

2021/22 Capital Funding Proforma

1. Introduction

1. What is the name of your local transport authority? *

North Yorkshire County Council

2. Are you completing this proforma for the first time, or are you providing the information for additional schemes? *

- This is my first response
- I have already provided the main proforma return - this is to provide information on additional schemes

2. Funding Amounts

3. How much total capital funding is your authority seeking from the DfT Active Travel Fund for 21/22? *

£1.645m

4. What is the total contribution being provided from the following sources (please enter "0" if no contribution is being provided). *

Contributions from your own local/combined authority

Third party contributions

5. Where relevant, please set out how you intend to use this funding to build on funding being received from other government funding sources (including any capital or revenue funding sources, such as the Transforming Cities Fund, Levelling Up Fund, Getting Building Fund) (enter n/a if this is not applicable). *

Not Applicable

3. Key Bid Requirements

6. As outlined in the bid invitation letter, to be eligible for funding, all bids must be accompanied by a letter from the leader of the authority submitting the bid, confirming long term commitment to delivery of your active travel schemes. Are you able to confirm that this letter will be included with your bid? *

- Yes
 No

7. All schemes must be developed in consultation with local communities, in line with the requirements, attached at [Annex A] to the bid invitation letter. This does not mean that the bid itself needs to be put out to consultation. This is a condition of funding and if not delivered funding may be clawed back. Are you able to confirm your authority's commitment to the consultation requirements outlined at [Annex A]? (NOTE: this is required for all bids) *

- Yes
 No

8. Are you able to confirm that you will give due regard to the needs of protected groups defined by The Equality Act 2010, and your commitment to undertaking an equality impact assessment of the measures outlined in your bid (required for all bids). *

- Yes
 No

9. Please identify below the protected groups who may impacted by the schemes outlined in your bid, and how you intend to consult and implement feedback from these groups. How will you ensure that you have fully assessed the impact of the scheme on protected groups, and that accessibility requirements (throughout the scheme and its surrounding area) will be met? (max 400 words): *

In all cases, the schemes being developed should enhance, not inhibit, people's ability to access travel options and opportunities. This includes people with reduced mobility, people in rural areas and people on a low income. Equalities Impact Assessments will be completed in accordance with legal and guidance criteria for any schemes that progress to delivery. We will develop a consultation plan to identify all stakeholders. We will speak directly with affected groups, such as the local disability forum for each scheme, to ensure that we consider all impacts.

4. Schemes seeking funding in 2021/22

We would now like to know about the schemes you are seeking to deliver using this funding.

A scheme is defined here as a single measure or group of related measures with the same objectives, for example to encourage more cycling/walking trips, reducing traffic flows, and shifting trips away from public transport whilst social distancing is in force. For example, a corridor scheme might be a series of investments along a given route to promote cycling and walking such

as a new segregated cycle lane, junction improvements and new signage. Alternatively, an area-wide scheme might represent a programme of similar investments over a wider geographic area to achieve a given objective; for example, a programme of junction safety improvements to reduce cyclist casualties at collision hotspots.

There is a limit of 15 schemes that can be included in an individual proforma response. If your authority has more than 15 schemes you will need to complete another questionnaire, however there is an option on the first page to ensure you are only required to provide the details of the additional schemes if you have already completed the main body of the proforma.

5. Scheme 1

10. What is the name of the scheme?

Kildwick to Silsden + Airedale

11. How much will the scheme cost?

£900k

12. How much DfT funding is being sought for this scheme? This could include funding for scheme development, feasibility, design, consultation, construction and monitoring and evaluation.

£900k

13. Please provide a description of the scheme, including details of its location. (e.g. postcode and street/road name) (max 200 words) *

This proposal will deliver improvements to a 3km stretch of towpath between Kildwick in the district of Craven and Silsden, in the District of Bradford. This cross-boundary route will be delivered by the Canal & River Trust, in close working with Bradford Metropolitan District Council, West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA), Craven District Council and NYCC. NYCC is seeking funding to deliver the 2km stretch of the towpath that lies within the North Yorkshire boundary. The 3km stretch of towpath for improvement starts at Bridge 187 (Warehouse Swing Bridge in Kildwick) and extends to Bridge 191A (Silsden Bridge). This scheme is a fully designed, shovel ready scheme, that the aforementioned partners support to realise a long-term ambition to enhance cross-boundary travel via active modes.

In addition to the towpath improvements, we will deliver improvements that will support better access to the canal near Kildwick through provision of ramped access onto the canal at Cononley Lane End / A629, which will provide improved connectivity to both the village of Cononley itself and to the railway station, providing access to both West Yorkshire and Skipton. Additionally we will carry out widening of the pedestrian underpass under the A629 roundabout in Cross Hills.

