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Introducing Streets for People

Streets for People is a £3m collaborative project between Newcastle City Council and stakeholders in three neighbourhoods of Newcastle upon Tyne. These areas focus on the inner-city suburbs to the north, east and west of the city centre and are:

- Arthur’s Hill and Fenham
- Heaton and Ouseburn
- Jesmond.

The project - funded by a grant obtained from the Department for Transport’s Cycle City Ambition Fund - seeks to identify and deliver improvements to promote walking, cycling and sustainable travel.

The process has been organised and supported by transport engagement staff at Newcastle City Council, drawing on the local and technical knowledge of a wide variety of stakeholders – including elected members, grass roots community groups, cycling organisations, local businesses and service providers, together with City Council engineers, planners, urban designers and the Healthy Streets Board.

The Reference Group

The first stage in each neighbourhood’s process was to identify and recruit interested parties to be part of a Reference Group. The role of this group was to:

- Advise on and guide the design of engagement materials and products
- Help shape and deliver the engagement plan to involve local people and other stakeholders in gathering information
- Be part of the analysis of that information
- Contribute to the design of proposals addressing the issues raised.

Reference Group members were a fundamental part of the first stage of the process by helping to raise awareness and build anticipation locally about Streets for People, and by encouraging their contacts to take part in the Needs Analysis.
Needs Analysis

Over a period of several weeks in 2016, the Reference Group and supporters worked hard to encourage as many people as possible to take part in the consultation about what it’s like getting around the area. The information was gathered transparently using a tool known as ‘Commonplace’ – a web based interactive map, allowing users to pin places on a map and add comments about their experiences of getting around in that place.

A number of key messages were obtained from this engagement period, with requests for new green spaces, improved pavements, safer junctions and renovated streets that work better for everyone. A copy of the key findings for Jesmond is attached as Appendix 2 to this report. The findings contributed significantly to the evidence base for prioritising and developing the design interventions in each of the three neighbourhoods.

Turning Identified Needs into Proposals

A national procurement competition was undertaken to identify an independent urban design resource that could work with; the findings from the needs analysis; the technical information (speed, collisions, traffic flows, pedestrian and cycle counts and parking surveys); and the local knowledge and insights of the Reference Group themselves.

Design workshops and site visits helped to draft and refine the ideas into a broad ‘neighbourhood plan’ for each area, with each containing a number of constituent scheme proposals.

The neighbourhood plans were discussed and challenged by both local elected members and technical officers from the Council before the urban designers put forward their final draft neighbourhood plan for consultation.

From October to November 2017, the general public were invited to make comments - again using the Commonplace engagement tool - on the draft proposals for each neighbourhood. The findings from this consultation are included in this report.

A timeline is presented overleaf in fig.1. It maps the different stages of the Streets for People project to date.
### The Streets for People Process and Timeline

**Fig. 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Date Range</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2015 - April 2016</td>
<td>Establishing Reference Groups to work with in Jesmond, Heaton &amp; Ouseburn and Arthurs Hill &amp; Fenham areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb - May 2016</td>
<td>Designing, opening and encouraging participation in perception surveys in all three areas by online Commonplace tool: Jesmond, Heaton &amp; Ouseburn, Arthurs Hill &amp; Fenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March - Sep 2016</td>
<td>Analysis of the needs and issues revealed in the Commonplace surveys by Sustrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>Appointment of Phil Jones Associates – Consultants in Urban Design after a national procurement exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - July 2017</td>
<td>Commonplace analysis: site visits; desk top research; identifying best practice; collaborative design; scrutiny of outline plans by councillors; challenge by technical officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Preparation for public engagement and consultation on first draft proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October - November 2017</td>
<td>Initial public consultation on packages of outline proposals in three Streets for People areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2017 - March 2018</td>
<td>Detailed design of Streets for People proposals informed by the feedback on the outline proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2018 onwards</td>
<td>Formal consultation on more complex proposals, and/or issuing work instructions for the simple and straightforward ones. The final decisions about which schemes will be taken forward will be made by the City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations will be presented to the Healthy Streets Board, local councillors and technical officers. Their views will be taken into consideration by senior officers who will ultimately make the final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project delivery, including trial periods of some schemes to understand their strengths and weaknesses, before finalising designs and entering formal consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Consultation Findings

The findings included in this report are drawn from the public consultation exercise which ran from the 16th October to the 30th November 2017.

The consultation was hosted via the Commonplace online platform, inviting interested people to view and comment on the draft proposals within the three neighbourhoods.

Proposals were presented in words and images, explaining the problems and potential solutions, as well as the advantages the changes might deliver.
Participants were given the option of completing a survey online, or completing a paper survey, about their reaction to the proposed improvement, available at a range of neighbourhood-based locations such as libraries and cafes, or via a telephone request for a questionnaire to be sent through the post. Survey questions were designed to be balanced and non-leading, focusing on the collection of a clear BAND of information collecting information about participants’:

- Behaviour (modes of transport used to travel around the neighbourhood).
- Attitudes (likes/dislikes about each of the proposals).
- Needs (perceptions of additional needs in terms of the strengthening or adapting of proposals).
- Demographics (gender, age, mobility-impairing disabilities, home/work postcodes).

Contributors could choose to complete the survey by responding to the questions asked, leaving comments as necessary. They could alternatively, or additionally, ‘agree’ with comments already submitted and publicly visible. This was done by simply liking a comment by clicking a ‘thumbs up’ icon. All such agreements have been included in the analysis within this report.

As an alternative or additional feedback channel, 12 people also emailed with their views about the Jesmond proposals. Emails included both support and constructive criticism for proposals, with themes largely reflected in the main survey findings.
Notes

- Grateful acknowledgements are extended to all research participants for their valuable contribution to this consultation.
- The Streets for People process has also been enhanced by collaborating with a Post Graduate Student from Newcastle University’s Open Lab. The Reference Group were able to benefit from the energy, ideas and opinions of local primary school children involved in his research project. The young people presented their findings after field trips in the neighbourhood around their schools and challenged the adults to consider the issues of traffic and air pollution, litter, smoking, greenery and journey to and from school, from a young person’s perspective. Their contribution was very welcome and we hope that in developing detailed designs, we are working towards their aspirations for the kind of place they want to grow up in. More information about the work with primary schools can be found on the Streets for People website.
- As this was a self-selecting, non-geographically bounded consultation, with the potential for multiple contributions by participants, the accuracy and representativeness of the sample cannot be definitively determined.
- Respondents have been quoted verbatim, but anonymously, to preserve confidentiality.
- The baseline number from which percentages have been calculated is shown as ‘n=x’. This varies due to some respondents choosing not to respond to certain questions.
- Percentages have been rounded and may therefore not total exactly 100.
- Percentages have also been calculated excluding missing data.
Key Engagement Statistics from Jesmond

A total of **995** contributions were received about the Jesmond proposals.

