

Local Development Framework

Draft Supplementary Planning Document on Student Housing **Summary of Consultation**

*Interim version published June 2006 pending
reissue in final version when revised SPD
released in autumn 2006*

Contacts:

Telephone: 0191 211 5637
Fax: 0191 211 4984
Email: ldf@newcastle.gov.uk
Web site: www.newcastle.gov.uk/ldf
Post: Planning Policy Team
Planning and Transportation Division
Newcastle City Council
Civic Centre
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 8PH

CONTENTS

Section	Title	Page
1	Introduction	2
2	How did we consult?	2
3	Summary of representations	5
4	The Council's response	10

Appendices

A	Table of questions asked in consultation documents	42
B	Summary of grouped (generic) comments	43
C	Council's responses to generic comments	49

Note:

This is an interim version of a document that will be produced in its final form when the Supplementary Planning Document has been redrafted and released in revised form for further consultation. This will probably be in October or November 2006.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The City Council recognises that Northumbria University, the University of Newcastle upon Tyne and Newcastle College help make the city a vibrant and thriving regional centre. However, the Council also recognises and understands the increasing local concern over the impact of high concentrations of students living in some parts of Newcastle. In short, the presence of the educational institutions brings clear social and economic benefits, but also brings additional pressures. We need a clearer strategy to manage student housing provision and its impact on the city.
- 1.2 The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Student Housing will introduce a new planning policy framework, which seeks to address the issue of student housing provision. It is just one of a number of initiatives, existing and proposed, that are being developed and implemented by the Council to better manage the provision of student accommodation.
- 1.3 On 14 November 2005 we formally published the Draft SPD on Student Housing, which outlined our preferred option for addressing the issues. The SPD was developed following initial discussions with key stakeholders and community interest groups. We invited comments on this document for the four weeks following its publication to 14 December 2005. All the comments received during this period have now been considered and this document contains a summary of the key points raised during the consultation.

2. How did we consult?

- 2.1 The Draft SPD on Student Housing was available for inspection in Libraries and Customer Service Centres across the city, along with a response form. A large scale map of the proposed Area of Student Housing Restraint (ASHoRe) boundary was also available for inspection alongside the document.
- 2.2 We sent a letter, along with a copy of the draft document and response form, to those organisations and individuals listed on our Local Development Framework (LDF) consultation database who had registered an interest in this aspect of planning. We also wrote to a wide range of estate and letting agents who provide student accommodation informing them of our proposals. We also attempted to engage private landlords through the Newcastle Private Landlords Forum via the Newcastle Private Rented Project.
- 2.3 In addition to this, we delivered over 17,000 leaflets to every household within the proposed ASHoRe boundary. They contained a brief outline of the Draft SPD on Student Housing, invited comments regarding the proposals and invited the recipient to attend a public drop in session about the proposals.

- 2.4 The public drop in session was held in the Banqueting Hall at the Civic Centre in Newcastle on 21 November 2005 and was well attended. This offered the opportunity to discuss the policy with some of the planning officers involved, gave details of background information used to develop the policy, provided information about other initiatives being developed by the Council to address the issue of student housing and invited feedback to the proposed policy.
- 2.5 The draft document, consultation response and the Background Paper and Sustainability Report were also all published on our LDF website at www.newcastle.gov.uk/ldf.

3. Summary of representations

- 3.1 We received 163 representations in response to our Draft SPD on Student Housing. This section gives a general overview of the opinions given by some of the key stakeholders. In order to help us analyse the results all comments made, whether in response to one of the leaflets, by filling in a response form or through general comments, were categorised into eight topics. Further details of how this was carried out are contained in Appendix A.
- 3.2 As some of the comments made were similar in nature to those made by other organisations and individuals, we were able to develop some generic responses to summarise comments. The statistics used in this section are based on the cumulative figures contained in the summary of generic responses (Appendix B).

Residents' representations

- 3.3 The vast majority of the responses we received during the consultation period were from local residents (141 people or 87%), most of whom lived in the proposed ASHoRe. This reflects the strength of feeling in the community regarding the difficulties facing localities that contain high concentrations of students.
- 3.4 Questions one and two relating to the value added by and problems caused by concentrations of students and young people, generally confirmed those outlined in the SPD itself. A good proportion (68 people or 48%) agreed that students bring benefits to the city, particularly economically, but also by adding to the life and vitality of a neighbourhood.
- 3.5 However, perhaps not surprisingly, 126 people (89%) quoted problems that are caused by students in their area, with anti-social behaviour, such as late night noise and parking problems being stated by 102 and 75 people respectively. Environmental damage and a negative impact on the visual amenity of the area also featured highly on the list of problems, although many conceded that these difficulties could not all be attributed to students. Young professionals living in houses of multiple occupation (HMOs) were quoted as causing similar problems and landlords were often held responsible for poor maintenance for properties.
- 3.6 The idea of restraint proposed in the SPD was widely supported by 117 people (83%) with only 11 people (8%) disagreeing with the principal. The majority felt it

was needed in their area (69%) with Jesmond seeming to be most in need of action. Many residents suggested specific streets or neighbourhoods to be included in the restraint area, although most of these are already covered by the ASHoRe. A few suggested omissions from the boundary, but most of these already fall outside the proposed boundary. Those streets and areas quoted are covered under the response to the non-generic comments (Section 4).

- 3.7 Despite the overwhelming support for restraint action, there were various questions raised over the precise methods, as only 60 people (43%) felt the ASHoRe principal and boundaries drawn were 'about right'. Many felt that they would like a much stronger stance to be taken by the Council, while others highlighted the fact that planning powers are fairly limited as many HMOs do not require planning permission. Others felt a city-wide approach would be better to avoid transplanting problems to areas outside the ASHoRe and to avoid penalising those within the ASHoRe.
- 3.8 The proposals for the use of occupancy conditions were supported in principle, by 97 people (69%), so that restraint could be applied without unfairly penalising local residents, although several questions were raised as to how practical they are and how enforceable they would be. It was highlighted that landlords and HMOs needed to be regulated and the feeling that the new licensing system would help to tackle this problem was underlined.
- 3.9 The question relating to purpose built student accommodation received a poor response rate, with 78 people (55%) making no comments on the subject. From those who did comment, most felt that the proposals were adequate and only 14 people (10%) suggested that POL 3 and POL 4 need adding to. 21 people suggested that purpose built student housing is the only feasible solution to the problem of housing high concentrations of students, suggesting that they would reduce the pressures placed on the private rented market. The main suggestions for additions to the criteria of POL 3 and POL 4 included being close to a university campus or a Metro station, being away from residential areas and being further out of the city centre.
- 3.10 104 people (74%) said that the protection of an area's character was an important issue, with only 1 person suggesting that it is not important. Unfortunately, the question as to whether the SPD says sufficient on the topic seemed to be missed by the vast majority of people, as 104 people (74%) did not comment. A high proportion of those people who did respond felt that the character of their local area had already been severely damaged by the high concentrations of students, while a similar proportion felt that the character of their locality was gradually being eroded by the high concentrations of students. The most common comment was that there is a need to create well balanced, mixed communities, without high concentrations of any particular social group.
- 3.11 Other more general comments received included people commending the Council for its work, people wishing that something had been done sooner to tackle these problems, a need to consider the needs of the permanent residents of an area and recognition that planning controls alone could not tackle all the problems. Suggestions for other necessary action included regulating the display of letting boards, imposing parking restrictions and encouraging landlords and the

universities to take more responsibility for the problems associated with housing students.

University of Northumbria

- 3.12 The University of Northumbria highlighted the importance of students in the economic and social life of the city, but agreed that the wider benefits come with some more localised problems. They suggested that problems with anti-social behaviour and noise are apparent and stated that they are willing to work on an area based initiative to address these issues. They currently respond to complaints, but suggest that many of the problems are beyond their control.
- 3.13 They regard the SPD's proposals as negative and feel that a restrictive approach would need to be balanced by a positive approach to developments elsewhere. Alternative sites would need to be located and promoted by the Council. They feel that the inclusion of South Gosforth and Fenham seems counterproductive, as these areas provide relief for the areas with the highest concentrations of students. This also raised question about the restriction on existing purpose built accommodation, as they claimed that small expansions in existing halls would have less impact than the same number of students in the private rented market.
- 3.14 The importance of purpose built student accommodation being close to the university campus was highlighted, with the suggestion that it would need to be within 10mins walk (0.5miles) of the university. They underline that the recent loss of the 'Larches' at Cruddas park is unfortunate as it provided a 'non-traditional' alternative, which catered for mature and overseas students.
- 3.15 Their agent, Dickinson Dees, also raised question about the appropriate nature of the SPD, especially POL 1 & 2, as an area of restraint is not clearly founded on adopted policy (Unitary Development Plan or UDP). They suggest that occupancy conditions are unreasonable and unenforceable and contrary to Planning Circular 11/95. They argue that the policy should be in a Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, rather than a SPD, suggesting that the Leeds approach on which our policy is modelled is less problematic, as their UDP does not have to be founded on existing policy.

Newcastle University

- 3.16 The University highlights the benefits of students to the city's economy, both through spending power and as a workforce. They underline the vital role of a positive student 'experience' in the future retention of graduates.
- 3.17 They are generally supportive of the policy, although they feel that the issue of improving existing purpose built student accommodation, through refurbishment or extension, should be clarified and seen more favourably.
- 3.18 They agree that Jesmond, Heaton and Sandyford contain high concentrations of students, but suggest that these areas have good infrastructures to support this high number. The inclusion of Spital Tongues, Arthur's Hill and South Gosforth is questioned as they do not currently contain the same number of students. Questions are also raised as to the flexibility and practicalities of implementing occupancy conditions.

- 3.19 They agree with the criteria used in POL 3 & 4, but suggest the addition of the words "and safe pedestrian/cycle routes" be included at criterion (b). They underline their commitment to Newcastle as a City and to future growth of the university, suggesting that more purpose built student accommodation needs to be built in the next few years. They are committed to high quality accommodation for their pupils and are highly supportive of the Newcastle accreditation scheme and similar initiatives.

The Union Society (Newcastle University)

- 3.20 The Students' Union for the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, the Union Society, "*disagrees entirely with the document,*" blaming landlords for a lot of the problems and suggesting that anti-social behaviour is only caused by a small minority.
- 3.21 They concede that Jesmond and Sandyford have high concentrations, but question the inclusion of Arthur's Hill and South Gosforth. They suggest that purpose built student accommodation is not the answer as most students do not wish to live in halls following first year, as living in the community is '*regarded as part of the experience of being a student and developing independence.*' They also suggest that many of the houses students live in would be unsuitable for families.
- 3.22 Any purpose built accommodation needs to be located close to the universities as students will not travel large distances, even with a good public transport service.
- 3.23 They raised questions as to how the situation would be monitored and suggested that the consultation period for the SPD was badly timed to engage students (with exam commitments and Christmas vacation, etc.) and wished to arrange a meeting to discuss some of these issues.