14. What types of scheme are to be delivered, and how many of each scheme will be delivered? Please refer to the requirements in the list below to ensure that the correct totals are provided. Please enter "0" if a scheme type will not be delivered. *

New on-road segregated cycleway (permanent) (answer with miles to be constructed)

0

New on-road segregated cycleway (trial temporary) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New off-road cycleway (e.g. greenway, canal towpath) (answer with miles to be constructed)	1.3
New permanent footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New trial temporary footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Widening existing footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Installing segregation to make an existing cycle route safer (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Bus priority corridor measures (e.g. bus lanes, bus only streets) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Bus priority measures at single locations (e.g. bus gates) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Park and cycle/stride facilities (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Provision of secure cycle parking facilities (answer with number to be constructed)	0
New road crossings (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Upgrades to existing facilities (e.g. surfacing, signage, signals) (answer with number to be constructed)	4
Restriction or reduction of parking availability (e.g. number of bays closed or increased fees) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Low Traffic Neighbourhood / selective road closures (e.g. using planters, cones or similar) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Traffic calming (e.g. lane closures, reducing speed limits) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
School streets (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Other (please specify below)	

Other:

15. Are there any aspects of this scheme that does not comply with DfT Cycling Design Standards? If so, please set them out below (max 200 words). Note that to be eligible for funding, all schemes must be delivered in compliance with the Cycling Design Standards set out in LTN 1/20. *

The scheme was designed considering LTN 1/20. Whilst towpath improvements cannot always be delivered to LTN 1/20 standard, it is recognized within LTN 1/20 that canal paths can be an exception to the design standards, as it will be delivering improvements to a valuable walking and cycling asset. The design of ramped access onto the canal at Cononley Lane End / A629, and the widening of the pedestrian underpass under the A629 roundabout in

Cross Hills will be designed to LTN 1/20 standard.

16. Has this scheme been prioritised through a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), or equivalent? *

- Scheme prioritised via LCWIP
- Scheme prioritised through equivalent local network plan
- Scheme not supported by LCWIP or equivalent

17. If the scheme has been prioritised, please name the relevant plan and provide a weblink if the document is available online. If the scheme is not supported by an LCWIP or equivalent, please answer "n/a" in the box below. *

<https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/Transport%20and%20streets/funding/LCWIP/Skipton%20LCWIP.pdf>

18. If you have a LCWIP or equivalent network plan, please provide a description of how this is integrated into your authority's local transport and other wider plans, e.g. for local development, public health, carbon reduction and economic development. (Max 200 words) *

NYCC's Local Transport Plan (LTP4) (2016-2045) covers the local transport strategy, objectives, transport improvements and policies adopted by NYCC. LTP4 states that NYCC will promote sustainable travel and encourage travel to work by active modes, rail and car sharing. It also highlights that, where possible, NYCC will provide additional infrastructure to support sustainable travel. NYCC will also seek to ensure that facilities to encourage healthier travel choices are included within new developments.

York & North Yorkshire LEP Strategic Economic Plan identifies connected and resilient places as a priority. A core part of this relates to ensuring that places are accessible and connected, with improved transport connectivity within towns and cities. Key outputs of this priority include: more accessible employment; Reduced congestion; and Reduced transport emissions.

NYCC's local planning authorities have adopted planning policies along with a Local Plan to address long-term housing and business need. These strategic development locations are considered as part of the LCWIP process, and form part of the criteria for network planning and route selection. Local policies reflect the need for sustainable transport and connectivity and the LCWIPs align with these objectives. Additionally LCWIPs are used by NYCC's Development Management team to inform the planning process.

19. What is the expected start date for construction? *

03/01/2022

20. What is the expected date the scheme will be open for public use (dd/mm/yy). Note that all schemes are expected to be completed by 31 March 2023 *

15/05/2022

21. What is the current status of this scheme? *

Business Case

22. What is the consultation status of this scheme? *

Consultation in progress

23. If this scheme has been appraised using AMAT, please provide the following information: (Note that all schemes costing £2 million or more must have an appraisal using AMAT) If this scheme has not been appraised using AMAT, please enter "n/a" into the answer boxes below. *

Estimated Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) N/A

Value for Money category or range N/A

24. Please set out your justification or rationale for the value for money assessment of this scheme. (Max 300 words) For those schemes appraised using AMAT, please provide the justification for the value for money category or range given. For all other schemes, please provide a justification that costs seem reasonable by comparison with cost benchmarks (please refer to cost benchmark data available in Appendix 6 of the CWIS model Technical reports and in the 'Typical Cost of Cycling Interventions' report for guidance). *

It is felt that the schemes taken forward for the bid not only meet the criteria of the Fund but represent value for money. We have used cost-benchmarking appraisals against similar schemes to ensure that the scheme costs are reasonable.

We also have the option to procure construction works directly through NY Highways as an alternative option to the tender process should that prove necessary.

Improved Safety

The proposed infrastructure will provide active travel facilities for pedestrians and cyclists; removing conflict between the two user groups and reducing conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles by providing off-road routes and improved crossing points.

Improved health

By encouraging journeys by walking and cycling, there are positive implications for the health of the residents who walk and cycle more. This project will link to new and existing infrastructure to provide residents with an opportunity to begin to walk and cycle or increase the amount of journeys made by active modes which will in turn benefit their own health and if switching from private cars will reduce the amount of pollution.

