

Respondents 08 – 42: Representations received via email or the Council’s ‘online’ response form.

Respondent No. & Name		Support/Object the modified Marton West Neighbourhood Plan	Identified Policy/Paragraph No.	Received Representation
08	J. Bowen	Support	-	-
09	J. Zigmond	Support	-	-
10	A. Lenaghan	Support	-	-
11	W. Hayes	Support	-	-
12	D. Streets	Support	-	-
13	P. Bainbridge	Support	-	-
14	L. Sutcliffe	Support	-	-
15	E. Chapman	Support	-	-
16	J. Roebuck (Mrs)	Support	Policy MW1 Parks and Green Space	<p>We should maintain our green spaces in light of climate change emergency. Open space also provides positive mental and physical benefits. This is particularly relevant given the current situation with Covid 19. The land south of Newham Hall should be protected to maintain these benefits to local people and the wider community.</p> <p>It is important that the parkland is recognised for its historical significance and is protected for the benefit of current and future generations.</p>
17	J. Roebuck (Mr)	Support	Policy MW1 Parks and Green Spaces	I support the Local Green Space designation of the parkland south of Newham Hall. It is important to retain the green space for its historical associations, value to the local community to support

				<p>positive health and well being and access to open countryside via the footpaths crossing the parkland.</p> <p>Likewise the locally valued landscape and ancient trees add to the character, tranquility and historic significance of the parkland and wider area</p>
18	J. Moses	-	Policies MW1-MW11 & paragraph 48	<p>My comments refer to Marton West draft Neighbourhood Plan - submission July 2020 (PDF) MW1 - MW11 and are fairly general to the Middlesbrough and Marton West area.</p> <p>It is a great shame that the land that belonged to Newham Hall has already been encroached on and that Newham Hall cannot have full protected listed status from English Heritage.</p> <p>All the historic and heritage sites in this area of Middlesbrough are more important for Middlesbrough than ever. It should not just be 'desirable' that they are not developed upon but they should be protected by law and not altered: Middlesbrough has lost a lot of its heritage over the last fifty years to re-development and shouldn't lose anymore.</p> <p>The area north of Gunnergate lane seems not to have a Doctor's surgery or any</p>

				<p>shops but looks quite crowded just looking at the pdf map. This seems to need addressing for sustainability I would imagine.</p> <p>Surely the Ford Horse riding school is good, strong and appropriate amenity which should be kept. Horse riding is a healthy countryside activity healthy for all concerned and useful to help disabled people live better lives. The availability of the nearby countryside for riding suggests the riding school is in the right place near to both housing and countryside.</p> <p>If development at Ford takes place, there will be more problems with travel into Middlesbrough centre both along Marton Road and Brass Castle Lane and along the B1356 and into Acklam Road.</p> <p>In fact the nature of Brass Castle lane would then be expected to change if Ford Riding School is developed. Someone will want to widen Brass Castle Lane, which probably should not be allowed given its historic context and location next to historic sites. Some of the Golf club and Newham Hall lands would most likely be lost if this road were widened. Given the commitment to historic area preservation sites in this area, road widening should not be allowed. Hence, my comment</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>about legal protection for Newham Hall land and the other heritage sites.</p> <p>Backland development should be managed as suggested, if allowed, to prevent shambolic development of structures altering the character of the area. Such development is now happening throughout the Borough due to relaxation of planning law by the government (I think).</p> <p>Again the problem of parking on pathways and grass verges addressed here is common throughout the town and needs proper action to stop it. Making parking space may just reduce pavement space for pedestrians.</p> <p>Some of the built areas look quite well developed if not over-crowded, from the pdf map, with the exception of Eagle Park and De Brus park. Both these sites plus Fairy Dell seem great assets to the lungs of Middlesbrough, not just the West Marton area, for outdoor activities for all groups walkers cyclist etc. and clearly need protecting.</p> <p>However, my major concern about the plan is the use of the word 'desirable' rather than the words 'must be protected at all costs' for historic and heritage sites in paragraph 48 of the MARTON WEST</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				MODIFIED NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN document.
19	R. Hill	Support	-	-
20	S. Jones Bureau of Analysed Samples	Support	-	-
21	B. Dawson	Support	-	-
22	C. Pearson	Support	-	-
23	L. Dowson	Support	-	I fully support the contents of the Marton West Neighbourhood Plan.
24	I. Jones	Support	-	I fully support the contents of the Marton West Neighbourhood plan
25	R. Meeres	Support	-	-
26	J. Penketh	Support	-	-
27	P. Wood-Woolley	Support	-	-
28	A. Walker	Support	-	-
29	M. Walker	Support	-	-
30	C. Flintoft Ridsdale & Co Ltd	Support	-	-
31	D & C. Moore	Support	-	-
32	J. O'Neill	Support	-	-
33	K. Eve	Support	-	Council comment: In the original draft version of this table of respondents, K. Eve was listed as a respondent, however, due to an oversight, the support/objective column did not indicate their preference. We apologise for this

				omission, and are happy to show their support for the modified Plan.
34	F. Bainbridge	Support	-	<p>Council comment: In the original draft version of this table of respondents, F. Bainbridge was listed as a respondent, however, due to an oversight, the support/objective column did not indicate their preference. We apologise for this omission, and are happy to show their support for the modified Plan.</p>
35	J. Fothergill	Support	-	<p>Council comment: In the original draft version of this table of respondents, J. Fothergill was listed as a respondent, along with their below comments, however, due to an oversight, the support/objective column did not indicate their preference. We apologise for this omission, and are happy to show their support for the modified Plan.</p> <p>Respondent comments (as shown in the draft version of this table of respondents): My comments refer to the Eagle Park estate, with a focus on Brass Castle Lane.</p> <p>In terms of highway safety and in terms of encouraging walking rather than car</p>

