North Tyneside Council
Report to Cabinet Member for Environment
Date: 6 October 2023

Title: Traffic Regulation Order – Waiting and Loading Restrictions associated with Sea Front Sustainable Route, Tynemouth

Portfolio(s): Environment	**Cabinet Member(s): Cllr H Johnson**

Report from Service Area:	**Regeneration and Economic Development**	
Responsible Officer:	**John Sparkes, Director of Regeneration and Economic Development**	**(Tel: 0191 643 7295)**
Wards affected:	**Tynemouth**	

PART 1

1.1 Executive Summary:

This report seeks the approval of the Cabinet Member for Environment to make variations to restrictions on waiting and loading on streets including Back Percy Gardens, East Street, Grand Parade, Percy Gardens, Percy Park Road and Sea Banks, Tynemouth, and set aside two objections received to the proposals.

1.2 Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Environment:

(1) considers the objections;

(2) sets aside the objections in the interests of increasing safety for all road users and contributing to ensuring that highway conditions are conducive to support greater usage of cycling, walking and wheeling; and

(3) determines that the Traffic Regulation Order should be made unchanged.

1.3 Forward Plan:

Considering objections relating to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders is a standing item on the Forward Plan.

1.4 Council Plan and Policy Framework

The proposals in this report relate to the following priority in Our North Tyneside, the Council Plan 2021 to 2025:

- A green North Tyneside
  - We will increase opportunities for safe walking and cycling, including providing a segregated cycleway at the coast
  - We will publish an action plan of the steps we will take and the national investment we will seek to make North Tyneside carbon net-zero by 2030

The proposals in this report relate to the following priority in the Carbon Net-Zero 2030 Action Plan:

- Creation of fully connected cycling network

1.5 Information:

1.5.1 <u>Background</u>

The Authority has obtained grant funding from the Government's Active Travel Fund (ATF), and supplementary funding offered by Sustrans, to deliver the Sea Front Sustainable Route project. This will improve local cycling, walking and wheeling links along the North Tyneside coast, in line with an aim of the Our North Tyneside Plan 2021 to 2025.

The full scheme involves proposals to introduce protected cycling provision, establish pedestrian crossings and install road humps in strategic locations, make associated amendments to waiting and loading restrictions, introduce a one-way restriction for general traffic on part of the route, and prohibit certain traffic movements in accordance with the proposals.

Engagement on the full scheme was carried out in Summer 2021, via a news item on the Authority's website linking to the 'Placechangers' consultation website. Feedback from this engagement informed the process of detailed design.

Ward Councillors were updated on the proposals. Households and premises affected by the proposals were contacted by letter.

The proposals associated with this report involve improvements to cycling, walking and wheeling links on Beach Road, Grand Parade, Percy Gardens, Sea Banks, East Street and Front Street in Tynemouth, on the existing King Charles III Coast Path and National Cycle Network Route 1.

These improvements necessitate variations to the existing traffic movements and waiting and loading restrictions contained in existing Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs).

The proposals were advertised in accordance with the Authority's usual procedure as set out in section 2.2. Two formal objections which were received related to the proposal in relation to waiting and loading.

1.5.2 Proposal in relation to waiting and loading

It is proposed that amendments be made to the existing waiting and loading restrictions on Back Percy Gardens, East Street, Grand Parade, Percy Gardens, Percy Park Road and Sea Banks to facilitiate new crossing opportunities for both pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed restrictions also include the creation of loading bays at two locations, and will assist in minimising obstructive parking in front of residential and commercial properties.

The proposal was advertised in accordance with the Authority's usual procedure as set out in section 2.2. Two formal objections were received to the proposal to the overall scheme proposals and the proposed variations in Tynemouth were received.

1.5.3 Statutory Consultation

Proposals that restrict traffic movements are subject to statutory legal process as described in section 2.2: this includes the local authority giving public notice of the proposals and taking such other steps as it may consider appropriate for ensuring adequate publicity of the proposals and the resultant variation of the existing traffic and parking restrictions. In North Tyneside, this includes notices advertising proposals being displayed on affected streets and on the Authority's website. This enables members of the public or businesses to object to the proposals and the proposed making of a TRO and/or varying of existing TROs. Any objectors are sent a response and invited to reconsider their objection. Any objections not withdrawn are referred to the Cabinet Member for Environment for consideration in accordance with the Mayor's Scheme of Delegation.