When compared against previous years spend the costs presented in this bid are comparable.

25. If this scheme will cost £2m or more, please outline briefly your approach to monitoring and evaluation of this scheme, using the monitoring and evaluation guidance provided. (If this scheme is expected to cost over £2m, please state "not applicable")

Not applicable

26. Do you have any further schemes to add to your submission? *

Yes

No

You can then provide information for up to 15 schemes in a single proforma. If you have

more than 15 schemes, you will need to complete a further proforma (albeit without the need to complete all of the standard proforma questions again).

5. Scheme 2

27. What is the name of the scheme?

Ripon West sustainable travel corridors

28. How much will the scheme cost?

£550k

29. How much DfT funding is being sought for this scheme? This could include funding for scheme development, feasibility, design, consultation, construction and monitoring and evaluation.

£550k

30. Please provide a description of the scheme, including details of its location. (e.g. postcode and street/road name) (max 200 words) *

We will deliver improvements that reduce design speeds to encourage trips by active modes in the Kirby Road area of Ripon. The scheme will have access benefits for four schools, the town centre and residential areas. Measures include footway-widening, crossing facilities, traffic calming measures and introduction of a one way system for vehicles in the area of Kirby Road, College Road and Trinity Lane. Ripon has a designated AQMA and provision of improved active travel infrastructure will result in a reduction in the number of vehicles travelling through this area.

The majority of residents live and work in Ripon and the primary mode, used for commuter trips made by residents, is private car or van (68%) with 16% travelling to work on foot and 2% by bicycle. Additionally, 31% of trips to work by residents are less than 5km and 43% are less than 10km, indicating there is potential for further growth by making cycling to work viable and attractive for more people.

The proposals build on sustainability and accessibility measures which will be delivered by a live planning application on an allocated site. If approved a further 1300 homes, a school and employment space will be delivered

31. What types of scheme are to be delivered, and how many of each scheme will be delivered? Please refer to the requirements in the list below to ensure that the correct totals are provided. Please enter "0" if a scheme type will not be delivered. *

New on-road segregated cycleway (permanent) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New on-road segregated cycleway (trial temporary) (answer with miles to be constructed)	<u>0</u>
New off-road cycleway (e.g. greenway, canal towpath) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New permanent footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0.11
New trial temporary footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0

Widening existing footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0.136
Installing segregation to make an existing cycle route safer (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Bus priority corridor measures (e.g. bus lanes, bus only streets) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Bus priority measures at single locations (e.g. bus gates) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Park and cycle/stride facilities (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Provision of secure cycle parking facilities (answer with number to be constructed)	0
New road crossings (answer with number to be constructed)	5
Upgrades to existing facilities (e.g. surfacing, signage, signals) (answer with number to be constructed)	1
Restriction or reduction of parking availability (e.g. number of bays closed or increased fees) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Low Traffic Neighbourhood / selective road closures (e.g. using planters, cones or similar) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Traffic calming (e.g. lane closures, reducing speed limits) (answer with number to be constructed)	6
School streets (answer with number to be constructed)	0

Other (please specify below)

Other:

School Streets are under review at NYCC; there is a desire to deliver them and previously we identified a location within our Ripon West Corridor scheme that would be subject to a pilot that could be used to inform policy development. We are moving toward getting this through our internal governance process to get approval to trial.

32. Are there any aspects of this scheme that does not comply with DfT Cycling Design Standards? If so, please set them out below (max 200 words). Note that to be eligible for funding, all schemes must be delivered in compliance with the Cycling Design Standards set out in LTN 1/20. *

The schemes will be LTN 1/20 compliant providing a zone where highways have a design speed of 20mph or less. This will create an environment where movement is subservient to place and residents feel safe and encouraged to walk & cycle for short journeys.

33. Has this scheme been prioritised through a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), or equivalent? *

- Scheme prioritised via LCWIP
- Scheme prioritised through equivalent local network plan
- Scheme not supported by LCWIP or equivalent

34. If the scheme has been prioritised, please name the relevant plan and provide a weblink if the document is available online. If the scheme is not supported by an LCWIP or equivalent, please answer "n/a" in the box below. *

N/A

35. If you have a LCWIP or equivalent network plan, please provide a description of how this is integrated into your authority's local transport and other wider plans, e.g. for local development, public health, carbon reduction and economic development. (Max 200 words) *

36. What is the expected start date for construction? *

01/07/2022

37. What is the expected date the scheme will be open for public use (dd/mm/yy). Note that all schemes are expected to be completed by 31 March 2023 *

03/01/2023

38. What is the current status of this scheme? *

Design

39. What is the consultation status of this scheme? *

Yet to start consultation

40. If this scheme has been appraised using AMAT, please provide the following information: (Note that all schemes costing £2 million or more must have an appraisal using AMAT) If this scheme has not been appraised using AMAT, please enter "n/a" into the answer boxes below. *

Estimated Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) N/A

Value for Money category or range N/A

41. Please set out your justification or rationale for the value for money assessment of this scheme. (Max 300 words) For those schemes appraised using AMAT, please provide the justification for the value for money category or range given. For all other schemes, please provide a justification that costs seem reasonable by comparison with cost benchmarks (please refer to cost benchmark data available in Appendix 6 of the CWIS model Technical reports and in the 'Typical Cost of Cycling Interventions' report for guidance). *

It is felt that the schemes taken forward for the bid not only meet the criteria of the Fund but represent value for money. We have used cost-benchmarking appraisals against similar schemes to ensure that the scheme costs are reasonable.

