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1 Introduction

Local Transport Plans (LTPs) are statutory documents that outline strategies for improving all forms of transport in a given area. Tyne and Wear’s first LTP covered the five-year period from 2001 to 2006 and was followed by a second Plan running up to 2011.

The third LTP for Tyne and Wear was produced by the Integrated Transport Authority (ITA), a body representing the region’s five local authorities (Gateshead, Newcastle, North Tyneside, South Tyneside and Sunderland), together with Nexus (the Passenger Transport Executive). LTP3 consists of a ten-year strategy from 2011 to 2021, with an associated three-year Delivery Plan. Further Delivery Plans will be produced from 2014 onwards.

A draft version of LTP3 was published on 18 October 2010, marking the beginning of a formal public consultation period originally scheduled to end on 10 December 2010. However, in view of the adverse weather conditions experienced in November and December, it was decided to extend the consultation period for an extra three weeks until 31 December 2010. The consultation therefore lasted 11 weeks. A number of further responses from stakeholder groups were received early in 2011 and were accepted as part of the consultation.

The aims of the consultation were to make as many stakeholders and members of the public as possible in Tyne and Wear aware of the draft LTP and to gain views from them on the proposals and how they could be enhanced or amended. The term ‘stakeholders’ covers a broad range of organisations, including businesses, transport providers, voluntary and community groups and local councillors.

In formulating the draft plan there were discussions with elected members and officers from across Tyne and Wear, Durham and Northumberland and a stakeholder workshop event was held on 13 July 2010, attended by 35 different organisations.

The final Tyne and Wear LTP3 was adopted by the ITA on 1 April 2011, taking into consideration the comments made during the public consultation.

Ensuring the draft LTP3 was available to view

To ensure the draft plan was fully accessible, it was made available online through Objective (a computer software package for carrying out public consultations) via the Tyne and Wear Local Transport Plan website. A 12-page easy to read A4 consultation summary document was also available on Objective, summarising the main proposals set out in the draft plan. Printed copies of these documents were made available in local libraries and Council offices across Tyne and Wear.

Receiving responses to the consultation

To receive feedback on the draft plans, a short questionnaire was placed on Objective, obtainable via the Tyne and Wear LTP website. This was also available within the summary documents left at libraries and Council offices.

To gain further responses, a Nexus Market Research Team carried out face-to-face interviews with approximately 80 people in each of the five districts of Tyne and Wear. Meetings were also held with various groups at their request, including Living Streets, the Tyne and Wear
Public Transport User Group, the Third Sector Transport Focus Group, Newcastle Community Voluntary Sector, Sunderland Carers Partners Group, North Tyneside Skills for People and Gateshead Access Panel.

Promotion of LTP3

The draft LTP3 was promoted before and during the consultation process via the Tyne and Wear LTP website, websites for the five local authorities and Nexus, the Tyne and Wear Freight Partnership, Living Streets, Sustrans, and Smarter Choices, amongst others. Council office display screens were also used to promote LTP3. Emails were sent to key stakeholders at the beginning of the public consultation period, advising where information was available and how they could respond. There was also coverage in the local press and use was made of the social networking sites facebook and twitter, to try to seek views from people who are hard to contact using traditional consultation methods.
2 Summary of Responses

There were 1,089 responses to the consultation questionnaire across Tyne and Wear, Durham, and Northumberland. The highest number of responses, 486 (45%) were made online, with the second highest 398 (37%) being interviews carried out by the Nexus Market Research Team. There were also 187 written questionnaire responses (17%) and one fax. The questionnaire took the form of 12 choices of priorities for transport, with respondents being asked to select their five most important ones.

Figure 1 below shows the results from the whole sample. The top priorities were:

- We will give priority to and invest in public transport (64%)
- We will keep our transport networks in good condition (62%)
- We will help people to reach key services, such as healthcare, employment and education, easily and safely (56%)
- We will enhance safety and security for all transport users (46%).

