

North Tyneside Council
Report to Cabinet Member for Environment
Date: 4 October 2024

Title: Pedestrian Crossings – associated with Sea Front Sustainable Route in Whitley Bay, Cullercoats and 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:	Cullercoats and Whitley Bay South, Tynemouth, Whitley Bay North	

PART 1

1.1 Executive Summary:

This report seeks the approval of the Cabinet Member for Environment to install pedestrian crossings in locations at Promenade and Rockcliffe Gardens, Whitley Bay; Beverley Terrace and Victoria Crescent, Cullercoats; and Grand Parade, Tynemouth, and set aside 28 objections received to these 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 pedestrian crossings should be established in accordance with the proposal.

1.3 Forward Plan:

Considering objections received in relation to the proposed establishment of a pedestrian crossing, and thereafter determining if a pedestrian crossing should be installed, 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 the Our North Tyneside 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 Background

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 introducing protected cycling provision, establishing pedestrian crossings and installing road humps in strategic locations, making associated amendments to waiting and loading restrictions, introducing a one-way restriction for general traffic on part of the route, and prohibiting 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 Promenade, Whitley Bay; Windsor Crescent, Promontory Terrace, Victoria Crescent and Beverley Terrace, Cullercoats; and Beverley Terrace, Tynemouth and National Cycle Network Route 1.

The proposals were advertised in accordance with the Authority's usual procedure as set out in section 2.2. 29 formal objections which were received related to the proposed installation of pedestrian crossings, one of which was subsequently withdrawn.

1.5.2 Proposal in relation to raised traffic calming features

It is proposed to construct raised table crossings at the following locations:

Promenade, Whitley Bay

- At a point 13m southeast of its junction with Brook Gardens, to a point 22m southeast of its junction with Brook Gardens
- At a point 55m northwest of its junction with Cheviot View, to a point 68m northeast of its junction with Cheviot View.

Rockcliffe Gardens, Whitley Bay

- At a point 225m southeast of its junction with Edwards Road, to a point 239m southeast of its junction with Edwards Road.

Beverley Terrace, Cullercoats

- At a point 8m south of its junction with John Street, to a point 20m south of its junction with John Street.

Victoria Crescent, Cullercoats

- At a point 14m south of its junction with Eskdale Terrace, to a point 28m south of its junction with Eskdale Terrace.

Grand Parade, Tynemouth

- At a point 52m south of its junction with Beverley Gardens, to a point 68m south of its junction with Beverley Gardens.

1.5.3 Statutory Consultation

Proposals to establish pedestrian crossings are subject to statutory legal process as described in section 2.2: this includes the Authority giving public notice of the proposal and taking such other steps as it may consider appropriate for ensuring adequate publicity for the proposal. In North Tyneside, this includes notices advertising a proposal being displayed on affected streets and on the Authority's website. This enables members of the public or businesses to object to the proposal. 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

The 29 objections received (of which one was subsequently withdrawn) can be summarised as follows:-

- 1 objection based on the view that raised traffic calming features could impact the response time for Royal National Lifeboat Institution (RNLI) crews
- 3 objections to road humps based on the view that these were unnecessary and unpleasant for drivers
- 25 objections (of which one was subsequently withdrawn) raising concerns of raised traffic features impacting access around Cullercoats Harbour and local Fishing operations

Details of objections made and not withdrawn, and associated correspondence, are included at Appendix 1 of this report.

Objections relating to response times for lifeboat crews

A local RNLI volunteer, **Dr H** submitted an objection that "raised bumps, lower speed limit and additional crossings on the sea front" could increase response times for crew when responding to a service call". Dr H also requested clarification that their servicing needs had been considered and that access for HGV deliveries was retained.

An officer responded and clarified that "during the implementation of the 20mph zone speed limit Traffic Regulation Order in August 2023, North Tyneside

Council had a statutory duty to consult with emergency services. The outcome of that consultation was no specific concerns being raised with regards to the effect of the new 20mph zone and response times”.