Newcastle College

- 3.24 Newcastle College supports the draft proposals of the SPD, focusing on the importance of mixed use and diverse character in the city. They would be very supportive of any purpose built student accommodation in the west of the city.

Other organisations

- 3.25 There are 17 remaining organisations that made comments regarding the Draft SPD on Student Housing, ranging from national property developers, to local tenants and residents associations. Nearly all of those organisations who commented agreed that there are problems with concentrations of students, but also underline the crucial role student's play in the economic and social life of the city. They generally agree that something should be done to address the issue, but don't necessarily back the proposed policy as it is, suggesting in some cases that ASHoRe will only have a minor impact and requires a much wider approach.
- 3.26 Action in Jesmond receives the most backing, while it is suggested that areas such as Heaton and Arthur's Hill should be removed from the ASHoRe. One or two suggested that the policy should be broadened or made city-wide in order to

avoid adversely affecting the housing markets or transferring the problems to nearby areas. Questions were raised as to the reasonableness and the Council's ability to enforce occupancy conditions.

- 3.27 Purpose built student accommodation is generally supported, although not by all. It should be close to the universities and close to local services, but will probably only appeal to first year students. Managed accommodation is separated from non-managed, with suggestions that managed accommodation could be allowed within the ASHoRe.
- 3.28 Nearly all support the aim of achieving mixed and balanced communities and emphasise the need to provide family housing. They also recognise the importance of student accommodation in regenerating areas and the role of graduate retention in strengthening the city's economy.

4. The Council's response

- 4.1 The Council has considered all of the responses received and is now revising the SPD proposals accordingly. The following table summarises the comments made by each individual or organisations, including a summary of comments that are not covered by the generic responses.
- 4.2 For the questions referred to (Q1a, etc) see Appendix A. We have responded to each comment either generically (in a group with others) or individually. For our grouping of generic comments and related codes together with generic Council responses see Appendices B and C

Table 1: Summary of comments

1263 - Joanne Allott									
Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-	-	-
Generic summary of comments[†]: 2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 2.11, 2.13, 5.2, 7.5, 7.6									
1336 - Mr Richard Archer									
Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-	-
Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.5, 3.4, 6.1, 7.5, 8.10									
Comments made regarding statistics used in the SPD: Need an accurate census recording student numbers and private rented housing.									
Council Response: Noted. Indicators are not perfect, but do give a reasonable picture of student numbers. The SPD and background paper are based on the most up-to-date statistics available to the Council, for example, council tax records and planning control records.									
1363 - Mr Derek Armour									
Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-
Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 8.13									
Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:									
Student housing should have Conditions of Tenancy, with co-operation of landlords and universities, which should include a requirement that the tenant should act with full consideration towards neighbours.									
Council Response: Beyond the scope of the SPD.									
82 - Ron Armstrong									
Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5, 5.4									
Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Grosvenor Avenue									
Council Response: Grosvenor Avenue is already in the AsHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.									

722 - Mr M F Atkinson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 1.7, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.8, 2.12, 3.1, 6.3, 6.4

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

The SPD should relate more to how more revenue can be taken from landlords of multiple occupancy to enable improvements in the infrastructure.

Council Response: This is beyond the scope of this SPD.

1267 - Mr Martin Baldwin

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.7, 2.1, 2.3, 2.7, 3.6, 5.2, 7.5, 8.1, 8.3, 8.8

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

I find it hard to understand how a 3 bed house can become a 6 bed etc without regulations.

Council Response: Such a change would be covered by aspects of housing legislation but not necessarily by planning powers.

1362 - Mrs Dorothy Bateman

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.11, 3.1, 3.7, 7.4, 8.6

1368 - Mr Christopher Beadle

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.11, 3.1, 3.6, 7.6

1209 - Ms Morag Bell

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	-	-	No	No	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 3.2, 4.1

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Byron Street, Harrison Place, Camden Street, South of New Bridge Street

Council Response: Harrison Place is already in the ASHoRe. Byron Street, Camden Street and the area South of New Bridge Street fall outside of the proposed ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1312 - The Bell Partnership

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	No	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 2.5, 3.4, 3.6, 6.9, 7.1, 7.6

1262 - Mr Suade Bergemann

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	No	No	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.6, 8.7

1288 - Ms Anastasia Boreham

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	Yes	No

Generic summary of comments: 1.7, 2.1, 2.6, 3.6, 3.7, 3.16, 5.2, 7.5, 7.6, 8.2

1320 - Mrs Susan Breen

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 2.2, 2.3, 2.12, 3.1, 3.7, 7.1, 7.6, 8.1

1264 - Chaz Brenchley

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	No	No	No	-	No	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.6, 2.3

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Questions in questionnaire were too leading.

Council Response: Noted.

380 - Bridging NewcastleGateshead

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	-	No	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.6, 1.9, 2.6, 2.11, 3.9, 3.14, 4.2, 4.3, 6.4, 7.6, 8.2, 8.12

Requested omissions from ASHoRe: Arthur's Hill & South Heaton

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Balance and sustainable communities raises concerns over conversion and adaption of existing stock in BNG areas, as there is already a shortage of family homes.

Criteria in App 2 characterise many BNG areas.

Support purpose built, but should be flexible enough to be suitable for other markets should student numbers fall – should be in mixed use developments.

Council Response:

South Heaton was not included in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

The revised SPD will have more emphasis on the issue of creating and maintaining balanced and sustainable communities, including the protection of valuable tenure types, such as family housing.

Support for purpose built housing is noted. The revised SPD will have more emphasis on creating a balanced housing mix and the impact of new purpose built accommodation on the balance will be part of the equation.

1258 - Mr Rob Brown

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 8.6

714 - Mr Julian Brown

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.13, 4.1, 5.2, 5.4, 7.5, 8.6, 8.7

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Trew hitt Road**Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:**

Suggests an Article 4 (2) Directive to control creation of hard standing.

Council Response:

Trew hitt Road is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

The suggested Article 4 (2) Directive is too specific for the SPD and is not just an issue for shared housing.

1280 - Mr & Mrs David & Frances Brownlee

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.9, 2.11, 3.1, 3.5, 5.2, 7.2

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Holly Avenue

Council Response: Holly Avenue is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1256 - Mr Bryan Burford

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.5, 3.16, 5.4, 5.7, 7.6, 8.6

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Kelvin Grove

Suggestions made regarding occupancy conditions: Could enforce higher standards of sound proofing?

Council Response:

Kelvin Grove is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

Occupancy conditions have been dropped in revised SPD. Sound proofing is dealt with by the normal development control processes and is not specific to student housing.

1207 - Dr Valerie Bythell

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1, 5.1, 7.8, 8.3

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Manor House Road --> Osbourne Road, Fenwick Terrace

Council Response: The area from Manor House Road to Osborne Road and Fenwick Terrace are already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

812 - Chantry Estate Agents

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 2.5, 2.8, 2.15, 3.8, 3.14, 5.1, 6.5, 7.8

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Students want to be close to universities, so there will be reduced demand if purpose built student halls are too far out. It would be better to create these with students only car parking nearby or force the universities to create parking.

Council Response: The SPD covers this issue in Appendix 3, emphasising that access to a good public transport system and proximity to one of the university campuses can both be positive considerations.

1351 - Marion Clark

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 3.4, 7.6, 8.2

1282 - Ms Imogen Cloet

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.13, 3.1, 3.4, 3.16, 4.1, 6.9, 7.2, 7.6, 8.3, 8.10

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Allotments opposite Oxfam, Castle Leazes

Comments made regarding statistics used in the SPD: Data used in SPD is out of date (2001 census) - changed in last 5 years, so needs new survey.

Council Response:

A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to the suggested additions to the ASHoRe.

Comments regarding statistics are noted. Indicators are not perfect, but do give a reasonable picture of student numbers. The SPD and background paper are based on the most up-to-date statistics available to the Council, for example, council tax records and planning control records. They do not rely solely on the data from the 2001 census.

1293 - Ms Catherine Collins

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	No	No	No	-	No	Yes	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 3.8, 3.14

275 - The Co-operative Group

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	-	-	No	-	-	No	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.9

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Asks for additional criterion to be added to SH POL 3, which recognises the potential benefits of student housing in providing economic and environmental improvements, particularly through urban regeneration and/or securing the continued use of listed buildings. The suggested wording for this additional criterion is as follows: 'direct contribution towards environmental and economic improvements either through urban regeneration or securing the continued use of listed buildings'

Council Response: This suggestion is acceptable in principle. However there is no 'hook' within the adopted UDP to hang such a criteria on and thus it cannot be used until we review and revise the UDP policies through one or other part of the LDF. In practice in a particular planning application weight could still be given to such supporting justification.

1250 - Mr Richard Corkhill

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.11, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 6.1, 7.2, 8.3

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Holmside Place

Council Response: Holmside Place is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1239 - Mr Michael Craft

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	-	No	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.6, 2.11, 3.5, 3.8, 4.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7.6, 8.5

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Lansdowe Terrace

Council Response: A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to the suggestion regarding Lansdowe Terrace.

1322 - Mr Barrie Craven

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.7

1281 - Mr & Ms Antony & Susan Cullen

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 2.3, 2.4, 7.1

1270 - Mrs Amanda Davidson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.7, 5.7, 8.11

Suggestions made regarding occupancy conditions: It is not unusual for elderly residents whose families have left home to choose to share their homes with students as a means of remaining in their own homes. Is it possible to safeguard against this clause of the policy adversely affecting such people?

Council Response: Occupancy conditions are likely to be dropped in revised SPD.

1283 - Joseph De Giorgi

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	-	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 3.4, 3.6

1277 - Mrs Ann Denton

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.3, 5.5

1375 - Ms Elizabeth Dicken

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.9, 1.10, 2.5, 2.7, 3.1, 3.4, 4.1, 6.1, 6.9, 7.9

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Castle Leazes

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Spital Tongues has little scope for socio-economic development, and the Town Moor is

already suffering from it. There should be a SPD on Residential Housing to protect vulnerable enclaves like Spital tongues.

Council Response:

A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to the comment regarding Castle Leazes.

The revised SPD will look at these issues in terms of creating and maintaining balanced and sustainable communities, and protecting and enhancing the range of housing tenure types in an area. Continuous monitoring will ensure that areas that become under threat from HMOs will be included in the restraint area in the future.

