Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
OBJ1	Christine Sinnett, 9 Brinkburn Street, Wallsend, Tyne & Wear NE28 0JJ	• Impact on bus services in East Howdon during construction	• Details of the bus diversions during the construction works are described in the Environmental Statement sections 5.2.4, 5.5.2 and 5.5.5. The text states that minimal interference to bus services is envisaged during the works and residents will not need to use the Metro as an alternative. Residents will still be able to travel to East Howdon.
OBJ3	Miss Gillian Storey 9 Seine Court, Jarrow	• In the future traffic congestion will be double so the tunnel is a waste of time	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence.
OBJ14	Mr. S. Yuen 5 West Meadow Drive	• There will be no congestion if the tunnel was free	• The current problems at the tunnel are caused by the inadequate capacity of the tunnel and its approaches to deal with the traffic demand as demonstrated in Section 9 of my evidence. Removing the toll would result in an increase in traffic demand and would inevitably exacerbate the existing serious traffic congestion.
		• The tunnel will make the current road systems on both sides of the river worse	• The increased capacity provided by the tunnel and the improvements proposed to the immediate approaches will significantly improve the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at this location. The local road network junctions in the vicinity of the north and south portals have been tested (para 5.4.2.3 of the Environmental Statement) and have been shown to have adequate capacity to accommodate the traffic forecasts associated with the scheme.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		• People cannot afford to pay higher tolls	• The traffic demand for the tunnel will increase as shown in Section 10 of my evidence, demonstrating that people will be prepared to pay the level of toll proposed in response to the benefits of reduced congestion and delays. Further information related to the response to tolling levels is contained in Mr. Christopher Tunnell's Proof of Evidence.
OBJ16	Heather Evans 32 Hawthorn Walk Newcastle Upon Tyne	• The tunnel will bring more congestion to our roads	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence.
		• The tunnel will increase car dependency	• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		• The tunnel will increase road accidents	• The scheme will result in a reduction of over 500 personal injury accidents on the wider road network as a result of a reduction in distance travelled and the transfer of traffic to higher standard less environmentally sensitive roads. Within the tunnel, the separation of the carriageways will provide an inherently safer traffic arrangement and will allow greater flexibility in maintaining the flow of traffic should an incident occur.
OBJ17	V. Gilbert Dickson 46 Broadway, Tynemouth	• Tunnel will increase traffic	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence.
		• Need more convenient public transport	• As a result of the significant benefits due to reduced congestion, existing bus services will suffer fewer delays and will be much more reliable. The bus operators have responded positively to this and have indicated that the scheme will provide an opportunity to improve the frequency of their services, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with the core routes. There are also plans to extend the Stephenson Jobs Link bus service through the tunnel to connect both sides of the river. The scheme will therefore create more opportunities for people to use public transport. See Section 13 of my evidence.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
OBJ18	Miss A.M. Allan 12 Tennyson Terrace	• The tunnel will bring more congestion to our roads	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence.
		• The tunnel will increase car dependency • Need better public transport	• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency.
		• The tunnel will increase road accidents	• The scheme will result in a reduction of over 500 personal injury accidents on the wider road network as a result of a reduction in distance travelled and the transfer of traffic to higher standard less environmentally sensitive roads. Within the tunnel, the separation of the carriageways will provide an inherently safer traffic arrangement and will allow greater flexibility in maintaining the flow of traffic should an incident occur.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		• The tunnel will attract longer distance traffic	• The A19 currently carries negligible long distance traffic compared to the A1. Even with the benefits of reduced congestion at the tunnel it is not anticipated that, with the toll still in place, the A19 will attract any of this traffic.
		• Should consider the feasibility of extending the Metro	• A number of studies including the Cross Tyne Studies undertaken in the early 90's and more recently the Tyneside Area Multi-Modal study have examined the issue of cross river capacity and have concluded that a public transport option including extending the Metro will not be viable or remove the need to provide additional capacity by a road crossing. It should be noted that the current study into the development of a new tram-based system linked to the existing Metro (Project Orpheus) has not included a cross-river option in its list of feasible corridors for more detailed assessment.
		• Should levy congestion tax on single occupancy vehicles	• Cross river tolling, which is a form of congestion tax, is one of the measures recommended in the TAMMS Transport Strategy. Should this be endorsed by the Regional Planning Bodies and confirmed by the Secretary of State detailed consideration will be given to the precise nature of the scheme to be implemented.
		• Increased traffic on Tynemouth and Wallsend Road	• Traffic flows (Figure GTH 10.2 of Proof of Evidence) on the A193 Tynemouth Road immediately to the west of the A19 are forecast in 2021 to increase to 14,200 vpd (AAWT) or 12,900 vpd (AADT) from existing traffic flows of 8,000 vpd (AAWT) or 7,800 vpd (AADT), an increase of around 65%. However, the specific impact of the new crossing is more appropriately assessed by comparing the scheme with the Do-Minimum situation. In 2021, the Do-Minimum traffic flows on Tynemouth Road are forecast to be 11,900 vpd (AAWT) or 10,900 vpd (AADT). The increase in traffic on the A193 Tynemouth Road adjacent to the

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		•	to the A19, as a result of the scheme, is therefore approximately 18% and not 65%. Further to the east the increase will be less. • Using a similar approach, the increase in traffic flows on the short section of Wallsend Road, west of the Howdon Bypass, will be 43%. The 79% quoted by Ms Allan relates to the increase based on the existing traffic flows. To the east of the Howdon Bypass the traffic increase in 2021 due to the scheme will be significantly less at 15%.
		• Impact of New Tyne Crossing on junctions along the A19 corridor	• The local road network junctions in the vicinity of the north and south portals have been tested (para 5.4.2.3 of the Environmental Statement) and shown to have adequate capacity to accommodate the traffic flows associated with the scheme. • The mainline carriageway of the A19 both north and south of the tunnel will also comfortably accommodate the scheme's traffic forecasts. • It is accepted that some of the junctions on the A19 corridor north and south of the river are currently operating at or around capacity. The additional traffic generated by the scheme at these junctions, however, is small and will not have a material effect on their operation. It should be noted that the recommendations from the TAMMS Study include improvements to a number of junctions on the A19 north and south of the river. Should these improvements be endorsed by the Regional Planning Bodies and confirmed by the Secretary of State, they would be promoted by the Highways Agency who strongly support the New Tyne Crossing proposals.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			• It is considered that, overall, any short term impacts of the scheme on the local road network will be negligible in comparison with the benefits derived from improved capacity and reduced congestion which will benefit public transport as well as general traffic on the network.
OBJ20	Anne Bromley 13 Normanton Terrace	• Roads do not ease traffic congestion	• Although the scheme will result in some increase in traffic at the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion from other crossings, the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion experienced at this location in both the short and long term. Details are given in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead, traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly, as explained in Section 9 of my evidence. North and South of the tunnel the A19 will have sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast traffic flows in 2021. On a more general point the Government's transport policy does not exclude the options of road building and in some of the recent multi modal studies addressing congestion on the UK motorway network it has accepted widening as a viable option.
		• Better to improve existing transport infrastructure	• The removal of traffic congestion will bring significant benefits to existing public transport services using the tunnel and will, as indicated by support from the operators, encourage the provision of new and improved services. The scheme will also facilitate an extension to the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. Consequently, as explained in Section 13 of my evidence, the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for improving the public transport infrastructure and increase the choice of people to travel by alternative modes to the car. In addition to the above, the recently completed Tyneside Area Multi-Modal study has recommended around £650m of investment in public transport systems covering rail and a new tram system (Orpheus).