It should be noted that the crew of the volunteer organisation use their own private vehicles when responding to a service call. Consequently, they must adhere to the traffic rules on all roads along their route to the station, many of which will already be subject to traffic calming measures and congestion at peak times. It is therefore difficult to differentiate how much more acute these potential delays in responding could become as a direct consequence of the raised features proposed along the Sea Front.

Existing congestion around Cullercoats at peak periods (Summer) significantly reduces traffic speeds in the vicinity of the Harbour, and this has been a regular occurrence for many years prior to the proposals of the Sea Front Sustainable Route. The proposed highway changes do not remove any operational capacity, nor are they anticipated to increase traffic demand along the route.

Dr H responded to confirm that he wished for his objection to remain.

Objections relating to the necessity of road humps and experience for drivers

Three local residents, **Mrs A**, **Mr A**, and **Ms C** each submitted an objection to the scheme based on their view that road humps (such as raised table pedestrian crossings) were unnecessary along the route and would make the road unpleasant for drivers and increase congestion and pollution.

An officer responded to these objectors clarifying that Department for Transport (DfT) guidance on 20mph zones suggests: “20mph zones, which have traffic calming features, are very effective at reducing collisions and injuries.” The response also clarified that “successful 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits are generally self-enforcing: that is, the existing conditions of the road together with measures such as traffic calming or signing, publicity and information as part of the scheme, lead to a mean traffic speed that is compliant with the speed limit”.

No further correspondence was received from any of these objectors.

Objections relating to suggested impact on harbour and fishing operations

25 objections were received, of which 23 were identical submissions, from members and affiliates of the Cullercoats Fishermen's Association (CFA), objecting to the introduction of raised traffic features. This submission was detailed and set out the concerns of the CFA in their transportation of vessels around Cullercoats Harbour and the risk of damage the proposals, and traffic humps specifically, represented. Details of the nine reasons for the CFA's objections are included in Appendix 4 which is a copy of the Authority's detailed response to the objection and summary of previous engagement with the CFA.

Through previous written and on-site consultation on the scheme proposals, the CFA have provided details of their operations, the measurements and parameters of the vehicles and vessels they use, and the routes along which they travel.

Officers have considered these requirements, and made appropriate accommodations to the design around Cullercoats, such that there are no sets of road humps proposed along any section of the key operational routes the CFA specified.

Officers have considered these requirements, and where possible have made appropriate accommodations to the design around Cullercoats. There remain some requests from the CFA that cannot be accommodated, and these have been detailed in the written response issued to these objections included in Appendix 4.

Following the issue of the detailed response referenced above, one of the 25 objections was withdrawn, while no further correspondence has been received in relation to the other objections.

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 objections and associated correspondence

Appendix 2 Notice advertised on site

Appendix 3 [Copies of proposed Phase 2 plans](#)

Appendix 4 Detailed response to the objection by the Cullercoats Fishermen's Association (CFA) and summary of previous engagement with the CFA



Cullercoats
Fishermens Associatio

Appendix 5 Equality Impact Assessment



Appx5-EqIA SFSR.pdf

1.9 Contact officers:

Nicholas Bryan, Senior Manager – Regeneration, 0191 643 6622

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) [The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016](#)

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.

2.2 Legal

Proposals that involve revocations or amendments to the provision of pedestrian crossings and the installation of any new pedestrian crossings 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 Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016. The Authority is required to consult the chief officer of police about its proposal and give public notice of the proposal.

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 those representations made and not withdrawn and to determine if a pedestrian crossing should be established.

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 5 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
- Interim Director of
Corporate Strategy and
Customer Service X

Details of Objection [No. 1] – Dr H

Dear Councillors,

As volunteer operations manager of a local charity, I am concerned about the potential impact of a series of raised bumps, lower speed limit and additional crossings on the sea front.

My queries are as follows:

1. Has a risk assessment been completed on the additional time it will take crew to get to a service call?

On Monday evening, for example, when there was a road closure there was a delayed response time for a number of crew who had to use side roads to attend station. Our crew are very careful, but crawling along to a service call may mean delayed responses, especially if it is a time critical shout.

