

Policy 50

Id No Respondent

Policy 50

428 Campaign To Protect Rural England

The upgrading of major rail transport corridors is welcome, particularly as improvements to the East Coast Main Line (ECML) will have beneficial repercussions beyond the North East region itself. We hope that the successor bodies to the SRA will be committed to the RSS Implementation Plan.

Investment in major roads as regional corridors is damaging environmentally and will not solve congestion in the medium term. Emphasis should be placed on making on rail routes the main focus for extra investment. Reference should be made to proposals for a high-speed rail link between Scotland, northern cities and London.

202 Durham County Council

Para 3.196 - refers to further major transport studies required on the A1 in County Durham. Should refer to "A1 corridor" because regional traffic uses the A167 and travels through Durham City and future studies may also be needed in relation to rail.

172 Durham Heritage Coast

support wholeheartedly the content of Policy 50 and its support for the improvements to the Durham Coast rail line. This single action provides significant support for the regeneration of the coastal communities and will allow a wider audience to enjoy the recreational benefits of the Durham Heritage Coast.

95 English Nature,

Amend third paragraph in Policy 50 to read:

'Demand Management measures should be used as part of a package of measures to address congestion , and environmental and safety issues.'

Reaso

To give stronger emphasis to the need to give priority to the application of demand management measures before considering new infrastructure enhancements to the existing transport network in line with PPS11 advice.

200 Environment Agency

3.193

Pleased to see that benefits from highway improvements should be 'locked in' by public transport improvements and demand management.

163 Friends of the Earth North East

Friends of the Earth does not support this policy in its current form, as it is a prime example of contradictions within the RSS. As Para 3.191 states, 'The focus of the transport strategy is to target investment to improve public transport and increase the role of demand management', and yet this policy places considerable emphasis and priority on expanding the road network.

The policy should be amended as follows:

- Change the second paragraph to read:

Within these corridors, the focus must be on improvements to the rail network in order to enable greater movement by sustainable modes.

Id No Respondent

Policy 50

Further investment in the road network should only occur if:

- there is a public safety imperative
- there is a clear, demonstrable need which cannot be met through public transport improvements and/or demand management measures

- Delete paragraphs 3,4 and 5 and replace with, 'An effective demand management approach must be taken to all strategic highways in the region, and such measures introduced before other solutions considered.'

- The outcomes should read: '100% of relevant LDFs/LTPs prioritising improvements to the sustainable transport infrastructure along the regional transport corridors', 'a Regional Demand Management Strategy to be in place by 2008', 'approval of ECML power supply upgrade and rail links to Teesport by...[ie end 2006]' and ' a demand management strategy for each of the four strategic corridors to be in place by end 2006.'

329 Friends of the Earth South Tyneside

South Tyneside Friends of the Earth does not support this policy in its current form, as it is a prime example of contradictions within the RSS. As Para 3.191 states, 'The focus of the transport strategy is to target investment to improve public transport and increase the role of demand management', and yet this policy places considerable emphasis and priority on expanding the road network.

The policy should be amended as follows:

- Change the second paragraph to read:

Within these corridors, the focus must be on improvements to the rail network in order to enable greater movement by sustainable modes. Further investment in the road network should only occur if:

- there is a public safety imperative
- there is a clear, demonstrable need which cannot be met through public transport improvements and/or demand management measures
- Delete paragraphs 3,4 and 5 and replace with, 'An effective demand management approach must be taken to all strategic highways in the region, and such measures introduced before other solutions considered.'

The major impacts of transport policies on land use and climate change require that the connection between them is controlled by a policy. The relationship between transport and climate change currently does not feature in any other RSS policies, but even if it did, these connections need to be restated within the transport section to ensure they are taken full account of by policy-makers.

South Tyneside Friends of the Earth recommends the following as a new policy 50:

Policy 50: Land use, climate change and transport integration

In order to reduce the climate change impact of transport activity and proposals, local and regional authorities, central government agencies (in relation to regional decision-making) and transport operators will:

- Implement policies which will reduce existing and forecast growth in climate change emissions from existing transport activity by the less sustainable modes (road and air); and
- Undertake and then act on climate change impact appraisals of significant new transport proposals and programmes.