These included online comments, agreements with comments, paper questionnaires completed and emails received. (See fig.2).

Fig.2

- **Over 540** agreements with online comments were made
- **Almost 100** people signed up for project news & updates
- **A further 154** people viewed online, but did not comment on, the proposals

The demographics of respondents who provided their details are summarised in Appendix 1.
Executive Summary

• In October/November 2017, Newcastle City Council ran an online public consultation as part of the Streets for People project – a collaboration between the City Council and three neighbourhoods of Newcastle – Arthur’s Hill & Fenham, Heaton & Ouseburn, and Jesmond.
• Streets for People seeks to identify and deliver a range of improvements to promote walking, cycling and sustainable travel.
• To date, initial engagement and consultation has led to a series of proposals being developed to this effect in each neighbourhood. This current phase of consultation was designed to gauge public opinion on these proposals, assessing perceptions of their suitability, strengths and potential shortcomings.
• Almost 1,000 responses were obtained in relation to the proposals for Jesmond – with a wide range of respondents in terms of their demographic characteristics.
• However, due to the self-selecting nature of participation in the consultation, together with the lack of a distinct ‘population’ base, the partially available demographics of the sample, and the possibility for duplicated participation, the degree of accuracy of the captured data cannot be stated.
• The proposals for St. George’s Terrace, West Jesmond Primary School area and Selborne Gardens to Greystoke Gardens specifically attract a great deal of support, with general applause for their overall ethos, and also the individual elements of their detail.
• The proposals for Moorfield - High West Jesmond, Forsyth Road, and to a lesser extent Springbank Road Bridge and Ouseburn Road and Osborne Road/Holly Avenue/Haldane Terrace, are felt to require a greater level of adjustment prior to their progression.
• For all proposals for Jesmond - regardless of their appeal - there are specific design challenges suggested by respondents which provide useful and practical considerations for the advancement of each proposal.
• These challenges are often very detailed in their scope and are offered to maximise the impact and effectiveness of each proposal within the local areas in focus.
The St. George’s Terrace Proposal

The location

- St. George’s Terrace – the section between Acorn Road and the junction with Osborne Road and the junction with Mistletoe Road / Norham Place.

The idea

- To create pedestrian priority on the library side of St. George’s Terrace by building continuous, blended footways that cross the ends of all the side roads, putting people on foot first.

- At the top end of St. George’s Terrace, at the junction with Osborne Road, introduce a crossing facility for people on foot and on bikes to allow safer access in and out of St. George’s Terrace.

- At the bottom of St. George’s Terrace, to change the priority of the junction to Mistletoe Road and Northam Place over St. George’s Terrace.

- Proposals are also under discussion for landscaping and tree planting on one or more of the streets off St. George’s Terrace.

The potential benefits

- People walking up and down St. George’s Terrace have safer, smoother access to the shops and services on the Street – especially helpful for people using wheelchairs or pushing buggies.

- The speed of traffic entering and leaving the side streets will be reduced, leading to improved road safety for people on foot and on bikes. The road safety benefits of the new crossing would address a long standing local issue and enhance the connections between Jesmond Dene Road and Osborne Road via Friday Fields Lane.

- The access to Bell’s Yard Play Area would be enhanced for all by putting the give way line at the bottom of St. George’s Terrace.
How Respondents Travel in and Around the Proposal Area

Whilst walking clearly dominates as the most typical method of travelling in and around the proposal area, this was frequently accompanied by additional transport modes, including cycling (50%) and car driving (36%). (See fig.3). Around three-quarters (74%) of respondents used more than one mode of transport to traverse the area.

Fig.3
What Appeals About the St. George’s Terrace Proposal

Many respondents commented on, or agreed with, aspects of the St. George’s Terrace proposal which they liked. The most appealing of these aspects focused on the addition of blended footpaths (26%), general praise and the addition of the crossing facility for pedestrians and cyclists (22%). Others specifically welcomed what they felt was a pedestrian focus in the area and a safer pedestrian/cyclist experience. Additionally, appealing aspects included a more attractive environment and reduced traffic speeds. (See fig.4) (More than one response or agreement was often given).

Fig. 4
What Respondents Said They Liked About the Proposal for St. George’s Terrace

“The continuous pavements are a very good idea and will give increased priority to pedestrians”

“This will mean it’s easier to walk along St. George’s Terrace and easier to cross Osborne Road”

“I like the blended footway and welcome anything that will make crossing the streets easier for pedestrians”

“I like the crossing facilities on Osborne Road”

“This is an excellent proposal. The ability for pedestrians to be able to walk safely and on the level from North Jesmond Avenue to Acorn Road is most welcome”

“It is a good idea to blend the west side footway”
What Respondents Dislike About the St. George’s Terrace Proposal

Respondents commenting on or agreeing with what they felt were the less appealing aspects of this proposal, focused on safety concerns, accompanied by concerns relating to insufficient cycle segregation, the proposal not going far enough in its scope, the changed traffic light priority, and increased congestion potentially resulting. Insufficient cycle lanes were additionally specified.

A number of other dislikes - each specified by just a handful of respondents - included perceptions of increased journey times, air pollution, restricted parking availability, a lack of proposal clarity and concerns about potential inconvenience to pedestrians. (See fig.5). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.5
Suggested Improvements to the St. George’s Terrace Proposal

Despite its obvious appeal, many respondents suggested improvements to this proposal, focusing on increasing cycle lanes and adding more pedestrian crossing facilities. (See fig. 6). A wide range of additional suggestions covered topics including tackling speeding traffic, modifying traffic signals, and removing access and parking restrictions. (More than one suggestion was sometimes given).