1358 - Mr Simon Dobson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.12, 3.1, 3.5, 3.6, 5.1, 7.1, 7.7, 8.8

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Clayton Park Square

Council Response: Clayton Park Square is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1252 - Nicky Douglas

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	No	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.5, 2.11, 2.14, 5.2, 7.6

343 - DTZ Debenham Tie Leung

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	No	No	-	No	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 3.9, 3.12, 8.7

1279 - Kath Egdell

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	-	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.3, 2.6, 7.6

1290 - Miss Marjorie Elcoate

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 3.1, 5.1, 7.1, 8.1, 8.9

1278 - Mr Paul Elliott

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	No	No	-	No	Yes	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.2, 2.3, 5.4, 6.4

1296 - Mr Michael Elund

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.16, 6.2, 7.1, 8.1

1285 - D Embleton

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 3.5, 5.2, 7.1, 7.6, 8.9

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Lyndhurst Avenue

Council Response: Lyndhurst Avenue is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1227 - Mr Colin Ferguson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Generic summary of comments: 1.2, 2.1, 2.6, 2.7, 2.11, 3.1, 8.1, 8.2

1335 - Mr Austin Futers

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.11, 3.1, 3.3, 3.10, 3.16, 4.1, 5.3, 5.4, 6.4, 7.5, 7.6, 8.8

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Westwood Avenue

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Need to provide good quality purpose built student housing out of 'student' areas., e.g. Portland Road, Shieldfield & West End.

Council Response:

Westwood Avenue is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

Agree with the comments regarding the provision of good quality purpose built student housing out of 'student' areas. The SPD covers this issues in Appendix 3. In practice, a variety of sites and locations may have to be considered. The Council is attempting to encourage alternatice sites for development of student housing.

1247 - Mr David Gardner

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 2.3, 2.4, 7.6

1329 - Isabel Garford

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	No	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.2, 2.5, 2.8, 3.1, 3.6, 3.16, 7.1, 8.1, 8.5, 8.8

476 - Gavin Black & Partners

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	-	No	-	-	No	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Purpose built student housing needs to be in established neighbourhoods, but where housing is an important issue it is extremely competitive.

Council Response: Noted. SPD covers this issue in Appendix 3. In practice, a variety of sites and locations may have to be considered.

1249 - Dr Bob Giddings

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.6, 3.7, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 7.5, 8.6

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Council tax exemptions should only apply to university run/owned accommodation.

Council Response: Council tax exemptions are set by central government, so are therefore beyond our control.

399 - Douglas Gilmour

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	No	No	No	-	No	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: None

1229 - Mr William Gould

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.12, 3.2, 3.5, 5.2, 6.1, 7.2, 8.3

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Copland Terrace

Council Response: Copland Terrace is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1230 - Dr T.A. Green

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 3.3, 3.16, 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 7.5

1274 - Mr Peter Grundy

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 2.3, 2.2, 2.5, 2.12, 2.15, 3.7, 3.15, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, 8.9, 8.10

Comments made regarding statistics used in the SPD: S3 - % of students doesn't represent actual numbers.

S.9 - could doc indicate the average no. of students occupying 3,4,5 and 6 bed houses, could be gathered from letting agents?

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Students make no cultural contribution.

High levels of complaints of noise / anti-social behaviour should be criteria for being included.

Council Response:

Indicators are not perfect, but do give a reasonable picture of student numbers. In Section 3, the percentage was calculated from the precise numbers. The percentage is used to show the proportion of students in each ward. This is more useful than actual numbers as the total population of each ward is different.

The SPD and background paper are based on the most up-to-date statistics available to the Council, for example, council tax records and planning control records. Average numbers of students occupying HMOs suggested is unavailable to the Council.

We disagree with the blanket comment that students make no cultural contribution. Both the universities and students contribute greatly to Newcastle's cultural life.

High levels of formal reports of noise and other anti social behaviour is a criterion for including an area in the restraint area (see Appendix 2 of SPD).

1305 - Mr Ronald Guariento

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 2.6, 2.8, 2.11, 3.1, 7.6, 8.2

251 - H J Banks & Company Ltd

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	-	Yes	No	Yes	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 3.10, 4.2, 6.5, 6.6

Requested omissions from ASHoRe: New Bridge Street

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Purpose built student housing should not cause pedestrian routes to run through residential areas.

Council Response:

New Bridge Street was not included in the ASHoRe.

Criterion (c) in SH POL 3 & 4 cover this issue, indicating that purpose built housing should be developed in such a way to minimise the impact on neighbouring residential neighbourhoods.

1287 - Mr R Haggart

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.11, 3.1, 4.3, 5.2, 5.4, 7.1, 8.11

1284 - Miss Celia Haigh

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	-	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 3.1

1357 - Y Haimes

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	-	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.6, 1.7, 2.1, 3.6, 3.7, 5.2, 6.4, 7.1, 8.1, 8.6

1286 - Mr Simon Hall

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.5, 3.10, 5.4, 7.2, 7.4, 8.8

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Ilford Road

Council Response: Ilford Road is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1273 - Miss Lynn Hall

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.10, 3.1, 3.3, 3.16, 5.5

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

I do not agree with the conversion or adaption of local authority housing for student use. This should be available for low income, permanent residents.

Council Response: This is based on the City's adopted policy – Newcastle upon Tyne UDP – policy H1.5 and cannot be re-written through this SPD. However the SPD does make clear that use of such buildings should only be where demand is already low of the buildings unsuitable for improvement for conventional housing use.

1328 - Mrs Valentina Hallett

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	No	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.11, 3.3, 3.6, 5.1, 5.2, 5.7

Suggestions made regarding occupancy conditions: Should be clarified by 'Family residence' and 'Multi-occupational'

Council Response: Occupancy conditions have been dropped in revised SPD.

1354 - L.A. Hann

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	No	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.11, 2.15, 2.16, 3.6, 8.1

1324 - Mrs Roberta Harding

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.11, 3.1, 3.3, 8.1

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

A hold should be put on all planning applications intended to enlarge properties which will house students.

Council Response: The revised SPD will seek to protect valuable tenure types, such as larger family homes, in order to maintain a balance and mix of housing types. It also seeks to restrict development that will have a negative impact on the neighbourhood. This will at least move towards the requested effect.

1327 - Mr J David C Harte

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.11, 2.12, 2.14, 2.15, 3.1, 3.17, 5.4, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7.6, 8.1, 8.2

1360 - Anna Haywood

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	-	No	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 1.7, 2.3, 2.11, 2.14, 5.2, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4

1370 - Heckley Homes

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	-	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.8, 3.7, 5.2, 5.6, 6.5, 6.8, 6.9, 8.3

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Problems are not from students, but from concentrations of drinking licences e.g. Osbourne Road. I'm not aware of noise disturbances on Chillingham Road.

Students want to be where other students are. SH POL 3/4 policies are probably too prescriptive.

Council Response:

Concern over drinking licenses and other comments noted.

826 - High West Jesmond Residents

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	No	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 2.6, 2.11, 2.14, 3.1, 3.5, 3.8, 5.1, 7.6, 8.5, 8.6

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Newlands Road, Albury Road, Woodthorne Road and Honister Avenue

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

The provision of off-road parking for tenants, or on-site management/supervision 24/7 could be included in the criterion for SH POL 3 & 4.

Council Response:

Newland Road, Albury Road, Woodthorne Road and Honister Avenue are already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

Criterion (d) of SH POL 3 & 4 cover the issue of parking provision. Management of halls and supervision of students is covered under HMO licensing legislation.

1350 - Mr Roger Hird

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 3.1, 8.2

1298 - Ms Olwyn Hocking

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.5, 2.1, 2.2, 3.5, 7.6

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Jesmond Dene Road

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Perhaps add proximity to safe cycling routes to the factors (SH POL 3/4).

Council Response:

Jesmond Dene Road is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

Cycling facilities not mentioned in UDP in relation to student housing, so cannot add in at this time, but will note for future review of SPD.

1302 - Mr & Mrs John Hodge

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.8, 3.1, 8.2

1333 - Miss Rosalind Hudson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	-	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.6, 2.11, 3.1, 4.1

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Lily Crescent

Council Response: Lily Crescent is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1332 - E L Hughes

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	-	No	-	Yes	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.3, 2.10, 3.1, 7.1, 7.7

1237 - Mr David Humble

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.6, 2.8, 2.11, 3.3,

1295 - Susan Hutton

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.8, 2.11, 2.12, 2.14, 3.3, 6.4, 7.2, 7.6

1240 - Mr Richard Innes

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 7.1, 7.3

1253 - Mr Ted Jarah

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.10, 7.6, 8.4

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Social harmony demands restraints on all sides.

Council Response: Agree.

1244 - Mr Mike Jellema

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.11, 3.5, 5.2, 7.6, 8.3, 8.5, 8.8,

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: East of Osborne Road, close to Manor House Road

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Better information would be helpful - e.g. lists of landlords names and addresses, and;

annual reports to residents groups. Incentives could be offered for good behaviour - landlords ask for deposits but they only cover property, not harm to the community.

Council Response:

The area east of Osborne Road, close to Manor House Road is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

Lists of landlords' names and addresses are covered by data protection legislation, so cannot be disclosed. Incentives for landlords to meet certain standards are covered by HMO licensing legislation.

1316 – A Jesmond Resident (Anonymous)

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.5, 3.1, 3.5, 8.5

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Grosvenor Avenue

Council Response: Grosvenor Avenue is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

290 - Jesmond Residents Association

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 1.7, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.11, 2.12, 2.14, 3.1, 3.7, 3.15, 6.1, 7.2, 7.6, 7.7, 8.6, 8.8

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Contains a lengthy explanation of Studentification and its impacts, as well as a general overview of student accommodation nationwide and some future projections of demand and supply of student accommodation.

Council Response: The Council acknowledges that the process of 'Studentification' as it is called here is occurring in some areas of Newcastle. The problems described are similar to those described in the SPD. The nationwide picture of student accommodation shows clearly that the associated problems are occurring across the country. These details underline the importance in not only addressing the housing issues in the private rented sector, but also in encouraging the development of suitable purpose built student accommodation to help relieve the pressure on the private housing market and taking 'management' measures of various sorts.

1248 - Dr Neil Kerry

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 2.11, 8.1

1243 - Mr Geoff Laws

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	-	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 8.2

1308 - Mrs Jane Lee

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.12, 3.1, 3.7, 5.1, 5.4, 8.1

1334 - Professor Emeritus Ruth Lesser

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 2.10, 3.1, 3.4, 4.1, 5.7, 7.2, 7.5, 8.2

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Castle Leazes Halls

Suggestions made regarding occupancy conditions: Clause for letting with financial profit, to exclude families with students.

Council Response:

A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to the comment regarding Castle Leazes.

Occupancy conditions are likely to be dropped in revised SPD.

1266 - Dr Lana Liu

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	-	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.4, 2.11, 8.10

Comments made regarding statistics used in the SPD: University accommodation is not fully occupied during term times - not sure how a shortage is perceived.

