

**OBJ: 2**  
**Jeffrey Connor, 16 Stirling Avenue**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Open space.	Loss of Jarrow Riverside Park.	The scheme would result in the removal of the Riverside Park in its current form but as I set out in Section 6.10 of my evidence, it would be reinstated. This would provide the opportunity to design out some of the features which at the moment can create feelings of insecurity and vulnerability, thereby making it more attractive for people to use.

**OBJ: 3**  
**Gillian Storey, 9 Seine Court**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Open space.	Loss of open space generally.	The loss of open space would be temporary except at Epinay Walk where half of the existing 0.5H (1.2 acre) triangular area of grassed open space would be lost permanently. All other existing areas of open space would be reinstated along with new areas of publicly accessible open space which would be created from the playing fields belonging to the former Jarrow St Peter's School, the Grange Residential Home, and the land over the southern portals as described in Sections 6.12, 6.13 and 6.14 of my evidence. At Epinay Walk the remaining 0.25H (0.6 acres) would remain as landscaped open space as described in Section 6.15 of my evidence. Alternative open space would be available within 100m of Epinay Walk on the land above the southern portal, as described in Section 6.16 of my evidence. I understand that consideration is being given to improving the access across Howard Street.

**OBJ: 97**  
**The Pedestrian Association**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Safety.	Inhospitable pedestrian and cycle routes.	The access to the pedestrian and cycle tunnel on the south side of the river would be improved as outlined in Section 6.19 of my evidence.

**OBJ: 348**  
**Teesside Green Party**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Amenity.	Reduction in amenity as loss of open space.	The scheme would not result in the loss of open space except at Epinay Walk. Overall, the scheme would increase the provision of publicly accessible open space. This is covered in greater detail in Sections 6.12, 6.13 and 6.14 of my evidence.

**OBJ: 396**  
**NECTAR**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Amenity.	Proposals will result in blight for a wide area.	There would be a temporary reduction in amenity whilst the scheme is being constructed. This would occur in Commercial Road, Stothard Street, and Salem Street. The scheme includes reinstatement proposals which would maintain or in the case of Stothard Street improve the current level of visual amenity as described in Section 5.20 of my evidence. At Epinay Walk the remaining area of open space would be landscaped and screen walls constructed to mitigate the effects of the new junction. This is described in Section 6.15 of my evidence.

**OBJ: 397**  
**Jarrow Residents Action Group**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Open space.	Open space will be lost in an area where there is limited play provision.	The scheme would result in a reduction by 50% in the size of the grassed open space adjacent to Epinay Walk from 0.5H (1.2 acres) to 0.25H (0.6 acres). It currently appears to provide an incidental play area and site for the annual bonfire. The scheme provides for the areas remaining after completion of the junction to be landscaped. Providing that the boundary adjacent to the road could be made secure they would continue to provide opportunities for incidental play although probably not for ball games or as a site for bonfires. Alternative provision would be available within 100m of Epinay Walk on the land which would be created over the tunnel portals although at the moment this would involve crossing Howard Street. Proposals to make this crossing safer are currently being considered.

**OBJ: 600**  
**Friends of the Earth**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Heritage.	Loss of the Gaslight Public House is unacceptable – Listed Building.	Although the building is listed it is in the lowest category. The reason for this is that the building has been severely altered over the years to the extent that the few features that were present have all but disappeared. Similarly, the setting of the building which formed an important part of the listing, has changed to such an extent that the building appears incongruous in its surroundings. This is recognised by English Heritage and is why they have not objected to the Listed Building Consent. Amending the alignment of the tunnel to avoid demolishing the Gaslight PH was considered but the disadvantages far outweighed the advantages. The townscape value of the building is covered in Section 4.6 of my evidence.

**OBJ: 600**  
**Friends of the Earth**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Heritage.	Relocation of statue.	The statue was relocated to the Riverside Park from its original site in the Town Centre during the 1980s. It was soon realised by the Council that this was not the ideal location since it was unsupervised and subject to vandalism. One of four valuable bronze plaques went missing from the base of the statue so the Council have removed the others to a safe store. The vandalism continues and a recent photograph showing the condition of the statue is included in fig. CJ/04 Appendix D of my evidence. It is the Council's intention, irrespective of whether the scheme proceeds, to move the statue back to a more secure location in the Town Centre.

