

Policy 49

Id No	Respondent	Policy 49
428	Campaign To Protect Rural England	<p>CPRE does not support airport expansion, and would wish to see reference to airports deleted from this policy.</p> <p>An argument can be made that if surface transport links were better within the region, the catchment areas of our two airports would overlap significantly and we would only need one airport.</p> <p>A further argument could be made that if rail services out of the region to Manchester, London and the Channel Tunnel were improved, we would not need any airports in the region.</p> <p>In our view, a genuine approach integrating air travel at an appropriate level with other modes of transport instead of regarding it in isolation as a potential economic driver would recognise these arguments and adopt them into policy.</p> <p>If reference to airport expansion is retained in the policy, we would wish to see references to improving road access to airports de-emphasised and preference given to rail and bus access. In addition, the use of greenfield land let alone Green Belt to create airport car parks should not be permitted.</p> <p>Rail links and interchanges with ports should be given clear preference over road interchanges. However, it is important to ensure that the ports and interchanges will not be expanded using greenfield sites.</p>
211	Castle Morpeth Borough Council	<p>Defines International Gateways concentrating on the needs of the two airports, Durham-tees-Valley Airport and Newcastle International Airport. With regards to Newcastle Airport, the policy states that priorities, will be given to improving the access on the surrounding road network, in the short term and in the long term to overcome the constraints on the wider network. The Council supports the inclusion of this policy within the RSS, however, it is considered that the policy and the supporting text should also make reference to improvements in areas to the west of the airport, such as Ponteland on the A696, where the village is already experiencing significant levels of traffic congestion and the impact of military traffic movements associated with the Otterburn ranges.</p>
282	City of Durham Trust	<p>Support, but see the caveats on (a) referred to in response to policies 6 and 7.</p>
102	Durham Tees Valley Airport	<p>DTVA supports the acknowledgement in paragraphs 3.184, 3.187 and 3.188 that the Airport can help to improve business competitiveness and support inbound tourism. It also welcomes the support Policy 49 gives to the growth of the Airport and measures to improve surface access</p>
200	Environment Agency	<p>3.185 The stated “..need for growth of the region’s airports..” is likely to conflict with sustainable development aims of the RSS. 3.188 Is there any evidence for these claims of a “..positive impact on the region’s economy in terms of job creation..”</p>
333	Freight on Rail	<p>Waste Management Provision</p> <p>As well as transporting conventional waste rail can remove recycled waste</p>

163 Friends of the Earth North East

In keeping with our comments on Policy 21 above Friends of the Earth opposes this policy as it is seeking to, 'support the growth of the region's airports,' which is unsustainable and based on the erroneous belief that such growth is essential for economic prosperity. Paragraph 3.186 states that, 'The Northern Way Growth Strategy recognises the importance of airports...as key economic drivers which are essential to successful city regions.' In fact, the support of the NWGS for aviation growth is based on a substantially flawed analysis. To give two examples: it falsely claims that the Air Transport White Paper sets 'targets' for an increase in air passenger numbers by 2030, when in fact the WP only identifies forecasts – a quite different concept; and it appears to be arguing that the expansion of northern airports capacity to cater for the 71% component of growth to 2030 that is represented by outbound UK discretionary leisure trips will make a positive contribution to regional economic activity – how this can be is not clear. The Friends of the Earth briefing 'Why airport expansion is bad for regional economies' in fact identifies that in 2004 there was an annual deficit of £0.75billion (between inward and outward visitors) in the NE, which can be forecast to double (£1.5B p.a) by 2020 if WP expansion forecasting is realised. The RSS has completely bought-into this view, without critically challenging it or examining the evidence.

Aviation growth is also wholly incompatible with sustainable development and the RSS's vision of a sustainable, high quality of life for present and future generations due to the major contribution the industry makes to greenhouse gas emissions. Unless emissions are drastically reduced, catastrophic climate change will pose a major threat to current and future generations of people in the North East and beyond. In addition, work undertaken by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change has established that – at various dates between 2020-40, depending on scenarios – the growth in aviation emissions will be such that this one sector will take up the entire 'carbon allowance' available to the UK under the declining emissions scenario required to achieve the –60% reductions scenario established by the Energy White Paper – the introduction of emissions trading would also make no difference to this outcome. Aviation growth will therefore require the almost complete 'decarbonising' of every other sector of economic and social activity, burdening them with huge increase costs. All the efforts to achieve a North East renaissance and greater economic prosperity will be fundamentally undermined by this major breach of environmental limits. It is vital to remember that our very existence hinges on the continuing support and functioning of the natural environment which human induced climate change is endangering.

