

Policy 11

Id No	Respondent	Policy 11
422	Acorn Business Park Durham Ltd	<p>It is suggested that criterion f) should refer to existing or potential rail connected sites as being "key regional Gateways" along with the ports and airports</p> <p>Paragraph 2.184 – Connectivity and Accessibility It is considered that reference should be made to the economic importance of inland sites that are or could be connected to the principal rail and road corridors, as detailed in Policy 11. Such sites will clearly form an important part of the regional internal and external connectivity of the region.</p>
177	Berwick-upon-Tweed Borough	<p>This policy is welcomed and supported.</p>
40	Blyth Valley Council	<p>Not sure why there is a need for a separate policy here when the issues are adequately covered in theme 3D</p>
428	Campaign To Protect Rural	<p>b) the focus of development should explicitly include key health education, retail, cultural facilities and extend in a hierarchy of key facilities from urban centres, through major towns, market towns and primary and secondary rural settlements.</p> <p>F) CPRE challenges the desire for a growth in the regional airports, particularly for domestic and inter-regional travel. In our view, in 'maximizing the potential' of the regional airports, F) is directly contradicting c)'s reference to 'minimising..climate change.' Reference to airports should be deleted.</p>
172	Durham Heritage Coast	<p>In addition we specifically support the inclusion in Policy 11 g of 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.</p>
102	Durham Tees Valley Airport	<p>We would also comment that within sub policy (d) that "heritage coasts" should be capitalized for consistency through out the document.</p> <p>Connectivity and Accessibility DTVA supports Policy 11 f).</p>

Id No Respondent

200 Environment Agency

Policy 11

2.173

We agree with this paragraph, but are not convinced that other text and policies in the RSS, particularly those promoting airport growth, fully reflect the requirements of this paragraph.

2.184

This paragraph states "The North East's airports are important economic drivers", but gives no evidence for this assertion. There should be a mention of the need to address the impacts of aviation growth on greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. This would assist in clarifying the issues that the RSS is expecting to be considered within Policy 11, bullet c).

Policy 11

c) minimizing the impacts of the movement of people and goods on the environment and climate change" We are pleased that the need to limit the impacts of transport on the climate is reflected within the policy, however the requirement for adapting to climate change also needs to be considered. We suggest an additional bullet between

c) and d): considering climate change resilience issues when siting transport infrastructure, so as to minimize the impact of climate change on the movement of people and goods.

f) maximizing the potential of the key regional Gateways of the ports and airports and strategic transport infrastructure in supporting regional economic growth and regeneration. What does this mean? It could be seen as promoting unsustainable further development of airports, ports and roads." Within a framework of sustainable development is used elsewhere and, if properly defined, could be used here as well.

Id No Respondent

163 Friends of the Earth North East

Policy 11

Para 2.170-2.186

Transport policies are one of the major problems with the RSS. Current policies highlight the Strategy's failure to shed the mentality of privileging economic growth over social and environmental objectives, and to put sustainable development firmly at the heart of regional planning and policy-making. The result is that wherever transport features in the RSS, there is a clear divide between unsustainable desires for more road and airport infrastructure to 'enable economic growth', and progressive, sustainable thinking on the urgent need to rebalance the transport system through demand management and modal shift to public transport, walking and cycling. The inconsistencies and contradictions this gives rise to creates the impression of reading two very different, and irreconcilable, transport policies based on very contrasting beliefs.

For example, we strongly support the statement in paragraph 2.173 that, 'It is important that the Strategy for managing and improving the transport network is sustainable, affordable and deliverable, and safeguards the environment of the North East...Consequently, the strategy is based on both making best use of the transport network first, before justifying investment in additional capacity, and on rebalancing the structure and use of the transport system towards more sustainable forms of transport.'

However, this statement is completely contradicted by paragraph 2.176 which says that, 'there is a significant need to invest in the transport infrastructure in the region to tackle transport barriers.' This would be fine if it implied considerable modal shift and accompanying investment. Yet paragraph 2.181 goes on to say, 'It is important to address the constraints on the region's transport network that affect the region's growth and its ability to interact and access other markets.' Paragraph 2.184 claims that, 'The North East's airports and ports are important economic drivers for the region.'