We also have the option to procure construction works directly through NY Highways as an alternative option to the tender process should that prove necessary.

Improved Safety

The proposed infrastructure will provide active travel facilities for pedestrians and cyclists; removing conflict between the two user groups and reducing conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles by providing off-road routes and improved crossing points.

Improved health

By encouraging journeys by walking and cycling, there are positive implications for the health of the residents who walk and cycle more. This project will link to new and existing infrastructure to provide residents with an opportunity to begin to walk and cycle or increase the amount of journeys made by active modes which will in turn benefit their own health and if switching from private cars will reduce the amount of pollution.

When compared against previous years spend the costs presented in this bid are comparable.

42. If this scheme will cost £2m or more, please outline briefly your approach to monitoring and evaluation of this scheme, using the monitoring and evaluation guidance provided. (If this scheme is expected to cost over £2m, please state "not applicable")

Not applicable

43. Do you have any further schemes to add to your submission? *

Yes

No

You can then provide information for up to 15 schemes in a single proforma. If you have more than 15 schemes, you will need to complete a further proforma (albeit without the need to complete all of the standard proforma questions again).

5. Scheme 3

44. What is the name of the scheme?

Helmsley Marketplace to Kirkbymoorside

45. How much will the scheme cost?

£50k

46. How much DfT funding is being sought for this scheme? This could include funding for scheme development, feasibility, design, consultation, construction and monitoring and evaluation.

£50k

47. Please provide a description of the scheme, including details of its location. (e.g. postcode and street/road name) (max 200 words) *

We will undertake feasibility work for a fully segregated foot/cycleway (approximately 9km long) between Helmsley and Kirkbymoorside along the A170 to enhance access to employment and services for residents, tourists and commuters. The route has been campaigned for by local stakeholders, including the Ryedale Cycle Forum and the Helmsley Town Council, with an ambition to eventually link Helmsley with Malton via Pickering.

The lack of services e.g. a major supermarket in both locations means that people often travel to Pickering by car. Helmsley and Kirkbymoorside suffer high levels of car ownership with 86% and 83% respectively, this is higher than the average for England (74%). Additionally, 39% of people in Helmsley and 41% of people in Kirkbymoorside travel to work in a car or van with 12% and 13%, respectively, of people travelling to work on foot and 1.2% and 1.5%, respectively, cycling to work.

With developments in the planning stages, if delivered, more people will come to the area with no safe access to key services via active modes.

48. What types of scheme are to be delivered, and how many of each scheme will be delivered? Please refer to the requirements in the list below to ensure that the correct totals are provided. Please enter "0" if a scheme type will not be delivered. *

New on-road segregated cycleway (permanent) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New on-road segregated cycleway (trial temporary) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New off-road cycleway (e.g. greenway, canal towpath) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New permanent footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New trial temporary footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Widening existing footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0

Installing segregation to make an existing cycle route safer (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Bus priority corridor measures (e.g. bus lanes, bus only streets) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Bus priority measures at single locations (e.g. bus gates) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Park and cycle/stride facilities (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Provision of secure cycle parking facilities (answer with number to be constructed)	0
New road crossings (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Upgrades to existing facilities (e.g. surfacing, signage, signals) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Restriction or reduction of parking availability (e.g. number of bays closed or increased fees) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Low Traffic Neighbourhood / selective road closures (e.g. using planters, cones or similar) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Traffic calming (e.g. lane closures, reducing speed limits) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
School streets (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Other (please specify below)	

Other:

49. Are there any aspects of this scheme that does not comply with DfT Cycling Design Standards? If so, please set them out below (max 200 words). Note that to be eligible for funding, all schemes must be delivered in compliance with the Cycling Design Standards set out in LTN 1/20. *

This feasibility study will include designs that meet LTN 1/20 standard

50. Has this scheme been prioritised through a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), or equivalent? *

- Scheme prioritised via LCWIP
- Scheme prioritised through equivalent local network plan
- Scheme not supported by LCWIP or equivalent**

51. If the scheme has been prioritised, please name the relevant plan and provide a weblink if the document is available online. If the scheme is not supported by an LCWIP or equivalent, please answer "n/a" in the box below. *

N/A

52. If you have a LCWIP or equivalent network plan, please provide a description of how this is integrated into your authority's local transport and other wider plans, e.g. for local development, public health, carbon reduction and economic development. (Max 200 words) *

NYCC's Local Transport Plan (LTP4) (2016-2045) covers the local transport strategy, objectives, transport improvements and policies adopted by NYCC. LTP4 states that NYCC will promote sustainable travel and encourage travel to work by active modes, rail and car sharing. It also highlights that, where possible, NYCC will provide additional infrastructure to support sustainable travel. NYCC will also seek to ensure that facilities to encourage healthier travel choices are included within new developments.