Fig. 6

Suggested Improvements to the St. George’s Terrace Proposal

- Increase cycling fac./lanes: 22%
- More crossings: 18%
- Segregate cycle lanes: 10%
- Green planting: 9%
- One-way system: 6%
- Other: 51%

n=77
Some Ideas and Suggestions from the St. George’s Terrace Consultation Responses that We Will Explore Further

Valuable feedback on many aspects of the proposal will be discussed and tested by technical officers when the scheme goes into detailed design – this is likely to mean that the design is amended and refined.

For example, some of the challenges in the detailed design work for this scheme will include:

The potential to extend the proposed continuous pavement treatment to include the end of Tavistock Road.

Is it possible to improve the design of the new traffic management facilities at the junction of St. George’s Terrace and Osborne Road by including provision for cyclists turning right into St. George’s Terrace from Osborne Road?

Review the proposed turning movements into North Jesmond Avenue from Osborne Road to ensure their compliance with road safety standards.

Investigate if the proposed change in the priority at the Norham Place/Mistletoe Road/St. George’s Terrace junction will result in increased traffic speeds. If this is the case, consider road closures in Norham Place or Lily Avenue to make them access only and retain the current priority arrangements.

Safer arrangements, possibly a pedestrian crossing, may be required to improve the access to Bells Yard.

Is it possible to identify locations for cycle storage in the St. George’s Terrace/West Jesmond area?

Opportunities to include trees and shrubs should be maximised in the designs.

Are there any solutions to the issues arising from parking on both sides of St. George’s Terrace which leads to traffic speeding up and down into gaps – could parking restrictions help? Blocks of parking with double yellows in between to create passing places? Or could the southern end of St. George’s Terrace become one way?

These design challenges will be worked through as and when this package of measures progresses onto detailed design.
The West Jesmond Primary School Area Proposal

The location

- Tankerville Terrace & Brentwood Avenue.

The idea

- At Tankerville Terrace – to repurpose the Metro embankment and make it useable public space for leisure use with seating and attractive planting. Removing 10 pay and display parking spaces to create the space to widen footways to improve safety.
- At Brentwood Avenue, outside the shops, a comprehensive decluttering of the footway would remove the bollards and unnecessary barriers to free up movement and create a better environment for shoppers and people passing by. One or two parking spaces would also be repurposed to provide parking for bicycles.

The potential benefits

- At Tankerville Terrace - less traffic congestion and traffic conflict because no one is able to stop and drop off or park – no idling leads to better air quality outside school and improved road safety. There would also be more space for carers and children to gather and socialise and a significantly enhanced street scene.
- On Brentwood Avenue, decluttering would improve access for all and increase the space outside the shops. Creating parking for bicycles would encourage people to cycle there.
How Respondents Travel in and Around the Proposal Area

Whilst walking clearly dominates as the most typical method of travelling in and around the proposal area, this was frequently accompanied by additional transport modes, including cycling (52%) and car driving (35%). (See fig.7). Just under 80% of respondents used more than one mode of transport to traverse the area.

Fig.7
What Appeals About the West Jesmond Primary School Area Proposal

A large proportion of respondents commented on an aspect of the West Jesmond Primary School area proposal which they liked. The most appealing of these aspects focused on what was felt to be a potentially more attractive environment (28%), accompanied by a safer pedestrian/cyclist experience (16%) and general praise (15%). Other appealing aspects included the widened footpaths, restricted parking and reduced pollution. (See fig.8). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.8
What Respondents Said They Liked About the Proposal for West Jesmond Primary School Area

“This will make the Metro embankment more attractive and useful”

“Excellent! This should really improve the situation”

“I love this and would certainly cycle there if it was safer. It’s brilliant for pedestrians too as there are lovely shops”

“Cycle parking will help the shops and decluttering will make it much nicer to walk and shop here”

“This will result in an improved visual and social environment around the school and also improved emissions”

“This is an excellent idea! It will really benefit the school and community!”
What Respondents Dislike About the West Jesmond Primary School Area Proposal

Many respondents commented on what they felt were the less appealing aspects of this proposal, with a clear focus on restricted parking availability. This was accompanied by perceptions that the proposal did not go far enough in its scope. Insufficient cyclist segregation and a lack of potential enforcement also featured – though to a far lesser degree.

A number of other dislikes - each specified by just one or two respondents - included perceptions of safety being compromised, a lack of proposal clarity and concerns that the proposal was not a priority in the area. (See fig.9).

(More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted parking</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal scope insufficient</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient cyclist segregation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of enforcement</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=67
Suggested Improvements to the West Jesmond Primary School Area Proposal

Despite its obvious appeal, around two-thirds of respondents suggested improvements to this proposal, focusing on modifications to parking restrictions (with opposing views as to whether they should be extended or removed). (See fig. 10). A wide range of additional suggestions covered topics including adding green planting, restricting through traffic/access, adding crossings, increasing and segregating cycle lanes and improving footpaths. (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig. 10
Some Ideas and Suggestions from the West Jesmond Primary School Consultation Responses that We Will Explore Further

Valuable feedback on many aspects of the proposal will be discussed and tested by technical officers when the scheme goes into detailed design – this is likely to mean that the design is amended and refined.

For example, some of the challenges in the detailed design work for this scheme will include:

Improving the Metro embankment isn’t controversial but there are serious and widely held concerns that the intervention will do little to address the issues with traffic congestion and the school run.

The footway outside of the school grounds on Tankerville Terrace is sub-standard and would benefit from widening.

The proposals for Tankerville Terrace should also acknowledge and take account of the transport needs of the other schools on the street - Percy Hedley and Newcastle School for Girls.

What opportunities are there to connect West Jesmond Primary School to local cycle routes such as Highbury and into Brandling Village?

Cycle parking is required on Tankerville Terrace to help encourage parents to make the journey to school by bike.

Is there also an opportunity to provide cycling facilities on Tankerville Terrace?

Provision for the safe and convenient parking of the school bus is required within the scheme.

Cycle parking is needed in Brentwood Avenue but is it possible to provide it without losing any car parking spaces? For example, on a built-out area at the end of the shops.

General call for park & stride to facilitate parents driving children to school and or changes in the local parking restrictions in nearby streets to allow pickups.