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		• Should explore alternative possibilities	• A number of studies including the Cross Tyne Studies undertaken in the early 90's and more recently the Tyneside Area Multi-Modal study have examined the issue of cross river capacity and have concluded that a public transport option including extending the Metro will not be viable or remove the need to provide additional capacity by a road crossing. It should be noted that the current study into the development of a new tram-based system linked to the existing Metro (Project Orpheus) has not included a cross-river option in its list of feasible corridors for more detailed assessment.
OBJ21	Celeste Hicks 2 Carlton Terrace, Yarm Stockton-On-Tees	• Tunnel will not alleviate congestion	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence. North and South of the tunnel the A19 will have sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast traffic flows in 2021.
		• Spending on roads does not encourage public transport use	• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will encourage greater public transport use.
		• Tunnel will attract more long distance traffic	• The A19 currently carries negligible long distance traffic compared to the A1. Even with the benefits of reduced congestion at the tunnel it is not anticipated that, with the toll still in place, the A19 will attract any of this traffic. •
OBJ24	Stephen Hamilton 18 Salmon Street South Shields	• Road building schemes attract new traffic cancelling out benefits	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence. • The traffic forecasts used in the evaluation of the scheme have taken into account an element of induced traffic. Despite this the scheme will still generate a large net present value of some £114m and a robust cost benefit ratio of 1.8. Consequently the small amount of new traffic generated by the scheme will not cancel out the benefits.
		• Funds should be concentrated on cross river Metro Link	• A number of studies including the Cross Tyne Studies undertaken in the early 90's and more recently the Tyneside Area Multi-Modal study have examined the issue of cross river capacity and have concluded that a public transport option including extending the Metro will not be viable or remove the need to provide

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			additional capacity by a road crossing. It should be noted that the current study into the development of a new tram-based system linked to the existing Metro (Project Orpheus) has not included a cross-river option in its list of feasible corridors for more detailed assessment. • However, The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency.
OBJ28	A Reynard and M Bond 162 Mowbray Road South Shields	• Concerns relate to effects of 25% increase in traffic on Mowbray Road	• The objection is based upon the percentage traffic increase on Mowbray shown in Figure 6.7 of the Environmental Statement. It should be noted that this change in traffic flows illustrates the difference between traffic flows in 2021 with the New Tyne Crossing in comparison with current traffic flows as required by the assessment technique described in section 6.2.1. To assess the specific impact of the scheme it is important to view the increases in the context of the same year and what the situation would be if nothing happened (do minimum) and current traffic trends continue. The identified increases in traffic flows are a consequence of overall traffic growth related to car usage over twenty years and are independent of the New Tyne Crossing. A comparison of the traffic flows on Mowbray Road shows that with the scheme there is no increase in traffic over the Do-Minimum. Consequently the scheme itself has no impact at this location.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
OBJ51	Marion Dobbins 45 Commercial Road Jarrow	• The tunnel will bring more traffic and congestion to the roads	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence.
		• The tunnel will increase car dependency	• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency.
		• The tunnel will increase road accidents	• The scheme will result in a reduction of over 500 personal injury accidents on the wider road network as a result of a reduction in distance travelled and the transfer of traffic to higher standard less environmentally sensitive roads. Within the tunnel, the separation of the carriageways will provide an inherently safer traffic arrangement and will allow greater flexibility in maintaining the flow of traffic should an incident occur.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		• The tunnel will attract long distance traffic	• The A19 currently carries negligible long distance traffic compared to the A1. Even with the benefits of reduced congestion at the tunnel it is not anticipated that, with the toll still in place, the A19 will attract any of this traffic.
OBJ87	Mr. John Strong 43 Auburn Gardens	• More roads do not reduce congestion.	• Government policy does not rule out the option of road building to reduce congestion. Indeed the 10 year plan has allocated £16 billion for investment in the strategic road network. Following the publication of a number of major studies commissioned in the last 2 to 3 years to investigate multi-modal solutions to traffic congestion on the motorway and trunk road network, the Government has concluded in some cases that whilst major investment in public transport is essential, it will not on its own solve the problem of traffic congestion and consequently further investment in road construction is necessary. • In the case of the New Tyne Crossing, there will be some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence.
		• Need to manage demand and provide better public transport	• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			• scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency. • • In addition a major two-year study recently completed on behalf of the Government Office for the North East (Tyneside Area Multi-Modal Study - TAMMS) has investigated and recommended a wide range of measures to improve future transport in Tyneside. These measures included an investment of around £650m in public transport Improvements including rail and a new tram system as well as demand management measures including the possibility of tolling all river crossings in the longer term. Despite this it was concluded that further investment in highway improvements, including the construction of a New Tyne Crossing at St. Bedes would be required to properly address the transport problems in the area.
OBJ97	Wendy Love (Pedestrians Association) 1 Linden Terrace, Benton	• Traffic growth greater with new tunnel than without	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence.
		• Public transport and pedestrians given little consideration.	• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson's Job Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency. • By removing congestion at the tunnel the scheme will generally reduce the level of 'rat running' traffic on local and residential roads. This will benefit both cyclists and pedestrians.
OBJ103	Mr. John Broderick 8 Beechwood, High Spen Rowlands Gill	• The tunnel will bring more traffic and congestion to the roads	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence.
		• The tunnel will increase car dependency	• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency.
		• The tunnel will increase road accidents	• The scheme will result in a reduction of over 500 personal injury accidents on the wider road network as a result of a reduction in distance travelled and the transfer of traffic to higher standard less environmentally sensitive roads. Within the tunnel, the separation of the carriageways will provide an inherently safer traffic arrangement and will allow greater flexibility in maintaining the flow of traffic should an incident occur. See Section 11 of my evidence.
		• The tunnel will attract long distance traffic	• The A19 currently carries negligible long distance traffic compared to the A1. Even with the benefits of reduced congestion at the tunnel it is not anticipated that, with the toll still in place, the A19 will attract any of this traffic.
OBJ116	Tyne Bikes - Michelle Whitworth 1 Brandon Grove Newcastle Upon Tyne	• Concerns about major expansion in road capacity in relation to Government Policy	• Government policy does not rule out the option of road building to reduce congestion. Indeed the 10 year plan has allocated £16 billion for investment in the strategic road network. Following the publication of a number of major studies commissioned in the last 2 to 3 years to investigate multi-modal solutions to traffic congestion on the motorway and trunk road network, the Government has concluded in some instances that whilst major investment in public transport is essential, it will not on its own solve the problem of traffic congestion and consequently investment in road construction is also necessary.
		• Contribute to increase in road use	• In the case of the New Tyne Crossing, the scheme proposed will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence.
		• Contribute to modal shift away from sustainable forms of transport	• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson's Job Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency.
		• The tunnel will close off opportunities for a truly multi modal set of solutions	• The New Tyne Crossing is only one of a number of measures in the transport strategy for Tyneside recommended by the Tyneside Area Multi-Modal Study (TAMMS). This study which adopted a balanced approach to addressing the transport needs of the area, also included in its recommendations some £650m investment in rail improvements and a new tram system linked to the existing metro; cross river tolling; traffic management and parking measures as well as improvements to the A1 and A19 and supported initiatives focused on changing travel behaviour, the promotion of cycling and pedestrian facilities and on the implementation of sustainable land use policies. The proposed scheme is therefore an integral element of a truly multi-modal and sustainable transport strategy.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		• Compatibility with Planning Policy Guidance Note 13, PPG13 Transport	• In line with PPG13, the construction of the tunnel will reduce the annual vehicle kilometres travelled by car by some 4 million by removing the need for traffic to travel longer distances to avoid traffic congestion at the existing tunnel. The tunnel will also create greater opportunities to travel by public transport.
		• Impact on cyclists on the local road network	• With the construction of the New Tyne Crossing overall levels of safety on the local road network will improve and the number of accidents will decrease. This is because traffic that is currently 'rat-running' through residential streets to avoid congestion in and around the tunnel will no longer need to do so and this should benefit pedestrians and cyclists alike. This traffic will travel on their preferred, more appropriate roads that actually have lower accident rates with less exposure to pedestrians and cyclists. The total number of vehicle miles travelled on the road network will also reduce thus reducing the potential for accidents. The impacts upon the cycle and footpath network in the vicinity of the tunnel during and after construction are detailed in the Environmental Statement section 11.5 and Figure 11.3 together with mitigation measures in Figure 11.4.
OBJ156	Mr M C Murphy 4 Gorseway Kirkhill, Morpeth	• 'Predict and Provide' argument has long been discredited. The M25 is cited as an example of this	• The new crossing is one element of a comprehensive multi modal strategy recommended in TAMMS to provide a balanced approach to transport problems on the A1 and A19. This package of measures includes major investment in public transport infrastructure and demand management measures, through cross river tolling, to control the future growth of traffic. The strategy has not therefore been based on unrestricted traffic growth but on an approach which attempts to encourage the use of public transport and to limit the extent of highway improvements to those necessary to achieve the key objectives. In the case of the Tyne tunnel these objectives relate to the removal of traffic congestion. In section 10 of my evidence I demonstrate clearly that this will be achieved by the scheme. It is notable that the