Council Response: The universities have provided us with the information regarding take up of university accommodation. The student numbers have gradually increased over the past 5 years while the number of managed bed spaces has remained relatively stable. A major shortage is predicted in the next 5 years as outlined in Section 2.

1315 - Mr James Lough

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 2.10, 2.12, 3.1, 6.1, 6.6, 7.1, 8.1

1269 - Mrs Estelle Louw

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.5, 4.2, 5.5, 6.6, 7.6, 8.2

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Fern Avenue, Brandling Village

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Supports the use of Occupancy Conditions, but, what happens if the house is sold? Will the new owner be able to change use?

Council Response:

Fern Avenue is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

Occupancy conditions are likely to be dropped in revised SPD.

1301 - Mrs Therese Lowe

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.5, 1.2, 2.8, 2.5, 2.1, 2.3, 2.2, 3.1, 3.7, 8.1,

1259 - Mr Roger Loxley

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 2.11, 3.5, 3.12, 5.1, 7.1, 8.1

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Kimberley Gardens

Council Response: Kimberley Gardens is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1251 - Mr Stephen Mann

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.11, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1, 5.2, 7.6, 7.7, 8.8

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Otterburn Terrace, All conservation areas

Council Response: Otterburn Terrace is already in the ASHoRe. The criteria used to determine inclusion within the ASHoRe is included in Appendix 2. Not all conservation areas meet these criteria, so are not contained in ASHoRe.

1352 - Mr Dan Marsden

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	-	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.6, 2.3, 2.6, 6.1, 8.4, 8.6, 8.7

1319 - Miss Patricia McDonald

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 3.17, 8.1

1297 - Dr William McKay

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 5.1, 6.7, 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, 8.8

1323 - Ms Anne McLeish

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 3.7, 5.1, 5.4, 6.1, 6.4, 7.1, 8.1, 8.8

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Purpose built Student Housing is the only way forward. The Byker Wall is a wonderful prototype of a contained village, where students could get up to what they like and police themselves.

Council Response: The SPD covers this issue in SH POL 3 & 4 and Appendix 3. In practice a variety of sites and locations will be considered for proposals for purpose built student housing.

1353 - Mr Andrew McRae

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	-	No	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 2.15, 8.7									
1208 - Dr Mary Midgley									
Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2									
1255 - Caren Moffett									
Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-
Generic summary of comments: 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, 2.11, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 7.2, 8.1,									
Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Simonside Terrace									
Council Response: Simonside Terrace is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.									
1245 - Mr & Mrs Tom & Linda Moore									
Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-
Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.11, 2.12, 3.1, 3.5, 5.2, 7.6, 8.11									
Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Clayton Road									
Council Response: Clayton Road is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.									
1261 - Rebecca Moosavian									
Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-
Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 2.3, 2.8, 2.14, 7.5, 7.6, 8.6									
1275 - Miss Jennifer Morrison									
Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	No
Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.3, 3.4, 2.2, 2.5, 2.10, 2.12, 5.4, 5.7, 6.1, 7.6, 8.4, 8.8									
Suggestions made regarding occupancy conditions: Supports the use of occupancy conditions, with perhaps a 10 year ban on renting the room out.									
Council Response: Occupancy conditions are likely to be dropped in revised SPD.									
1355 - Margaret Morrison									
Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-	-
Generic summary of comments: 2.6, 5.2, 5.6, 5.7, 7.6									
Suggestions made regarding occupancy conditions: Can anything be done with landlords who have 2+ in a room? Several houses for those with mental health problems / learning difficulties, etc. Could exceptions be made for such groups in the future? Also, e.g. houses for overseas nurses.									
Council Response: Occupancy conditions are likely to be dropped in revised SPD.									

1257 - Sue Nellist

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 2.6, 2.11, 3.1, 6.4, 8.8

1372 - New Student

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	-	No	No	No	No

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 3.6, 3.7, 3.11, 3.14, 5.4, 6.7, 7.8, 8.7

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Purpose built student accommodation is high rise and expensive, with en-suite bathroom (for top 30% of student population). More students are living with parents and going to home university.

If students don't live in an area, who will live there? Restriction could lead to derelict houses and a fall in prices. Student housing (without gardens) often isn't suitable for non-students. You should designate some areas for the letting market (as you designate land for industrial or commercial use).

Local landlords often live in area, so money is kept in the area.

Council Response:

Students who live at home with their parents do not have the same negative impacts on the private rented sector or the local neighbourhood as high concentrations of students do.

Land is designated for residential use in the adopted UDP. There is nothing to distinguish between occupancy types. Students are still able to live in any locality, the revised SPD will aim to preserve valuable tenure or house types, such as houses suitable for families and upper Tyneside flats, in order to maintain a balanced community.

It is noted that some landlords do in fact live locally and contribute to the local economy. However, this is not always the case.

680 - Newcastle College

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 2.13, 7.6

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Newcastle College would support purpose built student accommodation in the west of the City.

Council Response: Noted.

716 - Newcastle Great Park Consortium

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	-	-	No	-	-	Yes	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 6.4, 6.8

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Suggests accompanying policy text for SH POL 3 & 4 should include text stating that NGP will provide a range and mix of housing to include student housing to create a truly sustainable community.

Council Response: Noted. The SPD is not site specific in relation to promoting new

housing.

1310 - Mrs Jean Nicklin

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	-	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.5, 2.7, 2.11

1272 - Dr Peter Nicolls

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 5.7, 7.4, 8.2

Suggestions made regarding occupancy conditions: Supports the use of Occupancy Conditions provided a review can be requested after a reasonable number of years has elapsed.

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

SH POL 3 (c) suggests segregation of developments from 'sensitive areas' outside the ASHoRe boundary. Do you have any examples?

Council Response:

Occupancy conditions are likely to be dropped in revised SPD.

It is not the role of the SPD to dictate specific sites. The Council are looking at a variety of suitable locations as a separate process.

1254 - Katherine Norris

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.6, 2.3, 2.10, 2.12, 3.1, 5.4, 7.2

1374 - Northumbria University

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	-	No	No	-	No	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.14, 3.17, 4.2, 6.5, 8.6

Requested omissions from ASHoRe: Fenham, Existing purpose built

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Northumbria University is willing to work on area based initiatives and has increased its response to complaints about noise and misbehaviour. Other problems, such as rubbish, neglect, parking and crime are outside the University's remit.

It seems counterproductive to impose restrictions in areas (fewer students, eg S Gosforth and Fenham) that could provide some relief from the areas with highest concentrations.

Is restriction reasonable where established use, eg Stephenson Building in Shieldfield - and addition 20-30 rooms would have less impact than the same number of students in private rented sector.

Northumbria University has growth targets which must be met to deliver benefits of students. The loss of the 'Larches' at Cruddas Park is unfortunate as this 'non-traditional' alternative catered for mature overseas students. The Council's attitude is perceived as very negative and unpopular areas are not appealing to students or developers.

Council Response:

Fenham and most existing purpose built student accommodation were not included in the ASHoRe. The revised SPD will emphasise more the need to retain or regain balance

in the housing market in all areas, This may allow us to be sensitive to differences between areas rather than have a single blanket ASHoRe approach.

Northumbria University's willingness to work on an area based initiative is welcomed.

The Council is keen to work with the University to achieve a wider set of policies and proposals that overall are firm but fair. These may still include some restrictions, however.

1377 - Northumbria University (Dickinson Dees acting as agent)

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	-	No	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.8, 1.9, 2.1, 2.5, 2.7, 2.18, 3.9, 3.10, 5.1, 5.4, 6.5, 7.8, 8.3

Suggestions made regarding occupancy conditions: Unsafe in terms of circular 11/95. Condition would be unreasonable and unenforcable - for us to comment properly, a draft version of a standard condition should be published for consultation. Exemptions for families is appropriate, but should also exclude - mature students in full time education, students who do not have conventional families (welfare is a concern). Also serious questions over students sharing with non-students; employed people who become students; doctors and nurses in training; and, post-graduates.

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

It is unclear whether SH POL 3 is within or outside ASHoRe boundary & should be clarified.

Students need support and variety in tenure and price.

The SPD is not appropriate (see PPS12 2.44) as an area of restraint is not grounded in UDP policy (SH POL 1 & 2). SH POL 3 & 4 have some grounding in UDP, but are still inappropriate as a SPD. They would be more appropriate in a DC Policies DPD. The Leeds proposals are appropriate as they are in their UDP, not an SPD. The Leeds Inspector's Report is worth taking into account.

Council Response:

Occupancy conditions are likely to be dropped in revised SPD.

The SPD is being revised and the next version may answer the criticisms made. It will take on board the Leeds UDP review inspector's report.

650 - Geoff O'Brien

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	-	No	No	No	-	No	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 3.7, 3.8, 3.13, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 6.1, 7.3, 7.6, 8.6, 8.12

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Westgate Ward

Requested omissions from ASHoRe: Arthurs Hill

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Secion 4.3 of SPD is a broad generalisation.

Council housing stock is much needed and should not be reduced by converting to student housing.

There are security problems with purpose built student housing blocks. Are large blocks appropriate where there is already a high concentration of students?

Council Response:

Not all of Westgate ward meets the criteria for inclusion in ASHoRe contained in Appendix 2.

A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to the comment regarding Arthur's Hill.

Section 4.2 is not meant to be a comprehensive account of the problems, but it does provide a useful overview of some of the issues.

Conversion of Council Housing is based on the City's adopted policy – Newcastle upon Tyne UDP – policy H1.5 and cannot be re-written through this SPD.

The revised SPD will address the issue of large scale development in terms of refusing planning permissions for developments that will have an unacceptable impact on the surrounding area both in terms of quality of life for local residents and through loss of balance for the community.

1326 - Mr Stephen O'Mara

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 2.11, 3.1, 3.5, 5.1, 7.6, 7.2

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Rosebery Crescent

Council Response: Rosebery Crescent is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

32 - One NorthEast

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	-	-	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 3.10, 8.6, 8.12

1361 - Ms Danuta O'Neill

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 3.7, 6.4, 7.1, 8.6

1367 - Basirat Oyalouo

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	-	No	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 3.9, 3.10, 3.14

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Restricting student housing, while having some merits, has the potential to create other problems: high cost of campus accommodation has caused students to move to town - would lead to high demand in low fixed supply, therefore cost of housing would rise. Students will seek areas that are not so high demand. Does the Council have mechanisms to identify this housing and stop future problems there, or prevent students from being victimised (shield from high rents)?

Council Response: Displacement of the problems will be monitored carefully and any localities which meet the criteria outline in Appendix 2 would be included in a revised ASHoRe.

1366 - Miss Catherine Pagan

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 3.1, 3.12, 5.6, 5.7, 7.1, 7.4, 7.6

Suggestions made regarding occupancy conditions: But should also refer to part-time students - otherwise this loophole will be used. Restrict permission to properties occupied by families, couples and single individuals.

