

Safe Newcastle Bridges – Experimental Traffic Regulation Order Feedback

The ETRO was advertised from the 13th August 2020 but correspondence started when a press release was issued in early July announcing the intention to close 5 bridges to traffic using an experimental traffic regulation order. A commitment was made to consider all correspondence received, not just that received within the ETRO consultation period of 13th August 2020 to 15th February 2021.

Stakeholders

Contributions to this consultation were overwhelmingly from individual residents and households, typically by email although some letters and phone calls were also received and added to the consultation record.

53 contributions were made covering all 5 bridges – 16 objecting to and 37 supporting the prohibition of driving on the bridges, the comments and reasons have been attributed across all bridges.

There were also organisational / group and collective responses to the ETRO on one or more bridge from:

Asda; Catherine McKinnell MP; Elders' Council; Garden Village Action Group; Newcastle City Councillors; North Tyneside Councillor; Room for All; Safer Stoneyhurst; Newcastle Cycling Campaign; Space for Gosforth; Space for Jesmond; North East Ambulance Service; Tyne & Wear Fire & Rescue Service

ETRO Consultation Summaries

Stoneyhurst Road Bridge

Headlines

Total number of contributions - 362

284 Objecting, themes emerging or consistently raised included views that:

- Displaced traffic impacting on traffic levels, road safety, noise & air pollution, and parking in surrounding streets.
- The bridge was a legitimate route, that people were entitled to drive on it and that it was not used for through traffic; and
- The closure to motor vehicles discriminated against people that are disabled, elderly or vulnerable (principally due to time and cost changes to ways of travelling).

76 Supporting, themes consistently raised included views that:

- The changes encourage walking & cycling and help shift peoples' mode of travel.
- The closure had led to less traffic, noise, and air pollution; and
- The closure to motor vehicles improved road safety.

Of the 362 contributions, 24 people sent in representations both before and after the consultation formally started. Of those contributing, the three people who sent in the most responses submitted 24, 13, and 11 contributions respectively.

Correspondence before 13th August – 105 emails.

87 raising objections to and 18 in support of, the prohibition of driving on Stoneyhurst Bridge.

Of the 87 pieces of correspondence raising objections to the prohibition of driving, the following reasons were given:

Displaced traffic impacting on traffic levels, road safety, noise & air pollution and parking in surrounding streets

The bridge was a legitimate route, that people were entitled to drive on it and that it was not used for through traffic; with plenty of space for walking & cycling, so, the measure is not necessary.

Lack of consultation

Exacerbates issues created by school traffic in the area

Compromise - Improve the bridge don't close it, make it one way/ higher weight restrictions, make interventions on surrounding streets

Longer journeys by vehicle including journeys to work, leisure pursuits, shopping, caring responsibilities & socialising

Negative impact on emergency vehicles able to access this area

Of the 18 pieces of correspondence indicating support for the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Improved road safety

Encourages walking, cycling and helps to shift peoples' mode of travel

Better health & wellbeing

Less traffic, noise, and air pollution

Inconvenience outweighed by benefits

Pandering to a local pressure group

Correspondence 13th August 2020 to 15th February 2021 - 257 emails.

199 raising objections to and 58 in support of, the prohibition of driving on Stoneyhurst Bridge.

Of the 199 pieces of correspondence raising objections to the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Displaced traffic and the negative impact on traffic levels, road safety, air & noise pollution, and parking in surrounding streets

The bridge was a legitimate route, that people were entitled to drive on it and that it was not used for through traffic

The closure to motor vehicles discriminated against people that are disabled, elderly or vulnerable (principally due to time and cost changes to ways of travelling).

Emergency vehicle route compromised risking lives

Longer journeys by vehicle including journeys to work, leisure pursuits, shopping, caring responsibilities & socialising

Exacerbates issues created by school traffic in the area

Lack of prior consultation

Plenty of safe space for walking & cycling, the measure is not necessary

Closure is detrimental to local people – poorer road safety, impacting on mental health, discriminatory to disabled people

Compromise - Improve the bridge don't close it, make it one way/ higher weight restrictions, interventions on surrounding streets

Closure has no link to CV19 or social distancing

Pandering to a local pressure group

Of the 58 pieces of correspondence indicating support for the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Encourages walking & cycling and helps to shift peoples' mode of travel

Less traffic, noise, and air pollution

Improved road safety

Better health & wellbeing

Inconvenience outweighed by benefits

Salters Bridge

Headlines

Total number of contributions - 308

148 Objecting; themes emerging or consistently raised included views that:

- Displaced traffic causing congestion and higher pollution on surrounding roads and streets
- Longer, more expensive journeys by vehicle including journeys to work, leisure pursuits, shopping, caring responsibilities & socialising
- The bridge was a legitimate route that people feel entitled to drive over.