Id NoRespondent

Policy 50

Strategies, plans and programmes should work to minimise the resource demands of transport by:

- integrating land use and transport so as to reduce the need and demand for travel
- restricting the development of person trip generating uses to locations with good quality public transport
- restraining development alongside motorways, trunk roads and at motorway junctions

- 4 Friends of the Earth Tyne Bridge
- The three major building schemes proposed are all for roads despite references to “environmental issues” and the intention to “target investment to improve public transport and increase the role of demand management” (Para 3.191). These schemes are incompatible with other documents quoted in the RSS. Para 3.208 insists that “the region cannot build its way out of congestion”. The Government’s Transport White Paper “Better for Everyone” quoted in the Transport Technical Paper condemns “predict and provide” policies and insists that people’s transport choices cause less environmental damage.
- As with Policies 21 and 49 on airports, the road-building schemes are heavily influenced by the Northern Way Growth Strategy recommendations (Paragraph 3.172), which are purely economic and pay no heed to carbon emissions and climate change as mentioned in RSS Connectivity Key Objective 5 (Paragraph 3.180). It is also incompatible with Paragraph 3.183 which ties all planning and policy into reducing carbon emissions by 60% by 2050.
- 215 Government Office For The North
- The recent announcement on RFAs is relevant here. Regions now know their RFA allocations so prioritisation will need to be reconsidered with the results of the prioritisation exercise currently underway needing to be used as a basis for reconsidering the wider RSS. At para 3.197 there is a general statement that ‘rail investment continues to be needed along all strategic routes’. Is this true? Is it practicable? It also states that there is a ‘large untapped market for direct services to London’ but without the evidence to back up such assertions either of demand or of the vfm case for meeting such demand by direct services rather than connecting services. The SRA’s Regional Planning Assessment for the NE will be available at the EIP and should help to clarify some of the issues around rail markets.
- Part ‘a’ - This point requires the upgrading and enhancing of an enhancement needs rewording.
- Part ‘c’ This point requires upgrading of improvements needs rewording.
- Para 3.193 Refers to the need to ‘lock-in’ the benefits of new road investment with public transport improvements and demand management. More guidance is needed on this. Consideration also needs to be given to the argument that if public transport improvements and demand management elements were to be implemented (in particular the latter) the road investment might not be needed.
- 160 Highways Agency
- Connect the main centres of economic activity and population. Two fold priorities the priority is to improve public transport and also to optimise the existing corridors. It is recognised that additional infrastructure investment is required at key locations to support economic growth within the RSS period. Specifically the A1, A69 and the A19. Where there is congestion a combination of public transport and demand management measures should be implemented. Currently there are proposed improvements to the A1 North of Newcastle and to the South of the region, and also major dualling schemes on the A66. In addition a number of junction improvements on the A19 in Tyne and Wear and Northumberland. On the A69, the Haydon bridge bypass will also have positive impacts for the local community
- 70 Member of Parliament
- Consistent with the promotion of the sustainable regeneration of the broad city region, the re-opening of the Leamside and the 'ABT' rail lines should be given a high priority.

Id NoRespondent

Policy 50

453 Member of Public

I support view of Foe on this policy

272 Middlesbrough Town Centre

Do not support policy in current form. Para 3.191 states "The focus of the transport strategy is to target investment to improve public transport and increase the role of demand management" yet this policy places considerable emphasis on expanding the road network

Priority is given to major investment in various corridors including the A66/Tees Valley rail line which is clearly of benefit and importance to Middlesbrough given its strategic and central location. The report flags up current proposals to run four direct services from Sunderland to London. While an issue that has been looked at many times before there should be a similar initiative to link Tees Valley sub region to London in a similar fashion.

334 Morpeth Town Council

There should be improvement to east Coast mainline to enhance intercity and local train facilities

94 Nectar

The corridor concept of Policy 50 is supported by NECTAR.

However, there should be no priority for the upgrade of the roads identified in Policy 50; such upgrades would be in direct conflict with Paragraph 3.191, would be unsustainable, would exacerbate the climate change problem (Paragraphs 2.154 & 2.157) and would not solve congestion problems other than in the short term.

The Newcastle Sunderland intercity rail corridor should be added to the corridors identified in Policy 50.

The case should be made in the text and identified in the Policy for continuing to work towards bringing funding for the railway in the Region within the scope of such emerging bodies as the Regional Transport Board. Working with DfT Rail and Network Rail as equal partners should be a requirement of the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Policy 50a is supported as part of the enhancement programme needed for the East Coast Mainline.

Policy 50b is supported; if the Newcastle Gateshead Western Bypass peak time problems are not resolved by demand management and user charging techniques then the result will be unsustainable.