We recommend that this policy is fundamentally rewritten to focus exclusively on improving public transport access to the airports, and is moved from the very front of the transport section, setting as it does the wrong tone for the theme. Its principal components should be:

- the setting of the 'challenging short and long term targets for decreasing the proportion of journeys to the airport made by private car while increasing the share of journeys made by other modes' required by government guidance on surface access strategies (paragraph 6). The Regional Assembly will need to go through a process of setting those challenging targets.
- compliance with the requirements of the Air Transport White Paper that airport operators should demonstrate how they will achieve these targets, at the same time that they put forward proposals for developing new capacity (ATWP 4.56)
- and also with the requirement that 'developers [should] pay the costs of up-grading or enhancing road, rail or other transport networks or services where these are needed to cope with additional passengers traveling to and from expanded or growing airports' (ATWP 4.58)

Para 3.187

We do not support this paragraph in its current form, as the text disguises the difference between the forecast in passenger numbers supported by the Air Transport White Paper, and those contained in policy 21, which go hugely beyond those supported by the White Paper – see our previous comments on this. Consequently, the words 'Forecasts, particularly in the case of Newcastle International Airport, indicate a significant increase in growth' are misleading; and no mention is made of Teesside Airport. This is contrary to the guidance in PPS11, Annex B paragraph 24; and this paragraph must make clear whether it supports the White Paper forecasts or not.

- The outcome should read: 'Improve sustainable and public transport access to the region's airports and ports, and the proportion of

Id No Respondent**Policy 49**

journeys made by these modes.’ The indicator should read, ‘% of journeys to the region’s airports/ports made by sustainable/public transport

Overall Transport Strategy

- The outcomes for this policy should read: ‘100% of LDFs/LTPs to base their transport policies on the principles and objectives in policy 49’ and ‘100% of LDFs including policies to reduce traffic levels by 10% below 1990 levels by 2021, and to increase public transport (bus and light rail) usage by 12% by 2010 relative to 1990 levels.

329 Friends of the Earth South Tyneside

South Tyneside Friends of the Earth opposes this policy as it is seeking to, ‘support the growth of the region’s airports,’ which is unsustainable and based on the erroneous belief that such growth is essential for economic prosperity. Paragraph 3.186 states that, ‘The Northern Way Growth Strategy recognises the importance of airports..as key economic drivers which are essential to successful city regions.’ The RSS has completely bought-into this view, despite the lack of evidence to support this, and more importantly, the increasing evidence against such an assertion. Once again, we quote the findings of the Steer Davies Gleave report, ‘Economic Benefits Appraisal of Existing and Future Transport Infrastructure Requirements for the North East’ produced for One North East which states, ‘More transport infrastructure and service provision will not in itself drive economic growth’ (p.2).

Aviation growth is also wholly incompatible with sustainable development and the RSS’s vision of a high quality of life for present and future generations due to the major contribution the industry makes to greenhouse gas emissions. Unless emissions are drastically reduced, catastrophic climate change will pose a major threat to future generations of people in the North East and around the world. All the efforts to achieve a North East renaissance and greater economic prosperity will be fundamentally undermined by this major breach of environmental limits. It is vital to remember that our very existence hinges on the continuing support and functioning of the natural environment which climate change is endangering.

We recommend that this policy is fundamentally rewritten.