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

The ASHoRe proposals give insufficient controls for maintaining an acceptable housing mix for our communities. There are companies specialising in purchasing properties in 'buy to let' schemes who will exploit any loopholes. A stronger control for housing mix should be devised and implemented for the SPD in the defined ASHoRe areas.

Council Response:

Occupancy conditions have been dropped in revised SPD.

The revised SPD will give added emphasis to creating and maintaining balanced and mixed communities, including a diverse tenure type.

1265 - Julian Peck

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	-	Yes	No	Yes	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 3.1

1242 - Mr Ted Potts

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	-	-	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 8.7

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Thanks for saying how many students there are in Newcastle, and everything that is being done for them. Queried what is being done for aged and disabled people in the area. High rise flats are of no use to them, where are all the disabled bungalows? None are being built and the council and the government do not care.

Council Response: The SPD in its draft form was actually quite restrictive on students, although the revised version will be worded differently. The Council does not agree that nothing is being done for older people.

1238 - Mr & Mrs Roger & Margaret Power

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.6, 3.15, 5.2, 5.4, 7.2, 8.5

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

All external work to properties should be regulated - conversion activities should be monitored or subject to regular inspections, including the disposal of construction waste.

Council Response: Section 6 of the SPD outlines the planning powers in place and which forms of development require planning permission. Even if planning permission is not required, building regulations have to be met.

1318 - Mrs Pamela Ranson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	No

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 5.2, 3.1, 8.5, 1.7, 3.12

1330 - Ms Rachel Roberts

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.7, 2.2, 2.10, 6.1, 5.2, 8.4

1311 - Mr Gordon Robinson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 2.3, 2.10, 3.5, 3.6, 3.17, 8.1

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Bowsden Terrace

Council Response: Bowsden Terrace is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1228 - Myra Robinson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	No	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.11, 7.2, 7.6

1292 - Mr Peter J Rodgers

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 2.12, 3.1, 3.5, 5.1, 5.3, 5.5, 6.4, 6.6, 7.2, 7.6

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Salisbury Gardens

Council Response: Salisbury Gardens is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1246 - Mrs Pauline Roxburgh

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 6.6, 3.4, 3.5, 4.2, 6.4, 2.10, 5.3

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: North Terrace, Claremont Road

Council Response: Some parts of Claremont Road are already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1348 - Professor Sudipta Roy

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 2.11, 2.6, 5.1, 3.1, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 5.6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.7

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Fenham

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

SH POL 3 & 4 should separate undergraduate and postgraduate accommodation as their

needs are different.

Council Response:

A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to the comment regarding Fenham. The differences are acknowledged but they have more similarities than differences and can be dealt with under the fairly broad criteria.

1271 - Miss Jennifer Shaw

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.8, 2.11, 3.5, 5.4, 7.6

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Myrtle Grove

Council Response: Myrtle Grove is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1306 - Ms Maureen Shea

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.4, 8.2

776 – Shieldfield Tower Blocks Tenants and Residents Association

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.10, 2.11, 3.2, 3.9, 4.1, 7.2, 8.4

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Camden Street/Byron Street

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

The proximity clause (to the universities and Metro) in SH POL 3 & 4 would inevitably result in more student housing in Shieldfield.

Council Response:

A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to the comment regarding Camden Street and Byron Street.

Consideration of the location of additional purpose built student housing is covered by Appendix 3. In practice, a variety of sites and locations may have to be considered. If the current policies were carried through into the revised SPD, then the Council would not encourage purpose built accommodation in most if not all of Shieldfield.

1364 - Mr Richard Short

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.7, 2.11, 6.4, 7.2, 8.3

1307 - Mrs Joan Sigmund

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.3, 2.6, 3.1, 5.1, 6.4, 8.2, 8.8

1369 - Margaret Slade

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.9, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.11, 2.18, 3.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.5,

6.4, 7.6

1373 - Mr Jack Slade

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Generic summary of comments: 1.2, 2.1, 2.8, 2.11, 3.1, 5.2, 5.7, 7.2, 7.6

Suggestions made regarding occupancy conditions: Positive discrimination in favour of families would be preferable.

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Jesmond contains houses that were designed for families and the educational provision of the area supports this - I think this aspect of character should be stressed.

Council Response:

Occupancy conditions have been dropped in revised SPD.

The revised SPD seeks to prevent the loss of valuable tenure types, such as larger properties that are suitable for family occupation. The demographic mix and balance is emphasised in the revised version and the number of schoolchildren is one of the criteria considered under Appendix 2.

1321 - Mr John Smee

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.2, 2.3, 2.5, 5.1, 5.2, 7.1, 8.1, 8.2, 8.8

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Any proposed purpose built developments should consider all of the impacts on any community that may be affected.

Council Response: Agreed. This is covered by criterion (c) of SH POL 3 & 4 and Appendix 3.

1313 - Mr & Mrs Douglas Smith

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Generic summary of comments: 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 3.1, 8.8

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Students were used for a re-cycling trial.

Council Response: Noted.

1268 - Mrs Elizabeth Smith

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 3.5, 3.17

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Rothwell Road, Alwinton Terrace, Bath Terrace, Harley Terrace, Wolveleigh Road, Beaumont Terrace, Hyde Terrace

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Gosforth must not become another Jesmond.

Council Response:

All of the terraces west of the Metro line in East Gosforth currently fall outside the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

It is acknowledged that the problems may become more apparent and spread to other

areas of the city, though in many cases student occupation is not under the control of planning powers.

1236 - Mr Edmund Smith

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.7, 2.8, 2.11, 3.1, 3.5, 3.6, 6.1, 7.2

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: All Tyneside Flats, Larkspur Terrace and surrounding area

Council Response: Larkspur Terrace and the surrounding area are already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1317 - Mrs Barbara Stabler

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 3.1, 5.2, 6.1, 6.4, 7.2, 8.2

1289 - Mr Ronald Stamp

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: None

1359 - Mrs J Stobo

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 2.8, 2.12, 3.3, 5.4, 5.5, 8.8

1314 - Mrs Joan Stuart

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.5, 4.1, 5.4, 6.4, 6.6, 7.6

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Extended further in the West End, All of Arthur's Hill, Wingrove Gardens

Council Response: A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1303 - Mr Chris Sutcliffe

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.3, 1.6, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.6, 5.4, 5.6, 7.2, 7.6, 7.9

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

The character of Jesmond is what makes it so appealing to students and young people but, as with tourism, poorly and inadequately monitored planning control could make its popularity its downfall. A planning control based on density of living area would seem to be an obvious start.

Council Response: The revised SPD will address this issue in terms of creating sustainable communities and maintaining a mix and balance of housing in an area. Developments that upset this balance may not be granted planning permission.

1291 - Mrs Noray Sweeney

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 4.1

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Boundary should not end at the motorway - NOT Byron Street

Council Response: A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

776 - Mr Oliver Swingler

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.10, 2.11, 3.2, 3.9, 4.1, 8.4

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Camden Street/Byron Street

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Feeling that the ASHoRe boundaries have been drawn to take account of richer and more influential residents of Jesmond and Heaton.

Council Response:

A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to the comment regarding Camden Street and Byron Street.

The criteria for inclusion in the ASHoRe are included in Appendix 2. No other considerations are given to the boundaries.

1331 - J W Thompson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	-	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 5.2, 7.6

1325 - Prof J Barrie Thompson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.5, 2.3, 2.5

1371 - Ms Mary Thompson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 1.10, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.10, 2.11, 3.16, 4.1, 5.2, 8.1

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: wider area

Council Response: The ASHoRe boundary has been drawn to cover areas that meet the criteria detailed in Appendix 2. Continuous monitoring of the situation will insure other areas under treat from high concentrations of students will be included in the future. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1337 - Mr F Todd

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	-	No	-	-	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.7, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 2.7, 2.11, 3.1, 3.6, 7.1, 7.7,

1206 - Mrs Beryl Trevethan

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.11, 3.3, 3.5, 8.1

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Warwick Street

Council Response: Warwick Street is already in the ASHoRe.

801 - Union Society

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	No	No	No	No	-	No	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.7, 1.10, 2.16, 3.9, 5.2, 6.5, 6.7, 7.3, 7.6, 8.7

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

What are the local concerns about students and where have they come from?

Why does HMO definition not align with that of Housing Legislation?

Growth in student numbers is through Internationals, many of whom are postgraduates with families, who can't live in purpose built halls.

Many properties are unsuitable as family homes, e.g. lack gardens.

Council Response:

The local concerns about students are summarised in Section 4, and are re-enforced by this consultation (see Q2 of generic responses).

The Council agrees that it would be useful to have one common definition of HMOs, but this is beyond our control.

Some purpose built student housing is designed for family occupation and more will be provided in the future if there is a demand.

The revised SPD will focus on the need to create and maintain balanced and mixed communities, including a diverse tenure type. It is recognised that many properties may be unsuitable for families, but they may be valuable resources for other reasons. For example, an upper Tyneside Flat provides a good first step onto the housing ladder for first time buyers.

1376 - Unite Group plc

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 1.7, 1.9, 2.3, 2.5, 2.14, 2.17, 3.10, 3.14, 5.2, 5.4, 7.6, 7.9, 8.10

Comments made regarding statistics used in the SPD: Student housing should be allocated over and above general housing requirements. Our figures show that only 4,400 students are living with parents, a significantly lower figure than the 10,000 set out in the SPD - large private rented 21,000 (compared to 14,500 in SPD).

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Need distinction between purpose built and private landlords, and distinction between conversions of existing property and bespoke new builds. Conversion by a private landlord of further terraced houses in a street may have adverse effect on neighbourhood and local housing market. Well planned, managed, purpose built can bring positive impact, relieving pressure from traditional housing stock. ASHoRe should only apply to traditional housing stock, not purpose built, managed properties.

Is SH POL 3 appropriate?

A 'Student Village' approach would be good.

Council Response:

Comments regarding statistics have been noted. While the indicators used in Section 2 are not perfect, they do give a reasonable picture of student numbers. The SPD and background paper are based on the most up-to-date statistics available to the Council. If the proportion living in private rented accommodation is higher than our estimates this only serves to underline the need for the SPD.

The revised SPD will place more emphasis on minimising adverse effects on the local neighbourhood and seeks to create well balanced communities with a wide variety of tenure types. If a development brings a positive impact to a neighbourhood this will be a positive consideration in determining the application.

SH POL 3 provides clarification for the two key policies from the adopted UDP.

There Council agrees that development above a certain critical mass, perhaps in the form of a student village, makes economic and social sense in principle.