![Bar chart showing transport priorities](image)

**Figure 1: Transport priorities of questionnaire respondents**

Table 1 shows the transport priorities based on local authority area. The top 3 priorities per local authority were:

- Gateshead: public transport (73%), maintenance (66%), and accessibility (58%).
- Newcastle: public transport (67%), walking and cycling (58%), and maintenance (49%).
- North Tyneside: public transport (67%), maintenance (62%), and accessibility (59%).
- South Tyneside: maintenance (69%), public transport 63%), and accessibility (60%).
- Sunderland: maintenance (71%), accessibility (61%), and public transport (58%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Gateshead (161)</th>
<th>Newcastle (190)</th>
<th>North Tyneside (198)</th>
<th>South Tyneside (248)</th>
<th>Sunderland (137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road safety</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low carbon</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and cycling</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Transport priorities of respondents based on local authority area

Figure 2 shows the priorities of respondents based on those who are car drivers only, public transport users only and those who are both car and public transport users. Based on the different types of transport users, the responses were as follows:

- Car users only: maintenance (71%), accessibility (53%), and major scheme investment to improve our transport networks (53%).
- Public Transport users only: maintenance (67%), public transport (62%), and accessibility (57%).
- Users of both the car and public transport: public transport (66%), maintenance (61%), and accessibility (57%).
Figure 2: Transport priorities of questionnaire respondents based on those who are car drivers only, Public Transport (PT) users only and those who are both car and PT users

Figure 3 shows the transport priorities of respondents based on those who responded by Freepost, face to face, or through the LTP Team website. The main priorities were:

- Freepost: public transport (67%), accessibility (64%), and maintenance (62%).
- Face to face interviews: maintenance (69%), public transport (58%), and accessibility (57%).
- Website: public transport (69%), maintenance (57%), and accessibility (55%).
Figure 3: Transport priorities of questionnaire respondents based on those who responded by freepost, face to face or through the LTP Team website.
Table 2 shows the transport priorities of respondents based on age. The main priorities based on age were:

- Aged 15 or under: accessibility (60%), information (60%), road safety (60%), and low carbon (60%).
- 16-24 year olds: maintenance (70%), accessibility (62%), and public transport (52%).
- 25-39 year olds: public transport (65%), maintenance (59%), and accessibility (49%)
- 40-59 year olds: public transport (68%), maintenance (61%), and accessibility (54%).
- 60-64 year olds: public transport (69%), maintenance (65%), and accessibility (63%).
- 65-74 year olds: public transport (72%), accessibility (69%), and maintenance (66%).
- 75 years old or older: accessibility (67%), public transport (63%), and maintenance (62%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Public transport</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Safety and security</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Road safety</th>
<th>Low carbon</th>
<th>Walking and cycling</th>
<th>Links</th>
<th>Air quality</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 or under (5)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 24 (155)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 39 (277)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 59 (351)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64 (112)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74 (117)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or over (60)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Transport priorities of questionnaire respondents based on age

Figure 4 shows the priorities of respondents based on gender. The main priorities were:
- Females: public transport (66%), accessibility (61%), and maintenance (60%).
- Males: maintenance (66%), public transport (64%), and accessibility (53%).

**Figure 4: Transport priorities of questionnaire respondents based on gender**
3 Responses from Stakeholders

Some 70 organisations responded during the public consultation (see Appendix 1 for a summary of the responses received), including those from the community and voluntary sectors, disabled persons groups, education, health, Highways Agency, Older Persons Groups, the private sector, transport operators, transport user groups, a women’s group and a younger persons group. There was a general consensus amongst respondents that they agreed, on the whole, with the proposed approach to tackle the identified challenges, though many made detailed comments on ways in which the final document could be improved.

Summary of the Main Comments Received from the Stakeholders and the Outcome for the final Tyne and Wear LTP3

Some of the main issues raised were:

General Comments on the Strategy and Delivery Plan

- A more joined-up link is required between the strategy policies, and there should be a better fit between the Strategy, Delivery Plan and funding.
- Consistency is required between the different Delivery Plans.