Policy 50c is opposed. The inspector found that the new Tyne Crossing proposal was unsustainable but nevertheless recommended to proceed; a legal challenge on other grounds has been lodged which may decide the outcome of this Policy. This Policy will more than double the cost of tunnel use and hence will be socially exclusive.

Policy 50d is opposed; it is of lower priority and unsustainable, even if more readily deliverable than improvements to the Tees Valley rail line (Bullet three); these latter improvements should be given high priority.

Policy 50e should make explicit reference to the need for InterCity quality services through the Tees Valley, along the Durham Coast and between Sunderland and Newcastle to give connectivity within the Region and beyond to Scotland and the south.

Id NoRespondent**Policy 50**

157	Nexus	Para 3.193 - Concerns about the current inability of the region to influence certain government investment decisions e.g in respect of rail routes such as the East Coast Main Line. This creates questions about the prospects of some of the priorities identified in Policy 50 being successfully implemented.
222	Northumberland County Council	<p>Whilst the County Council welcomes the inclusion of the A1/ECML and A69/Tyne Valley Rail line as Inter-Regional Transport Corridors there are inconsistencies between this Policy, Policy 11 and Table 3 Major Regional Transport Schemes</p> <p>The County Council attaches high priority to the full dualling of the A1 and cannot support the delivery timescale and low priority attached to the scheme in view of the wider regeneration benefits it will bring in addition to the safety benefits. It is considered that the delivery timescale of this scheme should be closely aligned to that of the full dualling of the A1 north of the border reflecting the improved linkages with city regions in Scotland that this would bring. The County Council similarly attach a high priority to the early implementation of the Dualling of the A1 between Morpeth and Felton and Adderstone to Belford.</p> <p>The County Council consider that the delivery of the A19 Junction Improvements should be closely aligned to the development of the recently approved Second Tyne Tunnel.</p> <p>The County Council attach a high priority to the early implementation of the Haydon Bridge By-Pass in view of the safety and environmental benefits that this will bring, the improvements to inter regional connectivity and the deliverability of the scheme. It is also considered that a multi-modal study (or something similar) of the A69/Tyne Valley line is required to identify further improvements in this corridor in the longer term and that a reference to this should be included in Policy 50.</p>
338	Northumberland Tyne & Wear NHS	As above.
229	One North East	It is important that the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) within the RSS supports the vision of the RES and the RSS. The RTS within RSS should recognise the prioritisation undertaken by the interim Regional Transport Board and recommendations it will make to ministers.
194	PD Ports (Teesport & Seal Sands)	The changes to this policy in the light of PD Ports representations are welcomed. As stated above at 2.7 the enhancement of rail infrastructure is inextricably linked to the strategy for growth at Teesport. It is important that rail gauge enhancements remain as a separately listed priority.
66	Railfuture	<p>The corridor concept of Policy 50 is supported by Railfuture northeast. However, there should be no priority for the upgrade of the roads identified in Policy 50; such upgrades would be in direct conflict with Paragraph 3.191, would be unsustainable, would exacerbate the climate change problem (Paragraphs 2.154 & 2.157) and would not solve congestion problems other than in the short term.</p> <p>The Newcastle Sunderland intercity rail corridor should be added to the corridors identified in Policy 50. Policy 50e should make explicit reference to the need for InterCity quality services through the Tees Valley, along the Durham Coast and between Sunderland and Newcastle to give connectivity within the Region and beyond to Scotland and the south.</p>

Id NoRespondent

Policy 50

The case should be made in the text and identified in the Policy for continuing to work towards bringing funding for the railway in the Region within the scope of such emerging bodies as the Regional Transport Board. Working with DfT Rail and Network Rail as equal partners should be a requirement of the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Policy 50a is supported as part of the enhancement programme needed for the East Coast Mainline.

Policy 50c is opposed. The inspector found that the new Tyne Crossing proposal was unsustainable but nevertheless recommended to proceed; a legal challenge on other grounds has been lodged which may decide the outcome of this Policy. This Policy will more than double the cost of tunnel use and hence will be socially exclusive.

Policy 50d is opposed; it is of lower priority and unsustainable, even if more readily deliverable than improvements to the Tees Valley rail line (Bullet three); these latter improvements should be given high priority.

