of ridge and furrow will be retained as landscape features on the site.</p>	

## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>only "low heritage" but low usage therefore will predictably be yet another casualty for the licensing trade. Have the planners approached the proprietors of the Wheatsheaf Inn of these proposals? Explain their response? The western end of Murton Lane should continue to provide vehicle access to Murton Village at the Wheatsheaf Inn. Vehicle access from Norham Road roundabout to both New York Village and Murton Lane shown remain open as is the situation today. Downgrading Murton Lane (east) access to New York Village at Westminster Avenue to a public footpath and cycleway only without traffic access would be more useful for pedestrians giving direct access for convenience shopping. Car parking could be introduced to the village adjacent the Forge. Extract New York Forge: The New York Forge is located just to the south of the development site's boundary, within New York. It is non-designated and not on the local register. Although not a building high in external architectural quality, it has some attraction in its character and charm in its small-scale. Contradiction You say above that New York Forge is non designated. This is incorrect. New York Forge is designated in Tyne and Wear Historical Environmental Record HER 2149 and should therefore be refurbished and preserved for future generations. Explain how in the Masterplan and to quote New York Forge will have "some attraction, character" and "charm" if your solution in the Masterplan leads only to its demolition? The Report of the Inspector dated 15th May 2017 clause 114, the Inspector states 'I recognise that it (the Forge), has some resonance and heritage value to the local community but the building is now largely subsumed within residential development' I suggest, Forges throughout time have all been 'subsumed' in the centre of the villages in which there were built and have been preserved. New York village established in the 18th century with its Forge is an existing example and should therefore and likewise be preserved. Again in clause 114 the Inspector continues 'Any harm arising from its loss would be less than substantial and clearly outweighed by the public benefits of providing much needed housing' The public have never suggested this 'either' or 'scenario'. The Forge could remain standing and the 3,000 Murton Gap housing estate if that is the decision could be built, especially now that the Public have lost the</p>	<p>The school is the middle of the site to make it accessible to all residents.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>	



## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>argument to reduce housing numbers in Murton Gap estate. With the Will of the Council and Planners New York Forge could be retained and restored. Please explain why NT Council and its Capita planners have no respect for New York village whilst embracing Murton Gap Estate? An answer please? Extract Ridge and furrow survives as earthworks in pasture in field's north-west and south-east of Murton. On the west side of Murton Lane between the Village and New York there is a small enclosure with earthworks and the remains of Murton Cottage. Just outside of Murton Village to the west, on Murton Lane, was small village named Philadelphia. It is unknown if any remains of the village exist. Figure 13: Heritage Assets Plan (Heritage Statement, Capita 2015) Masterplan Considerations: 'c New development should give consideration to existing heritage assets; views from listed buildings should be screened from view with landscape buffers where possible. 'c Further evaluation of the extent and significance of any archaeological resources on the site is required. Give consideration to areas of ridge and furrow and retain the best areas where possible. Contradiction Referring to Fig 13, the ridge and furrow. I see from the Masterplan Fig 17 that you have resited Murton Gap primary school from near the Wheatsheaf Inn and propose to build it on the conserved area of ridge and furrow to the west of Murton Lane on the left whilst travelling northbound from Westminster Avenue to Murton village. In addition you show proposed house building on this area also. This contravenes the 'Local Policies Plan' approved by the Inspector in May 2017 and his Report clause 113 whereby ridge and furrow would be conserved. The Inspector states ' Various submissions have highlighted the medieval field patterns and remaining ridge and furrow features. The planned approach to the green amenity spaces would largely see the retention of these fields and features as set out in the concept plan at Map 20 of the Plan.' Ridge and furrow field patterns must therefore be conserved! Your brochure handed out at public meetings the fourth page map headed 'Opportunities and Constraints repeats the error. The second last item on the key list denotes in a brown colour the ridge and furrow ( very small writing) and this is shown on the map. On this area is a large red circle with note next it 'proposed primary</p>		

## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		<p>school' so to say that the ridge and furrow is to be safeguarded by North Tyne side Planning department and not to be built on is according to this map untrue. Did whoever relocated the school understand the implications of what they were doing? Houses also are shown built on the ridge and furrow as the map on the front cover of the brochure clearly indicates including the loop road crossing the site. This just makes a nonsense of your Heritage and conservation statements in the Masterplan. The school and house building should be relocated to the east of Murton Lane where the land was previously disturbed due to open cast mining. Again ridge and furrow field patterns must therefore be conserved! Extract 6.1 Education Schools are a crucial element of the local infrastructure and therefore Murton Gap must plan for education provision needs arising from new homes. A new primary school is required at Murton. Up to 2 hectares of land will be made available to deliver the primary school to the south of Murton village, suitably integrated into the new development and accessible from a secondary highway link. For secondary schools, a financial contribution will be required towards enhancements of existing schools within the local area. Contradiction This 2 hectares, (5 acres) of land is ridge and furrow land which must be conserved according to earlier proposals and not used for house building or other uses. Extract 8.2.3 Murton Lane Part of Murton Lane will be downgraded to a footpath. This relates to the area shown below from the A191 to the Secondary Road. In this area, traffic will be diverted to use the new link road. An alternative access to Murton Village is from the existing access from New York Road where the road and the junction with New York Road and Westminster Avenue is proposed to be upgraded. This will require the demolition of New York Forge. Contradiction With some Will and some flair by NT Council and its planners New York Forge could be restored to its 19th century status.</p>		
MGDM76	Resident	It appears that this should not stand in the way of progress.	Comment noted.	
MGDM77	Resident	The forge at New York though nothing to look at, has been on this site for over two hundred years a part of the village's foundation. In front of the forge set into the ground are 2 wheel showing rings. These date back to when the Blacksmiths	Comment noted.	

## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		shoe'd the wooden wheels used in the transport of the day. These should be saved as a heritage heirloom.		
MGDM78	Resident	The countryside is our heritage and must not be lost for ever to more and more housing. This country needs to be able to produce food, not more and more people. We need farm land.	Comment noted.	
MGDM84	Resident	Why have you ignored the views of many people who support the retention of the blacksmith forge in New York? The forge has been there for many many years and is part of the history and fabric of the village- leave it alone! Listen to the residents!	The land where the forge sits is needed to achieve a safe and fit for purpose highway design.	
MGDM87	Resident	My only concerns are around the old coal-mining heritage and whether there is a good enough understanding of the risks arising from all the old mine-workings.	Relevant coal and mining risks assessment will be undertaken along with site investigations which will inform the detailed layout.	
MGDM92	Resident	There are two community assets in the village - 1. The mid-nineteenth century blacksmith shop business, known as New York Forge. This building is a focal point for the village, a place of interest where locals, including young people, gather frequently to watch a traditional craftsman work in an authentic setting. Is really to be believed this building will be demolished to make way for a junction at Westminster Avenue/Brookland Terrace, which will destroy this heritage asset and split a village in two, thus increasing social isolation for its residents? - and create even more problems for the future. 2. Medieval Field System, Murton Lane. Proceeding along Murton Lane, past the blacksmith shop on the right hand side, fields to the left of the lane are covered with ridge and furrow markings, the remnants of ploughing done by teams of oxen in the medieval period. The plough marks have survived because the fields here have not been ploughed for centuries. It is here that the developers plan to build houses and a primary school. These fields are extremely important for the history of the area, and Murton Village especially, as they are a rare survival in an urban area of the medieval method of farming. Rather than build on them, they ought to be	The land where the forge site is needed to achieve a safe and fit for purpose highway design. A large area of ridge and furrow will be retained to the west of Murton Village as landscape features.	

## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		preserved as they are to be seen today, both as a cultural and historic feature for educational purposes, and also as an intriguing survival of the past for people who use the lane. The fields are immensely important educationally, both for adults and children. They ought to be left undisturbed and made a feature in the development, rather than disturbed and forced to lose their character. I wish to emphasize the importance of the fields in question - and I can again provide a map if needed - THEY ARE THE ONLY ONES IN THE AREA OF DEVELOPMENT AROUND MURTON WHICH ARE OF DEEP HISTORIC IMPORTANCE, YET IT IS ON THEM THAT A SCHOOL AND HOUSES ARE TO BE BUILT. PLEASE RECONSIDER THIS DISASTROUS PROPOSAL!		
MGDM99	Resident	No consideration has been given to the identity of villages that will now be merged into one large housing estate. What will happen to the Forge? Knock it down and stick a house on it?	The layout is divided into 6 different character areas.  The land where the forge site is needed to achieve a safe and fit for purpose highway design.	
MGDM105	Resident	Thought must be given to existing communities , e.g. Murton Village, New York, Shiremoor. Some families have lived in these areas generations upon generation.	Sensitive edges are buffers are included all around the site with different design solutions in different areas. Indicative widths and designs for some areas were included in the consultation material.	
MGDM107	Resident	Any new sites discovered during building will need to be assessed, protected and preserved. Any historic discoveries of significance the building programme should be temporarily or permanently halted.	Comment noted.	
MGDM109	Resident	Loss of open space in the borough	Comment noted.	
MGDM134	Resident	For generations an area called the ‘~Redder’, Red Hospital has entertained children. It has been a right of passage for most local children, every generation discovering it and calling it their own. Den’s, camps, ramps, hiding spot. This will	The alignment of the road may be pushed further west as shown on the Masterplan but	

## Historic Environment

Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Comment Reference	Officer Response	Amendments proposed / made
		be lost to suburban neatness. In spring the Redder is an area of Bluebells.	this is subject to further work. The road will include landscaping along the full length. To the north of the metro line the landscaping will be more natural in form with native species chosen.	
MGDM170	Resident	3) Given the Council now has no in-house Conservation Officer, we would like to see further information on how the Council has engaged a conservation consultant as part of the master planning process. As side from the impact on the Conservation Area noted above, the development area is close to a number of grade II listed buildings, including the New York Forge, and we do not feel that the current proposals incorporate these features as part of the proposals - these should not be ‘planned around’ or avoided, but instead the design should reflect them positively, otherwise this entire scheme is installing new build at the expense of North Tyneside’s heritage assets. Moreover, please can more information be given on how the Council has responded to consultation advice from statutory bodies on the lead up to these proposals and indicate how they have taken on board this advice (consulting official agencies should not be a ‘tick-box’ exercise, expert advice should be in the forefront of these proposals).	A heritage assessment of the site was undertaken as part of the Masterplans evidence base. This has informed the development of the Masterplan layout.  Responses to statutory bodies and other consultees are all detailed within this document.	