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			recommendations of the recent M25 multi-modal study are based on a combination of motorway widening and road user charging. This is very similar to the policy recommended in TAMMS of which the New Tyne Crossing is an important part.
		• The PTA should be engaged in the promotion of more sustainable travel	• The TWPTA (Nexus) has a major commitment to the provision of sustainable transport which offers an alternative to the car. This is clearly demonstrated by its Orpheus proposals, which involve development of a new tram system linked to the Metro.
		• The publicity material supporting the scheme wrongly attributes the knowledge that more roads create more traffic to those who oppose the tunnel. Refers to Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment • The economic value of a scheme can be overestimated by even a small amount of induced traffic	• The work undertaken by the Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment is acknowledged as a key piece of research undertaken in addressing the issue relating to the generation of traffic by new roads. As the scheme is effectively widening an existing corridor and it is also tolled the scale of induced traffic will be less than would be anticipated in a brand new corridor. The possibility that the new crossing might generate some additional traffic has been accepted and is dealt with in Section 10 of my evidence. The implications of this additional/induced traffic has also been taken into account in the economic analysis set out in Section 12 of that evidence. The transport economic case for the new crossing is strong with a positive net present value of £114m and a cost benefit ratio of 1.8.
		• The predicted traffic growth is unrealistic	• Mr Murphy suggests that the traffic growth predicted appears to be in excess of 2% whereas Department for Transport figures reported no growth in national traffic between 1999 and 2000. The predicted growth rate in the tunnel, based on Table 10.1 in Section 10 of my evidence is 1.8% between 2006 and 2021. In addition to normal traffic growth this also takes into account induced traffic and some traffic diverted from other crossings. The overall assumptions related to traffic growth in the Tyne and Wear area are discussed in Section 8 of my evidence and are based on the National Trip End Model. This shows that between