155 Supporting; themes emerging or consistently raised included views that:

- Less traffic means less noise, air pollution and litter
- Noticeable increase in the number of people walking & cycling, running, dog walking and children playing out, and helps shift peoples' mode of travel.
- Improved road safety, especially for disabled people and children

Of the 308 contributions, no individual submitted more than one contribution.

Correspondence before 13th August 2020 - 24 emails were received before this date.

11 raising objections to and 14 in support of, the prohibition of driving on Salters Bridge.

Of the 11 pieces of correspondence raising objections to the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Longer journeys to access shops and services

Increased traffic levels in surrounding streets

Lack of consultation

Negative economic impact on local businesses

Pandering to a local pressure group

Of the 14 pieces of correspondence indicating support for the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Improved road safety

Less traffic, noise and air pollution

Encourages walking & cycling

Better health & wellbeing

Inconvenience outweighed by benefits

Correspondence 13th August 2020 to 15th February 2021 - 283 emails and two phone calls.

140 raising objections to and 141 in support of, the prohibition of driving on Salters Bridge and 2 neutral comments.

Of the 140 pieces of correspondence raising objections to the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Displaced traffic causing congestion and higher pollution on surrounding roads and streets

Longer, more expensive journeys by vehicle including journeys to work, leisure pursuits, shopping, caring responsibilities & socialising

The bridge was a legitimate route that people feel entitled to drive over.

Plan for a compromise rather than full closure – restrict access to residents only or one way, enforce weight and speed restrictions effectively

Pandering to pressure groups

Negative Business and service impact in terms of ease of access for customers and clients and reduced turnover for businesses

No prior consultation done; poor consultation & previous consultation findings hidden

The closure is badly timed and compounded by the Gosforth High Street measures, other roadworks, and the pandemic

No need for any further measures to support walking and cycling, the measures are unnecessary

Emergency vehicle route compromised risking lives

Closure has no link to CV19

NCC poor planning decisions and poor management of the network cause the traffic problems

Of the 141 pieces of correspondence indicating support for the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Less traffic means less noise, air pollution and litter

Noticeable increase in the number of people walking & cycling, running, dog walking and children playing out, and helps shift peoples' mode of travel.

Improved road safety, especially for disabled people and children

Health & wellbeing of residents improved, better respiratory health, better sleep, better mental health, reduced anxiety

Previous issues of dangerous driving, excessive speed, intimidation, and road rage disappeared

Community spirit and cohesion increased

Protecting the structure of the bridge which was not fit for purpose with traffic and people

Better for wildlife and pets

Inconvenience outweighed by benefits

Bus journey times improved and approval for the electric bus.

Contribution to helping tackle climate change

Helps people to socially distance on pavements by being able to step out into the road

Dene Bridge, Castle Farm Road

Headlines

Total number of contributions - 210

111 Objecting; themes emerging or consistently raised included views that:

- Displaced traffic increasing traffic levels, air & noise pollution, poorer road safety and increased parking in surrounding streets
- A popular and legitimate route for drivers to access local services and main road network
- Compromise on a full closure by making the bridge one-way at certain times / residents only access/ separate provision for walking and cycling

96 Supporting; themes emerging or consistently raised included views that:

- Improved road safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- Encourages walking & cycling and helps shift peoples' mode of travel.
- Better Air Quality and reduced noise pollution

Of the 210 contributions, one individual submitted a contribution before and after the consultation formally started.

Correspondence before 13th August 2020 - 15 emails.

4 raising objections to and 11 in support of, the prohibition of driving on Dene Bridge.

Of the 4 pieces of correspondence raising objections to the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Lack of consultation and compelling evidence to support the prohibition of driving.

The bridge was a popular and legitimate route for drivers to access local services and main road network

Displaced traffic causing congestion on the surrounding network

Of the 11 pieces of correspondence indicating support for the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Encourages walking and cycling and helping shift peoples' mode of travel

Better health & wellbeing

Improved road safety for pedestrians and cyclists

Less pollution

Promoting community cohesion

Correspondence 13th August 2020 to 15th February 2021 – 195 emails and letters.

107 raising objections to and 85 indicating support for the prohibition of driving on Dene Bridge and 3 neutral comments.

