

Appendix 2 – Summary of responses to stakeholder consultation

Organisation	Brief summary of comments	Action taken
Nexus	Overall, Nexus welcomes the ambitions and vision set out within the SPD and is committed to working in partnership to ensure that sustainable travel can be utilised to its best potential within North Tyneside, and throughout the development planning process.	No amendments
Energy Saving Trust	Comprehensive response received, requesting that further technical information be provided within the SPD. Also requested additional text regarding the benefits of EVs for local air quality; ensuring that EV charging infrastructure is well-positioned and accessible; ensuring that details are provided by the developer re how these will be managed and maintained; and making reference to the recently approved guidance within Building Regulations (Part S).	Document updated to refer to the Building Regulations and the requirement for developers to ensure that, where relevant, EV charging infrastructure is well-positioned and accessible, with details provided of how it will be managed and maintained. With regard to the request for additional technical information, it is felt that this level of detail would not be appropriate for an SPD.
Historic England	Acknowledged the SPD, outlined their statutory duties in terms of the planning process, and confirmed that they have no further comments to make.	No amendments
Natural England	Acknowledged the SPD, outlined their statutory duties in terms of the planning process, and confirmed that they have no comments to make on the document. Noted that if an SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment, there is a requirement to consult Natural England at certain stages as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance.	Production of the SPD has involved a scoping assessment which indicated that an SEA/HRA is not required for this SPD.
National Highways	<p>Comprehensive response received. Requested strengthening of wording re:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How developers may be expected to develop and fund sections of the 'tube map' of Strategic Cycling Routes</li> <li>b. Providing a link to 'Decarbonising Transport: A Better, Greener Britain' (July 2021)</li> <li>c. Making specific reference to Department for Transport Circular 02/2013 and 'The strategic road network: Planning for the future' documents</li> <li>d. Requesting that the SPD reference the need for measures in Travel Plans to link to the Core Strategy policies</li> <li>e. Given the growth of weekend leisure travel and its impacts on the Strategic Road Network as well as the climate emergency, questioning whether the minimum standard public transport frequency of one service every 30 minutes during the daytime should be extended to Sundays for residential development and any other land use expected to operate on Sundays</li> <li>f. Query re requirements for a Travel Plan Bond</li> <li>g. Requesting parking control measures where parking associated with a development could impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN)</li> </ul>	<p>Document updated where appropriate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. improve linkages to Department for Transport guidance documents and documents related to Travel Plans;</li> <li>ii. retain the requirement for a Travel Plan Bond and remove some associated detail;</li> <li>iii. ensure that appropriate measures are in place to prevent parking associated with a development from impacting on the SRN.</li> </ul> <p>Regarding public transport frequency, no amendments are proposed to the SPD, however this will be considered as part of wider discussions with bus operators and Nexus.</p>
Northumberland County Council – Planning Policy	Comprehensive response received, expressing support for some statements in the SPD and highlighting where Northumberland County Council takes a different approach as the local authority for a largely rural area.	No amendments
Barton Wilmore on behalf of Taylor Wimpey	<p>Comprehensive response received. Main points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. clarification of the relevant links to the North Tyneside Local Plan</li> <li>b. concerns around viability in the context of requests from the Authority for measures which were not specifically named in the Local Plan or the earlier SPD, e.g. public transport season tickets for residents of new developments, and a suggestion that insufficient supporting evidence had been provided to support these requests</li> <li>c. concerns around car parking space dimensions and standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Wording updated in section 2.1.4 to clarify relevant links to the North Tyneside Local Plan</li> <li>b. Wording updated to remove reference to the value, however the provision of public transport season tickets remains one of the measures available as part of the Travel Plan. This, with other initiatives, will be considered when the Travel Plan is developed</li> <li>c. No amendments have been made to car parking space dimensions. It was necessary to update car parking standards to align with the national amendments to the Use Classes Order introduced in 2020. An updated car parking standard for extra care and over 55's accommodation has been included following surveys of relevant sites, copies of which can be provided on request. Disabled parking provision requirements were amended to include a consistent level of provision, including at sites with fewer overall parking spaces, in line with existing usual practice</li> </ul>