These design challenges will be worked through as and when this package of measures progresses onto detailed design.
The Selborne Gardens to Greystoke Gardens Proposal

The location

- The existing footpath that connects these two streets through a small woodland area.

The idea

- Widening the footpath to reduce the conflicts between people on foot and on bikes and improving the access at both ends.

The potential benefits

- The proposals will make more of an existing traffic free route that links Jesmond Vale to the north and aids walking and cycling to two local schools.
- This path is also part of an alternative quiet cycling route to Jesmond Road between the Cradlewell and City Stadium. Any changes must avoid any damage to healthy trees.
How Respondents Travel in and Around the Proposal Area

Whilst walking clearly dominates as the most typical method of travelling in and around the proposal area, this was frequently accompanied by cycling (55%). No respondents specified travel by car – either as a driver or passenger. (See fig.11). 63% of respondents used more than one mode of transport to traverse the area.

Fig.11
What Appeals About the Selborne Gardens to Greystoke Gardens Proposal

Many respondents commented on an aspect of the Selborne Gardens to Greystoke Gardens proposal which they liked. Whilst this tended to be general praise such as “it’s a good idea”, “long overdue” and “fantastic!”, the most appealing of these aspects specifically focused on the widening of footpaths. (See fig. 12). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig. 12

The Appeal of the Selborne Gardens to Greystoke Gardens Proposal

- General praise: 21%
- Widened footpaths: 17%
- Reduced car usage: 4%
- Encouragement of cycling: 2%
- More attractive environment: 2%
- Other: 8%

n=53
What Respondents Said They Liked About the Proposal for Selborne Gardens to Greystoke Gardens

“It’s an improvement. I used to walk or cycle that way often to work and these changes seem positive and well thought out.”

“This will hopefully reduce conflict and make it nice to walk here.”

“A very good proposal and long overdue. Please implement it!”

“It would be good to improve this path for both pedestrians and cyclists.”

“I strongly agree with the need to improve the access to the footpath at the Selborne Gardens end. The present path is very uneven and difficult to navigate for buggies and wheelchairs so greatly needs improving.”

“This will potentially reduce pollution, reduce inactivity and improve active travel.”
What Respondents Dislike About the Selborne Gardens to Greystoke Gardens Proposal

Many respondents commented on, or agreed with comments on, what they felt were the less appealing aspects of this proposal, with a focus on perceptions of pedestrian inconvenience and insufficient cyclist segregation from pedestrians and cars. A popular comment suggested a need for cyclists to give pedestrians priority, dismounting if the path became narrow. Compromised safety also featured, followed by perceptions of a lack of proposal clarity, and unfairly giving priority to cyclists. A number of other dislikes - each specified by one or two respondents - included perceptions of a less attractive environment, cyclists potentially riding dangerously and the proposal not going far enough in its reach. (See fig.13). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian inconvenience</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient cyclist segregation</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety compromised</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving priority to cyclists</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of proposal clarity</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=53
Suggested Improvements to the Selborne Gardens to Greystoke Gardens Proposal

A sizeable proportion of respondents suggested improvements to this proposal, focusing on additional/modified signage to indicate cycling facilities and priorities. (See fig. 14). A wide range of additional suggestions covered topics including scrapping/redrafting the proposal, ensuring enforcement, improving footpaths and increasing cycling facilities. (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig. 14
Some Ideas and Suggestions from the Selborne Gardens to Greystoke Gardens Consultation Responses that We Will Explore Further

Valuable feedback on many aspects of the proposal will be discussed and tested by technical officers when the scheme goes into detailed design – this is likely to mean that the design is amended and refined.

For example, some of the challenges in the detailed design work for this scheme will include:

The main challenge in this location is managing the fear of potential conflict between cyclists and pedestrians using the path. The route has appeal as both a route to school and an alternative to using Sandyford Road for cyclists, so has the potential to be busy.

An additional challenge is to design proposals that will minimise any impact on the vegetation in the area and hopefully improve it.

These design challenges will be worked through as and when this package of measures progresses onto detailed design.
The Springbank Road Bridge and Ouseburn Road Proposal

The location
- Ouseburn Road; Spring Bank Road

The idea
- To create a new footway on one side of the Springbank Road Bridge, helping to connect to the entrance to Armstrong Park, making it easier and safer to get in and out of the Park. To create the space for the new footway, the width of the road on the bridge will need to be reduced to 3.5m, making it passable in only one direction at a time. Priority would be given to vehicles travelling west. The aim is to calm traffic speeds and create the extra space for the new footway.
- The mini roundabout on Ouseburn Road, north of Spring Bank Road, is the proposed location of a set of bollards to prevent through traffic but maintain access to houses. Removing through traffic from Ouseburn Road will make it safer and more comfortable to walk and cycle along to Jesmond Dene.

The potential benefits
- Calmed and reduced traffic and a safer pedestrian/cyclist experience.
How Respondents Travel in and Around the Proposal Area

Whilst walking clearly emerges as the most typical method of travelling in and around the proposal area, this was frequently accompanied by additional transport modes, including cycling (45%) and car driving (41%). (See fig.15). 70% of respondents used more than one mode of transport to traverse the area.

Fig.15
What Appeals About the Springbank Road Bridge and Ouseburn Road Proposal

Many respondents commented on, or agreed with, an aspect of the Springbank Road Bridge and Ouseburn Road proposal which they liked. Whilst this tended to be general praise such as “this is a much-needed improvement”, and “a great idea”, the most appealing of these aspects focused on the widening of footpaths and the potential for reduced through traffic, together with improved safety. (See fig.16). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.16

![The Appeal of the Springbank Road Bridge and Ouseburn Road Proposal](chart.png)
What Respondents Said They Liked About the Proposal for Springbank Road Bridge and Ouseburn Road

“An improved footway is a good idea”

“Closing Ouseburn Road to traffic between Stratford Road and Armstrong Bridge would be terrific”

“Closing Ouseburn Road and making the area much quieter and more peaceful and pleasant for walkers and cyclists”

“I like everything! Good idea to close Ouseburn Road to traffic. Jesmond Dene Road is lovely now there isn’t lots of speeding traffic on it and it would be great if Heaton could have this too”

“This is a much-needed improvement”

“I like the widening of the bridge footpath”
What Respondents Dislike About the Springbank Road Bridge and Ouseburn Road Proposal

A number of respondents commented on or agreed with what they felt were the less appealing aspects of this proposal, with a focus largely on restricted access, accompanied by increased congestion. Some respondents considered the proposal to be unnecessary and felt that it was pandering to the needs of cyclists, with accompanying comments suggesting that the proposal was disproportionately large/unnecessary and lacking local knowledge. Increased pollution, reduced visibility and safety being compromised were also mentioned.