Policy 49: Overall Transport Strategy

In pursuit of a high quality, sustainable and accessible transport system, strategies, plans and programmes will be based on delivering the following objectives:

- Reducing the need for travel
- Reducing traffic levels, particularly through demand management
- Restricting unnecessary car usage
- Minimising the environmental impacts of transport, and particularly reducing greenhouse gas emissions
- Significantly improving the provision and quality of public transport services to achieve modal shift
- Encouraging cycling and walking for shorter journeys
- Making best use of existing infrastructure
- Addressing social exclusion

All investment decisions will be taken in accordance with these objectives. Road-building will be regarded as the option of last resort as a solution to transport problems. Support will not be given to any road-building proposal unless it can be demonstrated that all other possible options have been fully considered and it has been concluded that these do not provide an adequate solution.

Id No	Respondent	Policy 49
		<p>Strategies, plans and programmes will seek to meet the following targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reduction of 10% in road traffic levels by 2021 relative to 1990; • A 12% increase in public transport usage (bus and light rail) by 2010 relative to 2000 levels
4	Friends of the Earth Tyne Bridge	<p>Policy 49 insists on the growth of our airports and therefore the need to increase access. In our view the latter should not take place until the sustainability of the former is established, i.e. it should not lead to any increase in carbon emissions. A hard rail link to Newcastle International Airport (NIA) has been costed and dismissed by NIA and should certainly not be built to “facilitate growth”, so a more realistic aim would be to increase frequency or capacity of Metro services from Central Station to the Airport, while ensuring that NIA’s plans to build further car-parking spaces were rejected. Similarly there should not be allowance for offices or commercial development in the NIA Green Belt “window”, since this will only increase road use and congestion around the Airport. Tyne Bridge Friends of the Earth also disagrees with the decision of Darlington Council to subsidise non-stopping services to Durham-Tees Valley Airport when other more popular services are underfunded.</p>
215	Government Office For The North	<p>Para 3.189 This para seems to suggest that the ECML itself is cleared to W10 containers throughout - our understanding is that it is not so.</p> <p>Again promotes expansion of Teesport as in Policy 22. At ‘h’ there is a reference to passenger facilities but is this intended to refer to all ports or the current passenger services at the Tyne?</p> <p>Para 3.180 What is a ‘dynamic labour market’ and how can transport support the development of one?</p> <p>Para 3.170 It is not clear from the introduction that as stated in para 3.177 the RSS/RTS will be good basis for LTPs and LDFs given lack of spatial specificity and concentration on major schemes. The section doesn't mention the Transport Innovation Fund or the Regional Funding Allocations policy which will be the background against which major schemes will be developed. Whilst the most recent announcements on these two issues post-dated this draft it will be important to consider how it would be affected by these policies at the EIP.</p> <p>Para 3.179 On specifics what evidence is there that there is demand for improved rail services between the two city regions as stated in para 3.179? What evidence is there that better value for money solutions could not be provided buy bus services. This is an example of where we would expect to see an outcome based approach rather that scheme based approach.</p>
160	Highways Agency	<p>The regions ports and airports need to be made more attractive and part of this is the need to improve their surface access, particularly public transport. Mention is made of need to improve strategic highway network A1 Newcastle/Gateshead Bypass is only specific road improvement mentioned.</p>
273	Member of Public	<p>The public transport access to NCL Airport is third rate and after the various attempts to change road layout it continues to be a joke. The car parks there are a cash cow that is being milked and surely in spatial planning terms there is no reason other than saving cost to perpetuate the sea of tarmac around the terminal.</p>
453	Member of Public	<p>First policy of the section sets the tone for the section s as a whole .it is imperative the policy reflects the RSS's transport priorities Recommend following be inserted as new policy 49 In pursuit of a high quality, sustainable and accessible transport system strategies plans and programmes will be bases on delivering the following objectives; reducing need for travel reducing traffic levels</p>