*Improved links were provided in the final LTP3 between the Strategy, Delivery Plan and funding as actual levels of block funding were known by then, rather than being indicative. Different funding scenarios have been replaced with firm figures.*

*Delivery Plans for the five authorities of Tyne and Wear and Nexus were revised so they had a more consistent format. The Newcastle and Gateshead sections were merged to create a joint Delivery Plan, in line with their proposed draft single core strategy.*

Public Transport

- Needs to be made safer and more secure for all of its users. More accurate information needs to be provided to the public on expected waiting times, delays and likely journey times, in both visual and audible formats.
- Taxis and private hire vehicles should become an integrated part of public transport provision.
- Local rail services need to be improved and consideration given to opportunities to progress Community Rail Partnerships.
- Improvements are required for people with disabilities, as well as older people and those who are partially sighted in terms of accessing and egressing services.

*A policy on enhancing personal safety and security for all transport users is now one of the 12 main policies of the LTP3 strategy. We will look to better report incidents, reduce crime and disorder affecting transport users, improve the image of public transport as a safe and secure means of travel, deal with cycle theft and address key route / footpath safety issues, as well as other changes.*

*A policy on helping people make informed travel choices by giving them accurate information is now one of the 12 main policies of the LTP3 strategy.*
A key objective will be to ensure the role of the taxi trade is fully integrated into the wider transport strategy, embracing secured service delivery, information, marketing campaigns and infrastructure provision.

The strategy identifies that we will give consideration to Community Rail Partnerships. We will seek to improve the local rail network, using the Leamside Line for freight, local passenger and/or Metro services in the Pelaw, Washington and Fencehouses areas. However, Tyne and Wear’s heavy rail network is largely outside the control of LTP Partners, as it is currently administered nationally through the Office of Rail Regulation, the Department for Transport and Network Rail.

In terms of providing improvements for people with disabilities, older people and people who are partially sighted, we aim to increase the availability of Real Time Information and to enhance safety. However, responsibility for improvements is shared with the public transport operators.

Maintenance

- The highways infrastructure needs to be better maintained, including roads, pavements, and bridges.

“We will keep all our transport networks in good condition” is now one of the 12 main policies in the strategy.

Accessibility

- Enhancing accessibility to key services and amenities is important, particularly from deprived / rural areas where current services may be inadequate.
- UTMC should be used to aid disabled people’s access to the urban environment and infrastructure.
- Shopmobility is vital and should be funded through the LTP.

We will look to improve accessibility to key services and communities where possible. We will work with operators to improve access from deprived / rural areas where funding permits.

UTMC is being progressed, with improvements benefiting disabled people.

We will examine ways of improving Shopmobility provision and integrating it with other LTP3 strategies.

Integration

- More focus should be given to the integration of transport modes, particularly to key destinations.
- This includes linking the times of different services and providing cycle parking at public transport interchanges and at key destinations such as local shopping centres, health surgeries and clinics, hospitals, cinemas and theatres.
- Specific reference is given to allowing cycles to be taken on Metro.
- Park and Ride sites need to be more accessible for people with disabilities.
An integration policy has now been introduced – ‘We will improve integration between all transport modes.’

We aim to improve cycle parking at public transport interchanges. We will seek to improve cycle parking provision at other venues through the Travel Plan process.

The current policy of Nexus/DB Regio is that cycles cannot be taken on board Metro carriages, because of safety and access implications. We recognise the significant demand from local cycle groups for this to be addressed and, as plans for new rolling stock are developed, the case for carriage of bicycles on Metro will also be examined.

Our aim is that Park and Ride sites will be accessible to all, which includes people with disabilities.

Links with land use planning

- Links between transport and land use planning should be improved, particularly in terms of accessibility, car parking and road safety.
- A detailed examination of current and future land use planning requirements is needed to examine how they may require changes in the transport network.
- Developments should be promoted which lead to higher levels of walking, cycling and public transport use.