The crew are sensible, but vehicles are essential for them to attend station in an emergency.

In addition,

2. Will our deliveries still be able to take place (we sometimes have an HGV to move heavy plant (tractor) or bring shop deliveries for example).

Officer reply (Dated 22 July 2024)

Dear Dr H,

Thank you for your email. I'm pleased to be able to provide you with a response on behalf of the Seafront Sustainable Travel Route team.

During the implementation of the 20mph zone speed limit Traffic Regulation Order in August 2023, North Tyneside Council had a statutory duty to consult with emergency services. The outcome of that consultation was no specific concerns being raised with regards to the effect of the new 20mph zone and response times. There is, however, specific exemption to the 20mph speed limit for emergency services in an emergency situation.

Please note that as the 20mph zone Traffic Regulation Order was advertised and made in 2023 this cannot be objected to post-implementation. The concerns you have raised

about traffic calming measures and crossings are relevant to the currently advertised Traffic Regulation Orders, and I will turn to these now.

With regards to whether a risk assessment has been produced relating to the additional time it will take emergency services, a specific risk assessment has not been produced for this. However, traffic modelling was undertaken to evidence the impact of the proposals on the highway network and specific consultation has been undertaken with emergency services.

Neither the modelling exercise or consultation highlighted a significant issue with the traffic calming or pedestrian crossings. The traffic calming features themselves are designed to minimise the effect on emergency vehicles, with speed cushions designed to allow emergency vehicles to straddle them, and the raised tables having ramps that are no greater than 1:15 in line with current design standards.

With regards to your query of loading access, the proposals accommodate a legal limit sized HGV – existing loading practices should be uninterrupted by the proposals.

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 Monday, July 29. 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 Dr H in response to the above:

Many thanks for your prompt reply and clarification of some points.

I would just like to point out that our lifeboat crew are not classed as emergency vehicles. Crew travel to station in their own vehicles so some of the points made, for example in relation to emergency vehicles being able to straddle bumps, and exceeding 20mph, would not be applicable. Members of the public do not know we are carefully travelling to an emergency.

My concerns remain that the changes may impact upon response times for our local lifeboat.

Kind Regards

Details of Objection [No. 2] – Mrs A

As a resident in Monkseaton for 37 years I wish to strongly object to the proposed traffic calming on the Links and along the seafront.

The speed limit along most of the seafront is now 20 mph so I cannot see a need for speed bumps also. The council seem to have spent vast sums of money on cycle lanes and road changes along the seafront already. Surely this money would have been better spent on repairing pot holes and building better carparks. It seems to me that cyclists are being given priority when it comes to spending and they are certainly in the minority. Most of them do not use the cycle lanes and therefore hold up the traffic along the seafront and on the Broadway at the Tynemouth end.

The vast majority of people own and use a car daily and yet motorists in North Tyneside are being penalised.

If the council hope to have less cars on the road in the near future they need to pour more money into public transport.

The idea of speed bumps along the seafront is a complete waste of time and money and will simply result in the roads being clogged especially at weekends, cars using more fuel and therefore more emissions.

Please think again about the traffic calming. It will certainly do nothing to calm the vast majority of motorists!

Yours sincerely.

Officer reply (Dated 18 July 2024)

Dear Ms A,

Thank you for your email. I'm pleased to be able to provide you with a response on behalf of the Seafront Sustainable Travel Route team.

Firstly, the team would like to address your objection to traffic calming, which is proposed to support the 20mph zone as part of Phase 2 of the Seafront Sustainable Travel Route.

The proposed traffic calming is not being implemented to benefit cyclists only, but all road users, including vulnerable road users such as children or those with visual impairments. The DfT guidance on 20mph zones suggests: '20mph zones, which have

traffic calming features, are very effective at reducing collisions and injuries. Research in 1996 showed that overall average annual collision frequency could fall by around 60%, and the number of collisions involving injury to children could be reduced by up to two-thirds.'

