

11th February 2003.

Dear Sir,

**PROPOSED SECOND TYNE ROAD TUNNEL - PUBLIC INQUIRY - PROOF OF EVIDENCE.**

**REFERENCE: TWA/02/APP/03/OBJ/315**

This is my personal Proof of Evidence unconnected with my role in the Tyne Crossings Alliance. My particular concern is parking on pavements which is unacceptable in my opinion now, and must increase if traffic levels increase as must occur if the proposed second Tyne road tunnel is built.

In the 14-year-old estate from which I write, all houses have drives, many have double drives and some houses have double garages. The estate is well provided with visitor parking bays. Nonetheless the roads are lined every night with parked cars most of which are partly parked on the pavements and some of them are wholly so parked. These pavements were designed for people, not vehicles, and they are proportioned to be suitable for pedestrians. Therefore any vehicle parked on the pavement restricts its designed use. The practice is also unsightly and offensive. The practice is dangerous for people with prams, wheelbarrows etc, since these people have to walk in the road while cars occupy the pavement!

The main reason for pavement parking is that traffic density is far in excess of what was planned for in housing developments, even as recently as 14 years ago. Policies which increase car ownership and car use can only exacerbate this problem, and make a mockery of roads planning and residential housing design. Even if it were decided that the present level of car ownership were desirable, this level could not be contained in the urban framework we have without breaking what most believe to be the law, and it cannot in my view be accommodated in any foreseeable framework unless in future three parking bays were provided for every residence. In my view that would be absurd and it would turn our front gardens (when we have them) into a linear parking lot. This prospect is disgusting. In those areas where front gardens are not provided we have the prospect of car parking spaces requiring as much or more area than is devoted to dwellings. This also is absurd. It is grossly unfair to those who do not contribute to the nuisance and it is unsightly to everyone who cares about their visual environment.

If the cars now parked on our pavements were forced to park on the road (as they should be, of course) then many urban streets would clog up now. How much worse would that be if traffic increases even further, as is planned by the tunnel promoters?

On the grounds of increased traffic alone (and you will gather there are many other grounds for objecting to the tunnel proposals) the proposal for a new tunnel is insupportable. The scheme should be rejected in its totality. Measures to reduce the need to travel must always be sought as first priority. However I would support a rail-only tunnel from South Shields to North Shields if the demand for, and benefit from, additional travel could be proven, the expense could be justified, and the project could be shown to be equitable and workable.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Winch.

To:

Ian Stearman,

Programme Officer,

Proposed River Tyne (Tunnels) Order Inquiry  
Demographic Services Division,  
Strategic Support Directive,  
Civic Centre,  
Barrass Bridge,  
Newcastle upon Tyne,  
NE99 2BN