Id No	Respondent	Policy 49
		<p>restricting unnecessary car usage minimizing environmental impacts of transport and reducing greenhouse gas emissions significantly improving the provision and quality of public transport services to achieve modal shift encouraging cycling and walking for shorter journeys making best use of existing infrastructure addressing social exclusion</p> <p>Investment decisions will taken accordance with these objectives. Road building will be regarded as the option of last resort as a solution to transport problems Strategies plans & programmes will seek to meet the following targets reduction of 10% in road traffic levels by 2021 relative to 2001 12% increase in public transport usage by 2010 relative to 2000 levels</p> <p>Airports are detrimental to the tourist economy and I oppose this policy. There is no evidence to support the view that airports are key economic drivers which are essential to successful city regions. (Steer Davies Gleave report) Aviation growth is also incompatible with sustainable development and RSS vision of high quality of life due increased emissions of greenhouse gases.</p> <p>Recommend policy is rewritten to focus exclusively on improving public transport access to airports and is moved to the front of the transport section.</p>
470	Member of Public	<p>The impact of transport on the region's environment and on our capacity to contribute to greenhouse gas reduction targets must be taken into account. I therefore oppose airport expansion and large scale road expansion, but support improvements to public transport and seaport facilities.</p>
760	Member of Public	<p>3.181 & 3.183 - delighted and relieved that 3.181 says transport plans should seek to reduce climate change. This presumably means being carbon neutral or paying for offset measures. I would like to see (i) the airports included in the Carbon Neutral Newcastle Scheme and (ii) para 3.181 included in an actual policy.</p>
449	National Trust North East	<p>Para 3.183 refers to our Kyoto commitments on national level, and I am glad the RSS takes these seriously. I believe, however, that they should be included in concrete targets within an actual policy.</p> <p>This policy should be deleted. The Trust does not support the concept of International Gateways, and their expansion. Any public transport improvements required to facilitate access to airports should be included within Policies 50 and 51 where relevant. There has been no evidence provided by the Assembly that the expansion of airports will lead to economic growth in the North East Region, yet this assumption is carried right through the RSS, despite consistent rhetoric about reducing the impact of transport related emissions on the environment and threats they pose to climate change.</p>

Id No Respondent

Policy 49

The concept of International Gateways and their continued expansion is totally incompatible with the principles of sustainable development, and leads to numerous contradictions within the RSS itself.

Indeed, objectives outlined in para. 3.180 include “minimise the impact of the movement of people and goods on the environment and climate change”. If these objectives are real, where are the policies to support them? Policy 49 certainly doesn't! And where are the targets and indicators to monitor these targets within the Implementation Plan? Without policy back-up these objectives are pointless.

94 Nectar

Policy 49 is opposed by NECTAR in so far as it relates to airports

Policy 49 as drafted is unsustainable and inconsistent with the objectives set out in Paragraph 3.180. It gives undue emphasis to the region's airports and fails to recognise among other things, the role of channel tunnel traffic, of the channel tunnel rail link now nearing completion (Eurostar rail carries some two thirds of all London Paris Brussels traffic), of the proposed north south high speed rail link being studied by the DfT (High Speed Line Study, Atkins for DfT, 2005), and of the large volume of traffic entering the Region via Manchester Airport.

The introductory sentence should be amended to reflect the content of Policy 49 and should read, 'To develop airport strategies, plans and programmes to improve surface access links by sustainable transport modes'. Policies 49c and 49e are not sustainable, would worsen the climate change problem and should be deleted. Policy 49b should be pursued in the short term thus reducing the need for Policy 49c. Policies 49d and 49f should be more actively pursued as they offer the potential to deliver very many passengers directly to the airport without the constraints which may or may not be represented by the Newcastle Gateshead Western Bypass.

Policy 21 should be amalgamated with this policy (Policy 49) to generate a Policy in which the role of air travel is presented in context; the East Coast Mainline Railway stations bring a comparable if not greater number of people into the Region and the roads perhaps more. The land grab proposed for the airports, is based on unbridled predict and provide forecasts and is unsustainable. The Technical Background Paper

No.10: Transport gives a very partial statement on the economic impact of an airport which relies largely on circumstances elsewhere and does not address the key factors of the net outflow of tourists (cost nationally £17billionpa), the aviation fuel and VAT exemptions (cost nationally £10billionpa) or the environmental costs and consequences related to aircraft CO2 and other emissions. The figures quoted in the Technical Background Paper No.10: Transport serve to show how small the volume of business is nationally at around 10% of the passengers carried by the rail and 5% of those carried by the bus industry. Rail links are a more sustainable option generating far less CO2 and other emissions than air services; Policy 21b should be amended to reflect these points. Air service development should be restricted to journeys of 1 000 Km or more.