1.5.4 Summary of Objections

A local resident, **Mr M** submitted an objection to the scheme based on his view that the scheme would not suitably address parking issues which in his view are experienced on Percy Park, Percy Park Road and Seafield View. He referred to the provision of free on-street car parking in the area and stated that in his view there was a clear duty of care to manage traffic and demand accordingly. He made a number of points relating to current parking provision and demand in the area, and further suggested that non-residential demand for parking left residents in the area highly restricted in when they could move their vehicles.

An officer responded to the objector stating that the focus of the scheme was not to address any pre-existing issues which may be experienced in the area. The response noted that the implementation of the scheme could have some impact on parking behaviour in this area. It was stated that 'before' and 'after' parking surveys would be undertaken in the area so as to observe any impacts which might arise following scheme implementation and review parking management arrangements if necessary.

The objector was invited to withdraw his objection and was advised that the objection, if not withdrawn, would be included in a report for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment. No further correspondence was received.

A local resident, **Mr D** submitted an objection to the scheme suggesting that communication and consultation with affected residents had in his view been insufficient. He expressed the view that the scheme would cause increased

congestion and pollution at the junction of Percy Park Road and Grand Parade as the proposed northbound one-way flow on Sea Banks would imply more southbound vehicles turning to the right at this point. In addition he raised his concern about the loss of view of Tynemouth Castle and Priory that is currently available to southbound motorists. He suggested that existing echelon parking on Sea Banks should be converted to parallel parking, or removed entirely, to provide space for both a northbound and southbound general traffic lane adjacent to the proposed cycle route.

An officer responded to the objector stating that southbound vehicles are likely to re-route by turning to the right at the Percy Park-Grand Parade roundabout, and that traffic modelling would be carried out prior to scheme implementation to confirm that there would be no capacity issues. It was advised that the changes in vehicle movements would not be expected to imply any noticeable increase in air pollution. The officer also advised that a range of options had been considered by the design team, and stated that if echelon parking were replaced with parallel parking on Sea Banks it would result in the loss of substantial numbers of parking spaces, which could have a detrimental impact.

Mr D responded to this correspondence to raise his concerns around additional traffic being directed to the Percy Park-A193 roundabout and querying whether additional safe pedestrian crossings had been considered at this location. He also expressed the view that there would not be a significant detrimental impact from the removal of parking if echelon parking were replaced by parallel parking on Sea Banks.

An officer responded to the objector noting that two arms of the Percy Park-A193 roundabout have zebra crossings and one arm has an uncontrolled crossing, and confirming that there were no plans for additional crossing provision at this roundabout. Regarding the notional impact of loss of parking bays which would result from the objector's suggestion of replacing echelon parking with parallel parking on Sea Banks, the officer suggested that this could have a detrimental impact on local businesses such as shops and cafés and on local residents through displacement of parking into residential streets.

The objector was invited to withdraw his objection and was advised that the objection, if not withdrawn, would be included in a report for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment. No further correspondence was received.

Details of the objections and associated correspondence are included at Appendix 1 of this report.

1.6 Decision options:

The following decision options are available for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment:

Option 1
Approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2.

Option 2
Not approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2.

Option 1 is the recommended option.

1.7 Reasons for recommended option:

Option 1 is recommended in the interests of increasing safety for all road users and contributing to ensuring that highway conditions are conducive to support greater usage of cycling, walking and wheeling.

1.8 Appendices:

Appendix 1 Details of objection and associated correspondence
Appendix 2 Notice advertised on site
Appendix 3 Copy of Proposed Plan


SFSR-WSP-00-LSI-ZZ-DR-C-1001_S2_P01.pd


SFSR-WSP-00-LSI-ZZ-DR-C-1002_S2_P01.pd


SFSR-WSP-00-LSI-ZZ-DR-C-1003_S2_P01.pd


SFSR-WSP-00-LSI-ZZ-DR-C-1004_S2_P01.pd


SFSR-WSP-00-LSI-ZZ-DR-C-1005_S2_P01.pd


SFSR-WSP-00-LSI-ZZ-DR-C-1006_S2_P01.pd

Appendix 4 Equality Impact Assessment


Appx4-Equality Impact Assessment_SI

1.9 Contact officers:

Nick Saunders, Senior Traffic Engineer, Capita, 0191 643 6598
Mark Newlands, Senior Manager – Highways and Infrastructure, 0191 643 6129
Amar Hassan, Principal Accountant Investment (Capital) and Revenue, 0191 643 5747

1.10 Background information:

(1) North East Transport Plan

(2) North Tyneside Transport Strategy

(3) Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

(4) Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996

PART 2 – COMPLIANCE WITH PRINCIPLES OF DECISION MAKING

2.1 Finance and other resources

Funding to advertise and implement the proposal is available from the grant funding from the Government's Active Travel Fund and supplementary funding offered by Sustrans.