In order to have a coherent transport policy, the RSS will have to decide which approach it is going to take; either it chooses the unsustainable model of more road and aviation growth in the erroneous belief that both are essential preconditions for economic development, or they adhere to sustainable development principles by recognizing that road and aviation have a role to play in the transport mix, but that their further growth cannot be supported for environmental and social reasons, and that the priority instead is to rebalance the transport system firmly in favour of sustainable modes.

Friends of the Earth strongly suggests that the RSS adopts the latter approach, for the following reasons:

- The RSS claims to have sustainable development at its heart, and is seeking to achieve a vision of a high quality of life for present and future generations. Continued growth in unsustainable transport infrastructure will exacerbate climate change, which will seriously jeopardize the lives of future generations, and is therefore wholly incompatible with this vision. It will also affect the way in which land and other resources in the region are used because of the way land patterns are influenced by different transport policies. The unsustainable transport approach is one which reflects the prioritization of economic growth and short-term gain over environmental and social objectives and working in the long-term best interests of the region.
- All the arguments about the North East having transport barriers and constraints which are holding back economic growth, and about airports and ports being economic drivers are simply not supported by the evidence. As noted by the Steer Davies Gleave report for One North East on 'Economic Benefits Appraisal of Existing and Future Transport Infrastructure Requirements for the North East':

'In one model run, all congestion within the Region was eliminated through investment in transport infrastructure, and this very expensive solution had only a 1% impact on total regional employment.'

The report also notes that:

'The North East has a reasonably well performing internal transport system. Congestion levels and accident levels are relatively low in relation to many parts of the country and journey speeds are good....The region is well provided for in terms of ports and airports.'

Policy 11

The report's conclusion is particularly telling:

'As far as growth within the North East is concerned, the principal finding from both theoretical and empirical research is that in a well-developed transport system, additional transport infrastructure will generally have very little measurable economic impact in the Dublin region very high (by UK standards) rates of growth have been sustained over the last 10 years despite a creaking transport infrastructure...'

Given the persistent and trenchant belief in road and aviation growth for claimed economic benefit, it would seem that this is more a matter of narrow economic benefit to certain sectoral interest in denial of the need for sustainable development and change for wider benefit.

Friends of the Earth therefore recommends that paragraphs 2.170-2.186 are substantially rewritten to reflect throughout a sustainable transport approach focused on rebalancing the transport system, making the best use of existing infrastructure and significant modal shift to public transport, walking and cycling.

Policy 11

Despite much of what is written in the preceding paragraphs, policy 11 contains some good measures in points a) to d) which we support.

However, if the policy is to reflect the RSSs overarching sustainable development approach and vision of a high quality of life for present and future generations, some important amendments will be needed to the policy so that it reads as follows:

Policy 11- Connectivity and Accessibility

Strategies, plans and programmes will contribute to making sustainable improvements to connectivity and accessibility in the North East by:

- d) making best use of resources and existing infrastructure before seeking improvements;
- f) prioritizing public transport improvements to the region's airports and passenger ports to enable modal shift, and improvements to the accessibility of commercial ports by sustainable modes;

(Under point g)) add, 'The priority will always be to improve sustainable transport infrastructure (rail, buses, walking and cycling) and to implement demand management and other 'soft' measures before considering increased capacity in unsustainable modes (road and air).'

Id No Respondent

329 Friends of the Earth South

Policy 11

Para 2.170-2.186 Transport policies are one of the major problems with the RSS, as they highlight the Strategy's failure to shed the 'economic growth must come first' mentality and truly put sustainable development at the heart of regional planning and policy-making. The result is that wherever transport features in the RSS, there is a clear divide, contradictions and inconsistencies between unsustainable desires for more road and airport infrastructure to 'enable economic growth', and progressive, sustainable thinking on the urgent need to rebalance the transport system through demand management and modal shift to public transport, walking and cycling. It gives the impression of reading two very different, and irreconcilable transport policies based on very different sets of beliefs.