Policy 49 is supported in so far as it relates to Ports.

Policies 49g, 49h, 49i are supported but should further include specifically the enhancement of passenger access to the Port of Tyne ferry terminal and freight access to the Port of Tyne by rail.

Id No Respondent

Policy 49

241 Newcastle International Airport

3.184 It is important that in future the North East has a transport network that supports the accelerated economic growth. The international gateways include the region's airport's and ports but the region also needs to have high quality inter-regional networks, including strategic road and mainline rail links to the conurbations, main towns, and ports and airports, which provide fast and reliable access to national and international destinations. This will be important to improve the competitiveness of the region and improve access to existing and potential markets for businesses, as well as supporting inbound tourism, which is emerging as an increasingly important sector in the regional economy. The region's two airports and ports, in particular Teesport and Port of Tyne, have opportunity to expand and this can help to deliver wider economic benefits such as employment in direct and spin off industries.

The recognition given to the role of the airport in accelerating economic growth is welcomed.

3.186 The Northern Way Growth Strategy recognises the importance of airports both as key economic drivers which are essential to successful city regions and for transporting leisure and business passengers and freight. Durham Tees Valley airport and Newcastle International Airport both provide this role for the regions two city regions and function as international gateways for North East. Continued access to London Heathrow from the two regional airports will be important, as Heathrow offers destinations to other parts of the world that provides passengers with the opportunity for international interchange.

The recognition of the role of Newcastle International is contributing to the Northern Way is welcomed. The Northern Way document advocates Newcastle International as best placed to serve the North East given the strength of its existing route network.

3.187 The Future of Air Transport White Paper anticipates significant growth at the region's airports up to 2030 and suggests that impacts associated with growth are expected to be limited. Therefore, the White Paper supports the development of terminal capacity, runway, extensions and improved taxiway systems needed to cater for this growth. Forecasts, particularly in the case of Newcastle International Airport, indicate a significant increase in growth. Socio-economic factors, amongst others, are expected to contribute to an increase in passenger numbers as set out in policy 21. The increase in demand for low cost air travel has also contributed to the airports rapid growth.

NIAL welcomes the recognition given to Newcastle International in delivering national policy.

3.188 With the levels of growth anticipated, new routes, new markets and new opportunities will become accessible. These will have a positive impact on the region's economy in terms of job creation and access to other key international locations. Any expansion that is proposed will need to be subject to the relevant sustainability and environmental impact assessments

NIAL welcomes the recognition given to the role of airport growth in creating economic benefits.

Policy 49 – International Gateways

Id No	Respondent	Policy 49
		<p>To support the growth of the regions airports, strategies, plans and programmes should improve surface access links by all modes, particularly by public transport.</p> <p>At Durham-Tees Valley Airport priorities will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) improve bus serves to Darlington, Middlesbrough, Stockton and Durham City; b) Improve in the longer term, rail services and rail integration with the main terminal buildings; and c) Improve access on the surrounding road network, including Long Newton Junction and the A66 Darlington bypass / Darlington Eastern Transport Corridor <p>At Newcastle International Airport, priorities will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) improve in the short term, public transport access to the airport e) in the longer term, to overcome the constraints on the wider road network including the A1 Newcastle / Gateshead Western Bypass; and f) to further investigate the potential and feasibility of a heavy rail link to facilitate the expansion of the Airport <p>Newcastle International fully supports the above policy. It is believed that all surface access elements to the airport need improvements in order to deliver further growth. The Airport Company welcomes the RSS's commitment to improving the A1 Newcastle / Gateshead western bypass.</p>
		<p>The introduction in the long term of a heavy rail link to the Airport remains an long term aspiration.</p>
157	Nexus	<p>Para 3.184 - There may be conflict between the stated aims of supporting accelerated economic growth, and that of reducing the demand for travel, given that the relationship between the level of economic activity and the movement of goods and people remains largely intact.</p>
338	Northumberland Tyne & Wear NHS	<p>Positive about effect on health. Uncertain about effect on inequalities.</p>
66	Railfuture	<p>Policy 49 is opposed by Railfuture northeast in so far as it relates to airports</p> <p>Policy 49 as drafted is unsustainable and inconsistent with the objectives set out in Paragraph 3.180. It gives undue emphasis to the region's airports and fails to recognise among other things, the role of channel tunnel traffic, of the channel tunnel rail link now nearing completion (Eurostar rail carries some two thirds of all London Paris Brussels traffic), of the proposed north south high speed rail link being studied by the DfT (High Speed Line Study, Atkins for DfT, 2005), and of the large volume of traffic entering the Region via Manchester Airport.</p> <p>The introductory sentence should be amended to reflect the content of Policy 49 and should read, 'To develop airport strategies, plans and programmes to improve surface access links by sustainable transport modes'. Policies 49c and 49e are not sustainable, would worsen the climate change problem and should be deleted. Policy 49b should be pursued in the short term thus reducing the need for Policy 49c. Policies 49d and 49f should be more actively pursued as they offer the potential to deliver very many passengers directly to the airport without the constraints which may or may not be represented by the Newcastle Gateshead Western Bypass.</p>