2.2 Legal

Proposals that involve revocations or amendments to existing TROs are subject to statutory legal process set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Regulations that flow from that Act, namely, the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. All schemes are formally advertised and include a 21-day period for objections. Before making a TRO the Authority must consider all objections made and not withdrawn, and can decide whether to make the TRO unchanged, to make the TRO with modifications or not to proceed with making the TRO.

The Authority is required to publish at least one notice detailing the proposals to vary the waiting and loading restrictions in Tynemouth in a local newspaper circulating in the area, in addition to taking such other steps as it deems appropriate for ensuring adequate publicity is provided. The Authority is also required to make documents relating to the proposal available for public inspection. In North Tyneside, in addition to being advertised in a local newspaper, notices advertising the proposal are displayed on the Authority's website and on roads affected by the order. Documents relating to the proposal are also available for public inspection at the Authority's offices at Quadrant. Objections to the proposal may be made within a period of 21 days starting from the date the notice was published.

In accordance with the Mayor's Scheme of Delegation, if any objections cannot be resolved, then the Cabinet Member for Environment is asked to consider any objections made and not withdrawn and to determine if a Traffic Regulation Order should be made.

Within 14 days of the making of the proposed TROs varying the existing TRO in respect of the proposals for Tynemouth, the Authority must notify any objectors, publish a notice of making in a local newspaper and take such other steps as it deems appropriate for ensuring adequate publicity is given to the making of the TROs. In North Tyneside, in addition to being advertised in a local newspaper, notices of making are displayed on the Authority's website and on roads affected by the TRO. Documents relating to the order are also available for public inspection at the Authority's offices at Quadrant.

The Legal Notice of Intent was published in the local press (Appendix 2 of the report).

2.3 Consultation/community engagement

2.3.1 Internal consultation

Internal consultation has involved the Cabinet Member for Environment. Ward members' views on the proposal were sought as described in section 1.5.1.

2.3.2 Community engagement

Views on the proposal were sought as described in section 1.5.1. The proposal was advertised in line with statutory process as described in section 1.5.3.

2.4 Human rights

Any human rights implications must be balanced against the duty that the Authority has to provide a safe highway for people to use. It is not considered that the proposed restrictions will have a negative impact on individuals' human rights.

2.5 Equalities and diversity

An Equality Impact Assessment for the Seafront Sustainable Route cycling and walking improvements has been undertaken and is attached as Appendix 4 to this report. This notes that several identified potential impacts are positive, e.g.

for people who currently experience difficulty crossing the road, and that actions are specified to reduce the identified potential negative impact, which relates to temporary arrangements during construction.

2.6 Risk management

There are no risk management implications directly arising from this report. Strategic and operational risks associated with transport matters are assessed via the established corporate process.

2.7 Crime and disorder

There are no crime and disorder implications directly arising from this report.

2.8 Environment and sustainability

There are potential positive environment and sustainability implications in that the proposals support the use of more sustainable modes of transport in preference to car use. The proposals therefore support the target within the Carbon Net-Zero 2030 Action Plan for the creation of a fully connected cycling network.

PART 3 - SIGN OFF

- Chief Executive [X]
- Director of Service [X]
- Mayor/Cabinet Member [X]
- Chief Finance Officer [X]
- Monitoring Officer [X]
- Assistant Chief Executive [X]

Details of Objection [No. 1] – Mr M

Given the continued provision of Percy Park, Percy Park Road, Seafield View as the village free car park there is a clear duty of care to manage the traffic and demand accordingly.

I do not see any variation in the Consolidation Order to address this, please change the order accordingly.