York & North Yorkshire LEP Strategic Economic Plan identifies connected and resilient places as a priority. A core part of this relates to ensuring that places are accessible and connected, with improved transport connectivity within towns and cities. Key outputs of this priority include: more accessible employment; Reduced congestion; and Reduced transport emissions.

NYCC's local planning authorities have adopted planning policies along with a Local Plan to address long-term housing and business need. These strategic development locations are considered as part of the LCWIP process, and form part of the criteria for network planning and route selection. Local policies reflect the need for sustainable transport and connectivity and the LCWIPs align with these objectives. Additionally LCWIPs are used by NYCC's Development Management team to inform the planning process.

53. What is the expected start date for construction? *

01/12/2021

54. What is the expected date the scheme will be open for public use (dd/mm/yy). Note that all schemes are expected to be completed by 31 March 2023 *

30/06/2022

55. What is the current status of this scheme? *

Initiation

56. What is the consultation status of this scheme? *

Yet to start consultation

57. If this scheme has been appraised using AMAT, please provide the following information: (Note that all schemes costing £2 million or more must have an appraisal using AMAT) If this scheme has not been appraised using AMAT, please enter "n/a" into the answer boxes below. *

Estimated Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) N/A

Value for Money category or range N/A

58. Please set out your justification or rationale for the value for money assessment of this scheme. (Max 300 words) For those schemes appraised using AMAT, please provide the justification for the value for money category or range given. For all other schemes, please provide a justification that costs seem reasonable by comparison with cost benchmarks (please refer to cost benchmark data available in Appendix 6 of the CWIS model Technical reports and in the 'Typical Cost of Cycling Interventions' report for guidance). *

It is felt that the schemes taken forward for the bid not only meet the criteria of the Fund but represent value for money. We have used cost-benchmarking appraisals against similar schemes to ensure that the scheme costs are reasonable.

We also have the option to procure construction works directly through NY Highways as an alternative option to the tender process should that prove necessary.

Improved Safety

The proposed infrastructure will provide active travel facilities for pedestrians and cyclists; removing conflict between the two user groups and reducing conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles by providing off-road routes and improved crossing points.

Improved health

By encouraging journeys by walking and cycling, there are positive implications for the health of the residents who walk and cycle more. This project will link to new and existing infrastructure to provide residents with an opportunity to begin to walk and cycle or increase the amount of journeys made by active modes which will in turn benefit their own health and if switching from private cars will reduce the amount of pollution.

When compared against previous years spend the costs presented in this bid are comparable.

59. If this scheme will cost £2m or more, please outline briefly your approach to monitoring and evaluation of this scheme, using the monitoring and evaluation guidance provided. (If this scheme is expected to cost over £2m, please state "not applicable")

Not applicable

60. Do you have any further schemes to add to your submission? *

- Yes
- No

You can then provide information for up to 15 schemes in a single proforma. If you have more than 15 schemes, you will need to complete a further proforma (albeit without the need to complete all of the standard proforma questions again).

5. Scheme 4

61. What is the name of the scheme?

Knarborough to Flaxby Green Park Industrial Site

62. How much will the scheme cost?

£50k

63. How much DfT funding is being sought for this scheme? This could include funding for scheme development, feasibility, design, consultation, construction and monitoring and evaluation.

£50k

64. Please provide a description of the scheme, including details of its location. (e.g. postcode and street/road name) (max 200 words) *

We will undertake feasibility work for a fully segregated foot/cycleway (approximately 7km long) between Knarborough rail station and Flaxby Green Park, close to junction 47 on the A1, alongside the rail line, to provide access to key employment and residential sites along the route. With relatively similar levels of car ownership (79%) to the England average of 74%, the majority of residents live and work in the same area and our data shows that the primary mode, used for commuter trips made by Harrogate and Knarborough residents, is private car or van (67% of work-based trips from within Harrogate and Knarborough are made using this mode). There are also two AQMA's along the corridor.

Planned and proposed developments will see delivery of more than 5000 homes, more than 610,000 sq ft of B1 office space and there are proposals for an eco-park hosting 400 eco-lodges, a 30-bed hotel, swimming pool and spa, sports facilities, shops and pub/restaurant. The proposed corridor therefore will remove traffic from two AQMA's, reduce the volume of internal trips required and provide access to employment and key services via active mode. This route also links to wider plans to deliver a cohesive route to York. A section of this route is identified in the network map developed for the Harrogate Cycle Improvement Plan (HCIP). This route was identified as a priority route through the A59 multimodal study.