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			1999 and 2006 traffic is forecast to grow by around 1.4% per annum and between 1999 and 2021 by significantly less at around 1.1% per annum. The initial information obtained from 'Transport Statistics for Great Britain 2002' DfT does show that there was no growth in national traffic levels between 1999 and 2000. However, an updated version of 'Transport Statistics for Great Britain 2002' indicates that there was a small increase in traffic over the period 1999 to 2000. The low growth over this period is not surprising as it coincided with the fuel crisis. Between 2000 and 2001, however, the same source indicates growth in national traffic levels of around 1.3%. The growth levels adopted in assessing the new crossing proposals are therefore wholly realistic.
		• Tunnel itself is not congested – any congestion is on the tunnel approaches	• In Section 6 of my evidence I have shown that the existing stress level at the tunnel (that is the ratio of flow to capacity) is 124% indicating that the traffic demand is well in excess of the available capacity within the tunnel. The consequence of this is significant congestion and queueing on the approaches to the tunnel.
		• Possibility of operating the tunnel alternatively for north and south traffic (at 10 minute intervals) should have been explored. The period of 10 minutes was suggested as it was considered to be an acceptable frequency for buses and trains	• Operating the tunnel alternately north and south will significantly increase the existing delays and congestion due to the need to provide an adequate change over time to allow clearance of the tunnel on each phase. Suggesting a 10 minute interval between buses and trains as an acceptable basis for a suitable turn round interval is not appropriate or relevant since people using public transport on a regular basis decide their journeys on the knowledge of timetable information.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		• Disingenuous to suggest (publicity material) a link between car ownership in the north east and tunnel traffic and as well a strong interaction between tunnel traffic and that on other Tyne Crossings	• Increasing car ownership is one of the main drivers of traffic growth and as such will, along with a range of other factors, have an affect on the growth in traffic demand in the tunnel as well as on other roads.
OBJ168	Mr. Keith Brittan 36 Epinay Walk Jarrow	• The tunnel will bring more traffic and congestion to the roads	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence. North and South of the tunnel the A19 will have sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast traffic flows in 2021.
		• The tunnel will increase car dependency	• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		• The tunnel will increase road accidents	• The scheme will result in a reduction of over 500 personal injury accidents on the wider road network as a result of a reduction in distance travelled and the transfer of traffic to higher standard less environmentally sensitive roads. Within the tunnel, the separation of the carriageways will provide an inherently safer traffic arrangement and will allow greater flexibility in maintaining the flow of traffic should an incident occur.
		• The tunnel will attract long distance traffic	• The A19 currently carries negligible long distance traffic compared to the A1. Even with the benefits of reduced congestion at the tunnel it is not anticipated that, with the toll still in place, the A19 will attract any of this traffic.
OBJ206	B. Paget 18 West Avenue South Shields	• A new tunnel will increase localised congestion on A19 and feeder roads such as Wallsend Road	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. • The local road network junctions in the vicinity of the north and south portals have been tested (para 5.4.2.3 of the Environmental Statement) and shown to have adequate capacity to accommodate the traffic flows associated with the scheme. • The mainline carriageway of the A19 both north and south of the tunnel will also comfortably accommodate the scheme traffic forecasts. • It is accepted that some of the junctions on the A19 corridor north and south of the river are operating at around capacity. The

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			additional traffic generated by the scheme at these junctions, however, is small and will not have a material effect on their operation. It should be noted that the recommendations from the TAMMS Study include improvements to a number of junctions on the A19 north and south of the river. Should these improvements be endorsed by the Regional Planning Bodies and confirmed by the Secretary of State they would be promoted by the Highways Agency who strongly support the New Tyne Crossing proposals. • The overall effect of the scheme will be to reduce traffic levels on feeder roads to the A19. On the A193 Wallsend Road, however, an increase in traffic of 7,800 vehicles per day (AAWT) is anticipated compared to the Do Minimum Solutions. This increase however occurs on the short section of the Wallsend Road between the East Howdon Bypass and the A19 and is a result of the redistribution of traffic resulting from the new access arrangements proposed at the tunnel. To the east of the East Howden Bypass the increase in traffic due to the scheme is much less at 2000 vehicles per day (Figure GTH 10.3 in Proof of Evidence). • • It is considered that overall any short term impacts of the scheme on the local road network will be negligible in comparison with the benefits derived from improved capacity and reduced congestion which will benefit public transport as well as general traffic on the network.
		• Tolls could be increased to encourage the use of public transport and decrease congestion (per TAMMS)	• The most likely effect of increasing tolls at the existing tunnel would be to divert some traffic to other crossings which themselves suffer from traffic congestion. Diverting traffic will increase the distance travelled and will thus be contrary to PPG13. The Tyneside Area Multi-Modal Study (TAMMS) proposed tolling of all river crossings in the longer term to encourage

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			greater public transport use and to act as a demand management measure. However, the conclusion of TAMMS is that while such measures encourage some modal shift and make an important contribution to the overall transport strategy, they do not negate the need for further highway improvements including the new tunnel. The proposed scheme itself, by reducing congestion will significantly improve the reliability of existing public transport services using the tunnel and will facilitate the provision of new services thus encouraging greater use of public transport.
		• There is already good access between North and South Tyneside	• There are several river crossings between North and South Tyneside all of which are heavily congested during peak periods. The single carriageway Tyne Tunnel is a known traffic 'bottleneck' limiting access to car and bus users wishing to cross the river along the A19.
		• Public transport alternatives have not been adequately explored	• A major two-year study recently completed on behalf of the Government Office for the North East (Tyneside Area Multi-Modal Study) has investigated and recommended a wide range of measures to improve future transport in Tyneside. These measures included an investment of around £650m in public transport improvements including rail and a new tram system as well as the possibility of tolling all river crossings in the longer term. Despite this it was concluded that further investment in highway improvements, including the construction of a New Tyne Crossing at St. Bedes would be required to properly address the transport problems in the area.
OBJ315	Paul Winch 81 North Drive Hebburn	• Parking on pavements will increase if traffic levels increase as a result of the construction of the New Tyne Crossing	• Residential car parking is a function of car ownership. It is accepted that the scheme will generate a relatively small element of new traffic. However, this traffic occurs due to an increase in the opportunity to travel as a result of reduced congestion and not as a result of increased car ownership. The proposed scheme will have no effect, therefore, on car parking on pavements as suggested by Mr Winch.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			• General issues related to parking problems and the level of parking provision are a matter for the local authority to address.
		• Measures to reduce the need to travel must always be sought as a first priority	• Previous studies including the Cross Tyne Study and more recently the Tyneside Area Multi Modal Study (TAMMS) have explored a wide range of options to address the issue of the shortfall in capacity across the Tyne. These options have included public transport improvements and demand management measures including cross river tolling and parking restraint. The conclusion of the studies was that even with substantial investment in public transport including rail, and demand management measures there would still be a demonstrable need for a new road crossing.
OBJ328	Mrs. E. Winch 81 North Drive Hebburn	• Traffic will increase to fill capacity	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence.
		• Public transport improvements should take priority over road building	• A major two-year study recently completed on behalf of the Government Office for the North East (Tyneside Area Multi-Modal Study) has investigated and recommended a wide range of measures to improve future transport in Tyneside. These measures included an investment of around £650m in public transport improvements including rail and a new tram system as

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			well as the possibility of tolling all river crossings in the longer term. Despite this it was concluded that further investment in highway improvements, including the construction of a New Tyne Crossing at St. Bedes will be required to properly address the transport problems in the area.
OBJ348	Mr. Peter Goodwin (on behalf of Green Party) 49 Church Howie Crescent Marsk-By-Sea, Redcar	• The tunnel will increase gross traffic levels	• The scheme will result in some increase in traffic through the tunnel due to a small element of induced traffic as well as some diversion of traffic from other crossings. However, even taking this into account the overall effect of the increased capacity provided by the scheme will be to remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the location in both the short and long term. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as general traffic using the tunnel. Details of these effects are covered in Section 10 of my evidence. If the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions at the tunnel will deteriorate significantly as explained in Section 9 of my evidence.
		• The tunnel will increase car dependency	• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency. • The removal of congestion at the tunnel will benefit existing bus services using the tunnel as well as car traffic. The bus operators have responded positively to this and have indicated that the scheme will provide an opportunity to improve the frequency of