Please consider the below points :

a. No less than 4 round about signs directing traffic to park in Percy Park, Tynemouth, NE30
b. Existing hybrid TM2 restrictions with Permit Parking and Pay / Display only apply at weekends and bank holidays.
c. It is current council policy to utilize Percy Park as a free beach car park as demonstrated by the road signage directing traffic to park and the lack of restrictions to match either TM1 or foreshore restrictions.
d. Non-residential demand is continuous 7 days a week up to 8pm due to the 'free parking' status.
e. Residents of Percy Park sacrifice 50 % of the available parking capacity for non-residential traffic on weekends and bank holidays even though demand from residents already exceeds capacity,.
f. Residents of Percy Park sacrifice 100 % of available parking capacity for non-residential traffic on week days even though demand from residents already exceeds capacity
g. When the residential units of the former Nursing home on Percy Park are occupied this will add an additional 84 metres of residential demand (considering 12 cars)
h. Demand from residents alone from Percy Park already exceed capacity, these are our homes and in most cases our places of work.
i. The adjacent foreshore parking which is pay and display 7 days a week is left empty until Percy Park, Seafield View and Percy Park Road capacity is consumed.
j. The adjacent Metro Station parking which is pay and display 7 days a week is left empty until Percy Park capacity is consumed.
k. The opening of Del Mio Ice Cream pallor on Seafield Green has created continual non-residential demand for parking all day, every day, through to 8 pm.
l. Non-residential demand for free beach parking consumes all available space

m. Non-residential demand for Del Mio Ice cream outlet parking.
n. The introduction of TM1 for Queensway which is adjacent to Percy Park has increased demand further.
o. The introduction of TM1 for Princeway which is adjacent to Percy Park has increased demand further.
p. Only being able to leave your home and to use your car when it is raining is not a sustainable way to live.

We are prisoners in our own homes.

Officer reply (Dated 16 August 2023)

Thank you for your emailing relating to the Sea Front Sustainable Route. With regards to your email points, we contacted the designers who provided the following response:

Your email highlights numerous parking concerns around Percy Park, Percy Park Road and Seafield View.

The proposed scheme is about improving cycling infrastructure and does not include any proposals to address current parking issues. However, it is accepted that the scheme may have some impact on parking behaviour in the locale. We will therefore be undertaking before and after parking surveys in the area so we can accurately see any impacts that might arise after the scheme implementation and review parking management arrangements if need be.

I hope this response addresses your concerns and provides enough reassurance for you to withdraw your objection. If so, please notify us in writing by Friday, September 1. If we do not hear from you by then, your objection will be referred to the Cabinet Member for Environment for consideration. You will be informed of the Cabinet Member's decision regarding your objection and the proposed scheme in due course.

Details of Objection [No. 2] – Mr D (Dated 22 August 2023)

While I welcome the plans for a sustainable seafront route I feel communication and consultation with affected residents has been virtually nonexistent.

My main objection is the introduction of a one way street on Sea banks. During times of heavy traffic flow this will cause congestion and pollution at the roundabout at Percy park road and Grand Parade as the Northbound traffic will have to give way to the stream of Southbound traffic turning right. One of the greatest views on our

magnificent coastline is when travelling south past the Grand hotel and seeing our Priory come into view. Yes, the fit and healthy can enjoy this experience walking or cycling. Unfortunately my 88 year old Mother, and many others like her, will not be able to see this. Even in the winter months when the coast is Deserted.

My proposal would be to change the parking on Sea banks to be parallel to the carriageway, or remove the parking all together, allowing room for a footpath, cycleway and two way traffic.

I look forward to receiving your comments.

Officer reply (Dated 30 August 2023)

Thank you for your patience on this matter. Please find the response to your queries below:

- It is true that more traffic will be routed around the Percy Park roundabout but the roundabout has the capacity to deal with the flows.
- We are expecting much of the diverted southbound traffic to enter Tynemouth via Percy Park then the A193. This junction will be modelled before the scheme is implemented to make sure there will be no capacity issues.
- The changes to vehicle movements are not expected to result in any noticeable increase in air pollution.
- The same arrangement operated well when the temporary scheme was in place.
- We looked at all options for Sea Banks including the use of parallel parking to allow two-way traffic to be maintained. However, this would have resulted in loss of 51 parking spaces and 11 permit bays which would have a significant detrimental impact on visitors wanting to come to Tynemouth. It is acknowledged that there is a down side in terms of loss of views for southbound travellers but this is deemed to be less harmful than the removal of parking which is an essential part of the Tynemouth visitor offer and local economy.