Of the 107 pieces of correspondence raising objections to the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Displaced traffic increasing traffic levels, air & noise pollution, poorer road safety and increased parking in surrounding streets

The bridge was a popular and legitimate route for drivers to access local services and main road network

Compromise on a full closure by making the bridge one-way at certain times / residents only access/ separate provision for walking and cycling

Longer journey times – time, money, stress, using more fuel, polluting others

There is no need for more cycling and walking infrastructure, the measures are unnecessary

Lack of consultation and compelling evidence to support the closure

Discriminates against residents who rely on their cars

Emergency vehicles delayed

Compound impact of roadworks and bridge closures are unacceptable

Pandering to pressure groups

Of the 85 pieces of correspondence indicating support for the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Improved road safety for pedestrians and cyclists

Encourages walking & cycling and helps shift peoples' mode of travel

Better Air Quality and reduced noise pollution

Protecting an important old structure which is unfit for traffic and walking and cycling.

Improves the local environment

Ends the frequent road rage that went on

Full closure imperative, one way will not generate any improvements

Inconvenience outweighed by benefits

No impact on the surrounding roads

Benefit to wildlife

Contribution to community cohesion

Helps with social distancing

Haldane Bridge, Haldane Terrace

Headlines

Total number of contributions - 115

55 Objecting; themes emerging or consistently raised included views that:

- Displaced traffic and increased traffic levels, air & noise pollution, and poorer road safety in surrounding streets
- Exacerbates issues created by school traffic in the area
- Nothing to do with CV 19 / impossible to assess impact because of CV19

60 Supporting; themes emerging or consistently raised included views that:

- Improves road safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- Encourages walking and cycling

- Health benefits to residents including better Air Quality.

Of the 115 contributions, no individual submitted more than one contribution.

Correspondence before 13th August 2020 - 13 emails.

2 raising objections to and 11 supporting the prohibition of driving on Haldane Bridge.

Of the 2 pieces of correspondence raising objections to the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Lack of consultation and compelling evidence to support the closure

A popular and legitimate route for drivers to access local services and main road network

Displaced traffic causing congestion on the surrounding network

Of the 11 pieces of correspondence indicating support for the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Encourages walking and cycling and helping shift peoples' mode of travel

Better health & wellbeing

Improved road safety for pedestrians and cyclists

Less pollution

Promoting community cohesion

Correspondence 13th August 2020 to 15th February 2021 – 102 emails

53 raising objections to and 49 in support of the prohibition of driving on Haldane Bridge.

Of the 53 pieces of correspondence raising objections to the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Displaced traffic and increased traffic levels, air & noise pollution, and poorer road safety in surrounding streets

Exacerbates issues created by school traffic in the area

Lack of consultation

Nothing to do with CV 19 / impossible to assess impact because of CV19

Compromise - Improve the bridge for pedestrians or make it one way

Unnecessary - Low number of pedestrians and cyclists so the measures are unnecessary.

Inconvenience & longer journey times

Incompetent Council

Reduces quality of life locally

Of the 49 pieces of correspondence indicating support for the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Health benefits to residents including better Air Quality

Encourages walking and cycling

Improves road safety for pedestrians and cyclists

Creates opportunities to travel plan with local schools

Improved access to local amenities and services

Prohibition of driving benefits walkers and cyclists 24/7 but opening the bridge to vehicles only benefits drivers at peak times

Compliments existing provision linking to other cycling infrastructure.

Argyle Street Bridge

Headlines

Total number of contributions - 62

20 Objecting; themes emerging or consistently raised included views that:

- Longer journey times costing time and money
- Lack of consultation / inappropriate use of emergency powers
- Not practical to travel to this area by sustainable methods for businesses

42 Supporting; themes emerging or consistently raised included views that:

- Improved road safety
- Improved health & wellbeing
- Improved environment for walking and cycling

Of the 62 contributions, no individual submitted more than one contribution.

Correspondence before 13th August 2020 - 13 emails.

2 raising objections and 11 supporting the prohibition of driving on Argyle Street Bridge.

Of the 2 pieces of correspondence raising objections to the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Lack of consultation and compelling evidence to support the closure

The bridge was a popular and legitimate route for drivers to access local services and main road network

Displaced traffic causing congestion on the surrounding network

Of the 11 pieces of correspondence indicating support for the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Encourages walking and cycling and helping shift peoples' mode of travel

Better health & wellbeing

Improved road safety for pedestrians and cyclists

Less pollution

Promoting community cohesion

Correspondence 13th August 2020 to 15th February 2021 – 49 emails

18 raising objections to and 31 in support of, the prohibition of driving on Argyle Street Bridge.

Of the 18 pieces of correspondence raising objections to the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Longer journey times costing time and money

Lack of consultation / inappropriate use of emergency powers

Increased air pollution

Not practical to travel to this area by sustainable methods for businesses

Plenty of space for walking & cycling, the measure is not necessary

Of the 31 pieces of correspondence indicating support for the prohibition of driving the following reasons were given:

Improved environment for walking and cycling

Improved Road Safety

Improved health & wellbeing

Less traffic and pollution

Notes finalised - 12.3.21