Id No	Respondent	Policy 49
		<p>Policy 21 should be amalgamated with this policy (Policy 49) to generate a Policy in which the role of air travel is presented in context; the East Coast Mainline Railway stations bring a comparable if not greater number of people into the Region and the roads perhaps more. The land grab proposed for the airports, is based on unbridled predict and provide forecasts and is unsustainable. The Technical Background Paper No.10: Transport gives a very partial statement on the economic impact of an airport which relies largely on circumstances elsewhere and does not address the key factors of the net outflow of tourists (cost nationally £17billionpa), the aviation fuel and VAT exemptions (cost nationally £10billionpa) or the environmental costs and consequences related to aircraft CO2 and other emissions. The figures quoted in the Technical Background Paper No.10: Transport serve to show how small the volume of business is nationally at around 10% of the passengers carried by the rail and 5% of those carried by the bus industry. Rail links are a more sustainable option generating far less CO2 and other emissions than air services; Policy 21b should be amended to reflect these points. Air service development should be restricted to journeys of 1 000 Km or more.</p> <p>Policy 49 is supported in so far as it relates to Ports. Policies 49g, 49h, 49i are supported but should further include specifically the enhancement of passenger access to the Port of Tyne ferry terminal and freight access to the Port of Tyne by rail</p>
124	South Tyneside Council	<p>Port of Tyne must be referred to here</p> <p>It is requested that criterion (h) is amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “the development of existing infrastructure at ports such as the Port of Tyne for strategic multi-modal road-rail, as well as rail-sea freight interchanges.”
148	Tees Valley Regeneration	<p>It is noted that reference to Teesport has been added – lacks consistency</p> <p>TVR welcome the support for the growth of the regions airports and requirement for SPP’s to prioritise improvements to access (bus, rail and road) to the Durham-Tees Valley Airport, as well as improved rail links to Teesport. Furthermore the reference to developing existing port infrastructure at ports and support for a deep sea container terminal at Teesport is welcomed.</p>
105	Tynedale Council	<p>Paragraphs 3.173 This paragraph states that the recent document ‘Devolving Decision Making – Regional Funding Allocations’ “could enable the North East Assembly, in partnership with others, to begin to develop proposals for a Regional Transport Board that would have the remit to advise the Secretary of State for Transport on the priorities for major transport schemes and the subsequent allocation of funds .to deliver transport priorities as set out in RSS. However there is a far greater urgency than this suggests. If the Assembly wishes to ensure that schemes already prioritised in the existing RSS, such as the Haydon Bridge Bypass - are retained in the programme, it is imperative that the Regional Transport Board should be formed without delay. This sentence should be rewritten to reflect this.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.173 to 3.176 The text then goes on to state that the “Regional Funding Allocations could give the region the opportunity to switch funds between economic development, housing and transport” before going on to describe the strong relationship between transport and other aspects of the strategy, remarking that larger schemes will need to be brought forward in the medium to long term to ensure delivery of the wider strategy. These latter statements are welcome in that they imply that it is unlikely that the Assembly would be inclined to divert transport resources towards other regional spatial needs.</p>