I hope this response addresses your concerns and if you would like to withdraw your objection based on the above information, please notify us in writing by Friday, September 1. If we do not hear from you by then, your objection will be referred to the Cabinet Member for Environment for consideration. You will be informed of the Cabinet Member's decision regarding your objection and the proposed scheme in due course.

Further correspondence from Mr D – (Dated 31 August 2023)

Thank you for your response to my objections to the proposed Sea Front Route. The reply did not answer my comment that "communication / consultation with affected residents has been virtually non existent " Does this mean communication has been plentiful and I have just missed it all?
You state " We are expecting much of the diverted southbound traffic to enter Tynemouth via Percy Park then the A193. " This brings extra traffic to the Holy Saviour's roundabout on the Broadway. You state " This junction will be remodelled before the scheme is implemented" However it does not appear on your plans SFSR-WSP-00-LSI-ZZ-DR-C-1001 to 1008. Have you any provision for additional safe pedestrian crossings?

With regards to Sea Banks, how would the loss of 51 parking spaces have a significant detriment impact? I doubt 51 out of the total number of spaces at the coast is significant. No trial of this has been conducted. I suspect the real reason is the loss of revenue for the Council. Can I ask who deemed the loss of views to less mobile locals to be less harmful than visitor parking?

I look forward to hearing from you further.

Officer reply (Dated 30 August 2023)

I can confirm a six-week consultation took place between 13 September 2021 and 24 October 2021.

With regards to the query of improved pedestrian crossing at the Holy Saviour's roundabout on the Broadway, there are currently controlled crossings (zebras) on two arms of the roundabout, and an uncontrolled crossing (one that pedestrians cannot give a physical signal in order for traffic to stop for them to cross). on the Percy Park Arm. Please note that we anticipate the majority of southbound traffic is likely to use Percy Park Road then Front Street, rather than Percy Park. As such there are currently no plans to undertake any further pedestrian improvement work at this roundabout.

With regard to you further comments on the loss of view, Tynemouth is one on the borough's premier coastal visitor attractions so it essential that a degree of parking space be made available. The loss of 51 bays would have a serious economic impact, not so much on council revenues but on loss of trade to the local shops, cafes etc. Additionally, parking capacity in nearby residential is limited and the removal of so many bays on the seafront would likely lead to parking problems in

these residential areas by visitors trying to seek alternative places to park. It is difficult to assess what is more important in terms of retaining views versus managing parking and this will always be subjective, but the council believes that retaining the sea front parking will be of the most benefit to the general public.

I hope this response addresses your concerns, as we are now beyond the date that has been set for objections we will be taking forward your comments as an objection unless we are told by you otherwise. If we do not hear from you, your objection will be referred to the Cabinet Member for Environment for consideration. You will be informed of the Cabinet Member's decision regarding your objection and the proposed scheme in due course.

NORTH TYNESIDE COUNCIL
SEAFRONT SUSTAINABLE ROUTE

North Tyneside Council gives notice that it proposes to make variation orders under Sections 1, 2, 4, 32, 35, 82, 83, 84 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and all other enabling powers. The effect of the orders, if made, will be to vary:

A. the North Tyneside (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading) (Consolidation) Order 2022, so that:

1. no waiting at anytime restrictions be revoked on the following lengths of road:
   a) East Street, east side, between its junction with Sea Banks and its junction with Pier Road;
   b) Sea Banks, north-east side, between its junction with Percy Gardens and its junction with East Street.
   c) Percy Gardens, north-east side, between its junction with Spa access road and its junction with Sea Banks.
   d) Grand Parade
      (i) north-east side,
         a. between a point 147 metres south-east of the roundabout at its junction with Beach Road and a point 67 metres north-west of a point opposite the north-western kerb-line of Parkside;
         b. between a point 170 metres north-west of its junction with the Spa access road and a point 92 metres north-west of its junction with the Spa access road;
         c. between a point 27 metres north-west of a point opposite the north-western kerb-line of Parkside and a point 203 metres north-west of its junction with the Spa access road;
         d. between a point 80 metres north-west of the roundabout at its junction with Beach Road and a point 112 metres south-east of the roundabout at its junction with Beach Road;
      (ii) South-west side, from its junction with Hotspur Street for a distance of 65 metres in a south-easterly direction.
   e) Percy Park Road, Tynemouth;
      (i) west side, between its junction with Percy Park and a point 30 metres south of that junction;
      (ii) east side, between a point 5 metres north of its junction with the road at the rear of Stanwick Street/Warlkworth and a point 5 metres south of that junction;