A number of other dislikes - each specified by just one or two respondents - included perceptions of increased journey times, insufficient cyclist segregation, a less attractive environment, a lack of proposal clarity and inconvenience to pedestrians. (See fig.17). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.17
Many respondents suggested improvements to this proposal. Among these respondents, improving/broadening the footpath, changing signage and signalling and removing access restrictions were most frequently mentioned. A number of other suggestions included parking restrictions via yellow lines, bridge located traffic lights and shrub cutting to improve visibility. (See fig.18). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.18
Some Ideas and Suggestions from the Springbank Road Bridge and Ouseburn Road Consultation Responses that We Will Explore Further

(Combined Feedback from Both the Heaton & Ouseburn & Jesmond Commonplaces)

Valuable feedback on many aspects of the proposal will be discussed and tested by technical officers when the scheme goes into detailed design – this is likely to mean that the design is amended and refined.

For example, some of the challenges in the detailed design work for this scheme will include:

The proposals for the priority movements over the bridge seem to be acceptable but there needs to be more clarity about how the priority would work and the suitability for buses – better management of parking on Stratford Grove, improved visibility for right turners from the bridge into Stratford Grove, perhaps including a convex mirror or better management of the vegetation could be addressed through the proposals?

Proposed restrictions to motor vehicles on Ouseburn Road have been vehemently opposed by some people – for example, there are fears that residents won’t be able to get out of the valley in their cars in bad weather because Springbank Road and Stratford Grove are too steep. Is it possible to restrict access to include residents and exclude through traffic?

Is there any design solution to improving the safety of Ouseburn Road and retaining vehicular access?

Managing parking along the park wall at the turning onto the bridge would improve manoeuvrability, particularly for buses.

Is there an opportunity to also fix the drainage issues around the chicane build-out at the entrance of the park?

Clarify if there is a need for footpaths on both sides of the bridge or would it be better to stick to one footpath but on the other side of the bridge?

These design challenges will be worked through as and when this package of measures progresses onto detailed design.
The Osborne Road/Holly Avenue/Haldane Terrace Proposal

The location

- Osborne Road and its junctions with Osborne Avenue, Holly Avenue and Haldane Bridge.

The idea

- Signalising the Holly Avenue and Haldane Terrace junctions to provide pedestrian crossings and safe cycling routes and turns; and providing protected cycle lanes between these two junctions.
- Haldane Bridge would be filtered, with no access or egress for motor vehicles but open to people on foot and on bikes.
- The existing pedestrian crossing on Osborne Road between Osborne Avenue and Holly Avenue will be removed and the crossing over Osborne Avenue at its junction with Osborne Road will be improved for pedestrians.

The potential benefits

- The additional crossings enhance safety on an important route across Jesmond, effectively connecting the Cradlewell area with west Jesmond.
- Osborne Road, and the junctions with its side streets, was the most frequently mentioned place in last year’s survey.

Osborne Road / Holly Avenue / Haldane Terrace

173 contributions

Providing pedestrian crossings and safe cycling routes and turns along Osborne Road.
Travel in and Around the Proposal Area

Whilst walking clearly dominates as the most typical method of travelling in and around the proposal area, this was frequently accompanied by additional transport modes, including car driving (63%) and cycling (50%). (See fig. 19). Around three-quarters (74%) of respondents used more than one mode of transport to traverse the area.

Fig. 19

How Respondents Usually Travel in and Around the Proposal Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car driver</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/ jogging</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car passenger</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi/ mini-cab</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pram/ buggy</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van/ lorry</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair/ mobility scooter</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=77
What Appeals About the Osborne Road/Holly Avenue/Haldane Terrace Proposal

Many respondents commented on/agreed with an aspect of the Osborne Road, Holly Avenue and Haldane Terrace proposal which they liked. This focused sharply on improved safety for both cyclists (29%) and pedestrians (17%), with the potential closure of Haldane Bridge to motor vehicles drawing some specific applause. Other likes included potentially reduced congestion, improved pavements and the introduction of traffic signals. (See fig.20). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.20
What Respondents Said They Liked About the Proposal for Osborne Road/Holly Avenue/Haldane Terrace

“This will mean increased safety for people on foot and on bikes. The Haldane Bridge proposal is also welcomed.”

“Seems like an excellent way of slowing down the traffic and making a busy junction safer for pedestrians/cyclists.”

“This will give a more streamlined connection over Osborne Road on Holly Avenue, leading to a safer cycling street.”

“The proposal would improve the environment and safety for pedestrians and cyclists. The removal of vehicles from Haldane Terrace is also a plus point.”

“Cycling on Osborne Road is terrifying and it would be fantastic to have cycle lanes here.”

“Pavements will be nicer to walk on with a cycle lane to buffer against the traffic. Narrower traffic lanes should reduce speeding.”
What Respondents Dislike About the Osborne Road/Holly Avenue/Haldane Terrace Proposal

However, many respondents also commented on/agreed with what they felt were the less appealing aspects of this proposal, with a focus on increased congestion, accompanied by the closure of Haldane Bridge. A number of other dislikes included perceptions of compromised safety and increased rat-running, a less attractive environment, traffic light modifications, concerns that the proposal is not needed/insufficient in scope, restricted parking availability and a perception that the proposal is pandering to cyclists. (See fig. 21). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given). Those comments receiving the largest number of ‘agreements’ referred specifically to a dislike of road markings, the proposed extended pavement, unnecessary closure of Haldane Bridge and not spending money for the sake of it for a pro-cycle agenda.

Fig. 21
Suggested Improvements to the Osborne Road/Holly Avenue/Haldane Terrace Proposal

Many respondents suggested or agreed with improvements to this proposal, focusing on opposing views on removing or restricting through traffic/access. (See fig. 22). A wide range of additional suggestions covered topics including the need for a one-way system, ensuring enforcement, adding crossing facilities and segregating/protecting/adding cycle lanes. (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig. 22
Some Ideas and Suggestions from the Osborne Road/Holly Avenue/Haldane Terrace Consultation Responses that We Will Explore Further

Valuable feedback on many aspects of the proposal will be discussed and tested by technical officers when the scheme goes into detailed design – this is likely to mean that the design is amended and refined.