For example, we strongly support the statement in paragraph 2.173 that, 'It is important that the Strategy for managing and improving the transport network is sustainable, affordable and deliverable, and safeguards the environment of the North East...Consequently, the strategy is based on both making best use of the transport network first, before justifying investment in additional capacity, and on rebalancing the structure and use of the transport system towards more sustainable forms of transport.'

However, this statement is completely contradicted by paragraph 2.176 which says that, 'there is a significant need to invest in the transport infrastructure in the region to tackle transport barriers.' Paragraph 2.181 goes on to say, 'It is important to address the constraints on the region's transport network that affect the region's growth and its ability to interact and access other markets.' Paragraph 2.184 claims that, 'The North East's airports and ports are important economic drivers for the region.'

In order to have a coherent transport policy, the RSS will have to decide which approach it is going to take; either it chooses the unsustainable model of more road and aviation growth in the erroneous belief that both are essential preconditions for economic development, or they adhere to sustainable development principles by recognizing that road and aviation have a role to play in the transport mix, but that their further growth cannot be supported for environmental and social reasons, and that the priority instead is to rebalance the transport system firmly in favour of sustainable modes. South Tyneside Friends of the Earth strongly suggests that the RSS adopts the latter approach, for the following reasons:

- The RSS claims to have sustainable development at its heart, and is seeking to achieve a vision of a high quality of life for present and future generations. Continued growth in unsustainable transport infrastructure will exacerbate climate change, which will seriously jeopardize the lives of future generations, and is therefore wholly incompatible with this vision. The unsustainable transport approach is one which reflects the prioritization of economic growth and short-term gain over environmental and social objectives and working in the long-term best interests of the region.

- All the arguments about the North East having transport barriers and constraints which are holding back economic growth, and about airports and ports being economic drivers are completely unfounded and simply false. As noted by the Steer Davies Gleave report for One North East on 'Economic Benefits Appraisal of Existing and Future Transport Infrastructure Requirements for the North East':

'In one model run, all congestion within the Region was eliminated through investment in transport infrastructure, and this very expensive solution had only a 1% impact on total regional employment.'

The report also notes that:

'The North East has a reasonably well performing internal transport system. Congestion levels and accident levels are relatively low in relation to many parts of the country and journey speeds are good....The region is well provided for in terms of ports and airports.'

The report's conclusion is particularly telling:

'As far as growth within the North East is concerned, the principal finding from both theoretical and empirical research is that in a well-developed transport system, additional transport infrastructure will generally have very little measurable economic impact....in the Dublin region very high (by UK standards) rates of growth have been sustained over the last 10 years despite a creaking transport infrastructure...'

Id No Respondent**Policy 11**

South Tyneside Friends of the Earth therefore recommends that paragraphs 2.170-2.186 are substantially rewritten to reflect throughout a sustainable transport approach focused on rebalancing the transport system, making the best use of existing infrastructure and significant modal shift to public transport, walking and cycling.

Despite much of what is written in the preceding paragraphs, policy 11 contains some good measures in points a) to d) which we support.

However, if the policy is to reflect the RSS's overarching sustainable development approach and vision of a high quality of life for present and future generations, some important amendments will be needed to the policy so that it reads as follows:

Policy 11- Connectivity and Accessibility

Strategies, plans and programmes will contribute to making sustainable improvements to connectivity and accessibility in the North East by:

d) making best use of resources and existing infrastructure before seeking improvements;

f) prioritizing public transport improvements to the region's airports and passenger ports to enable modal shift, and improvements to the accessibility of commercial ports by sustainable modes;

(Under point g)) add, 'The priority will always be to improve sustainable transport infrastructure (rail, buses, walking and cycling) and to implement demand management and other 'soft' measures before considering increased capacity in unsustainable modes (road and air).'