With regard to your point regarding spending the funding on potholes, the funding has been granted by the Department for Transport Active Travel England fund. The funding is specific to active travel improvements. However, as seen in Phase 1 (Tynemouth Front Street to Tynemouth Aquarium) large areas of highway resurfacing (some 1.7km of road for example) have been undertaken. This would not have been possible without the funding received from Active Travel England.

With regards to your point of cyclists holding up traffic, the scheme aims to separate motor vehicles and active travel users and therefore should remove or at least reduce the frequency of cyclists and motorist interaction.

Finally, with regards to your point of funding should be allocated to public transport, North Tyneside Council is committed to public transport improvements such as the recent delivery of the award-winning bus improvement scheme at Four Lane Ends Interchange and the bus interchange at North Shields. North Tyneside Council is also supporting the North East Combined Authority in delivering their share of £163.5 million to improve public transport as part of the Bus Service improvement Plan – <https://www.northeast-ca.gov.uk/how-we-work/transport/bus-service-improvement-plan#:~:text=The%20North%20East%20BSIP%20is,The%20plan%20is%20refreshed%20annually.>

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, July 26. 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. 3] – Mr A

I wish to object to the proposed traffic calming measures along the coastal route. Yet again the supposed safety needs of a tiny proportion of road users, namely the small number of cyclists, are dictating huge limitations for the vast majority of road users.

I am a regular bike user myself and have to say that there are far fewer cyclists along these routes (and other places such as Rake Lane/New York) than the council supposes.

Also, as a regular cyclist I have to say that the 'improvements' so far have done little to increase my perception of safety while riding.

We are simply choking and slowing road traffic in our area with increasing negative impact on the local economy. What are the criteria for defining success with these projects? How is this to be measured? I suggest we need detailed surveys of actual bike use in all the places where vast amounts of money have been spent in road changes. Also, how is the impact on the local economy being measured?

Officer reply (Dated 17 July 2024)

Thank you for your email. I'm pleased to be able to provide you with a response on behalf of the Seafront Sustainable Travel Route team.

Firstly, the team would like to respond to your question about how success is defined. The funding body (Department for Transport – Active Travel England) set a specific set of criteria to be monitored and evaluated. Specifically for this scheme, the criteria include:

- Increase in numbers of cycling,
- Reduction in collisions,
- Reduction in traffic volume,
- Increased coastal visitor numbers.

Baseline surveys are undertaken prior to a scheme proposal and then at defined increments post completion, surveys are undertaken to determine success level. Although impact of local economy is not directly measured, the metric 'Increased coastal visitor numbers' would be the most appropriate gauge for this.

Next, the team would like to address your objection to traffic calming, which is proposed to support the 20mph zone as part of Phase 2 of the Seafront Sustainable Travel Route.

The proposed traffic calming is not being implemented to benefit cyclists only, but all road users, including vulnerable road users such as children or those with visual impairments. The DfT guidance on 20mph zones suggests: '20mph zones, which have traffic calming features, are very effective at reducing collisions and injuries. Research in 1996 showed that overall average annual collision frequency could fall by around 60%, and the number of collisions involving injury to children could be reduced by up to two-thirds.'

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 Thursday, July 25. 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. 4] – Ms C

To whom it may concern

I would like to register my objections to the proposed traffic calming measures along the links in Whitley bay through to Tynemouth.

As a resident of the Links in Whitley bay, by these proposals you are making it increasingly unpleasant and difficult to drive into and around my property, which I have every right to do.

I don't understand and nowhere has the case been made of the rationale for the changes, which will add wear and tear onto cars tyres and brakes and ruin a beautiful drive along our beautiful coast.

The stated aim - to make things safer for cyclists - seems to be innocuous at best as there is already a cycle lane so the measures will have no impact on that and the speed limit has already been reduced to 20mph along the entire stretch, so I would like to understand the need for additional calming measures.

The proposals are also neglecting to consider our older residents of which my mother is one. As a dementia sufferer one of her last pleasures in life is a drive along the coast when she is distressed, however multiple raised zebra and parallel crossings and additional traffic cushions will now make that journey deeply unpleasant for her robbing her of the view she has enjoyed for 55years as she can longer walk or cycle it.