Throughout the LTP, we encourage joint working between transport and land use planning for sustainable outcomes. However, success in this will rely to a large extent on the work of local authorities and guidance from central government.

Congestion

- There are concerns that getting school children to use peak time bus services could result in increased congestion as adults decide to travel by car instead.

This is an issue for the bus operators, but an aim of the LTP is to get more people using public transport.

Road Safety

- Road safety should be strengthened within the plan.
- Home Zones should not be promoted as they are problematic and dangerous for sensory-impaired people who cannot see or hear vehicles approaching, or from which direction.

‘We will work to improve road safety’ is now one of the 12 main policies of the LTP.

The policy in relation to Home Zones has been deleted.

Active Travel

- The plan should give more priority to the needs of pedestrians and cyclists, which should be demonstrated through increases in funding.
To encourage more active travel, there should be public realm improvements. There need to be more audits to find out the impacts of transport initiatives on pedestrians and cyclists. Employers should be encouraged to take up travel plans and the LTP should advise how this will be done.

More attention has now been given to walking and cycling in the LTP, such as the reference to safety issues on key routes and footpaths, growing levels of cycling and giving consideration to a walking strategy. Funding for walking and cycling will, on the whole, increase, as identified in the indicative allocations for the five Tyne and Wear local authorities referred to in the Delivery Plan.

We will seek to encourage public realm improvements.

There are audits for pedestrians and cyclists through the planning and development process. Through our successful bid to the Government’s Local Sustainable Transport Fund, there will be improvements in walking and cycling links to schools and we are hoping that a further bid, for wider sustainable transport improvements, will be successful.

Local authorities in Tyne and Wear already work with large private and public sector organisations to promote the introduction of travel plans, such as those successfully introduced at the Cobalt and Quorum Business Parks in North Tyneside.

Highways Enforcement

- There should be more effective and proactive enforcement against illegal parking (including coaches and lorries) and driving over legal speed limits.

We will look to work effectively with partners including the police. There is now a policy which states: ‘We will use a combination of engineering, education and enforcement to curb illegal parking.’

Parking

- Parking charges should be at a reasonable level and should give some consideration to meeting the economic growth objectives for Tyne and Wear.
- Parking facilities need to better meet the requirements of people with disabilities, such as by the provision of parking bays which can be accommodated by wheelchair accessible vehicles, and improved parking infrastructure, including signage.

The LTP encourages local authorities to consider parking as part of an overall transport strategy. However, practices at private car parks are the responsibility of the providers.

Freight

- More reference should be given to freight.

Freight has now been referred to in more detail in the Strategy.

Climate Change / Air Quality
Climate change mitigation through transport should be given more priority. This is necessary as, if European Union air quality targets are not being met in the near future, fines may have to be paid by the local authorities in the areas concerned rather than by central government.

The section on Climate Change in the strategy has now been improved, including climate forecasts and potential adaptation measures.

Electric / Hybrid Vehicles

- Electric and hybrid vehicles can be a real danger to people with sensory impairments as they are so quiet when they are moving.
- Charging points for electric vehicles should be designed to be accessible for vehicles driven by Blue Badge holders, and they should also be available for use by mobility scooters and powered wheelchairs.

Although the points raised are outside the remit of LTP3 the Plugged in Places team has advised that the European Commission is developing new noise regulations for road vehicles which may consider adding sound to electric and hybrid vehicles. They also advised that, dependent on the system installed, there is potential for electric vehicle charging points to be used by electric scooters or wheelchairs.
Appendix A Summary of Responses from the Stakeholders

LTP Partners

Gateshead Council

- Support the vision and challenges of the draft LTP and the format and content of the Delivery Plan.
- The plan needs to take into account the Comprehensive Spending Review for future investment.
- Suggested revisions to the Strategy, such as that it should be more succinct, with the more detailed information being provided in background papers.
- The A1 corridor needs to be covered more in the Strategy.
- Some changes recommended to the Delivery Plan.