8	Gateshead Council	Para 2.180 - The studies referred to here are needed now. It is the measures themselves that may be needed in the longer term. In para 2.185 consideration of demand management measures should be considered alongside surface access improvements, particularly given predicted levels of growth.
215	Government Office For The North	Para 2.173 Para states that 'strategy is based both on making best use of the transport network first, before justifying investment in additional capacity' but this is not clear from rest of strategy which is largely new scheme based. Para 2.175 States that the NE does not suffer as severely from congestion as other regions and para 3.208 says that NE has a comparatively uncontested road network but para 3.217 says that congestion within 'hotspots' is already adversely affecting ease of movement and the wider regional economy. RSS needs to be clearer about this and back up with evidence.
164	Hallam Land Management Ltd	This is supported
160	Highways Agency	The policy states that strategies, plans and programmes should seek to improve and enhance the internal and external connectivity and accessibility of the north east: Improving accessibility and efficiency of movement along the four key transport corridors: A1/East Coast Main Line; A66/Tees Valley Rail Links; A19/Durham Coast Line; A69/Tyne Valley Line.
340	Kirkwhelpington Parish Council	xz
470	Member of Public	I agree that strategies, plans and programmes should seek to improve and enhance the internal and external connectivity and accessibility of the North East. The proposals on managing travel demand particularly by the promoting public transport, travel plans, and cycling and walking; and reducing the need to travel by focusing development in urban areas that have good access to public transport, cycling and pedestrians; are particularly relevant. It is important to secure cooperation of existing employers and organizations to promote these initiatives, as well as including relevant conditions when considering new developments.

Id No	Respondent	Policy 11
293	Member of Public	We are not well served by public transport. At a regional level it is important to be realistic about what can be done within the framework of existing government policy.
453	Member of Public	<p data-bbox="618 296 2018 344">Para 2.170 - 2.186</p> <p data-bbox="618 296 2018 344">Concerned there are get out clauses which can be used to increase air and road travel. I do not agree airport are important economic drivers for the region</p> <p data-bbox="618 411 2042 459">I have a hotel in Northumberland and cheap air travel is having the net effect of removing tourist spend from the region. UK residents flying out is in no way matched by European visitors flying in.</p> <p data-bbox="618 499 2042 547">Paragraphs should be rewritten to reflect a sustainable transport approach focused on balancing the transport system , making the best use of existing infrastructure and significant modal shift to public transport walking and cycling</p>
		<p data-bbox="618 616 1592 632">The following amendment swill improve the policy with regard to achieving sustainable development</p> <p data-bbox="618 675 1906 691">Strategies plans & programmes will contribute to making sustainable improvements to connectivity and accessibility in North East by:</p> <p data-bbox="618 703 1469 719">d) making best use of resources and existing infrastructure before seeking improvements</p> <p data-bbox="618 732 2042 780">f) prioritize public transport improvements to the region's airports and passenger ports to enable modal shift and improvements to the accessibility of commercial ports by sustainable modes</p> <p data-bbox="618 820 2029 868">g) add "the priority will always be to improve sustainable transport infrastructure and to implement demand management and other "soft" measures before considering increased capacity in unsustainable modes</p>
273	Member of Public	<p data-bbox="618 900 2042 948">The contention that the North East does not suffer as much as the South with congestion and gridlock bears little scrutiny in reality. The A1 Western Bypass is already a joke as is the A19 Tyne Tunnel and the various intersections and connections do not sustain additional growth.</p> <p data-bbox="618 954 2042 1059">The legacy of the former industry in the North East is such that major infrastructure and connectivity has been ignored and shelved for decades and even the public transport network has suffered from poor investment. Unless infrastructure is lifted up the agenda the RSS will struggle just like the South East as it is my own view access in the South is far better and a few cycle routes and promoting public transport will not be sufficient. The policy needs some real revision if the issues of connectivity and accessibility are to be addressed for the RSS period.</p>
173	Morpeth & District Civic Society	<p data-bbox="618 1075 1137 1091">. Policy 11 – Connectivity and Accessibility – page 64</p> <p data-bbox="618 1104 2042 1235">This policy should explicitly state that the A1 should be upgraded to a dual carriageway to the north of Newcastle upon Tyne throughout its length within Northumberland. Stating that the aim is to improve accessibility and efficiency of movement is not enough. Without saying exactly what is needed we go on suffering from pitiful piecemeal schemes that make the completion of this task lie in the dim and distant future. There are few more potent symbols of government neglect of the North East than this matter. It is a matter that eminently falls within the province of a regional strategy</p>
334	Morpeth Town Council	<p data-bbox="618 1251 2042 1299">Need to travel should be minimized in towns and villages within city regions by developing a hierarchy of appropriate facilities across different sized settlements.</p> <p data-bbox="618 1334 2007 1382">The Town Council supports the movement along the key four key transport corridors, but would emphasize this should appertain to both rail and road.</p>

Id No Respondent

449 National Trust North East

Policy 11

Since this policy inherently contradicts itself, it is impossible to say whether the Trust overall supports it or not!