I would like to know what the statistics are for cyclists/pedestrian injuries on this stretch of road that has prompted additional safety measures?

I do not object to the idea of additional zebra crossings, but this proposal seems to be excessive in the extreme and another example of the this local authorities war against motorists which is sewing seeds of disharmony and creating animosity towards cyclists and cycling which seems to be at odds with its purpose.

Thank you

Officer reply (Dated 18 July 2024)

Dear Ms C,

Thank you for your email. I'm pleased to be able to provide you with a response on behalf of the Seafront Sustainable Travel Route team.

The team would like to address your objection to traffic calming, which is proposed to support the 20mph zone as part of Phase 2 of the Seafront Sustainable Travel Route.

The proposed traffic calming is not being implemented to benefit cyclists only, but all road users, including vulnerable road users such as children or those with visual impairments. The DfT guidance on 20mph zones suggests: '20mph zones, which have traffic calming features, are very effective at reducing collisions and injuries. Research in 1996 showed that overall average annual collision frequency could fall by around 60%, and the number of collisions involving injury to children could be reduced by up to two-thirds.'

Successful 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits are generally self-enforcing: that is, the existing conditions of the road together with measures such as traffic calming or signing, publicity and information as part of the scheme, lead to a mean traffic speed that is compliant with the speed limit. To achieve compliance, there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity unless this has been explicitly agreed.

With regards to the raised features themselves, driver comfort has been considered. They are all proposed to be raised by 75mm which is significantly less than those implemented previously on The Links. As well as the height, the grade of the ramp and the length of the plateau are also key attributes in driver comfort. The specified ramps are no greater than 1:15 which reduces passenger discomfort as compared to steeper ramps.

With regards to accident statistics these are below, and guidance would suggest that reduction in speed limit through a self-enforcing traffic-calmed 20mph zone would reduce the severity of the accidents.

2018

Slight - 9

Serious - 3

Fatal - 0

2019

Slight - 13
Serious - 1
Fatal - 0

2020

Slight - 9
Serious - 3
Fatal - 0

2021

Slight - 8
Serious - 0
Fatal - 0

2022

Slight - 8
Serious - 6
Fatal - 0

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, July 26. 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. 5] – Mr O

Good evening I write to express my personal objections to your proposal regarding the development of the cycle way at Cullercoats.

I have had generations of my family who have fished from Cullercoats and I have been a member of Cullercoats RNLI from the age of 17 until 47. These are not only part of my history but also part of the history and heritage of Cullercoats Village. This is something that you appear to just want to throw away in one fell swoop. I cannot understand your contradictions – on the one hand you tell a fabulous story about Winslow Homer the artist, the fishing girls, the many, many boats that have fished from Cullercoats for centuries, the smugglers, the local caught seafood and yet on the other hand your recent proposals seem to wish to wipe this all away. Cullercoats will lose all its character and identity – it will be lost between Tynemouth and Whitley Bay.

Council staff, planners, officers and the general public may think 'Well what is the issue – your boat is not wider than the road however when you feature in the length wheels,

trailer and tractor then this is way too long to be able to operate under your new restricted available space. They would never be able to turn out of the boat park.

Trailers are designed and built to be very low to the ground – often as low as 4 inches when unladen. This is to allow the trailer to enter the water and then quickly and safely launching of the boat. When rising up on or descending down from a raised feature it is most likely that the keel of the boat will catch on the raised feature causing massive amount of damage to the vessels. This is not only for fishing boats but for Cullercoats RNLI and also pleasure crafts which launch from Cullercoats too. Your proposal to install raised features will make this impossible to do. Insurance companies would simply write off the vessel thus ending someones livelihood. Your proposals are likely to render their insurance policies null and void.

As has been pointed out on several occasions, over many years, to various officers, departments, working groups etc etc the fishermen of Cullercoats were granted rights of use and rights of access to and from the harbour and is surrounding roads. Your plans are in direct contravention of these rights. You may feel that the small number of fishermen who use Cullercoats are not important, that they do not matter. Cullercoats fishermen have been given the right to return to fish from Cullercoats and these rights are also to be passed on to their families and future generations of fishermen who want to use Cullercoats for launching their boats. Your plans directly infringe these rights.