For example, some of the challenges in the detailed design work for this scheme will include:

Consider the value of continuing the cycle track from Eslington Terrace (south) up Eslington Terrace (north) to connect with Haldane Bridge and Osborne Road as part of this scheme.

The proposal to close Haldane Bridge to vehicles is controversial, but would restricted movements give any advantages as an alternative to full closure?

Is there scope to provide protected cycle lanes along the length of Osborne Road?

Are there potential conflicts between the proposals for the cycle lanes and the entrances / exits of properties in Burdon Place and Osborne Road?

Could additional improvements be attached to the proposals to address issues about safety and flow on Osborne Avenue.

The safety of the right turn out of Osborne Avenue into Osborne Avenue needs to be considered if the location of pedestrian crossings changes.

Enforcing the speed limit on Osborne Road was also raised as a challenge … driver feedback signs or speed cameras?

These design challenges will be worked through as and when this package of measures progresses onto detailed design.
The Forsyth Road Proposal

The locations

- Forsyth Road between Great North Road and Tankerville Terrace inclusive.

The idea

- Reduction in the quantity of parking places on Forsyth Road between Great North Road and Highbury. This space is currently used for parking but could be reallocated to provide cycling facilities on this popular route.
- Introduce a trial one-way system on the residential stretch of Forsyth Road between Highbury and Brentwood Avenue to address congestion and deter ‘rat-running’ through West Jesmond.
- Improve crossing facilities at the Brentwood Avenue / Forsyth Road / Tankerville Terrace junction, enhancing safety and comfort for pedestrians.

The potential benefits

- Improve access and road safety from all approaches to West Jesmond Primary for children and carers on foot and on bikes.
- Reduce congestion and improve traffic flow on Forsyth Road, to reduce the need for drivers to speed to avoid conflicts with oncoming traffic and reduce risk of damage to parked and moving vehicles. Provide a deterrent to ‘rat-running’ through West Jesmond from the Great North Road.

For 214 contributions

Improving cycling connectivity and reducing traffic congestion and conflicts along Forsyth Road.
How Respondents Travel in and Around the Proposal Area

Whilst walking clearly dominates as the most typical method of travelling in and around the proposal area, this was frequently accompanied by additional transport modes, including car driving (54%) and cycling (52%). (See fig.72). Around three-quarters (23%) of respondents used more than one mode of transport to traverse the area.

Fig.23
What Appeals About the Forsyth Road Proposal

Many respondents commented on an aspect of the Forsyth Road proposal which they liked. This focused on the potential introduction of a one-way system from Highbury and Brentwood Avenues, together with increased cycle facilities, reduced congestion and improved overall safety. (See fig.24). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.24

The Appeal of the Forsyth Road Proposal

- One-way system: 12%
- Increased cycle facilities: 11%
- Reduced congestion: 10%
- Improved overall safety: 9%
- General praise: 8%
- Crossing facilities: 8%
- Cyclist priority: 5%
- Other: 21%

n=214
What Respondents Said They Liked About the Proposal for Forsyth Road

“The introduction of a one-way system on Forsyth Road would be of great benefit to residents and visitors”

“It does make sense to reduce the parking places...as this will ease issues which arise from time to time”

“This area is already heavily congested and I think that these overall proposals will encourage a modal shift to more sustainable transport”

“Cycle lanes on both sides of Forsyth Road are a good idea”

“One-way is a good, solid idea. The cycle connectivity is also a good idea but really needs to be re-thought and a better solution found”

“It’s very important to make changes to this area to facilitate cyclists coming across the moor and into Jesmond”
What Respondents Dislike About the Forsyth Road Proposal

However, a significant proportion of respondents commented on/agreed with what they felt were the less appealing aspects of this proposal, with a focus on perceptions of restricted parking availability (accompanying comment ‘agreements’ referred to revisiting parking availability on Brentwood Avenue), together with pedestrian inconvenience and increased congestion. Comment ‘agreements’ focused on school drop off/collection bottlenecks and the potential for traffic displacement onto Lavender Gardens and Brentwood Avenue. Compromised safety, increased rat-running and an insufficient number of cycle lanes also featured. A number of other dislikes - each specified by just a handful of respondents - included perceptions of a lack of proposal clarity, concerns that the proposal doesn’t go far enough in its scope, and giving unnecessary priority to cyclists. (See fig.25). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.25
What Respondents Said They Disliked About the Proposal for Forsyth Road

“Do not restrict parking. The elderly and disabled need to park cars to access the local area.”

“You are proposing to add more complications and danger to an already over-engineered situation.”

“This could deter people from using shops on Brentwood.”

“The parking places are needed. Prioritising cyclists will make life more difficult for the many motorists who NEED to come into Jesmond.”

“Highbury can’t take the additional traffic - neither can Brentwood.”

“Closure of the east bound traffic - increases congestion and travel time and pollution by transferring traffic elsewhere.”
Suggested Improvements to the Forsyth Road Proposal

In improving this proposal, respondents focused on suggestions for a need to increase parking restrictions – focusing on eliminating parking spaces and sometimes on limiting parking permits to one per household. In direct contrast, a very similar proportion focused on retaining parking spaces, removing some of the proposed restrictions. (See fig.26). A kaleidoscope of additional improvements – all very diverse in nature - were received in relation to this proposal, ranging from increasing cycle lanes and traffic signal modifications, removing access restrictions, tackling speeding traffic to not prioritising cycling, to increasing pedestrian/car/cycle segregation, and increasing pavements and their shared usage. (More than one response/agreement was often given). 

Fig.26
Cycle Lane Preferences

Respondents also commented on their preference for a cycle lane – selecting one of the two options shown below in fig.27. The consultation findings show a preference for Option A – appealing to 56% of respondents, compared to 44% who preferred Option B.

Fig.27

56% selected Option A.

44% selected Option B.
Some Ideas and Suggestions from the Forsyth Road Consultation Responses that We Will Explore Further

Valuable feedback on many aspects of the proposal will be discussed and tested by technical officers when the scheme goes into detailed design – this is likely to mean that the design is amended and refined.