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			their services, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with the core routes thus increasing the public transport options available.
		• There will be a lack of any clear multi-modal study to justify a road crossing	• The New Tyne Crossing is only one of a number of measures included in the transport strategy for Tyneside recommended by the Tyneside Area Multi-Modal Study (TAMMS). This study adopted a balanced approach to addressing the transport needs of the area, also included in its recommendations some £650m investment in rail improvements and a new tram system linked to the existing metro; cross river tolling; traffic management and parking resources as well as improvements to the A1 and A19 and supported initiatives focussed on changing travel behaviour, the promotion of cycling and pedestrian facilities and on the implementation of sustainable land use policies. The proposed scheme is therefore an integral element of a truly multi-modal and sustainable transport strategy.
OBJ358	John d'Egville Turvey 13 Beckenham Avenue East Baldon	• The tunnel will increase car use contrary to Government Policy	• The New Tyne Crossing is only one of a number of measures included in the transport strategy for Tyneside recommended by the Tyneside Area Multi-Modal Study (TAMMS). This study adopted a balanced approach to addressing the transport needs of the area, also included in its recommendations some £650m investment in rail improvements and a new tram system linked to the existing metro; cross river tolling; traffic management and parking resources as well as improvements to the A1 and A19 and supported initiatives focussed on changing travel behaviour, the promotion of cycling and pedestrian facilities and on the implementation of sustainable land use policies. The proposed scheme is therefore an integral element of a truly multi-modal and sustainable transport strategy aimed at reducing dependency on the car by providing real alternatives where that is practical. In line with PPG13 the construction of the tunnel will reduce the vehicle kilometres travelled by car by removing the need for

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			traffic to travel longer distances to avoid traffic congestion at the existing tunnel. • The Government's policy does not exclude the options of road building. Indeed the 10 year plan has allocated £16 billion for investment in the strategic road network and in some of the recent multi modal studies which have addressed congestion on the UK motorway network it has accepted widening as a viable option. The scheme will, in reducing delays at the tunnel contribute to the Governments policy to reduce congestion.
		• The tunnel will move congestion elsewhere • Transport Expenditure should be directed towards public transport, walking and cycling	• North and South of the tunnel the A19 will have sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast traffic flows in 2021. • The recommendations from the TAMMS study strongly support the promotion of cycling and pedestrian facilities as part of the overall strategy. In addition the TWPTA (Nexus) has a major commitment to the provision of sustainable transport systems which offer a real alternative to the car and is currently promoting a new tram system linked to the Metro.
OBJ382 Memorandum 4	Tyne Crossings Alliance (CPRE, FoE, Living Streets, Railway Development Society, Roadpeace, Green Party, Transport 2000, Tynebikes and Tyneside Action for People and Planet)	• Challenge traffic predictions	• The predicted growth rate in the tunnel, based on Table 10.1 in Section 10 of my evidence, is 1.8% between 2006 and 2021. In addition to normal traffic growth this also takes into account induced traffic and some traffic diverted from other crossings. The overall assumptions related to traffic growth in the Tyne and Wear area are discussed in Section 8 of my evidence and are based on the National Trip End Model. This shows that between 1999 and 2006 traffic is forecast to grow by around 1.4% per annum and between 1999 and 2021 by significantly less at around 1.1% per annum. The information initially obtained from 'Transport Statistics for Great Britain 2002' Dft shows that there was no growth in national traffic levels between 1999 and 2000. However, an updated version of 'Transport Statistics for Great

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			Britain 2002' indicates that there was a small increase in traffic over the period 1000 to 2000. The low growth over this period is not surprising as it coincided with the fuel crises. Between 2000 and 2001, however, the same source indicates growth in national traffic levels of around 1.3% depending on the type of road. The growth levels adopted in assessing the new crossing proposals are therefore wholly realistic.
			• The new crossing is one element of a comprehensive multi modal strategy recommended in TAMMS to provide a balanced approach to transport problems on the A1 and A19. This package of measures includes major investment in public transport infrastructure and demand management measures, through cross river tolling, to control the future growth of traffic. The strategy has not therefore been based on unrestricted traffic growth but on an approach which attempts to encourage the use of public transport and to limit the extent of highway improvements to those necessary to achieve the key objectives. In the case of the Tyne Tunnel these objectives relate to the removal of traffic congestion. In Section 10 of my evidence, I demonstrate clearly that this will be achieved by the scheme.
		• Alternative Crossings: Challenge decision to focus on a new tunnel from Jarrow to Howdon	• The earlier Cross Tyne Studies carried out a very thorough assessment of possible alternative road crossings of the River Tyne. These studies have been reviewed in the light of the latest guidance on transport appraisal (GOMMMS and NATA). It was found that the conclusions reached would have been the same had the studies been carried out using the latest techniques. This is explained in Mr Simpson's evidence. The Cross Tyne Studies did examine the possible impact of traffic restraint and public transport improvements in reducing traffic flows and congestion at the Tyne Tunnel and at the upstream bridges. It was concluded that, even with significant improvements in public •

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			• transport services combined with a range of traffic restraint measures traffic on all crossings combined could only be reduced by 4%. The impact at the Tyne Tunnel was less than on the central crossings between Newcastle and Gateshead. This level of traffic reduction would not negate the need for further road improvements to tackle congestion. The TAMMS study also looked at the combined role of public transport improvements and road user charging. Again the study found that these measures would not reduce traffic flows sufficiently to remove congestion at the Tyne Tunnel, and the need for a New Tyne Crossing. •
			• It should be noted that the current study being undertaken by TWPTA (Nexus) into the development of a new tram-based system linked to the existing metro has not included a cross river option in the list of feasible corridors for more detailed consideration.
		• Reference is made to PPG13 indicating that the statement *"the car will continue to have an important part to play ..."* does not mean that the car must have priority over other modes	• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency. The removal of congestion will also benefit freight traffic and emergency vehicles.
		• Tunnel has a good safety record – the prospect with the scheme is for an increase in road accidents	• The existing tunnel has a good accident record. However, within the tunnel separation of the carriageways will provide an inherently safer traffic arrangement allowing greater flexibility in maintaining traffic flow should an incident occur and making it