Fair, safe, workable, accessible use of the roads and access to and from Cullercoats Harbour must be available for all. You desire to create a cycle lane of this nature through Cullercoats will prevent this. Why should the provision of a cycle lane take precedence over the boats at Cullercoats? At no point are the fishermen stating that there should not be a provision for improved safety for cyclists what we are saying is that this should not be at the detriment and safety of launching and retrieving vessels from the harbour.

Your proposals are to install 6 raised features and an additional 2 zebra crossings. Have you considered the impact that would have on the launch time of the Cullercoats RNLI? Picture this – a busy sunny day, Cullercoats sea front is jammed packed, traffic s bumper to bumper, they are now having to negotiate the raised features and the zebra crossings and the lifeboat pagers go off and the boat is needed for a child in the water – your child in the water. You may say that the impact may only add a minute or two onto the launch time. That minute or two may make all the difference to the outcome of the rescue mission. The last rescue I launched Cullercoats RNLI on was to a you boy who was in the water just off Cullercoats, it was October, the roads were clear, our boat was launched and under way in under 4 minutes, when we got to the young man only his hand was visible out of the water. Had your proposals been in place on that day then we would not have been able to save his life. Please think of that – that alone should deter you from these proposals.

Please do not implement these measures – there must be some other way to provide safe cycle ways and allow boats safe access to and from the harbour.

Thank you

Officer reply (Dated 29 August 2024) – Response also provided to objectors No.6 – No.29

Dear Mr O

Thank you for your email. I'm pleased to be able to provide you with a response on behalf of the Seafront Sustainable Travel Route team.

All the matters you raised are covered in the responses to fishing issues set out in the attached document titled "Cullercoats Fishermen's Association Design Consultation". (Appendix 4)

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 September 6, 2024. 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. 6] – Mr C

Dear Sir.

I wish to object to the implementation of some the proposals for traffic measures and a cycleway at Cullercoats.

I am fully in support of the objections raised by Cullercoats Fishermens Association.

Not enough consideration and allowance has been given to the legitimate operation and logistics for the fishermen operating at Cullercoats. The measures as proposed will severely jeopardise and restrict fishing operations.

The traffic calming measures(speed bumps) and restricted road width do not take into account ,the need for fishermen to access the harbour and boat park in a safe and efficient manner. Neither of these measures are essential to the operation of the cycleway and could easily be removed from the proposals in this area without any

negative impact to anyone. In general they appears to be a lack of consideration for the requirements of fishermen to move their vessels and equipment around the village and access all points around the harbour. This is not acceptable.

Despite constructive input and objections by the local fishermen, no serious attempt has been made to accommodate their concerns. The fishermen have a legal right to operate in Cullercoats and their legal rights should be recognised by the Council and attempts to solve the access issues should be made. The council must make the effort to balance the interests of all the users of the area not just one minority group. There is adequate scope to placate all of the interested parties without prejudicing anyone's singular use.

The reason for there being so few fishermen left operating in Cullercoats is because North Tyneside Council has had a deliberate policy for many years of making life difficult for the fishermen to operate at Cullercoats.

Regards

Officer reply – [as provided to objection No.5 above]

Details of Objections [Nos. 7 - 29]

Dear Sirs.

I object to the proposed measures above for the following reasons:

1. Fishing vessel trailer axles have, by design, very low ground clearance, being around four inches when unladen. This is for practical purposes during launch and recovery operations on the beach in the Harbour.

2. When moving heavy fishing vessels with low, single axle trailer ground clearance, raised tables on the road pose severe risks of damaging tractors, trailers, and vessels. If when rising onto, or descending from the table, the overhanging keel and skeg grounds onto the road and/or table, the friction produced would inevitably drag a vessel off the trailer onto the road, causing catastrophic damage to the vessel and trailer. A vessel could be rendered unrepairable and written off by the insurance company, with associated costs and loss of livelihood for the fishermen. Vessels are designed to be supported by water and their trailers, and not designed to be driven over obstacles.