Newcastle City Council (Housing Policy)

- There may be a need to refer to older people in the policies as they make up a growing percentage of the population and we already make specific reference is made to children, young people, and families in our policies.

Nexus

- The LTP is generally aligned to Nexus’s own policy and strategy priorities for public transport.
- The extensive list of possible schemes outlined in the Strategy should be reduced to only the key strategic projects, within the restrictions of funding now available.
- Spend needs to be identified and agreed by partners.
- The Strategy should be tightened, and provide a clear and focused high-level document that partners can use to inform their investment programmes over the next four years.

North Tyneside Council

- A concise summary document should be provided, up to 25 pages in length.
- The Executive Summary should be thoroughly revised for maximum clarity and accuracy.
- The plan should refer to emerging funding opportunities such as LSTF, RGF, LEPs.
- Plain English should be used, with reference made to detailed comments on the pre-consultation working draft.
- Other comments are made on improving the plan.

South Tyneside Council

- The vision and challenges of the LTP link well to the Council’s own approach and are to be supported.
- Main priorities for investment are consistent with the Council’s priorities of investment and regeneration.
- The draft LTP should give more prominence to investment in new transport infrastructure to support economic development and growth, especially for the New Tyne Crossing and the A19 Corridor.
The plan should show how the community have been involved in key decisions that affect public transport provision.

A process is required to enable greater local participation in decision making.

Objectives should be more precise on carbon reduction and reducing the impacts of transport on the natural and built environment.

Focus should be given to the low-carbon economy, supporting the development of the electric vehicle at Nissan and endorsing Plugged in Places.

More emphasis in the plan should be given to the benefits of active travel and sustainable transport modes.

The number of policies should be reduced and a concise summary is required, up to 25 pages long.

Opportunities such as the North East LEP, LSTF and RGF should be highlighted.

Sunderland City Council

- The vision and challenges of the draft LTP link well to the Council’s own approach and should be supported.
- Main priorities for investment and the proposals in the draft Delivery Plan are consistent with the Council’s priorities.
- LTP3 should give more prominence to investment in new transport infrastructure for supporting economic growth and development.
- The ITA should review its position on the importance of major highway schemes.
- Chapter 8 should have targets for improvement, and consider the use of interim accident reduction targets.
- There should be greater local involvement in decision making.
- A policy commitment should be made to work with partners to deliver the development of the Durham Coast Line.
- In the Delivery Plan, Nexus should revise the methodology for allocation of public transport funding with the objective of producing a method that ensures funding is distributed on an equitable basis.

Other Public Agencies

Bridging Newcastle Gateshead

- Support the LTP goals of economic development, healthy and safe communities and a fairer Tyne and Wear.
- Transport infrastructure should ensure there is good access to existing and new housing sites, as well as regeneration sites.
- Public transport is a priority.
- The LTP should look at potential methods to reduce travel costs for those returning to work in Tyne and Wear.
- Delivering good transport links within and beyond the City Region area will be crucial to meeting the needs of businesses and residents.
- Design principles should be introduced between and through neighbouring residential areas to ensure transport routes do not act as physical barriers.
- More detail is required in the Delivery Plan on Gateshead’s district priorities in relation to their strategic commission areas.
Highways Agency

- Generally supportive of the plan, giving some advice on required changes / improvements.
- Some comments given on the policies and initiatives proposed within the five Tyne and Wear authorities.

NHS North of Tyne

- The flow of traffic in towns is restricted by the high number of competing bus companies providing similar routes.
- Late night / early morning bus and Metro provision needs to be improved, specifically to reduce the potential for drink driving.
- Public transport drivers / staff should be trained to treat customers with respect.
- Concessionary public transport provision should be provided for 16-18 year olds.
- Existing cycle paths should have improved lighting and the number of cycle paths should increase.
- Travel to School Plans should be progressed.
- A campaign is required to raise the importance of cyclists making themselves more visible when cycling, particularly when it is dark.