248 - University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	-	Yes	No	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.3, 1.4, 3.1, 3.3, 3.16, 4.2, 5.4, 6.4, 8.12

Requested omissions from ASHoRe: Spital Tongues, Arthurs Hill and Gosforth

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

The policies are generally supported, but there should be some flexibility within policy SH POL 2 for the refurbishment or demolition and rebuild of existing halls of residence. Such proposals would look to improve facilities that have become outdated. New bed spaces could be achieved due to the improved efficiency of floor space. The blanket policy does not account for this and the City Council need to clarify how situations would be dealt with.

Suggest that the words "and safe pedestrian/cycle routes" be included at criterion (b) of both SH POL 3 and 4.

Character is an important influence for people deciding where they wish to live, including students.

We welcome the view that the additional need for bed spaces of between 2500 and 3500 should be provided in purpose built accomodation.

We support the comment at para 4.4 that traditional halls and flatted development have less impact on the housing market. Further, they provide safer environments for student and given they are managed premissis there is more control over security and car parking etc. More importantly, these are high investment projects and therefore are more likely to be maintained to a high standard.

It is important to emphasise the positive image of Newcastle City. Key stakeholders within the city must be sensitive and ensure that young people and students are not seen as a nuisance.

In terms of para 4.5 we would want to reinforce the University's commitment to the Newcastle accreditation scheme and would want to work in partnership to strengthen the standards.

Council Response:

A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to the comment regarding omissions from the ASHoRe.

The Council would not wish too many exceptions built in to the SPD under POL2 or otherwise, but the planning system has a fair amount of discretion in dealing with individual applications.

The Council has no objection in principle to including reference to walking and cycling routes, but these are not referred to in the parent UDP policies.

We welcome the support for aim to provide the future shortfall in bed spaces in purpose built student accommodation.

We agree that students should not be seen in a negative light as they contribute greatly to the city's cultural and economic vitality.

We welcome the universities commitment to working with the Council on improving the accreditation scheme.

1294 - Mrs Anne Wadsworth

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.9, 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.11, 3.1, 3.5, 3.12, 5.4

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Queens terrace, Devonshire Place, Cavendish Place.

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

Student HMOs could serve to re-vitalise deprived areas, but careful attention should be paid to effects on existing residents.

Council Response:

Queens terrace, Devonshire Place and Cavendish Place are already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

Agree with comment regarding students acting as a catalyst for regeneration. This is covered by criterion (c) of SH POL 3 and Appendix 3.

724 - Mr Geoff Wadsworth

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.2, 1.9, 1.5, 2.3, 2.6, 2.11, 3.1, 3.5, 3.10, 3.12, 4.2, 5.4, 8.6

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Queens Terrace, Devonshire Place

Requested omissions from ASHoRe: Wellburn Park

Council Response:

Queens Terrace, Devonshire Place and Wellburn Park are currently in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to these comment.

673 - Robert Walker

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.10, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.8, 2.11, 3.6, 3.12, 3.15, 7.4, 7.6, 8.6

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

The SPD ASHoRe proposals do not contain sufficient controls to achieve the aim of sustaining a proper housing mix, and loopholes will be exploited by all those with an interest in profiting from increasing student numbers. Stronger and more effective controls in the SPD are necessary to prevent the exploitation of these loopholes.

Council Response: The SPD can have some effect, but this is limited as acknowledged in the SPD. The revised version will give added emphasis to creating and maintaining a balanced housing mix and a sustainable community.

1241 - Mr Andrew Wareing

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.11, 3.1, 5.3, 7.4, 8.5

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

The classification of 'distance to metro' looks odd (SH POL 3/4). Is 400m too far for students to walk? My kids walk further than that to school!

Council Response: This is a fairly standard national figure that tries balance the abilities of people of varying degrees of mobility and also recognises the realities of personal motivation!

1356 - Mr Tim Watson

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.11, 6.1, 7.6, 8.4, 8.10

Comments made regarding statistics used in the SPD: 1) monitor school numbers to see if its disproportionate, 2) Liason with police and enviro. Health, & universities, 3) monitoring complaints, 4) participation of students union in monitoring process.

Council Response: The numbers of schoolchildren in a locality and the levels of formal complaints of noise and other anti-social behaviour are part of the criteria monitored and considered to determine whether an area is included in the ASHoRe (see Appendix 2 of SPD). Discussions with student welfare officers are in hand.

1309 - MR Robert Weiner

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	-	No	-	-	-	-	-

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.5

1304 - Mr David Wett

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.10, 2.7, 3.1, 3.3, 3.7, 3.10, 3.16, 4.2, 5.4, 8.6

Requested omissions from ASHoRe: Arthurs Hill, Grainger Park Road

Other Responses not covered by generic summaries:

All the students I've spoken to don't want to move to Fenham because there is no decent pub.

Council Response:
Grainger Park was not included in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

Comments about Fenham noted.

1260 - Mr Noel Whinn

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 1.7, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5, 3.7, 8.1, 8.6

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Bayswater Road

Council Response: Bayswater Road is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1276 - Mr Bernie Whiting

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

Generic summary of comments: 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 3.1, 3.5, 7.9

Suggested additions to the ASHoRe: Jesmond Gardens

Council Response: Jesmond Gardens is already in the ASHoRe. A revised boundary is currently being developed and due consideration will be given to this comment.

1299 - Mr Finn Willcock

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
-	No	Yes	No	No	-	No	-	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 7.1, 8.1

1300 - Mrs Lesley Withers

Q1a	Q1b	Q2	Q3a	Q3b	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7a	Q7b
No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Generic summary of comments: 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 5.4, 7.6

Appendix A: Table of questions asked in consultation documents

In order to help us analyse the results all comments made, whether in response to one of the leaflets, by filling in a response form or through general comments, were categorised into one of eight topics. These are based on the question posed in the response form published alongside the draft document. The table below outlines how we interpreted responses in line with these eight questions. We were then able to devise a series of generic summaries for each of the eight topics (see Appendices B and C).

8 themes	Question	Question from the response form	Questions from the leaflet
Value added by students and young people	Q1a	The SPD says that students and other young people living in shared housing can add to the social and economic vitality of the city and its neighbourhoods. Do you agree?	Do you consider that in some residential areas of the city the numbers and concentrations of students are causing problems? If so, do you think they outweigh the benefits of having young people in the area?
	Q1b	Are there any particular benefits in your area you would like to mention?	
Problems caused by concentrations of students and young people	Q2	Much of the SPD is based on evidence that the numbers and concentrations of students and other young people in shared housing can cause problems in some parts of the city. From your experience, do you think there are problems and, if so, what are they?	
Restraining further growth in some parts of the city	Q3a	The Council through the SPD is seeking to restrain further growth in numbers of students in those parts of the city currently under most pressure. Although planning powers are limited, policies POL 1 and POL 2 in the SPD should allow the Council to refuse planning permissions for some extensions, conversions involving roof lights in upper Tyneside flats and new developments that would create more bed spaces for students. Do you support this general restraint approach?	Do you think the idea of defining an Area of Student Housing Restraint is a good one or not?
ASHoRe principle	Q3b	Do you have any comment about whether it is needed where you live or in an area you know?	If it's a good idea, should your street should be in an area of restraint?
	Q4	In order to focus the policies contained in the SPD on areas that demonstrate the most significant problems, the SPD proposes an Area of Student Housing Restrain or ASHoRe. If you have seen the ASHoRe boundary, do you agree that it is about right or would you like to see changes to include or leave out certain streets?	
Use of occupancy conditions	Q5	There is a problem with introducing planning restrictions on conversions and extensions. For example, longer term residents may wish to extend their house for a growing family. It is possible to grant planning permission subject to what is called an <i>occupancy condition</i> . This could prohibit new rooms being used by full time students. Do you consider that the use of occupancy conditions in this way is acceptable as part of the wider package of measures in the SPD?	Do you consider that the of occupancy conditions in this way is acceptable as part of the wider package of measures in the SPD?
Purpose built student housing	Q6	The SPD says that the Council will encourage a certain amount of new purpose built housing for students outside the ASHoRe boundary. Specific locations are not mentioned. Policies POL 3 and POL 4 in the SPD try to clarify how we judge such new developments. If you have read the policies, do you agree that the lists of factors to be taken into account are adequate or do they need adding to?	No-comparable question.
Protection of character of a locality	Q7a	A key part of coming to a view on planning applications should be the impact they might have on the character of an area, especially where people live. SPD policies POL 3 and POL 4 refer to this. Do you think character is an important issue?	Do you think it is important to protect the character of the area you live in & what would you say are the main characteristics of your area? Should we be using planning policy of the sort set out above to protect character?
	Q7b	Do you consider the SPD says enough about this aspect of decision making?	
Any other comments	Q8	We would welcome any other comments or concerns about the impact of the SPD.	Any other comments or concerns about the possible impact of the SPD are welcome!

Appendix B: Summary of generic (grouped) comments

Figures in all cases are numbers, *not* percentages.

How did people respond?

	RESIDENTS	ORGANISATIONS	TOTAL
Responded to questions in the leaflet	28	1	29
Filled in response form	78	12	90
Continuous prose letter or email	21	9	30
Written response during the drop-in session	14	0	14
TOTAL	141	22	163

Q1 Value added by students and young people

The SPD says that students and other young people living in shared housing can add to the social and economic vitality of the city and its neighbourhoods.

Do you agree?

	YES	NO	DID NOT SPECIFY
Residents	68	35	38
Organisations	16	0	6
Total	84	35	44

Are there any particular benefits in your area you would like to mention?

	YES	NO
Residents	55	86
Organisations	11	11
Total	66	97

Comments made regarding the benefits of students and young people:

CODE	COMMENT	RES.	ORGS.	TOTAL
1.1	They make the area lively.	21	1	22
1.2	They help create a diverse population.	16	1	17
1.3	They support local shops and services.	23	12	35
1.4	They provide economic benefits to the city as a whole.	26	9	35
1.5	They provide social benefits to the city as a whole.	14	2	16
1.6	Students aren't entirely to blame - young professionals and local youths are just as bad and there are problems with other forms of Housing in Multiple Occupation (HMOs).	12	5	17
1.7	Only greedy landlords benefit from housing students and young people as the maintenance, for example, is their responsibility. They don't care about the local community. They should be penalised in some way for their negative impact on the community, for example through council tax or business rates.	19	3	22
1.8	They Help to reduce crime.	0	2	2
1.9	They can act as a catalyst for regeneration and often fill properties that would otherwise be left vacant.	4	5	9
1.10	The benefits of housing student and young people are not to local residents or are only if the numbers are in moderation.	3	2	5

Q2 Problems caused by concentrations of students and young people

Much of the SPD is based on evidence that the numbers and concentrations of students and other young people in shared housing can cause problems in some parts of the city.

From your experience, do you think there are problems and, if so, what are they?