We would like to support part (c) of the policy which recognizes the need to minimize the impact of transport on the environment, and recognizes the impact transport has on climate change.

We would like to object to part (f) of the policy, as it is contrary to part (c) and targets within the IRF, and does not support the concept of sustainable development, for all the reasons raised in other objections to policies on airport expansion.

The wording of parts (a) and (b) needs attention (delete “the” in (a), and (b) : good access to pedestrians?!)

Id No Respondent

94 Nectar

Policy 11

Paragraphs 2.170 to 2.186

Attention should be drawn to the findings of the Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment (SACTRA) that the link between investment and regeneration is tenuous. The SACTRA findings are supported by more local Studies for ONE North East (Economic Benefits Appraisal of Existing and Future Transport Infrastructure Requirements for the North East, 2003, "There is virtually no evidence that transport investment on its own can generate economic development") and the A1 North of Newcastle Multi-Modal Study for the Government Office North East (Summary and recommendations, 2002, "No evidence has been found to suggest wider economic development benefits would arise from completing the dueling of the A1 in Northumberland"). NECTAR is of the view that this extensive body of evidence should direct the Regional Spatial Strategy towards investment in public transport, in which context the Study for ONE North East drew the conclusion that "The changes in transport policy required to bring about significant and sustained locational changes would in our view be concerned with the cost of use of the system rather than with investing in more infrastructure."

At Paragraph 2.173, it is noted that it is important that the strategy for managing and improving the transport network is sustainable, affordable and deliverable, and safeguards the environment as well as promoting the health of the people. Paragraph 2.180 identifies the need for demand management measures to address the identified congested areas but nevertheless the historical claim that new road building is essential is still pursued in Paragraph 2.181. The case for improvements to the roads identified is limited as stated at Paragraph 2.41; the caution stated at Paragraph 2.42 should be addressed by the application of demand management and road user charging techniques. Specifically, the Table in Section 3D does not prioritise even the region's major schemes (Paragraph 2.183) since it ranks road and rail schemes separately. NECTAR notes, however, that by the priority system used in the Technical Background Paper No.10: Transport the top three rail schemes score from 33 to 28, even the lowest of these being more than achieved by the highest scoring road scheme at 27. Indeed only two of the road schemes come within the range of the top six rail schemes.

The significance of the region's airports is again overstated (2.184, 2.185). The role of air travel should be presented in perspective; the East Coast Mainline Railway stations bring a comparable if not greater number of people into the Region. 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 the 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.

In view of the inconsistencies of the arguments currently advanced, it is recommended that Paragraphs 2.170 to 2.186 be radically and objectively revised to reflect the changed circumstances brought about by the emphasis of the Strategy on sustainability, climate change management and the commitment to an improved quality of life for all. The revision should take into account the Study commissioned by ONE North East (Steer, Davies, Gleave: Economic Benefits Appraisal of Existing and Future Transport Infrastructure Requirements for the North East, 2003). Policy 11 is supported by NECTAR.

Tourism as a future economic force across the region has the potential to support transport facilities needed for other purposes but to destroy the environment and structures which attract the visitor. Reference to meeting the travel needs of tourists in a sustainable way should be made in this policy and the supporting text.

The case for a deep sea container terminal at Teesport (Paragraph 2.186) is supported throughout the Strategy and should be identified specifically in Policy 11.

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. General reference should be made to the preservation of passenger and freight rail

Id No Respondent

Policy 11

routes and facilities to ensure their availability for future use as the modal shift measures promoted in the Regional Spatial Strategy bear fruit in the medium to long term.