One North East

- They welcome the aspirations of the LTP and the goal of economic development and regeneration.
- Investment in the rail network is critical, and they support the reference to high speed rail in the Strategy.
- The plan should provide a more detailed examination and understanding of current and future land use patterns in Tyne and Wear.

South of Tyne PCT

- The plan needs to mention more on the needs of disadvantaged groups, the elderly, and children.

Other Stakeholder Group Responses

AECOM

- The Delivery Plan should refer to freight in more detail.
- In the Strategy more details should be provided on the Freight Partnership regarding options for the future.
- Suggested amendments and additions are made to the section on freight in the Strategy.

Age UK North Tyneside (incorporating Older People’s Network and the Older People’s Forum)

- A more local mechanism is needed that includes regular meetings to address specific routes and public transport concerns.

Benton Park View Public Transport Users Group
- There should be more focus on supporting dedicated bus services to some of the major employers in the region.
- A priority should be work bus services to the Longbenton DSS site.

Biddick Hall Community Focus Group

- Public transport is required between Biddick Hall Estate and Sunderland.
- Accessibility is an issue for getting to the nearest Metro station, in particular for older people and parents with young children.

Blue Line Taxis / Blue Line Taxis (Newcastle) Ltd / Dean Taxis / Felling Taxis / Preston Tynemouth Taxis

- Detailed comments given on policy 35 regarding examining ways in which taxis and private hire vehicles can become a more integrated part of public transport provision.

British Horse Society

- The plan should refer to reduction of speed limits on single track roads which link the network of routes that horse riders, cyclists, and joggers use.
- Rectify the problems that horse riders encounter with traffic sensitive traffic lights (i.e. not activated by horse riders) which are causing hazardous situations to arise on some T-junctions and bridges.
- Enable horse riders to use cycle routes where they form a strategic link in the bridleway network.

City of Sunderland College

- A good bus system is required to support the education of young people, which is particularly necessary for Sunderland College where there are five specialist campuses spread across the city.

Cobalt Business Park

- Partnerships should be formed of relevant groups to work together to deliver ambitions for transport through Planning and Section 106 monies.

Cyclists Touring Club

- Comments made on Strategy, Delivery Plan and Rights of Way Improvement Plan, mainly suggesting changes to the wording.

Cyclops

- Should aim to get cyclists off the main roads onto shared use pavements, but only where few pedestrians use these.
- Safe cycle route signs should be placed down quiet side streets between main urban centres.

East Coast
• Ask if road traffic at Central Station in Newcastle could be diverted to the back of the station so a pedestrian / cycle area can be created.
• In Newcastle a central city information point is required to support travel choices.

**Elders Council Newcastle**

• The Strategy is welcomed.
• Suggestions made regarding improving public transport for older people.
• There are too many secured local bus services travelling with hardly any passengers.

**English Heritage**

• Advice given from a heritage perspective for preparing and reviewing the LTP.

**Friends of the Earth**

• In support of many of the proposals within the plan.
• Active, measurable policies to achieve carbon reduction should be included in the LTP.
• More should be done to inform and offer alternatives for modal shift away from cars and air travel.
• Cycle paths should be included in all major scheme investment.
• They do not agree with the support the LTP gives to the UK Committee on Climate Change’s aim of constraining national aviation growth to a maximum of 60% by 2050.

**Gateshead Access Panel**

Detailed comments received included:

• Accurate information should be provided to the public on public transport, including in an audible format.
• Improvements should be provided for people with disabilities and older people for accessing and egressing public transport services.
• UTMC should be used to aid disabled people’s access to the urban environment and infrastructure.
• Shopmobility is vital and should be funded through the LTP.
• Park and Ride sites need to be more accessible for people with disabilities.
• Home Zones are problematic and dangerous for sensory impaired people who cannot see or hear vehicles approaching, or from which direction.
• Parking facilities need to better meet the requirements of people with disabilities.
• Charging points for electric vehicles should be accessible for blue badge holders.