For example, some of the challenges in the detailed design work for this scheme will include:

Identify appropriate strategies to reduce the amount of through traffic using the area.

The direction of the proposed one-way section on Forsyth Road should be further considered and a trial period is strongly recommended.

The impact of a one-way system on the surrounding streets needs to be fully assessed.

Consider closing or signalising Forsyth Road Bridge.

Assess the impact of preventing the left turn from the Great North Road into Forsyth Road.

Is it possible to manage the parking on Forsyth Road (residential end) so that there is room for 2 vehicles to pass?

Would tweaks to the timings of parking permits help designate certain streets as drop off zones for the school run, helping to ease the pressure on Tankerville Terrace and Forsyth Road?

Could the back lanes, for example back Fairfield Road, be designated as cycle routes?

Find a way of providing better cycling facilities on Forsyth Road which addresses concerns about parking and green spaces.

Monitor and check the timings of the traffic lights controlling the exit of Forsyth Road onto the Great North Road to maximise the flow of traffic off Forsyth Road at peak times.

Recognise that the issues on Forsyth Road are not just about the school run and are present day and night.

These design challenges will be worked through as and when this package of measures progresses onto detailed design.
The Moorfield - High West Jesmond Proposal

The location

- Moorfield, High West Jesmond.

The idea

To reduce the speed of traffic on Moorfield and the southern end of Ilford Road and to improve facilities for both cyclists and pedestrians by:

- Remodelling the junction of Moorfield and Ilford Road to tighten the corners, require drivers to reduce their speed when approaching from every direction and turn former carriageway into space for people on foot and bicycle.
- Reducing the width of the main carriageway on Moorfield by introducing a new cycle track on the southern side between the existing grass verge and parked cars on this connection to the Great North Road.
- Widening the pavement at the western end of Moorfield and providing enhanced pedestrian crossing facilities along the whole length of Moorfield.

The potential benefits

- A long standing local issue concerning excessive speeds on Moorfield will be addressed. Connections will be made with existing cycle facilities on the Great North Road, extending the local cycle network. Road safety will be improved at the crossroads of Moorfield and Ilford Road and pedestrian space will be enhanced through widened paths, improvement of the footway alongside the allotments and enhanced crossing facilities.
How Respondents Travel in and Around the Proposal Area

Whilst walking emerged as the most typical method of travelling in and around the proposal area, this was frequently accompanied by additional transport modes, including cycling (62%) and car driving (61%). (See fig. 28). 80% of respondents used more than one mode of transport to traverse the area.

Fig. 28
What Appeals About the Moorfield – High West Jesmond Proposal

Many respondents commented on or agreed with an aspect of the Moorfield - High West Jesmond proposal which they liked. Appeal clearly focused on the potential reduction in traffic speeds on Moorfield and the southern end of Ilford Road (50%), together with widened footpaths on Moorfield, improvements to safety and the remodelling of the junction of Moorfield and Ilford Road. The introduction of crossing facilities and cyclist priority were also specified. (See fig.29). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.29

The Appeal of the Moorfield - High West Jesmond Proposal

- Reduced traffic speed: 50%
- Widened footpaths: 24%
- Safer overall experience: 16%
- Junction improvements: 15%
- Crossing facilities: 14%
- Cyclist priority: 9%
- Other: 31%

n=270
What Respondents Said They Liked About the Proposal for Moorfield – High West Jesmond

“This will mean an improved footpath alongside the allotments.”

“We are keen cyclists and would welcome anything to make cycling safer.”

“I welcome the plans to address problems at the junction of Moorfield and Ilford Road, especially if that means a realignment of the junction, rather than the staggered junction we currently endure.”

“I like the recognition that there is speeding traffic on Moorfield Road.”

“Pavement widening at the west end of Moorfield is a good idea.”

“This is a valuable extension to the cycle route on Moor Road.”
What Respondents Dislike About the Moorfield – High West Jesmond Proposal

Most respondents commented on what they felt were the less appealing aspects of this proposal, with a focus on a feeling that this was an unnecessary proposal, not needed as a priority in the area. This was a view accompanied by concerns about a reduction in the width of the road, with other concerns focusing on compromised safety and the proposal being insufficient in its scope. A number of other dislikes included perceptions of a less attractive environment, restricted parking and access, reduced visibility/sightlines, inconvenience to pedestrians and a lack of proposal clarity. (See fig.30). (More than one response/agreement was sometimes given).

Fig.30
What Respondents Said They Disliked About the Proposal for Moorfield – High West Jesmond

“As a wide road it is safe for cyclists as there is plenty of room to overtake”

“The whole scheme appears to be the result of a desktop exercise with no evidence from a traffic survey or similar to base it on”

“The currently attractive wide road will be made less attractive, with very few, if any, compensating benefits for pedestrians and cyclists”

“It seems disproportionate - the main issue is speeding”

“This would waste taxpayers’ money on a facility that would very rarely be used. Where and why has this strange, bespoke scheme originated?”

“Moorfield is fine for pedestrians already”
Suggested Improvements to the Moorfield – High West Jesmond Proposal

In improving this proposal, respondents focused on suggestions for restricted through traffic/access, together with additional pedestrian crossing facilities, often around the Ilford Road/Moorfield junction, residents parking only, and signage (often focusing on speed warnings). (See fig.31). A kaleidoscope of additional improvements spotlighted a need for extended parking restrictions, improved footpaths, additional cycling facilities/lanes and a more attractive environment. (More than one response/agreement was often given).

Fig.31
Some Ideas and Suggestions from the Moorfield – High West Jesmond Consultation Responses that We Will Explore Further

Valuable feedback on many aspects of the proposal will be discussed and tested by technical officers when the scheme goes into detailed design – this is likely to mean that the design is amended and refined.

For example, some of the challenges in the detailed design work for this scheme will include:

Consider removing the cycle lane from the Moorfield proposals because the provision is widely contested and considered to be over provision.

Road safety improvements are welcomed at the junction of Moorfield and Ilford Road – more thought is required to identify the right intervention though, because pedestrian facilities are important here to cater for the high footfall to and from the Metro Station.

Management of speed on Moorfield is the key issue – perhaps looking at the provision of a driver speed feedback panel or similar.