Policy 11 and the associated text would seem to be the appropriate place in which to record support for the more easterly route for the North South high speed rail link now being studied by the DfT

The Sunderland Newcastle corridor should be included in Policy 11g as to be upgraded to provide an intercity quality rail service. Policy 11f should not be restricted to the key regional Gateways; it should be extended to recognize the role of the rural railway stations as key to the surrounding transport network.

Whilst Policy 11b is strongly supported it should be made clear in the text and Policy that the regeneration of the areas identified throughout the Regional Spatial Strategy is to be predicated on a presumption in favour of the pedestrian and where conflict arises, against the motorist; pedestrian zones, street layouts, crossing arrangements, road signs etc should be designed to enhance the quality of life of those who live and work in the area. An attractive and desirable built environment should become a key feature of any sustainable community. Emphasis should be placed on the need to provide attractive access on foot to key services (health, shopping, recreation etc) locally provided.

Under Policy 11d, reference should be made to the role and value of the emerging private transport links being developed for healthcare, social inclusion, disability and educational purposes. Such dedicated links offer a valuable opportunity to reduce car dependence. Similarly, reference should be made to the potential impact of free concessionary bus travel for older people and the impact this may have on other provisions and services.

Id No Respondent

241 Newcastle International Airport

Policy 11

2.184 The North East's airports and ports are important economic drivers for the region, acting as key Gateways into the region for business, tourism and leisure purposes. They play an essential role in maintaining and attracting new development and investment in the region and are significant sources of employment in their own right. Policies 21, 22 and 49 provide more detail and emphasis regarding the role of airports and ports in economic and accessibility terms.

The Airport Company welcomes the importance which is placed on the airport as a key economic driver.

Newcastle International currently employs nearly 3000 people on site during the summer months. It is expected with the continued expansion that this figure will increase making the airport one of the largest employers in the region. It is therefore vital that the RSS supports this development.

2.185 The region's airports have to remain competitive both nationally and internationally in order to continue to contribute to the region's economic growth. As both airports expand and offer more international destinations, surface access improvements will be required to cater for an increase in the number of passengers using the airports, particularly by public transport. Other demand management measures may have to be considered alongside surface access improvements as part of Airport Masterplans.

Newcastle International Airport is supportive of the need for further improvements to the surface access arrangements to the airport especially with the predicted rise in passenger numbers.

Policy 11 – Connectivity and Accessibility

Strategies, plans and programmes should seek to improve and enhance the internal and external connectivity and accessibility of the north east by:

- a) managing travel demand particularly by the promoting of public transport, travel plans, and cycling and walking;
- b) reducing the need to travel by focusing development in urban areas that have good access to public transport, cycling and pedestrians
- c) minimizing the impact of the movement of people and goods on the environment and climate change
- d) making best use of resources and existing infrastructure
- e) making safe transport networks and infrastructure
- f) Maximizing the potential of the key regional Gateways of the ports and airports and strategic transport infrastructure in supporting regional economic growth and regeneration.
- g) improving accessibility and efficiency of movement along the four key transport corridors of
 - A1/ East Coast Mainline
 - A66 / Tees Valley Rail links
 - A19 / Durham Coast Line
 - A69 / Tyne Valley Line

The recognition within the above Policy of the role of airport is supported

222 Northumberland County Council

The County Council supports the policy objectives for connectivity and accessibility particularly the priority attached to improving efficiency of movements along the four key transport corridors in the region

136 Northumberland National Park

The policy and particularly the reference to improving accessibility and efficiency of movement along the A69/Tyne Valley Line is supported, as this rail route provides scope for non-car access to the National Park in conjunction with the Hadrian's Wall bus. This is important to the National Park Authority in the achievement of one of the statutory purposes of the National Park.