				<p>use, I believe Brass Castle Lane would benefit from a pedestrian footpath.</p> <p>The development of De Brus Park and Brass Castle Lane Executive homes have resulted in small housing developments which provide no pedestrian footpaths from their estate to access bus stops or amenities. The net result in this is that elderly, children and people without a motor vehicle cannot walk safely to school, bus stops or shops.</p> <p>The area has a chronic lack of amenities. However, the Private Golf Club does have the potential to offer function suites and facilities for people to hire and Brass Castle House has recently emerged, with a small refurb, as at least somewhere to access a coffee.</p> <p>However, these facilities are cut off from Marton West residents unless you travel by car. You can walk safely through Eagle Park, however, when you reach Brass Castle Lane it becomes a death trap for walkers due to the lack of pedestrian infrastructure.</p> <p>In recent months, partly due to the pandemic, many residents are walking around Marton West and Nunthorpe. This mixture of public footpaths and housing developments provides excellent and safe</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>walking routes. The only anomaly is Brass Castle Lane.</p> <p>Ultimately, with large scale housing estates around Brass Castle Lane, developments being built on Brass Castle Lane, the only facilities in the area on Brass Castle Lane, there is a duty of care into making this road more pedestrian friendly.</p>
36	C. Taylor Northumbrian Water		Policy MW8	<p>Generally we support the modifications to the Marton West Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We are pleased to note Policy MW8 specifically aims to reduce surface water run-off from new development sites. We believe it is critical to ensure that development proposals separate, minimise and control surface water run-off, with SUDS being the preferred option. Northumbrian Water actively promotes sustainable surface water management across the region, and we welcome the use of the Hierarchy of Preference contained within Revised Part H of the Building Regulations 2010 when creating a surface water drainage solution.</p>
37	Mr & Mrs Bull	Support	-	In favour and support the modified Plan.

38	Mr & Mrs Southerton	Support		<p>We fully support the principles of the Plan and particularly the alignment of the Plan and Ward boundaries.</p> <p>While the Plan area is already primarily developed we fully support proposals to safeguard areas of public or amenity open space.</p> <p>In this regard it is surprising there is no reference to the importance of the Brass Castle Golf Course. While there is no public access to the site and limited views of the course externally it does contribute significantly to the openness of the southern part of the Plan area. It also provides an important part of the backdrop to the linear public open space along Marton West Beck which has particular amenity value and provides connections between housing areas and connectivity to footpaths accessing land to the south of the Borough. The open area along the beck should be coloured as open space on the plan at page 21. The reference to 'continued' maintenance in the text to policy MW 1 rather stretches a point as this area receives very little attention and proposals to establish a local group to assist and promote maintenance have never come to fruition. It should be given the same status in plan terms as the other areas of open space.</p>
----	---------------------	---------	--	--

				<p>As a minor point renaming the former Sudbury pond as 'Wetlands at West Moor farm' seems clumsy and hardly likely to be adopted by the local community.</p> <p>We believe the main deficiency of the plan is the lack of any significant comments about traffic movements generated by the increased level of housing but also the use of certain highways as 'rat runs' to avoid the peripheral highway network. The two key, interrelated, issues are the use of Brass Castle Lane as a short cut and its junction with the A172/Dixons Bank. The lack of signs on this route prohibiting HGVs (except for access) and the 60mph speed limit make the lane heavily used by speeding traffic. All of this traffic exiting the area at Brass Castle Lane, together with the large volume of vehicles from the housing estates, have to enter Dixons Bank without any signal control. The right turn out of Brass castle Lane requires negotiating two lanes of fast moving north and south bound traffic trying to 'beat the lights' and vehicles in the filter lane on Dixons Bank wishing to turn right. It had originally been proposed to realign Brass Castle Lane to meet Dixons Bank in a signal controlled cross roads. This option has been lost because of the permission allowing housing on the proposed alignment. A</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				signal controlled staggered junction would still be possible and should be a stated aspiration of this plan.
39	S. Wood	Support		I wish to support our Neighbourhood Plan.
40	J. Harrison	Support		I am writing to say that I support the plan.
41	B. Dinsdale	Support	-	<p>Below response submitted 23.11.20:</p> <p>I confirm my support for the modified plan as submitted.</p> <p>I thought that I had responded via the on line system to give my support during the consultation period but am unable to give the precise date of my response. I was surprised when my name was omitted from the consultation statement.</p> <p>Council comment: Once we were notified of the respondent's omission from the list of respondents, an immediate search of our 'online' consultation and email systems, was undertaken, however we could not locate the respondent's original response or that the respondent had received a confirmation message stating that the 'online' response had been successfully submitted. We are however, happy to include the respondent's support for the modified Plan.</p>
42	Cllrs. C. & J Hobson	Support	-	Below response submitted 23.11.20.

	<p>Marton West Ward Councillors</p>			<p>We definitely support this Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Council comment: Once we were notified of the respondents omission from the list of respondents, an immediate search of our 'online' consultation and email systems, was undertaken, however we could not locate the respondents original response. No further information has been received from the respondents, i.e. method of submission or when the response was sent. We are however, happy to include the respondents support for the modified Plan.</p>
--	---	--	--	---

Received total number of online responses, emails and letters: 42.

Total number of respondents (including responses sent jointly): 47