	YES	NO	DID NOT SPECIFY
Residents	126	6	9
Organisations	14	2	6
Total	140	8	15

Comments made regarding the problems caused by concentrations of students and young people:

CODE	COMMENT	RES.	ORGS.	TOTAL
2.1	They create a poor visual amenity as gardens are unkempt and houses are poorly maintained.	67	4	71
2.2	They cause environmental damage through littering, lack of recycling and poor disposal of household rubbish, for example, leaving the bin out permanently or storing waste in the gardens.	61	3	64
2.3	Anti-social behaviour, including drunkenness, late night noise and parties, etc.	102	6	108
2.4	Increased levels of crime and vandalism	23	3	26
2.5	Car use is a problem causing congestion and parking difficulties.	75	7	82
2.6	The transient nature causes an unbalanced population. This in turn leads to loss of community spirit and loss of democratic power, as most students aren't registered to vote.	41	3	44
2.7	They cause over-crowding generally.	21	2	23
2.8	Local services, such as schools decline as there aren't as many young children present. Local shops cater to students need, selling more junk food or fast food and takeaways.	27	3	30
2.9	House values decline.	2	0	2
2.10	Tensions emerge between residents and students in a 'town vs. gown' dispute.	13	0	13
2.11	There is an uneven balance of house types. Families move out and the family homes are lost through conversions to HMOs.	46	4	50
2.12	Students don't make a contribution to local services due to Council Tax exemptions, despite using them very intensively.	15	1	16
2.13	Part 4 of the SPD summarises the problems well.	3	1	4
2.14	House prices are pushed up and become unaffordable to local residents.	5	3	8
2.15	It is the responsibility of the police to do more to deal with anti-social behaviour.	4	1	5
2.16	Not all students are to blame. It is just a selfish minority.	1	1	2
2.17	Properties need to be managed, as managed properties don't have the same problems with anti-social behaviour.	0	1	1
2.18	Vacation vacancies create further problems of neglect, for example burglaries increase and no one is present to deal with the house if, for example, the burglar alarm sounds or a water pipe bursts.	1	1	2

Q3 Restraining further growth in some parts of the city

The Council through the SPD is seeking to restrain further growth in numbers of students in those parts of the city currently under most pressure. Although planning powers are limited, policies POL 1 and POL 2 in the SPD should allow the Council to refuse planning permissions for some extensions, conversions involving roof lights in upper Tyneside flats and new developments that would create more bed spaces for students.

Do you support this general restraint approach?

	YES	NO	DID NOT SPECIFY
Residents	117	11	13
Organisations	11	6	5
Total	128	17	18

Do you have any comment about whether it is needed where you live or in an area you know?

	YES	NO
Residents	97	44
Organisations	5	17
Total	102	61

Comment about the restraint approach:

CODE	COMMENT	RES.	ORGS.	TOTAL
3.1	Restraint is required in Jesmond	61	4	65
3.2	Restraint is required in Shieldfield	5	0	5
3.3	Restraint is required in Heaton	14	1	15
3.4	Restraint is required in Spital Tongues	9	1	10
3.5	Restraint is required in Specific Streets (see non-generic comments).	31	2	33
3.6	Student numbers are already too high.	18	3	21
3.7	The restraint approach will only have a limited effect as there is a need to do more to convert houses back to family homes. The situation needs to be remedied, not just preventing from worsening.	14	4	18
3.8	The restraint policy should be city-wide as it penalises those who live in the ASHoRe.	2	3	5
3.9	The restraint policy will cause problems elsewhere in non-ASHoRe's. The dispersal of student housing therefore needs to be very carefully managed.	3	5	8
3.10	The Council needs to actively promote and encourage alternative sites for development of student housing.	5	5	10
3.11	Planning cannot deal with these problems as many HMOs do not require planning permission.	0	2	2
3.12	The problem requires changes in the Council's powers by the national Government. For example, Council Tax rules, the Use Classes Order and HMO definitions.	5	2	7
3.13	Emphasis should be on providing family housing rather than restraint.	0	1	1
3.14	The restraint approach will adversely affect the housing market in various ways: affecting house prices and creating a two-tier pricing system for those properties with and without extensions or conversions; or, vacant properties will be left as families won't be attracted to areas.	2	5	7
3.15	The restraint approach should be on a street-by-street basis, rather than area based.	2	2	4
3.16	Restraint is required in Sandyford	10	1	11
3.17	Restraint is required in Gosforth	4	1	5

Q4 ASHoRe principle

In order to focus the policies contained in the SPD on areas that demonstrate the most significant problems, the SPD proposes an Area of Student Housing Restraint or ASHoRe.

If you have seen the ASHoRe boundary, do you agree that it is about right or would you like to see changes to include or leave out certain streets?

	ABOUT RIGHT	WOULD LIKE TO SEE CHANGES	DID NOT SPECIFY
Residents	60	19	62
Organisations	6	6	10
Total	66	25	72

Comments made about the ASHoRe boundary:

CODE	COMMENT	RES.	ORGS.	TOTAL
4.1	Suggested specific streets or areas to be included in the ASHoRe (see non-generic comments)	15	1	16

4.2	Suggested that specific streets or areas are taken out of the ASHoRe (see non-generic comments)	4	5	9
4.3	Monitoring will be very important so that the policy is flexible and adaptable.	1	1	2

Q5 Use of occupancy conditions

There is a problem with introducing planning restrictions on conversions and extensions. For example, longer term residents may wish to extend their house for a growing family. It is possible to grant planning permission subject to what is called an *occupancy condition*. This could prohibit new rooms being used by full time students.

Do you consider that the use of occupancy conditions in this way is acceptable as part of the wider package of measures in the SPD?

	YES	NO	DID NOT SPECIFY
Residents	97	12	32
Organisations	8	4	10
Total	105	16	42

Comments made regarding occupancy conditions:

CODE	COMMENT	RES.	ORGS.	TOTAL
5.1	Responsible owner occupier's need to be able to modernise their homes in order to support full time residents.	13	3	16
5.2	HMOs or landlords need better accountability, for example, licensing.	26	4	30
5.3	There are ancient covenants attached to the deeds of many of these homes, which need to be enforced.	5	0	5
5.4	Occupancy conditions would be too difficult to enforce.	22	5	27
5.5	Occupancy conditions would need to be maintained after a house is sold.	6	0	6
5.6	Occupancy conditions should target all HMOs, not just students.	4	1	5
5.7	Made specific suggestions as alternatives to occupancy conditions (see non-generic comments).	9	0	9

Q6 Purpose built student accommodation

The SPD says that the Council will encourage a certain amount of new purpose built housing for students outside the ASHoRe boundary. Specific locations are not mentioned. Policies POL 3 and POL 4 in the SPD try to clarify how we judge such new developments.

If you have read the policies, do you agree that the lists of factors to be taken into account are adequate or do they need adding to?

	ADEQUATE	NEED ADDING TO	DID NOT SPECIFY
Residents	49	14	78
Organisations	7	11	4
Total	56	25	82

Comments made regarding purpose built student accommodation:

CODE	COMMENT	RES.	ORGS.	TOTAL
6.1	The universities need to take more responsibility for purpose built accommodation.	16	2	18
6.2	Any purpose built student housing needs to be close to a metro or public transport link.	5	0	5
6.3	Any purpose built student housing needs to be built further out of the city centre.	4	0	4
6.4	Fully support any purpose built student housing as it is the only solution to the student housing issue.	21	3	24
6.5	Any purpose built student housing needs to be close to the universities, i.e. within a ten minute walk.	1	6	7
6.6	Any purpose built student housing needs to be away from residential areas.	6	1	7
6.7	Purpose built student halls will not provide a suitable solution to this issue. Only first year undergraduates want to live in halls. Being in unmanaged	2	2	4

	student accommodation is regarded as part of the student 'experience' and helps to develop life skills. Also, halls are unsuitable for many students, including postgraduates and international students, especially those with families.			
6.8	Any purpose built student housing needs to be close to shops and services, including the city centre.	0	2	2
6.9	Object specifically to Castle Leazes halls of residence or object to extensions of existing purpose built student housing generally.	2	2	4

Q7 Protection of the character of a locality

A key part of coming to a view on planning applications should be the impact they might have on the character of an area, especially where people live. SPD policies POL 3 and POL 4 refer to this.

Do you think character is an important issue?

	YES	NO	DID NOT SPECIFY
Residents	104	1	36
Organisations	10	1	11
Total	114	2	47

Do you consider the SPD says enough about this aspect of decision making?

	YES	NO	DID NOT SPECIFY
Residents	26	11	104
Organisations	5	1	16
Total	31	12	120

Comments made in reference to the character of an area:

CODE	COMMENT	RES.	ORGS.	TOTAL
7.1	The character of the area has already been eroded by a high concentration of students.	21	1	22
7.2	The character of the area is slowly being eroded by a high concentration of students.	19	1	20
7.3	Safety needs to be emphasised more as an aspect of character.	1	2	3
7.4	The social character or community is a very important aspect.	5	1	6
7.5	Students need to be spread out more evenly across the entire city.	10	0	10
7.6	We need balanced, mixed communities, not concentrations of any particular group, including students.	38	9	47
7.7	Several Conservation Areas have been designated in Jesmond, but this seems to make little difference in protecting or 'conserving' the character.	4	1	5
7.8	Character, by definition, is non-static and a change of character can often be a positive feature of an area.	1	3	4
7.9	Character is difficult to quantify as it can mean different things to different people.	3	1	4

Q8 Any other comments

We welcomed any other comments or concerns about the impact of the SPD:

CODE	COMMENT	RES.	ORGS.	TOTAL
8.1	Wish that something had been done sooner to tackle the problems of high concentrations of student housing.	25	0	25
8.2	Commend the Council for its work in this area.	17	1	18
8.3	The photocopy of the ASHoRe boundary published with the document was too small and of too poor quality to be able to read properly.	7	2	9
8.4	Not anti-student. They just feel that student accommodation needs regulating in some way.	7	0	7
8.5	Parking restrictions are needed urgently and would greatly assist in tackling the problems caused by high concentrations of students and young people.	8	1	9
8.6	The problems caused by high concentrations of students require a much wider policy approach to tackle them, not just planning restrictions.	12	6	18

8.7	You should not target and discriminate against particular groups, in this case students. Concentrations of any kind will cause problems.	6	3	9
8.8	The needs of the permanent residents should be considered first and foremost, before the needs of transient or temporary residents.	16	1	17
8.9	Regulation of letting boards is badly needed and would greatly help to reduce the negative visual impacts of student accommodation. There are just too many boards and they are often left up all year round.	3	0	3
8.10	Question how accurate the statistics used in the SPD are, and suggest updates and/or alternative indicators that could be monitored (see non-generic comments).	5	1	6
8.11	Landlords need to be forced to maintain their properties. They could be offered incentives for voluntarily improving their standards.	3	0	3
8.12	Encouraging students to remain in the city following their graduation is very important.	0	4	4
8.13	Students need to be included more in devising a strategy to tackle the problems associated with student housing.	1	0	1

Appendix C: Council's responses to generic comments

CODE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Q1 Value added by students and young people		
1.1	They make the area lively.	Noted.
1.2	They help create a diverse population.	Noted.
1.3	They support local shops and services.	Noted.
1.4	They provide economic benefits to the city as a whole.	Noted.
1.5	They provide social benefits to the city as a whole.	Noted.
1.6	Students aren't entirely to blame - young professionals and local youths are just as bad and there are problems with other forms of Housing in Multiple Occupation (HMOs).	Revised SPD will have a broader coverage of shared housing.
1.7	Only greedy landlords benefit from housing students and young people as the maintenance, for example, is their responsibility. They don't care about the local community. They should be penalised in some way for their negative impact on the community, for example through council tax or business rates.	Beyond the scope of the SPD.
1.9	They can act as a catalyst for regeneration and often fill properties that would otherwise be left vacant.	Noted.
1.10	The benefits of housing student and young people are not to local residents or are only if the numbers are in moderation.	Noted.