Id No	Respondent	Policy 11
338	Northumberland Tyne & Wear	The health improving and reduction of inequalities capacity will be dependent on the schemes. Airport and other specific large schemes should be subject to individual Health Impact Assessment.
194	PD Ports (Teesport & Seal Sands)	<p>PD Ports believe that connectivity and accessibility are vital to the successful renaissance of the region. They also believe (for reasons set out at 1.4 above) that it is a national issue rather than just regional, which could be further recognized in this policy.</p> <p>As stated at the outset, there are significant infrastructure barriers to the Ports expansion. Rail capacity within the port estate and on the North East rail network needs improvement in order to cope with more containers. Furthermore, with increased sizes of containers (increasing from typically 8' 6" to 9' 6" in height and also increasing the proportion of longer containers from 20 and 30" to 40 and 45" in length) becoming more typical, there are incompatibility issues with the gauge for the Tees Valley rail network. It is considered that the RSS can assist in planning to overcome these barriers to the use of rail freight and (g) is clearly of some help in this context but could go further.</p>
406	Port of Tyne	Item f) is good in recognizing the key focus in supporting the regional gateways. In that context can I take the opportunity to mention 4 key issues affecting the Port of Tyne.
Network		<p>a) The need for Network Rail to re-establish main line signals into the Port of Tyne. Currently trains in and out of the Port are controlled on a temporary, divisible staff working method.</p> <p>b) We need an increased slot allocation from the Port of Tyne onto the Main Line Rail Network. Discussion is currently underway with Rail on the matter.</p> <p>c) The East Coast Main Line pass by's must be lengthened/improved to allow the passage of 750 metre (118SLU) length trains. At present train lengths are restricted to 500 metres. This compromises, for example, the cost per unit of cars ex Nissan being rail transported from the Port of Tyne to Northern Italy.</p> <p>d) The Port of Tyne, whilst enjoying good close links to the main road network, requires improvements to the immediate off road access into the Port at South Shields</p>

Id No Respondent

66 Railfuture NorthEast

Policy 11

Paragraphs 2.170 to 2.186

Attention should be drawn to the findings of the Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment (SACTRA) that the link between investment and regeneration is tenuous. The SACTRA findings are supported by more local Studies for ONE North East (Economic Benefits Appraisal of Existing and Future Transport Infrastructure Requirements for the North East, 2003, "There is virtually no evidence that transport investment on its own can generate economic development") and the A1 North of Newcastle Multi-Modal Study for the Government Office North East (Summary and recommendations, 2002, "No evidence has been found to suggest wider economic development benefits would arise from completing the dualing of the A1 in Northumberland"). This extensive body of evidence should direct the Strategy towards investment in public transport, in which context the Study for ONE North East drew the conclusion that "The changes in transport policy required to bring about significant and sustained locational changes would in our view be concerned with the cost of use of the system rather than with investing in more infrastructure."

At Paragraph 2.173, it is noted that it is important that the strategy for managing and improving the transport network is sustainable, affordable and deliverable, and safeguards the environment as well as promoting the health of the people. Paragraph 2.180 identifies the need for demand management measures to address the identified congested areas but nevertheless the historical claim that new road building is essential is still pursued in Paragraph 2.181. The case for improvements to the roads identified is limited as stated at Paragraph 2.41; the caution stated at Paragraph 2.42 should be addressed by the application of demand management and road user charging techniques. Specifically, the Table in Section 3D does not prioritise even the region's major schemes (Paragraph 2.183) since it ranks road and rail schemes separately. Railfuture northeast notes, however, that by the priority system used in the Technical Background Paper No.10: Transport the top three rail schemes score from 33 to 28, even the lowest of these being more than achieved by the highest scoring road scheme at 27. Indeed only two of the road schemes come within the range of the top six rail schemes.

The significance of the region's airports is again overstated (2.184, 2.185). The role of air travel should be presented in perspective; the East Coast Mainline Railway stations bring a comparable if not greater number of people into the Region. 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 the 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.

In view of the inconsistencies of the arguments currently advanced, it is recommended that Paragraphs 2.170 to 2.186 be radically and objectively revised to reflect the changed circumstances brought about by the emphasis of the Strategy on sustainability, climate change management and the commitment to an improved quality of life for all. The revision should take into account the Study commissioned by ONE North East (Steer, Davies, Gleave: Economic Benefits Appraisal of Existing and Future Transport Infrastructure Requirements for the North East, 2003).