2. no waiting at anytime restrictions be introduced on the following lengths of road:
   a) Back Percy Gardens, Tynemouth, both sides, from its junction with Percy Gardens to a point 7m south of its junction with Percy Gardens;
   b) Grand Parade, Tynemouth,
      (i) from its junction with Hotspur Street to a point 5 metres north-west of its junction with Percy Park.
      (ii) south side, from its junction with Hotspur Street, to a point 37m east of its junction with Hotspur Street.
   c) Percy Park Road, Tynemouth north west side, from its junction with Percy Park, to a point 10 metres south of its junction with Percy Park

3. loading bays, operational on all days and at all times be introduced on

a) Sea Banks Tynemouth, west side, from a point 5m south of its junction with Percy Gardens (private road, northern access), to a point 12m south of its junction with Percy Gardens; and
b) Grand Parade, Tynemouth, north east side, from a point 86m south of its junction with Beach Road, to a point 104m south of its junction with Beach Road.

B. the North Tyneside (Traffic Movements) (Consolidation) Order 2022, so that:
1. a prohibition of entry for vehicular traffic be introduced from Grand Parade, Tynemouth into Percy Gardens at its junction with Tynemouth Longsands Southern Access Ramp, with exemptions for emergency vehicles and pedal cycles;
2. a prohibition of left-hand turn for vehicular traffic be introduced from Tynemouth Longsands Southern Access Ramp into Percy Gardens, Tynemouth with an exemption for emergency vehicles;
3. a prohibition of right-hand turn for vehicular traffic be introduced from Middle Street, Percy Street, Lovaine Row, Percy Gardens and Back Percy Gardens into East Street, Tynemouth with an exemption for pedal cycles; and
4. a one way restriction, with exemptions for emergency and operational vehicles, be introduced on the following lengths of road:
    a. East Street, Tynemouth from its junction with Front Street to its junction with Percy Gardens
    b. Sea Banks, Tynemouth from its junction with Percy Gardens (south) to its junction with Percy Gardens (north); and
    c. Percy Gardens, Tynemouth from its junction with Sea Banks to its junction with the unnamed Spa car park access road.

C. the North Tyneside (Speed Limits) (Consolidation) Order 2011, so that a 20mph speed limit be introduced on:
1. Grand Parade Tynemouth, from a point 150 metres northwest of its junction with Hotspur Street to Beverley Terrace
2. Beach Road, Tynemouth from its junction with Grand Parade to a point 260m west of its junction with Grand Parade
3. Beverley Terrace, Cullercoats
4. Victoria Crescent, Cullercoats
5. Promontory Terrace, Cullercoats
6. Windsor Crescent, Cullercoats
7. Rockcliffe Gardens, Whitley Bay and
8. Promenade, Whitley Bay from Rockcliffe Gardens to a point 34 metres south of its junction with Marine Avenue/A193.

D. The North Tyneside (On Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2022 so that:
1. permit holders parking places, operational at all hours on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays, on the north-west side of Percy Park, Tynemouth from a point 62 metres south-west of its junction with Grand Parade to a point 70 metres south-west of its junction with Grand Parade be revoked;
2. parking places with a parking charge, operational between 9am and 6pm on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays, on the following lengths of road be revoked:
    a) south east side of Percy Park, Tynemouth from a point 158m north east of its junction with Seafield View to a point 162m north east of that junction;
    b) west side of Percy Park Road, Tynemouth from a point 181m north of its junction with Seafield View to a point 186m north of that junction.
3. Parking places with a parking charge, operational on all days between 9am and 6pm, be varied so that they are located:
    a) on the western side of Grand Parade, Tynemouth

(i) From a point 142m south of its junction with Beach Road to a point 60m north of its junction with Parkside;
(ii) From a point 5m south east of its junction with Parkside to a point 90m south east of that junction.