Appendix 2 – Summary of responses to stakeholder consultation

<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of The Killingworth Consortium</p>	<p>Comprehensive response received. Main points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. clarification of the relevant links to the North Tyneside Local Plan</li> <li>b. wording regarding sustainable transport provision, specifically around compliance with current Government guidance Local Transport Note LTN 1/20 'Cycling Infrastructure Design' and links to development viability</li> <li>c. seeking pragmatism in terms of how the SPD will be applied such that it would not pose an unnecessary financial burden for the development</li> <li>d. clarification around domestic garage dimensions in terms of cycle parking requirements</li> <li>e. expressing the view that the public transport walking distance threshold of 400m was too onerous and that this should instead be set at between 600m and 800m</li> <li>f. concerns around the detail of the requirement for developers to provide pre-loaded public transport smartcards as a Travel Plan incentive</li> <li>g. concerns regarding requirements for Travel Plans, the setting of the Travel Plan Bond and potential for impact on viability</li> <li>h. expressing the view that the cost of Travel Plan monitoring should be met from the Authority's own budgets</li> <li>i. asking for reference to be made to the emerging new Manual for Streets</li> <li>j. suggesting that parking standards should specify whether standards are minimum or maximum</li> <li>k. query re distribution of visitor parking bays within site layouts</li> <li>l. Electric Vehicle (EV) provision – suggesting that the text should make reference to Building Regulations and to the changing nature of technology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The text has been updated to clarify the links to specific policies in the North Tyneside Local Plan</li> <li>b. The text has been updated to reflect the latest Government guidance, LTN 1/20. As with all sites, viability will be taken into consideration</li> <li>c. see b)</li> <li>d. Wording updated to clarify that the specified dimensions for a garage can accommodate provision for two cycles</li> <li>e. No changes have been made to the public transport threshold of 400m: this is a recognised standard which has the support of Nexus. In cases where this is not achievable, the document includes provision for the developer to provide the Authority with acceptable evidence of the reasons and agree proportionate mitigation measures</li> <li>f. Wording updated to remove reference to the value, however the provision of public transport season tickets remains one of the measures available as part of the Travel Plan. This, with other initiatives, will be considered when the Travel Plan is developed</li> <li>g. Document updated where appropriate to retain the requirement for a Travel Plan Bond and remove some associated detail</li> <li>h. No amendment is proposed. Any additional monitoring work associated with a new development would appropriately be funded by the developer</li> <li>i. Wording updated to refer to make appropriate reference to the emerging new Manual for Streets</li> <li>j. No amendment is proposed. The parking standards set out are expected standards</li> <li>k. No amendment is proposed. To maximise usage by visitors of visitor parking, it is appropriate for there to be a distribution of bays throughout the site</li> <li>l. Wording updated to make reference to Building Regulations. The regulations may be updated to reflect technological developments</li> </ul>
<p>SAJ Transport Consultants</p>	<p>Comprehensive response received. Main points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Comments regarding Travel Plan monitoring – rather than a timescale of 5 years, suggests using a threshold of 90% occupancy</li> <li>b. Travel Plan Bond – suggests there is a lack of detail on how the value of the bond will be calculated</li> <li>c. Travel Plan Bond – queries the means of demonstrating that it is reasonable and relevant to make use of the bond when targets have not been achieved</li> <li>d. Travel Plan Bond – queries what is the mechanism for returning the bond if the target is achieved</li> <li>e. Seeks clarification on specific aspects regarding proposed Travel Plan incentives, e.g. cycling vouchers of £150 and pre-loaded public transport smartcards, suggesting there is a lack of evidence for how the Authority derived these figures and that an approach based on a single value may not achieve optimum outcome</li> </ul>	<p>A number of amendments have been made to align to specific points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. No amendment is proposed. The five-year post-completion monitoring period reflects expected standards and allows for the effects of measures implemented to be monitored</li> <li>b. Document updated where appropriate to retain the requirement for a Travel Plan Bond and remove some associated detail</li> <li>c. No amendment is proposed. The Travel Plan Bond is proposed to be used only in the event that Travel Plan targets are not achieved and then for the implementation of additional sustainable transport measures</li> <li>d. The mechanism for returning a Travel Plan Bond would be set in the appropriate legal agreement</li> <li>e. Wording updated to remove reference to the value, however the provision of public transport season tickets remains one of the measures available as part of the Travel Plan. This, with other initiatives, will be considered when the Travel Plan is developed</li> </ul>