Improve the layout of Moorfield at the Moor Road end to better connect to Great North Road and the crossing facilities there.

There is no support for Moorfield to be narrowed in the way the proposal envisages.

Would the use of blended footways at junctions with Moorfield’s side streets contribute to reducing speeds and improving pedestrian priority and safety?

Parking restrictions should be considered, especially at the corners of junctions.

Look at reducing through traffic on Moorfield, by closing the exit from Moorfield to Great North Road and on Moorfield between Lodore Road and Treherne Road, so that through traffic uses main roads instead.

Change priority at the Ilford Road/Moorfield junction so Moorfield has priority.

Can anything be added to this package to improve Ilford Road?

These design challenges will be worked through as and when this package of measures progresses onto detailed design.
Appendix 1 – Overall Respondent Demographics

The Gender of Respondents

60%: Male: 40% Female

n=287

The Age of Respondents

n=291

The Age of Respondents

Under 18: 1%
18-29: 7%
30-39: 11%
40-49: 21%
50-59: 23%
60-69: 21%
70-79: 12%
80+: 3%

n=291

The Age of Respondents

19%
44%
36%

n=291
Ward of Residence

* including Dene, Newburn, Parklands, South Heaton, West Gosforth, Westgate, Longbenton and Benton wards.

Ward of Employment Location

* including Byker, Dene, Denton, Elswick, Lemington, Ouseburn, Wingrove, Killingworth and Valley wards.

Mobility Impairing Disability

5% of respondents had a disability which impaired their mobility.
The Residence of Respondents

n=105
## Demographics Split by Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Home Ward</th>
<th>Employment Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. George’s Terrace</td>
<td>Male: 64%</td>
<td>Under 40: 15%</td>
<td>0% with an impairment to their mobility</td>
<td>North Jesmond: 74%</td>
<td>Westgate: 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 36%</td>
<td>40-59: 39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Gosforth: 15%</td>
<td>South Jesmond: 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 plus: 47%</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Jesmond: 5%</td>
<td>North Jesmond: 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others: 6%</td>
<td>Others: 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Jesmond Primary School Area</td>
<td>Male: 64%</td>
<td>Under 40: 18%</td>
<td>4% with an impairment to their mobility</td>
<td>North Jesmond: 64%</td>
<td>Westgate: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 36%</td>
<td>40-59: 43%</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Jesmond: 15%</td>
<td>North Jesmond: 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 plus: 39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Gosforth: 11%</td>
<td>Dene: 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others: 11%</td>
<td>Others: 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selborne Gardens to Greystoke Gardens</td>
<td>Male: 36%</td>
<td>Under 40: 15%</td>
<td>0% with an impairment to their mobility</td>
<td>South Jesmond: 64%</td>
<td>Westgate: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 64%</td>
<td>40-59: 39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Gosforth: 18%</td>
<td>South Jesmond: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 plus: 47%</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Jesmond: 9%</td>
<td>Others: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbank Road Bridge &amp; Ouseburn Road</td>
<td>Male: 53%</td>
<td>Under 40: 15%</td>
<td>19% with an impairment to their mobility</td>
<td>South Jesmond: 59%</td>
<td>Westgate: 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 47%</td>
<td>40-59: 51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Jesmond: 22%</td>
<td>South Jesmond: 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 plus: 34%</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Gosforth: 13%</td>
<td>North Jesmond: 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others: 6%</td>
<td>Others: 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborne Road/Holly Avenue/Haldane Terrace</td>
<td>Male: 67%</td>
<td>Under 40: 15%</td>
<td>4% with an impairment to their mobility</td>
<td>North Jesmond: 47%</td>
<td>Westgate: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 33%</td>
<td>40-59: 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Jesmond: 36%</td>
<td>South Jesmond: 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 plus: 34%</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Gosforth: 9%</td>
<td>North Jesmond: 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others: 8%</td>
<td>Others: 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth Road</td>
<td>Male: 58%</td>
<td>Under 40: 25%</td>
<td>3% with an impairment to their mobility</td>
<td>North Jesmond: 57%</td>
<td>Westgate: 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 42%</td>
<td>40-59: 41%</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Jesmond: 18%</td>
<td>Wingrove: 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 plus: 35%</td>
<td></td>
<td>East Gosforth: 11%</td>
<td>North Jesmond: 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others: 14%</td>
<td>Others: 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorfield – High West Jesmond</td>
<td>Male: 60%</td>
<td>Under 40: 20%</td>
<td>8% with an impairment to their mobility</td>
<td>East Gosforth: 79%</td>
<td>Westgate: 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 40%</td>
<td>40-59: 47%</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Jesmond: 9%</td>
<td>East Gosforth: 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 plus: 33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Others: 12%</td>
<td>Others: 23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – Previous Consultation Findings

Streets for People - Jesmond

**Respondents usually travel by**
- **walk**: 36%
- **cycle**: 25%
- **drive**: 12%

**97% say it is difficult to get around**
- Average rating of ease of getting around: 34%

**Things that make it harder to get around**
- **difficult crossing**: 35%
- **speeding**: 31%
- **irresponsible parking**: 24%

**It would be easier to get around if there was**
- **slower traffic**: 40%
- **safer crossings**: 38%
- **less traffic**: 36%
Streets for People - Jesmond

Cyclists say the main issues are:
- Speeding: 39%
- Difficult crossing: 26%
- Irresponsible parking: 26%

Walkers say the main issues are:
- Difficult crossing: 40%
- Irresponsible parking: 24%
- Speeding: 31%

- 64% want segregated cycle lanes
- 53% want safer crossings

Drivers say the main issues are:
- Irresponsible parking: 41%
- Congestion: 41%
- Speeding: 23%

- 40% want responsible parking

All groups agree they want less and slower traffic.
Streets for People - Jesmond

Most people were rational in their use of the feedback form.

70% sent a message about just one problem

Listed streets account for 50% of all issues

Tankerville Terrace
Sandyford Rd
Jesmond Rd
Jesmond Dene Rd
Osborne Rd

55 other streets

36% suggested one idea
22% two ideas
19% three ideas

Speeding

congestion
most popular combinations

Difficult crossing
Irresponsible parking

rat-running
congestion

Osborne Rd
all three issues are very popular here

Difficult crossing
Irresponsible parking