**Link Gateshead**

• They agree with most of the plans for buses in Tyne and Wear.
• Some bus drivers need retraining.
• There should be a disabled step provided on buses.

**Living Streets**
• Agree with the principle of many of the policies.
• Views given on how the policies could be improved and they feel the wording of some of them could be strengthened.
• The Delivery Plan should offer a more consistent means of understanding and interpreting the choices and rationales of the five Delivery Plans.

Living Streets Northumbria

• They have major concerns about the scope and balance of LTP3.
• There is no clear link between the policies, Delivery Plans and funding.
• The Strategy needs to flow through the policies into a series of funded Action Plans.
• The current Delivery Plans are too vague.
• Walking and public realm improvements are not given sufficient weight.
• Greater focus on integration required.
• The plan needs to include more tangible projects to improve the public realm for the benefit of pedestrians.
• Plan needs to give more details about planned projects.
• A determined approach to dealing with anti-social behaviour is required.

Motorcycle Action Group (North East)

• Motorcycle access to bus lanes is required.

Natural England

• A policy should be included to cover the need to protect and enhance the natural environment in developing transport proposals.

NECTAR

• Agree with the principles of many of the policies but give views on how they can be improved.
• Feel the wording of some of the policies is weak.
• Delivery Plan should offer a more consistent means of understanding and interpreting the choices and rationales of the five Delivery Plans. A coherent parking policy for the whole of Tyne and Wear is required.

Network Rail

• Support the Government’s commitment to the development of rail in Tyne and Wear.
• Generally in favour of the policies but suggest some changes / issues regarding rail.

Newcastle Cycling Campaign

• Cycling, sustainable, affordable and active travel must be given a more prominent place within the LTP3 Strategy and Delivery Plan.
• The Newcastle Section of the Delivery Plan is weak on cycling and walking matters.
• A Cycling Strategy is required for Newcastle.
• The Strategy makes a number of positive references in relation to cycling.
- Delivery Plan lacks focus and clarity and fails to translate the priority given to cycling in the strategy document.
- Improvements are also suggested regarding the text within the plan.
- A safe, convenient and continuous network with high quality bike parking/storage and signage is required.

Newcastle International Airport
- The links to the airport should be maintained and improved.

Newcastle Society for Blind People
- The transport needs of blind people should be considered.

Newcastle Youth Council
- They outline what young people feel is important in terms of transport.

North East Road Safety Project
- Sections 6.2 and 8.1 should be more structured, identifying evidence, key issues, and approach.

North Tyneside Older People’s Forum
- Broad support given to the strategy, but there should be greater emphasis on public transport, cycling, walking, and improvements to streetscapes.
- Priority should be given to making active travel more attractive and safer.
- The transport system should be older people friendly.
- Advice is given regarding public transport, walking and cycling.
- Pavements need to be unobstructed and traffic speeds should be reduced in these areas.

Quality Streets
- Focus should be given to making streets into spaces for people as well as cars, by redesigning them to reduce the speed and volume of traffic.
- 20mph should be made the default speed limit across areas where people live, work and play.

Quorum Bicycle User Group
- There are accessibility issues for schools and buses in the Longbenton area.
- Cycling issues raised with specific reference to North Tyneside.

Quorum Development Partners
- The condition of existing pedestrian and cycle routes should be looked into.
A shared pedestrian and cycle path is required heading north along Benton Lane to enable people to cycle to Balliol and Quorum Business Parks and Killingworth from Newcastle city centre.

Can the pedestrian path along the north and south side of Benton Lane be upgraded into a shared pedestrian / cycle route to benefit people working at Quorum and Balliol?

Businesses need grants to support cycle promotion, including funding for improved cycle parking.