**OBJ: 600**  
**Friends of the Earth**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Heritage.	Impact on setting of Tyne Cycle and Pedestrian Tunnels.	The entrances to the Tunnels are remote and hidden by the fall of the land from the activity taking place on Chaytor Street. The immediate access is poor particularly for the disabled as can be seen from fig. CJ/06 Appendix E of my evidence. The scheme provides the opportunity to radically improve the setting of the Tunnel entrances and the means of access by getting rid of the ramps and steps. Re-opening Ferry Road would improve the access from Chaytor Street and make the whole area more visible which should also improve security. Incorporating the area around the Tunnel entrances into the Riverside Park would also improve the setting. This is discussed in Section 6.9 of my evidence.

**OBJ: 600**  
**Friends of the Earth**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Amenity.	Change in character and setting of houses on Epinay Walk.	The scheme would result in the loss of 50% of the green open space to the front of the houses on Epinay Walk. The character would change but there would be areas of landscaped open space between the houses and the new junction. Measures in the form of good quality boundary walls would be provided to screen the new junction from the houses as described in Section 6.15 of my evidence.

**OBJ: 600**  
**Friends of the Earth**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Amenity.	Loss of open space to front of Stothard Street.	Creating new landscaped open space above the Tunnels would improve the aspect from Stothard Street. The existing landscaped area would be reinstated and the length of the boundary wall around the Tunnel entrances would be reduced. This is demonstrated in fig. CJ/14 Appendix L of my evidence. <u>During the construction period there would be a loss of amenity.</u>

**OBJ: 600**  
**Friends of the Earth**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Amenity.	The new ventilation building will occupy green space and dominate the area.	The new ventilation building is located on the original line of Howard Street and does not occupy green space. Whilst the design has not been finalised it would be smaller than the existing ventilation building. In its current location it would be in scale with the surrounding road system and highway structures. It is sufficiently removed from the residential area to not be visually intrusive. This is covered in Section 5.22 of my evidence.

**OBJ: 600**  
**Friends of the Earth**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Amenity.	Loss of Riverside Park in current form. No evidence for social problems.	The scheme results in the loss of the Riverside Park in its current form. However, many of the problems which result in the Park being under-used would be addressed in the redesign. The scheme would provide the opportunity to reappraise the whole concept of the park in the light of current social conditions which have changed since the Park was first built. The Park in its current form is a magnet for certain forms of anti-social behaviour – vandalism, solvent and drug abuse particularly, the evidence for which can clearly be seen. These activities tend to take place in areas which do not have the advantage of casual supervision, are isolated and under-used. These are the issues which would be addressed in the redesign of the Park. The principles are illustrated in fig. CJ/14 Appendix L of my evidence.

**OBJ: 95**  
**John Richardson, 43 Epinay Walk**

<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>Open space.</p>	<p><b>Description :</b></p> <p>Loss of open space at Epinay Walk. Detrimental impact on housing.</p>	<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The scheme would result in the loss of 50% of the existing open space at Epinay Walk. The remaining areas would be landscaped and maintained as public open space. The closest that the proposed boundary wall gets to the houses is 13.0m. It is envisaged that the wall would be approx 2.5m high on the side facing Epinay Walk and look something like the existing wall between the St Paul's area and the ring road. This is covered in Section 6.15 of my evidence.</p>
---	--	---

**OBJ: Standard Letter 11**

<p><b>Issue:</b></p> <p>Amenity.</p>	<p><b>Description :</b></p> <p>Impact on residents of Howdon, Jarrow and Simonside.</p>	<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>The scheme would have no significant impact on residents in Howdon. In the current scheme all the works take place south of the metroline embankment. Some residents in Jarrow would suffer loss of amenity during the construction period but this would be temporary. Residents in Epinay Walk would suffer permanent loss of amenity but this would be mitigated as described in Section 6.15 of my evidence. Simonside residents would not be affected.</p>
--------------------------------------	---	--

**OBJ: Standard Letter 12  
Epinay Walk Estate**

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Description :</b>	<b>Response:</b>
Amenity.	Loss of community and open green space	<p>The scheme would result in a reduction by 50% in the size of grassed open space adjacent to Epinay Walk from 0.5H (1.2 acres) to 0.25H (0.6 acres). It currently appears to provide an incidental play area and site for the annual bonfire. The scheme provides for the areas remaining following completion of the junction to be landscaped. The boundary adjacent to the junction would be screened by a 2.5m high brick wall. The areas of open space could continue to be used for incidental play although probably not for ball games or bonfires. Alternative provision would be available within 100m of Epinay Walk on land created above the Tunnels adjacent to St Bede's School. At the moment this would involve crossing Howard Street but proposals to make this crossing more convenient and safer are currently being considered.</p>