65. What types of scheme are to be delivered, and how many of each scheme will be delivered? Please refer to the requirements in the list below to ensure that the correct totals are provided. Please enter "0" if a scheme type will not be delivered. *

New on-road segregated cycleway (permanent) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New on-road segregated cycleway (trial temporary) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New off-road cycleway (e.g. greenway, canal towpath) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New permanent footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New trial temporary footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0

Widening existing footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Installing segregation to make an existing cycle route safer (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Bus priority corridor measures (e.g. bus lanes, bus only streets) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Bus priority measures at single locations (e.g. bus gates) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Park and cycle/stride facilities (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Provision of secure cycle parking facilities (answer with number to be constructed)	0
New road crossings (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Upgrades to existing facilities (e.g. surfacing, signage, signals) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Restriction or reduction of parking availability (e.g. number of bays closed or increased fees) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Low Traffic Neighbourhood / selective road closures (e.g. using planters, cones or similar) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Traffic calming (e.g. lane closures, reducing speed limits) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
School streets (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Other (please specify below)	

Other:

66. Are there any aspects of this scheme that does not comply with DfT Cycling Design Standards? If so, please set them out below (max 200 words). Note that to be eligible for funding, all schemes must be delivered in compliance with the Cycling Design Standards set out in LTN 1/20. *

This feasibility study will include designs that meet LTN 1/20 standard

67. Has this scheme been prioritised through a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), or equivalent? *

- Scheme prioritised via LCWIP**
- Scheme prioritised through equivalent local network plan
- Scheme not supported by LCWIP or equivalent

68. If the scheme has been prioritised, please name the relevant plan and provide a weblink if the document is available online. If the scheme is not supported by an LCWIP or equivalent, please answer "n/a" in the box below. *

<https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/Transport%20and%20streets/f>

69. If you have a LCWIP or equivalent network plan, please provide a description of how this is integrated into your authority's local transport and other wider plans, e.g. for local development, public health, carbon reduction and economic development. (Max 200 words) *

NYCC's Local Transport Plan (LTP4) (2016-2045) covers the local transport strategy, objectives, transport improvements and policies adopted by NYCC. LTP4 states that NYCC will promote sustainable travel and encourage travel to work by active modes, rail and car sharing. It also highlights that, where possible, NYCC will provide additional infrastructure to support sustainable travel. NYCC will also seek to ensure that facilities to encourage healthier travel choices are included within new developments.

York & North Yorkshire LEP Strategic Economic Plan identifies connected and resilient places as a priority. A core part of this relates to ensuring that places are accessible and connected, with improved transport connectivity within towns and cities. Key outputs of this priority include: more accessible employment; Reduced congestion; and Reduced transport emissions.

NYCC's local planning authorities have adopted planning policies along with a Local Plan to address long-term housing and business need. These strategic development locations are considered as part of the LCWIP process, and form part of the criteria for network planning and route selection. Local policies reflect the need for sustainable transport and connectivity and the LCWIPs align with these objectives. Additionally LCWIPs are used by NYCC's Development Management team to inform the planning process.

70. What is the expected start date for construction? *

01/12/2021

71. What is the expected date the scheme will be open for public use (dd/mm/yy). Note that all schemes are expected to be completed by 31 March 2023 *

30/06/2022

72. What is the current status of this scheme? *

Initiation

73. What is the consultation status of this scheme? *

Yet to start consultation

74. If this scheme has been appraised using AMAT, please provide the following information: (Note that all schemes costing £2 million or more must have an appraisal using AMAT) If this scheme has not been appraised using AMAT, please enter "n/a" into the answer boxes below. *

Estimated Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) N/A

Value for Money category or range N/A

75. Please set out your justification or rationale for the value for money assessment of this scheme. (Max 300 words) For those schemes appraised using AMAT, please provide the justification for the value for money category or range given. For all other schemes, please provide a justification that costs seem reasonable by comparison with cost

benchmarks (please refer to cost benchmark data available in Appendix 6 of the CWIS model Technical reports and in the 'Typical Cost of Cycling Interventions' report for guidance). *

It is felt that the schemes taken forward for the bid not only meet the criteria of the Fund but represent value for money. We have used cost-benchmarking appraisals against similar schemes to ensure that the scheme costs are reasonable.

We also have the option to procure construction works directly through NY Highways as an alternative option to the tender process should that prove necessary.

Improved Safety

The proposed infrastructure will provide active travel facilities for pedestrians and cyclists; removing conflict between the two user groups and reducing conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles by providing off-road routes and improved crossing points.

Improved health

By encouraging journeys by walking and cycling, there are positive implications for the health of the residents who walk and cycle more. This project will link to new and existing infrastructure to provide residents with an opportunity to begin to walk and cycle or increase the amount of journeys made by active modes which will in turn benefit their own health and if switching from private cars will reduce the amount of pollution.

When compared against previous years spend the costs presented in this bid are comparable.

76. If this scheme will cost £2m or more, please outline briefly your approach to monitoring and evaluation of this scheme, using the monitoring and evaluation guidance provided. (If this scheme is expected to cost over £2m, please state "not applicable")

Not applicable

77. Do you have any further schemes to add to your submission? *

- Yes
- No

You can then provide information for up to 15 schemes in a single proforma. If you have more than 15 schemes, you will need to complete a further proforma (albeit without the need to complete all of the standard proforma questions again).