3. When moving heavy fishing vessels with low, single axle trailer ground clearance, speed cushions pose an even greater severe risk than raised tables. On approach, trailer wheels will straddle the cushion, and the low axle and draw bars will then slam into the cushion, bringing every thing to a sudden halt. The impact would cause the tractor drive

train to smash, damage the trailer, with the vessel, in all likelihood, flying off the trailer, having parted its securing ropes. In the unlikely event that a trailer does manage to get over a speed cushion, then the overhanging keel and skeg would ground on the cushion and drag the vessel off the trailer. In either case, damage to the tractor, trailer, and vessel would be catastrophic, and everything would be a write off. Associated costs, loss of livelihood, and road damage, would be inevitable. Crush and collision injuries to the driver are highly likely.

4. Fishermen and their families have lawful historic and granted rights of use of, and access to and from, the: Northern Boat Park; North and South Harbour Access roads; and the Southern Boat Field. Raised tables and speed cushions are obstacles which would prevent the fishermen exercising their tenant and licensee rights. There is also the matter of the access road onto the Southern Boat Field. This has been adversely and deliberately blocked by steel posts, behind the public toilet at the North end of the field. The only means of access is at the Southern end of the field, opposite numbers 12 and 13 Beverley Terrace. Speed cushions on the road would completely prevent all vessel access.

5. Registered fishermen have a granted right of return to operate a fishing vessel if they have been out of the area for some time. Unsafe road conditions would deter any fisherman investing in a suitable vessel to work from this Harbour. These rights also apply to their families. Unsafe road conditions infringe fishermen's rights of use and access.

6. Fishermen and their families should not be discriminated against, in order to favour other road users, by the imposition of unsafe and unfair working conditions with impassable roads. Fair, safe, workable, and lawful use of the road should be available to all.

7. There is a real risk of voiding all insurance policies should fishermen drive their vessels on a provably unsafe road.

Yours sincerely,

Officer reply – [as provided to objection No.5 above]

**NORTH TYNESIDE COUNCIL
SEAFRONT SUSTAINABLE ROUTE**

**NORTH TYNESIDE COUNCIL
SEA FRONT SUSTAINABLE ROUTE
PROPOSED PARALLEL, PUFFIN, TOUCAN AND ZEBRA CROSSINGS**

North Tyneside Council also gives notice that it proposes under Section 23(2) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police, to:

A. Establish New zebra crossings at the following:

- 1) Beverley Terrace, Tynemouth
 - a) At a point 15m south of its junction with John Street
 - b) At a point 6m south of its junction with Beverley Terrace Side Road (between No. 26 and 27)
 - c) At a point 9m south of its junction with Marden Avenue
- 2) Rockcliffe Gardens, Whitley Bay
 - a) At a point 61m north west of its junction with Cheviot View
- 3) Victoria Crescent, Cullercoats
 - a) At a point 22m south of its junction with Eskdale Terrace
 - b) At a point 29m south west of its junction with Unnamed Access Road to Cullercoats Bay and the RNLI

B. Establish New parallel crossings at the following:

- 1) Rockcliffe Gardens, Whitley Bay
 - a) At a point 232m south east of its junction with Edwards Road

C. Update existing Zebra crossings to parallel crossings at the following:

- 1) A193 The Links, Whitley Bay
 - a) At a point 37m south of its junction with Coquet Park First School Access Road

D. Update existing Puffin crossings to Zebra crossings at the following:

- 1) Promenade, Whitley Bay
 - a) At a point 17m south of its junction with Brook Street

E. Update existing Puffin crossings to Toucan crossings at the following:

- 1) Grand Parade, Tynemouth
 - a) At a point 59m south of its junction with Beverley Gardens
- 2) Promenade, Whitley Bay

a) At a point 18m west of its junction with Park Road

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 19 July 2024. Any objections received 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.

28 June 2024

Head of Law, Quadrant, Silverlink North, Cobalt Business Park, NE27 0BY