**Recyke y’Bike, Newcastle**

- The plan’s emphasis on enhancing public transport, pedestrian and cycle facilities is welcomed.
- Cycling should be given a higher priority.
- More statistics are required on levels of cycling.
- Improved urban cycle routes are needed, which are integrated with public transport and separated from pedestrians.
- Separation of pedestrian routes, cycle routes and road traffic should be the norm across Tyne and Wear.

**Ryhope Community Association**

- Ensure that, where possible, non-profitable bus routes are kept in operation so that people can reach key services such as healthcare, employment and education easily and safely.
- The no.38 bus in Ryhope should be reinstated.

**Save our ‘Specials’ Association**

- The reinstating of the special bus services previously known as the 991 to Newburn/Throckley via Fenham is required as well as the 995 service.

**Skills for People North Tyneside**

A number of issues raised with the most important being:

- Enhancing safety and security for all transport users.
- People need to be given accurate information to help them make travel choices.
- Priority should be given to investing in public transport and improving access to key services.

**Smarter Choices**

- Comments made mainly relate to improved links between transport and land use development.
- Refers to the importance of access, car parking and road safety for dealing with planning matters.

**South East Northumberland Rail User Group**
• Need to consider the needs of people living outside Tyne and Wear who wish to access the area.
• Public transport should be improved between South East Northumberland and Newcastle and the potential to re-open the Ashington, Blyth, and Tyne railway line should be looked into.

South Shields Pensioners
• Public transport fares should not be increased.

Stagecoach North East
• They support the strategy regarding land use and connectivity with the existing sustainable transport system.
• Congestion needs to be dealt with, which impacts on journey times and the punctuality of buses.
• School Travel Planning is of concern as cascading high volumes of children onto peak time local bus services could result in displaced adult fares and increased car based commuter journeys.
• They are keen to have Park and Ride sites in partnership with local authorities.
• The plan should make reference to working with bus operators in the future.
• Road enforcement should be pro-active and it should be ensured that legislation prevents coaches from using bus stops.
• The strategy should give reference to the Megabus Service and that multi-modal/multi-operator ticketing already exists and is provided by Network Ticketing Ltd.

Station Lane Area Residents Association, Birtley
• Improve the quality and safety of footpaths, bridges and underpasses.
• There should be more investment in winter road and footpath clearing and gritting.

Sunderland Carers Centre Partners Group Meeting
• Public transport issues were raised of specific relevance to Sunderland.
• When smart ticketing is introduced, consideration needs to be given to the needs of disabled and older people.

Sunderland Hackney Carriage Operators Association
• The plan must include taxi provision.
• The transport system needs to be fully integrated.

Sustaine
• In general agreement with most of the policies, suggesting amendments to some.
• LTP3 should be reviewed against new Department for Transport guidance and governance arrangements.
• The Delivery Plan requires considerable editing.
Sustrans

- Hard measures to improve public transport and walking and cycling are important.
- Should ensure people have the knowledge and confidence to take advantage of those improvements.

Tyne and Wear City Region Third Sector Focus Group

- Agree with the principle of many of the policies but give views on how they can be improved.
- Feel the wording of some of the policies is weak.
- Delivery Plan should offer a more consistent means of understanding and interpreting the choices and rationales of the five Delivery Plans.

Tyne and Wear Public Transport Users Group

- Generally in support of the Strategy.
- Questionnaire is too simplistic and priorities are ones that no-one could argue against.
- Suggestions made on how public transport could be improved, such as accessibility, affordability, security, fares, ticketing and integration.

Whickham View National Guild of Co-operators

- More low level buses are required.

WWT Washington Wetland Centre

- Welcome the strategic approach chosen and believe it adopts a realistic approach given the current economic climate.
- They welcome the ROWIP being part of LTP3, but feel it should be mainstreamed and further integrated within the Strategy and Delivery Plan.
- Format, style, and presentation of data in each of the chapters of the Delivery Plan should be consistent in approach.