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			easier for emergency vehicles to access any persons involved in an accident. The scheme will result in a reduction of over 500 personal injury accidents on the wider road network as a result of a reduction in distance travelled and the transfer of traffic to higher standard less environmentally sensitive roads.
		• Tunnel will boost traffic and hinder freight movements	• The scheme has significant benefits for road freight. The cost benefit analysis shows that the benefits in travel time savings to goods vehicles amount to £20M.
		• Dedicated new priority lanes to the present tunnel would improve bus access	• Priority measures in the vicinity of the tunnel have been implemented by the TWPTA to assist bus services. As previously stated the scheme will facilitate a significant enhancement of bus services through the tunnel.
		• The scheme is contrary to PPG1 which seeks to 'reduce growth in the length and number of motorised journeys	• In terms of the wider road network, the construction of the new tunnel will reduce the vehicle kilometres travelled by car by removing the need for traffic to travel longer distances to avoid congestion at the existing tunnel. In the scheme opening year, vehicle kilometres will be reduced by over 4 million. Such an impact is consistent with the aims expressed in PPG1 and PPG13 relating to the need to reduce travel.
		• Costs of roadworks remote from the tunnel and arising from the new crossing not taken into account	• Some of the junctions on the A19 corridor north and south of the river are currently operating at or around capacity. The additional traffic generated by the scheme at these junctions, however, is small and will not have a material effect on their operation. Consequently no other road improvements are being proposed as part of the scheme and there is no reason to take their costs into account. It should be noted, however, that the recommendation from TAMMS includes improvements to a number of junctions on the A19 north and south of the river. These improvements would

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			be promoted by the Highways Agency who strongly support the New Tyne Crossing propsoals.
		• The scheme is out of step with the emerging Regional Transport Plan	• The Draft Regional Transport Strategy identifies the New Tyne Crossing as one of the *"major schemes that should aim to be delivered in the short term"*. The scheme is therefore consistent with the strategy.
OBJ 396	North East Combined Transport Activists Round Table (NECTAR)	• 'Predict and Provide' argument has long been discredited. The M25 is cited as an example of this	• The new crossing is one element of a comprehensive multi modal strategy recommended in TAMMS to provide a balanced approach to transport problems on the A1 and A19. This package of measures includes major investment in public transport infrastructure and demand management measures, through cross river tolling, to control the future growth of traffic. The strategy has not therefore been based on unrestricted traffic growth but on an approach which attempts to encourage the use of public transport and to limit the extent of highway improvements to those necessary to achieve the key objectives. In the case of the Tyne tunnel these objectives relate to the removal of traffic congestion. In section 10 of my evidence I demonstrate clearly that this will be achieved by the scheme. It is notable that the recommendations of the recent M25 multi-modal study are based on a combination of motorway widening and road user charging. This is very similar to the policy recommended in TAMMS of which the New Tyne Crossing is an important part.
		• The PTA should be engaged in the promotion of more sustainable travel •	• The TWPTA (Nexus) has a major commitment to the provision of sustainable transport which offers an alternative to the car. This is clearly demonstrated by its Orpheus proposals, which involve development of a new tram system linked to the Metro.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		• The publicity material supporting the scheme wrongly attributes the knowledge that more roads create more traffic to those who oppose the tunnel. Refers to Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment • The economic value of a scheme can be overestimated by even a small amount of induced traffic	• The work undertaken by the Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment is acknowledged as a key piece of research undertaken in addressing the issue relating to the generation of traffic by new roads. As the scheme is effectively widening an existing corridor and it is also tolled the scale of induced traffic will be less than would be anticipated in a brand new corridor. The possibility that the new crossing might generate some additional traffic has been accepted and is dealt with in Section 10 of my evidence. The implications of this additional/induced traffic has also been taken into account in the economic analysis set out in Section 12 of that evidence. The transport economic case for the new crossing is strong with a positive net present value of £114m and a cost benefit ratio of 1.8.
		• The predicted traffic growth is unrealistic	• It is suggested that the traffic growth predicted appears to be in excess of 2% whereas Department for Transport figures reported no growth in national traffic between 1999 and 2000. The predicted growth rate in the tunnel, based on Table 10.1 in Section 10 of my evidence is 1.8% between 2006 and 2021. In addition to normal traffic growth this also takes into account induced traffic and some traffic diverted from other crossings. The overall assumptions related to traffic growth in the Tyne and Wear area are discussed in Section 8 of my evidence and are based on the National Trip End Model. This shows that between 1999 and 2006 traffic is forecast to grow by around 1.4% per annum and between 1999 and 2021 by significantly less at around 1.1% per annum. The initial information obtained from 'Transport Statistics for Great Britain 2002' DfT does show that there was no growth in national traffic levels between 1999 and 2000. However, an updated version of 'Transport Statistics for Great Britain 2002' indicates that there was a small increase in traffic over the period 1000 to 2000. The low growth over this period is not surprising as it coincided with the fuel crises.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			Between 2000 and 2001, however, the same source indicates growth in national traffic levels of around 1.3% depending on the type of road. The growth levels adopted in assessing the new crossing proposals are therefore wholly realistic.
		• Tunnel itself is not congested – any congestion is on the tunnel approaches	• In Section 6 of my evidence I have shown that the existing stress level at the tunnel (that is the ratio of flow to capacity) is 124% indicating that the traffic demand is well in excess of the available capacity within the tunnel. The consequence of this is significant congestion and queueing on the approaches to the tunnel.
		• Possibility of operating the tunnel alternatively for north and south traffic (at 10 minute intervals) should have been explained. The period of 10 minutes was suggested as it was considered to be an acceptable frequency for buses and trains	• Operating the tunnel alternately north and south will significantly increase the existing delays and congestion due to the need to provide an adequate change over time to allow clearance of the tunnel on each phase. Suggesting a 10 minute interval between buses and trains as an acceptable basis for a suitable turn round interval is not appropriate or relevant since people using public transport on a regular basis decide their journeys on the knowledge of timetable information.
		• Disingenuous to suggest (publicity material) a link between car ownership in the north east and tunnel traffic and as well a strong interaction between tunnel traffic and that on other Tyne Crossings	• Increasing car ownership is one of the main drivers of traffic growth and as such will, along with a range of other factors, have an affect on the growth in traffic demand in the tunnel as well as for other roads.
OBJ 414	Mr James D Curry, 75 Crowhall Towers, Gateshead	• A new tunnel will worsen traffic congestion on the roads	• The new tunnel will remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at this location in both the short and long term. Details are contained in Sections 9 and 10 of my evidence. The benefits in travel time savings of reduced congestion across the wider network will be substantial. These benefits will be experienced by public transport services as well as car traffic. If