Q2 Problems caused by students and young people		
2.1	They create a poor visual amenity as gardens are unkempt and houses are poorly maintained.	Already acknowledged in the SPD.
2.2	They cause environmental damage through littering, lack of recycling and poor disposal of household rubbish, for example, leaving the bin out permanently or storing waste in the gardens.	Already acknowledged in the SPD.
2.3	Anti-social behaviour, including drunkenness, late night noise and parties, etc.	Already acknowledged in the SPD.
2.4	Increased levels of crime and vandalism	Already acknowledged in the SPD.
2.5	Car use is a problem causing congestion and parking difficulties.	Already acknowledged in the SPD.
2.6	The transient nature causes an unbalanced population. This in turn leads to loss of community spirit and loss of democratic power, as most students aren't registered to vote.	Already acknowledged in the SPD.
2.7	They cause over-crowding generally.	Already acknowledged in the SPD.
2.8	Local services, such as schools decline as there aren't as many young children present. Local shops cater to students need, selling more junk food or fast food and takeaways.	Already acknowledged in the SPD.
2.9	House values decline.	Noted, but may not be the case in all affected areas.
2.10	Tensions emerge between residents and students in a 'town vs. gown' dispute.	Noted.
2.11	There is an uneven balance of house types. Families move out and the family homes are	Already acknowledged in the SPD.

	lost through conversions to HMOs.	
2.12	Students don't make a contribution to local services due to Council Tax exemptions, despite using them very intensively.	There is some compensatory payment to the Council from central government to cover lost council tax.
2.13	Part 4 of the SPD summarises the problems well.	Noted with thanks.
2.14	House prices are pushed up and become unaffordable to local residents.	Noted, but may not be the case in all affected areas.
2.15	It is the responsibility of the police to do more to deal with anti-social behaviour.	Noted.
2.16	Not all students are to blame. It is just a selfish minority.	Noted.
2.17	Properties need to be managed, as managed properties don't have the same problems with anti-social behaviour.	These issues are dealt with under HMO licensing legislation.
2.18	Vacation vacancies create further problems of neglect, for example burglaries increase and no one is present to deal with the house if, for example, the burglar alarm sounds or a water pipe bursts.	Already acknowledged in the SPD.

Q3 Restraining further growth in some parts of the city		
3.1	Restraint is required in Jesmond	Already in the area covered by SPD.
3.2	Restraint is required in Shieldfield	Already in the area covered by SPD.
3.3	Restraint is required in Heaton	Already in the area covered by SPD.
3.4	Restraint is required in Spital Tongues	Already in the area covered by SPD.
3.5	Restraint is required in Specific Streets (see non-generic comments).	See non-generic comments.
3.6	Student numbers are already too high.	Already acknowledged in the SPD.
3.7	The restraint approach will only have a limited effect as there is a need to do more to convert houses back to family homes. The situation needs to be remedied, not just preventing from worsening.	Not possible to make actions retrospective.
3.8	The restraint policy should be city-wide as it penalises those who live in the ASHoRe.	Revised SPD will probably remain area based, but nature of restrictions will be more limited and existing residents should not be penalised (unless selling on to a property developer).
3.9	The restraint policy will cause problems elsewhere in non-ASHoRe's. The dispersal of student housing therefore needs to be very carefully managed.	Agreed. Situation will be monitored.
3.10	The Council needs to actively promote and encourage alternative sites for development of student housing.	The Council is doing this.
3.11	Planning cannot deal with these problems as many HMOs do not require planning permission.	The SPD can have some effect, but this is limited as acknowledged in the SPD.
3.12	The problem requires changes in the Council's powers by the national Government. For example, Council Tax rules, the Use Classes Order and HMO definitions.	Agreed, but beyond our control.
3.13	Emphasis should be on providing family housing rather than restraint.	Revised SPD has this emphasis.
3.14	The restraint approach will adversely affect the housing market in various ways: affecting house prices and creating a two-tier pricing system for those properties with and	Under revised SPD, extensions or conversions would only be stopped where they would lead to likely loss of house types which are valuable in their own right,

	without extensions or conversions; or, vacant properties will be left as families won't be attracted to areas.	especially family housing or smaller flats suitable for those who are stepping onto the housing ladder.
3.15	The restraint approach should be on a street-by-street basis, rather than area based.	Revised SPD will look at the neighbourhood, though not street-by-street level.
3.16	Restraint is required in Sandyford	Already in the area covered by SPD.
3.17	Restraint is required in Gosforth	Some already in the area covered by SPD and an extension is proposed.

Q4 ASHoRe principle		
4.1	Suggested specific streets or areas to be included in the ASHoRe (see non-generic comments)	See non-generic comments.
4.2	Suggested that specific streets or areas are taken out of the ASHoRe (see non-generic comments)	See non-generic comments.
4.3	Monitoring will be very important so that the policy is flexible and adaptable.	Agreed.

Q5 Use of occupancy conditions		
5.1	Responsible owner occupier's need to be able to modernise their homes in order to support full time residents.	Occupancy conditions will be dropped in revised SPD.
5.2	HMOs or landlords need better accountability, for example, licensing.	
5.3	There are ancient covenants attached to the deeds of many of these homes, which need to be enforced.	
5.4	Occupancy conditions would be too difficult to enforce.	
5.5	Occupancy conditions would need to be maintained after a house is sold.	
5.6	Occupancy conditions should target all HMOs, not just students.	
5.7	Made specific suggestions as alternatives to occupancy conditions (see non-generic comments).	

Q6 Purpose built student accommodation		
6.1	The universities need to take more responsibility for purpose built accommodation.	Agreed, but beyond the immediate scope of SPD.
6.2	Any purpose built student housing needs to be close to a metro or public transport link.	SPD covers this issue in Appendix 3. In practice, a variety of sites and locations may have to be considered.
6.3	Any purpose built student housing needs to be built further out of the city centre.	SPD covers this issue in Appendix 3. In practice, a variety of sites and locations may have to be considered.
6.4	Fully support any purpose built student housing as it is the only solution to the student housing issue.	Noted.
6.5	Any purpose built student housing needs to be close to the universities, i.e. within a ten minute walk.	SPD covers this issue in Appendix 3. In practice, a variety of sites and locations may have to be considered.
6.6	Any purpose built student housing needs to be away from residential areas.	SPD covers this issue in Appendix 3. In practice, a variety of sites and locations may have to be considered.
6.7	Purpose built student halls will not provide a suitable solution to this issue. Only first year undergraduates want to live in halls. Being in	Noted. This supports the need for measures to influence the student housing market in the private rented sector.

	unmanaged student accommodation is regarded as part of the student 'experience' and helps to develop life skills. Also, halls are unsuitable for many students, including postgraduates and international students, especially those with families.	
6.8	Any purpose built student housing needs to be close to shops and services, including the city centre.	SPD covers this issue in Appendix 3. In practice, a variety of sites and locations may have to be considered.
6.9	Object specifically to Castle Leazes halls of residence or object to extensions of existing purpose built student housing generally.	Noted. SPD provides criteria against which to judge such applications.

Q7 Protection of the character of a locality		
7.1	The character of the area has already been eroded by a high concentration of students.	Noted.
7.2	The character of the area is slowly being eroded by a high concentration of students.	Noted.
7.3	Safety needs to be emphasised more as an aspect of character.	Revised SPD acknowledges this issue more.
7.4	The social character or community is a very important aspect.	Noted.
7.5	Students need to be spread out more evenly across the entire city.	This is the implication of the SPD.
7.6	We need balanced, mixed communities, not concentrations of any particular group, including students.	Agreed. Revised SPD gives added emphasis to this.
7.7	Several Conservation Areas have been designated in Jesmond, but this seems to make little difference in protecting or 'conserving' the character.	Comment passed on to colleagues.
7.8	Character, by definition, is non-static and a change of character can often be a positive feature of an area.	Noted.
7.9	Character is difficult to quantify as it can mean different things to different people.	Noted.

Q8 Any other comments		
8.1	Wish that something had been done sooner to tackle the problems of high concentrations of student housing.	Noted.
8.2	Commend the Council for its work in this area.	Noted with thanks.
8.3	The photocopy of the ASHoRe boundary published with the document was too small and of too poor quality to be able to read properly.	Acknowledged, though large scale map available at libraries.
8.4	Not anti-student. They just feel that student accommodation needs regulating in some way.	Noted.
8.5	Parking restrictions are needed urgently and would greatly assist in tackling the problems caused by high concentrations of students and young people.	Being pursued by the Council as a separate process.
8.6	The problems caused by high concentrations of students require a much wider policy approach to tackle them, not just planning restrictions.	Agreed. The SPD says this.
8.7	You should not target and discriminate against particular groups, in this case	Agreed. The revised SPD is much more positive in tone.

	students. Concentrations of any kind will cause problems.	
8.8	The needs of the permanent residents should be considered first and foremost, before the needs of transient or temporary residents.	Noted. The revised will SPD look at these issues in terms of seeking balanced and sustainable communities.
8.9	Regulation of letting boards is badly needed and would greatly help to reduce the negative visual impacts of student accommodation. There are just too many boards and they are often left up all year round.	Being pursued by the Council as a separate process.
8.10	Question how accurate the statistics used in the SPD are, and suggest updates and/or alternative indicators that could be monitored (see non-generic comments).	Noted. Indicators are not perfect, but give a reasonable picture of student numbers.
8.11	Landlords need to be forced to maintain their properties. They could be offered incentives for voluntarily improving their standards.	These issues are dealt with under HMO licensing legislation.
8.12	Encouraging students to remain in the city following their graduation is very important.	Agreed. Being pursued by the Council as a separate process.
8.13	Students need to be included more in devising a strategy to tackle the problems associated with student housing.	Agreed. Discussions with student welfare officers are in hand.