444 Royal Mail Property Holdings

We welcome the statement in Para 3.193 stating that future major transport investment in the four strategic corridors of the A1/ECML, A66/Tees Valley rail line, A69/Tyne Valley rail line, and the A19/Durham Coast rail line will be required for both public transport and new highways infrastructure. It then goes on to positively state that investment in these corridors, which form the 'spines' for the development of the Northern Way Growth Strategy will be essential to supporting improved accessibility to external markets.

We would like to request notification of any major transport proposals that should come forward in response to this Submission Draft RSS, as these may have a significant impact on the operational use of Royal Mail Property.

124 South Tyneside Council

Policy 50 page 129

Potential links to A19 corridor and reference to the importance of the Tyne Tunnel / New Tyne Tunnel essential – it is requested that the following is added to the end of paragraph 3.196 ... "There is also the need to continue to support the development of the Second Tyne Tunnel and other emerging strategic transport improvements"

Policy 50, page 129 and Table 3, pages 141-145

Policies need to reflect schemes beyond the 5-year time span of Local Transport Plans [e.g. grade separation at Testo's roundabout and upgrade at White Mare Pool to support the Tyne Wear Regional Employment site].

151 Sunderland ARC

Regional Transport Corridors is supported.

However, Sunderland arc seeks recognition in the RSS that the northern, east-west Regional Transport Corridor (A69-A1-A1231/Carlisle-Sunderland railway) extends further westwards to Sunderland. This emphasises the regional dimension of the proposed Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor (SSTC).

72 Sven Investments Ltd

The SSTC is a major infrastructure project of fundamental regional as well as sub-regional and city-wide importance, which provides an economic channel to the Northern Way and the key to unlocking the regeneration potential of Sunderland's urban river corridor, the city centre and Port.

Para 3.196 suggests the need in the 'long term' for major transport studies to take place of the A19/A66 interchange. This is set in the context of 'pressing needs' for investment in the A66 at Darlington and at Newcastle/Gateshead (Western Bypass). Table T1, Major transport schemes (sub table 3) –contains no suggestion that the Tees Valley A66/A19 issues are a priority.

The Highways Agency clearly view the A19/A66 interchange and other related Stockton/Middlesbrough junctions as a major cause for concern now. This has been evinced by the service of Article 14 directions in respect of major developments which would impact upon these junctions.

Given this situation, it seems wholly inappropriate for the situation to merit a 'Long Term Study' to be carried out at an unspecified point in the future. It seems clear that if the wider RSS objectives and locational strategy are to be carried forward within the plan period, the highway constraints which could constrain the situation need to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

This is all the more pressing in view of the fact that at present there is no 'solution' to the problem in terms of a scheme or schemes to be implemented, nor any funding streams reserved to implement an agreed scheme.

Given the linkage to the Northern Way connectivity agenda, it is suggested that the RSS needs to re-prioritise this issue and expedite the investigation of a solution with the utmost urgency.

105 Tynedale Council

Paragraph 3.192 In the light of the above concerns, support should be expressed for the inclusion of the statement "The schemes North of Newcastle on the A1 and the A69 Haydon Bridge bypass will help resolve safety concerns and environmental problems associated at these locations. They will also help with the strategic flow of traffic along regional transport corridors to Scotland and the North West of England." This is entirely in line with the statement in paragraph 3.181 regarding the achievement of the Government's PSA targets of improving road safety and air quality, as well as being in accordance with the status given to the A69/Tyne Valley rail line in this RSS, as a Regional Transport

Corridor.

Paragraph 3.193 Further to the above, the statement, in this paragraph, that "future major transport investment in the four strategic corridors, [including the A69/Tyne Valley rail line], will be required for both public transport and new highways infrastructure" can be welcomed and supported.

Paragraph 3.195 This paragraph lists committed major highway improvement schemes currently being taken forward in the region. However it should refer to the A69 Haydon Bridge Bypass scheme, which is a clear commitment in the existing, adopted RSS. The scheme has been prepared and is, in fact, more advanced in terms of its readiness for early implementation than some other schemes that are mentioned in this paragraph. (See also comments (below) on Table 3 (1.6) and "Technical Background Paper No.10: Transport", Appendix 1).

Id NoRespondent

Policy 50

Policy 50 and Key Diagram Connectivity: The status given to the A69/Tyne Valley rail line as a Regional Transport Corridor should be welcomed. However, as long as there remains uncertainty over the timing of the implementation of the Haydon Bridge Bypass, the RSS should retain this route within the list of priorities in the Policy that deals with these Corridors.

02 January 2006

Page 8 of 8