Railfuture northeast supports Policy 11

The case for a deep sea container terminal at Teesport (Paragraph 2.186) is supported throughout the Strategy and should be identified specifically in Policy 11.

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. General reference should be made to the preservation of passenger and freight rail routes and facilities to ensure their availability for future use as the modal shift measures promoted in the Regional Spatial Strategy bear fruit in the medium to long term.

Id No Respondent**Policy 11**

Policy 11 and the associated text would seem to be the appropriate place in which to record support for the more easterly route for the North South high speed rail link now being studied by the DfT

The Sunderland Newcastle corridor should be included in Policy 11g as to be upgraded to provide an intercity quality rail service. Policy 11f should not be restricted to the key regional Gateways; it should be extended to recognize the role of the rural railway stations as key to the surrounding transport network.

444	Royal Mail Property Holdings	<p>We support the policy objectives in Policy 11 in particular the aim of improving accessibility and efficiency of movement along the four key transport corridors of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A1/East Coast Main Line• A66/Tees Valley Rail links• A19/Durham Coast Line• A69/Tyne Valley Line
452	Shotley Low Quarter Parish	<p>Para 2.173 Improved integrated transport services required.</p> <p>Rural rail services do not have facilities to cope with car parking. Rural communities travel to conurbations for shopping and cultural needs but are penalized due to high cost of parking and fuel</p>
124	South Tyneside Council	<p>Paragraphs 2.180 – 2.181, page 63 - The A19 should be identified here in more detail.</p>
151	Sunderland ARC	<p>More mention required of Improvements to A1 and A19, as well as congestion and demand management issues on A1 and A19 Connectivity and Accessibility is supported and the inclusion of the four strategic transport corridors within the text of the policy itself is welcomed.</p>
148	Tees Valley Regeneration	<p>The proposed Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor (SSTC), linking the A19 with Central Sunderland via a new bridge crossing of the River Wear, is a high priority for Sunderland arc and Sunderland City Council and central to the arc strategy for regeneration of the river corridor, the city centre</p> <p>TVR notes the more regional focus (with separate policies dealing with international travel) and expansion of this policy. TVR support the promotion of public transport and maximizing the potential of the key regional Gateways of the ports and airports and strategic transport infrastructure in supporting regional economic growth and regeneration. The growth and progression of Teesport, Durham Tees Valley Airport and the Metro (global Change) proposals are all vital to the success of the TVR projects.</p> <p>Furthermore TVR strongly supports (g) improving accessibility and efficiency along the 4 key transport corridors, notably the East Coast Mainline, A66/Tees Valley Rail links and the A19/Durham Coast line. The regenerative benefits of transport improvements must not be underestimated.</p>

Id No	Respondent	Policy 11
337	Tow Law Town Council	<p>The Town Council strongly advocates the inclusion of the A68 Trunk Road as a strategically important route. This highway bisects the town and could play a vital part in the economic and environmental regeneration of the community. Given the provision of a number of much needed visitor facilities. The route would facilitate both casual visits and stopovers to the economic benefit of the town.</p>
105	Tynedale Council	<p>The recent acquisition by Durham Wildlife Trust of the Hedleyhope Fell as a potential nature preserve will provide a range of recreational activities, which could be promoted as visitor and tourist attractions, particularly by the provision if a visitor/educational centre.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.181 The continuation for the four 'strategic routes' approach should be welcomed insofar as it recognizes the importance of the A69 in terms of regional connectivity.</p>
254	UK Coal Mining Ltd	<p>It is suggested that criterion f) should refer to existing or potential rail connected sites as being "key regional Gateways" along with the ports and airports.</p>
243	Wear Valley District Council	<p>Paragraph 2.184 – Connectivity and Accessibility</p> <p>It is considered that reference should be made to the economic importance of inland sites that are or could be connected to the principal rail and road corridors, as detailed in Policy 11. Such sites will clearly form an important part of the regional internal and external connectivity of the region.</p> <p>Opposition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The exclusion of the A68 as a strategically important route. The Council considers that such recognition should be attached to this route so as to assist in facilitating the development and regeneration of West Durham.