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			the scheme does not go ahead traffic conditions will deteriorate significantly.
		• Proposed feeder roads do not take into account the interests of pedestrians or cyclists	• With the construction of the New Tyne Crossing overall levels of safety on the local road network will improve and the number of accidents will decrease. This is because traffic that is currently 'rat-running' through residential streets to avoid congestion in and around the tunnel will no longer need to do so and thus this should benefit pedestrians and cyclists alike. This traffic will travel on their preferred, more appropriate roads that actually have lower accident rates with less exposure to pedestrians and cyclists. The total number of vehicle miles travelled on the road network will also reduce thus reducing the potential for accidents. The impacts upon the cycle and footpath network in the vicinity of the tunnel during and after construction are detailed in the Environmental Statement section 11.5 and Figure 11.3 together with mitigation measures in Figure 11.4.
OBJ 429	The Council for the Protection of Rural England	• Local congestion is best addressed by improved local transport provision e.g. by across river Metro link	• The removal of traffic congestion will bring significant benefits to existing public transport services using the tunnel and will, as indicated by support from the operators, encourage the provision of new and improved services. The scheme will also facilitate an extension to the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. Consequently, as explained in Section 13 of my evidence, the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for improving the public transport infrastructure and increase the choice of people to travel by alternative modes to the car. In addition to the above, the recently completed Tyneside Area Multi-Modal study has recommended around £650m of investment in public transport systems covering rail and a new tram system (Orpheus). • A number of studies including the Cross Tyne Studies undertaken in the early 90's and more recently the Tyneside Area Multi-Modal study have examined the issue of cross river capacity and have concluded that a public transport option including extending

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			the Metro will not be viable or remove the need to provide additional capacity by a road crossing. It should be noted that the current study into the development of a new tram-based system linked to the existing Metro (Project Orpheus) has not included a cross-river option in its list of feasible corridors for more detailed assessment.
			• The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson Jobs Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency.
		• The Highways Agency has committed to reviewing the use of the A19 as a freight route which challenges the basis for developing the A19 corridor	• It is understood that the Highways Agency is still preparing the Route Management Strategy (RMS) for the A19 trunk road and a draft document is not yet out to consultation. The RMS in any case only includes the A19 south of South Tyneside i.e. South of Testos. It should be noted that although the tunnel is not the responsibility of the Highways Agency it is strongly supported by them.
OBJ 486	Ms C P Davies 76 Deleval Road	• Improvements should be made to existing tunnel traffic flows	• The Tyneside Wear PTA has already implemented improvements to operations at the existing tunnel. These have involved public transport priorities, enhanced lane definition with queue segregation and improved road signage. These measures are only considered to be short term to improve existing operations and do not obviate the need for the new crossing.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
OBJ 518	Railway Development Society	• 'Predict and Provide' argument has long been discredited. The M25 is cited as an example of this	• The new crossing is one element of a comprehensive multi modal strategy recommended in TAMMS to provide a balanced approach to transport problems on the A1 and A19. This package of measures includes major investment in public transport infrastructure and demand management measures, through cross river tolling, to control the future growth of traffic. The strategy has not therefore been based on unrestricted traffic growth but on an approach which attempts to encourage the use of public transport and to limit the extent of highway improvements to those necessary to achieve the key objectives. In the case of the Tyne tunnel these objectives relate to the removal of traffic congestion. In section 10 of my evidence I demonstrate clearly that this will be achieved by the scheme. It is notable that the recommendations of the recent M25 multi-modal study are based on a combination of motorway widening and road user charging. This is very similar to the policy recommended in TAMMS of which the New Tyne Crossing is an important part.
		• The PTA should be engaged in the promotion of more sustainable travel	• The TWPTA (Nexus) has a major commitment to the provision of sustainable transport which offers an alternative to the car. This is clearly demonstrated by its Orpheus proposals, which involve extending the metro network and linking it with a new tram system linked to the Metro.
		• The publicity material supporting the scheme wrongly attributes the knowledge that more roads create more traffic to those who oppose the tunnel. Refers to Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment	• The work undertaken by the Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment is acknowledged as a key piece of research undertaken in addressing the issue relating to the generation of traffic by new roads. As the scheme is effectively widening an existing corridor and it is also tolled the scale of induced traffic will be less than would be anticipated in a brand new corridor. The possibility that the new crossing might generate some additional traffic has been accepted and is dealt with in Section 10 of my evidence. The implications of this

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		• The economic value of a scheme can be overestimated by even a small amount of induced traffic	additional/induced traffic has also been taken into account in the economic analysis set out in Section 12 of that evidence. The transport economic case for the new crossing is strong with a positive net present value of £114m and a cost benefit ratio of 1.8.
		• The predicted traffic growth is unrealistic	• It is suggested that the traffic growth predicted appears to be in excess of 2% whereas Department for Transport figures reported no growth in national traffic between 1999 and 2000. The predicted growth rate in the tunnel, based on Table 10.1 in Section 10 of my evidence is 1.8% between 2006 and 2021. In addition to normal traffic growth this also takes into account induced traffic and some traffic diverted from other crossings. The overall assumptions related to traffic growth in the Tyne and Wear area are discussed in Section 8 of my evidence and are based on the National Trip End Model. This shows that between 1999 and 2006 traffic is forecast to grow by around 1.4% per annum and between 1999 and 2021 by significantly less at around 1.1% per annum. The initial information obtained from 'Transport Statistics for Great Britain 2002' DfT does show that there was no growth in national traffic levels between 1999 and 2000. However, an updated version of 'Transport Statistics for Great Britain 2002' indicates that there was a small increase in traffic over the period 1999 to 2000 of around 0.5 percent. The low growth over this period is not surprising as it coincided with the fuel crisis. Between 2000 and 2001, however, the same source indicates growth in national traffic levels of around 1.3% depending on the type of road. The growth levels adopted in assessing the new crossing proposals are therefore wholly realistic.
		• Tunnel itself is not congested – any congestion is on the tunnel approaches •	• In Section 6 of my evidence I have shown that the existing stress level at the tunnel (that is the ratio of flow to capacity) is 124% indicating that the traffic demand is well in excess of the available