5. Scheme 5

78. What is the name of the scheme?

Brayton to Selby

79. How much will the scheme cost?

£95k

80. How much DfT funding is being sought for this scheme? This could include funding for scheme development, feasibility, design, consultation, construction and monitoring and evaluation.

£95k

81. Please provide a description of the scheme, including details of its location. (e.g. postcode and street/road name) (max 200 words) *

Brayton to Selby Corridor was included in the Phase 2 Selby LCWIP to the outline design stage. We will develop this work to detailed design stage. The corridor features a direct radial route connecting Brayton to both Selby town centre and the rail station. The route encompasses prestige and primary walking/cycling routes (as defined in the Selby LCWIP) and the central location of the corridor means many trips will either end within or make use of any associated interventions. This corridor connects potential growth sites and links existing key employers and education facilities, a hospital and shopping destinations as well as the rail and bus stations, maximizing permeability into the town centre, whilst aligning with district aspirations. This scheme directly links to the existing Transforming Cities Fund project and will encourage new trips from a new residential development

82. What types of scheme are to be delivered, and how many of each scheme will be delivered? Please refer to the requirements in the list below to ensure that the correct totals are provided. Please enter "0" if a scheme type will not be delivered. *

New on-road segregated cycleway (permanent) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New on-road segregated cycleway (trial temporary) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New off-road cycleway (e.g. greenway, canal towpath) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New permanent footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
New trial temporary footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Widening existing footway (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Installing segregation to make an existing cycle route safer (answer with miles to be constructed)	0

Bus priority corridor measures (e.g. bus lanes, bus only streets) (answer with miles to be constructed)	0
Bus priority measures at single locations (e.g. bus gates) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Park and cycle/stride facilities (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Provision of secure cycle parking facilities (answer with number to be constructed)	0
New road crossings (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Upgrades to existing facilities (e.g. surfacing, signage, signals) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Restriction or reduction of parking availability (e.g. number of bays closed or increased fees) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Low Traffic Neighbourhood / selective road closures (e.g. using planters, cones or similar) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Traffic calming (e.g. lane closures, reducing speed limits) (answer with number to be constructed)	0
School streets (answer with number to be constructed)	0
Other (please specify below)	

Other:

83. Are there any aspects of this scheme that does not comply with DfT Cycling Design Standards? If so, please set them out below (max 200 words). Note that to be eligible for funding, all schemes must be delivered in compliance with the Cycling Design Standards set out in LTN 1/20. *

This feasibility study will include designs that meet LTN 1/20 standard

84. Has this scheme been prioritised through a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), or equivalent? *

- Scheme prioritised via LCWIP**
- Scheme prioritised through equivalent local network plan
- Scheme not supported by LCWIP or equivalent

85. If the scheme has been prioritised, please name the relevant plan and provide a weblink if the document is available online. If the scheme is not supported by an LCWIP or equivalent, please answer "n/a" in the box below. *

<https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/Transport and streets/funding/LCWIP/Selby LCWIP.pdf>

86. If you have a LCWIP or equivalent network plan, please provide a description of how this is integrated into your authority's local transport and other wider plans, e.g. for local development, public health, carbon reduction and economic development. (Max 200 words) *

NYCC's Local Transport Plan (LTP4) (2016-2045) covers the local transport strategy, objectives, transport improvements and policies adopted by NYCC. LTP4 states that NYCC will promote sustainable travel and encourage travel to work by active modes, rail and car sharing. It also highlights that, where possible, NYCC will provide additional infrastructure to support sustainable travel. NYCC will also seek to ensure that facilities to encourage healthier travel choices are included within new developments.

York & North Yorkshire LEP Strategic Economic Plan identifies connected and resilient places as a priority. A core part of this relates to ensuring that places are accessible and connected, with improved transport connectivity within towns and cities. Key outputs of this priority include: more accessible employment; Reduced congestion; and Reduced transport emissions.

NYCC's local planning authorities have adopted planning policies along with a Local Plan to address long-term housing and business need. These strategic development locations are considered as part of the LCWIP process, and form part of the criteria for network planning and route selection. Local policies reflect the need for sustainable transport and connectivity and the LCWIPs align with these objectives. Additionally LCWIPs are used by NYCC's Development Management team to inform the planning process.