b) on the western side of Sea Banks, Tynemouth
(i) from a point 23m south of its junction with Percy Gardens (private road, northern access), to a point 65m south of its junction with Percy Gardens
(ii) from a point 70m south of its junction with Percy Gardens (private road, northern access), to a point 205m south of its junction with Percy Gardens
(iii) from a point 77m north of its junction with Percy Gardens (private road, southern access), to a point 21m north of its junction with Percy Gardens

4. a RLNI vehicle parking place be introduced on the west side of Sea Banks Tynemouth, from a point 12m south of its junction with Percy Gardens (private road, northern access), to a point 24m south of its junction with Percy Gardens;
5. The motorcycle parking places on the following lengths of road be revoked:
   a) The west side of Grand Parade, Tynemouth
      (i) from a point 82 metres south of its junction with Beach Road to a point 84 metres south of that junction.
      (ii) from a point 170 metres south of its junction with Beach Road to a point 172 metres south of that junction.
   b) the east side of Sea Banks, Tynemouth
      (i) from a point 57 metres south of its northern junction with Percy Gardens to a point 60 metres south of that junction
      (ii) from a point 89 metres north of its southern junction with Percy Gardens to a point 86 metres north of that junction
6. Motorcycle parking places, operational on all days and at all times, be introduced on the west side of Sea Banks, Tynemouth
   a) from a point 78m south of its junction with Percy Gardens (private road, northern access), to a point 83m south of its junction with Percy Gardens
   b) from a point 84m north of its junction with Percy Gardens (private road, southern access), to a point 89m north of its junction with Percy Gardens

North Tyneside Council also gives notice under Section 90C of the Highways Act 1980 and Section 23(2) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, it proposes to:

A. construct raised tables on
1. Sea Banks, Tynemouth on the northbound, one-way lane at a point 3m southeast of its junction with Percy Gardens (private road, northern access).
2. Grand Parade, Tynemouth at the following points:
   a) 42m north of its junction with Tynemouth Aquarium Car Park Access Road, to a point 55m north of its junction with Tynemouth Aquarium Car Park Access Road.
   b) 62m southeast of its junction with Beach Road, to a point 78m south of its junction with Beach Road.
   c) 41m northwest of its junction with Parkside, to a point 53m northwest of its junction with Parkside.
   d) 42m northwest of its junction with Percy Park, to a point 58m northwest of its junction with Percy Park.
   e) 10m west of its junction with Hotspur Street, to a point 23m west of its junction with Hotspur Street.
3. Beach Road, Tynemouth from a point 7m west of its junction with Regent Drive to a point 7m east of its junction with Regent Drive, and on Regent Drive from its junction with Beach Road to a point 10m south of its junction with Beach Road.
4. Promenade, Whitley Bay at a point 7m southeast of its junction with South Parade, to a point 24m southeast of its junction with South Parade.

The raised tables will extend across the full width of the carriageway and be 0.075m in height, with a gradient of 1 in 15 on the approach.

B. establish zebra crossings on:
   1. East Street, Tynemouth at a point 15m south of its junction with Middle Street; and
   2. Percy Park Road, Tynemouth at a point 9m north of its junction with Warkworth Terrace.

C. establish parallel crossings on:
   1. Grand Parade, Tynemouth at a point 70m south of its junction with Beach Road;
   2. Beach Road, Tynemouth at a point 21m south west of its junction with Grand Parade;
   3. A193 Broadway, Tynemouth at a point 22m south of its junction with Beach Road; and
   4. Promenade, Whitley Bay at a point 15m southeast of its junction with South Parade.

D. upgrade the existing zebra crossing on Grand Parade, Tynemouth at a point 16m west of its junction with Hotspur Street to a parallel crossing; and

E. upgrade the existing zebra crossing on Grand Parade, Tynemouth at a point 50m north of its junction with Tynemouth Aquarium Car Park Access Road to a toucan crossing.

Further details of the proposals may be examined in the documents available on the Council's website www.northtyneside.gov.uk (Statutory Notices). If you wish to object to the proposals, you should send the grounds for your objection in writing to the undersigned or via email to trafficconsultations@northtyneside.gov.uk by 23 August 2023. Any objections may be published as part of any reports to councillors on the matter.
If you need us to do anything differently (reasonable adjustments) to help you access our services, including providing this information in another language or format, please contact sustainabletravel@northtyneside.gov.uk or telephone 0191 643 6500.

2 August 2023
Law & Governance, Quadrant, The Silverlink North, Cobalt Business Park, NE27 0BY