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			capacity within the tunnel. The consequence of this is significant congestion and queueing on the approaches to the tunnel.
		• Possibility of operating the tunnel alternatively for north and south traffic (at 10 minute intervals) should have been explained. The period of 10 minutes was suggested as it was considered to be an acceptable frequency for buses and trains	• Operating the tunnel alternately north and south will significantly increase the existing delays and congestion due to the need to provide an adequate change over time to allow clearance of the tunnel on each phase. Suggesting a 10 minute interval between buses and trains as an acceptable basis for a suitable turn round interval is not appropriate or relevant since people using public transport on a regular basis decide their journeys on the knowledge of timetable information.
		• Disingenuous to suggest (publicity material) a link between car ownership in the north east and tunnel traffic and as well a strong interaction between tunnel traffic and that on other Tyne Crossings	• Increasing car ownership is one of the main drivers of traffic growth and as such will, along with a range of other factors, have an affect on the growth in traffic demand in the tunnel as well as for other roads.
OBJ600	Friends of the Earth	• Road building is seen as first option	• Government policy does not rule out the option of road building to reduce congestion. Indeed, in the Government's document 'Transport 2010 - The 10 Year Plan', some £16 billion has been allocated for investment in the strategic road network. In addition, following the publication of a number of major studies commissioned in the last two to three years, to investigate multi-modal solutions to traffic congestion on the motorway and trunk road network, the Government has concluded that in some instances, whilst major investment in public transport is essential, it will not as its own solve the problem of traffic congestion and major widening has been accepted as a viable option for contributing to the Government's policy to reduce congestion. The issue of the consideration of alternatives is dealt with later.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
		• Based on 'predict and provide' methodology	• The new crossing is one element of a comprehensive multi modal strategy recommended in TAMMS to provide a balanced approach to transport problems on the A1 and A19. This package of measures includes major investment of some £650M in public transport infrastructure and demand management measures, including cross river tolling, to control the future growth of traffic as well as initiatives focussed on changing travel behaviour and on the promotion of cycling and pedestrian facilities. The scheme is therefore an integral element of a truly multi-modal strategy. The strategy has not therefore been based on unrestricted traffic growth but on an approach which attempts to encourage the use of public transport and to limit the extent of highway improvements to those necessary to achieve the key objectives. In the case of the Tyne tunnel these objectives relate to the removal of traffic congestion. In section 10 of my evidence I demonstrate clearly that this will be achieved by the scheme. It is notable that the recommendations of the recent M25 multi-modal study are based on a combination of motorway widening and road user charging. This is very similar to the policy recommended in TAMMS of which the New Tyne Crossing is an important part.
		• Inadequate consideration of alternatives	• The earlier Cross-Tyne Studies carried out a very thorough assessment of possible alternative road crossings of the River Tyne. These studies have been reviewed in the light of the latest guidance on transport appraisal (GOMMMS and NATA). It was found that the conclusions reached would have been the same had the studies been carried out using the latest techniques. This is explained in Mr Simpson's evidence. The Cross Tyne Studies did examine the possible impact of traffic restraint and public transport improvements in reducing traffic flows and congestion at the Tyne Tunnel and at the upstream bridges. It was concluded that, even with significant improvements in public transport services combined with a range of traffic restraint measures traffic on all crossings combined could only be reduced by 4%.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			The impact at the Tyne Tunnel was less than on the central crossings between Newcastle and Gateshead. This level of traffic reduction would not negate the need for further road improvements to tackle congestion. The TAMMS study also looked at the combined role of public transport improvements and road user charging. Again the study found that these measures would not reduce traffic flows sufficiently to remove congestion at the Tyne Tunnel, and the need for a New Tyne Crossing. • The provision of increased capacity and the removal of traffic congestion will deliver significant benefits to existing public transport services and, as indicated by support from the bus operators, will encourage the provision of new and improved services including enhanced frequency, the range of destinations served and the interchange opportunities with core routes. The scheme will also facilitate an extension of the Stephenson's Job Link south of the river. As explained in Section 13 of my evidence the proposed tunnel will create greater opportunities for cross-river traffic by public transport and as such will reduce rather than increase car dependency. • It is considered therefore that adequate consideration has been given to the viability of alternatives to a new road crossing, as well as to the improvements to public transport which the scheme will facilitate.
		• The proposals run counter to PPG13's aim to reduce the need to travel, the length of journeys and facilitate travel by public transport, walking and cycling	• The New Tyne Crossing will not induce a significant amount of additional traffic because of the tolls. Indeed, vehicle kilometres are forecast to reduce by some 4 million in the year of opening.

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			• In addition, as indicated by support from the bus operators, the scheme will facilitate improvements to bus services. The scheme will also benefit the extension of the Stephenson Jobs Camden Link south of the river.
		• Public consultation undertaken for the Tyneside Area Multi-Modal Study (TAMMS) indicates that the public are very supportive of public transport investment schemes (including extensions of the Metro system) and that support for new road crossings of the River Tyne was limited. •	• It is true that the TAMMS public consultation exercise demonstrated strong support for public transport intitiatives, and this is reflected in the composition of the recommended strategy which includes substantial investment in rail and Metro improvements. However, these measures on their own will not solve congestion problems at locations such as the Tyne Tunnel. Therefore, increased road capacity is required to reduce delays for cars, good vehicles and buses and to improve reliability of journey times which is also important (particularly to business and commuters).
		• The proposals are inconsistent with the emerging Regional Transport Strategy.	• The Draft Regional Transport Strategy identifies the New Tyne Crossing as one of the *"major schemes that should aim to be delivered in the short term"*. The scheme is therefore consistent with the Strategy.
OBJ 606	Mr. Gareth Ayres, 1 Marden Crescent, Whitley Bay	• Development of road transport is a short term and poor method of improving transport. Would support of the building of tram or Metro tunnels but not road transport in its current forms.	• The scheme will remove the serious traffic congestion currently experienced at the tunnel in both the short and long term. In doing so it will provide benefits to public transport services through reduced delays and increased reliability. These benefits have been recognised by the bus operators who have indicated positively the new opportunities that will arise from improved services through the tunnel. • The scheme is of course one of a number of measures included in a long term transport strategy for Tyneside recommended by the Tyneside area Multi Modal Study (TAMMS). This study which adopted a balanced approach to addressing the transport issues on the A1 and A19 corridors also included in its recommendations

Objection No.	Objector/Organisation	Summary of Objection	Response
			some £650 million investment in rail improvement nad a new tram system linked to the existing Metro; cross river tolling; traffic management as well as improvements to the A1 and A19. In addition it supported initiatives focused on changing traffic behaviour, the promotion of cycling and pedestrian facilities and on the implementation of sustainable land use policies. The proposed scheme is therefore an integral element of a wider, long term sustainable strategy. • A number of studies including the Cross Tyne Studies undertaken in the early 90's and more recently the Tyneside Area Multi-Modal study have examined the issue of cross river capacity and have concluded that a public transport option including extending the Metro will not be viable or remove the need to provide additional capacity by a road crossing. It should be noted that the TWPTA is promoting development of a new tram-based system linked to the existing Metro (Project Orpheus). The study currently being undertaken has not included a cross-river option in its list of feasible corridors for more detailed assessment.