87. What is the expected start date for construction? *

01/12/2021

88. What is the expected date the scheme will be open for public use (dd/mm/yy). Note that all schemes are expected to be completed by 31 March 2023 *

30/06/2022

89. What is the current status of this scheme? *

Outline Design

90. What is the consultation status of this scheme? *

Consultated as part of an LCWIP

91. If this scheme has been appraised using AMAT, please provide the following information: (Note that all schemes costing £2 million or more must have an appraisal using AMAT) If this scheme has not been appraised using AMAT, please enter "n/a" into the answer boxes below. *

Estimated Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) N/A

Value for Money category or range N/A

92. Please set out your justification or rationale for the value for money assessment of this scheme. (Max 300 words) For those schemes appraised using AMAT, please provide the justification for the value for money category or range given. For all other schemes, please provide a justification that costs seem reasonable by comparison with cost benchmarks (please refer to cost benchmark data available in Appendix 6 of the CWIS model Technical reports and in the 'Typical Cost of Cycling Interventions' report for guidance). *

It is felt that the schemes taken forward for the bid not only meet the criteria of the Fund but represent value for money. We have used cost-benchmarking appraisals against similar schemes to ensure that the scheme costs are reasonable.

We also have the option to procure construction works directly through NY Highways as an alternative option to the tender process should that prove necessary.

Improved Safety

The proposed infrastructure will provide active travel facilities for pedestrians and cyclists; removing conflict between the two user groups and reducing conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles by providing off-road routes and improved crossing points.

Improved health

By encouraging journeys by walking and cycling, there are positive implications for the health of the residents who walk and cycle more. This project will link to new and existing infrastructure to provide residents with an opportunity to begin to walk and cycle or increase the amount of journeys made by active modes which will in turn benefit their own health and if switching from private cars will reduce the amount of pollution.

When compared against previous years spend the costs presented in this bid are comparable.

93. If this scheme will cost £2m or more, please outline briefly your approach to monitoring and evaluation of this scheme, using the monitoring and evaluation guidance provided. (If this scheme is expected to cost over £2m, please state "not applicable")

Not applicable

94. Do you have any further schemes to add to your submission? *

- Yes
- No

You can then provide information for up to 15 schemes in a single proforma. If you have more than 15 schemes, you will need to complete a further proforma (albeit without the need to complete all of the standard proforma questions again).

20. Value for Money and Monitoring & Evaluation

264. Are you able to confirm that your Section 151 officer has confirmed in writing that the proposed spending is expected to deliver value for money? Note that you may be required to provide this confirmation to the DfT for audit purposes. *

- Yes
- No

265. Please provide an estimate of the costs associated with monitoring and evaluation. *

£50k

266. Please provide an estimate of the costs associated with consultation and opinion surveys. *

£50k

267. Please set out your proposed approach to monitoring and evaluation of your proposed schemes, beyond the scheme-specific activities you have already described for any scheme costing £2m or more. (Max 500 words) *

For Kildwick to Silsden route we will use current cycle counts to compare with cycle counts conducted 3 and 6 months after construction. This will give an idea of the uplift in pedestrians and cyclists due to the new infrastructure we can then evaluate this against the forecast uplifts. We will share cycle count information with the partners to demonstrate usage of the full route.

For Ripon NYCC will conduct school mode shift surveys 3 and 6 months after construction. AQMA Monitoring on a quarterly basis (information to be received from Harrogate Borough Council who are responsible for monitoring the AQMA), and install cycle and traffic counters to understand current flows, to be reviewed 3 and 6 months after construction. Link in to monitoring undertaken through the travel plan for the proposed development at the Barracks.

For all schemes the delivery of the projects will be managed through the County Council's long established Highways North Yorkshire governance structure which has a long track record of successful delivery of work programmes of approximately £50m per year. A Project Manager from each relevant local area highway office will be appointed and will coordinate the various elements of each of the project/s, they are responsible for to ensure a local focus which will be overseen, led and supported by the Project Sponsor, and the senior Highways and Transportation Management Team within the and the Business and Environment Services Directorate of the County Council. The Project Sponsor and Project Managers will constitute the nucleus of the project team which will be able to call on the various specialisms across the H&T service unit and beyond. The team will liaise with various consultation groups including local Councillors, borough, district, town and parish councils, cycling forums and groups, travel awareness, road safety, and public health bodies and, where necessary, will programme and monitor design work conducted by NYCC partner consultants and following this the construction of the scheme by the appointed contractor. The Project Sponsor will report regularly, on behalf of the project team, to the Business and Environmental Service Executive Members meetings, chaired by the Senior Responsible Owner, the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services where the key decisions for the project will be made.

21. LCWIP Information 1

This section is designed for you to provide DfT with your authority's latest scheme pipelines. The information you provide will assist the Department in making the case for future rounds of funding, as well as improving our monitoring of future schemes across multiple funding streams.

Bids that provide more comprehensive information in this section will be viewed more favourably.

268. Please complete the table below, highlighting your pipeline of schemes to be delivered across all funding streams, over the next 1 year (2021-22), 4 (years from Apr 2022 – Mar 25) and 10 years (from Apr 2025 - Mar 2031) (use column 5 to indicate the delivery timescale). Please leave rows blank if you have less than 15 schemes, while ensuring that all columns are populated for your proposed schemes.

	Scheme name and location	Scheme type	No. of units (scheme length, area covered, no of cycle racks etc)	Total cost	Delivery timescale (1,4,10 years)	Prioritised in LCWIP (y/n)	Anticipated funding source(s)
Scheme	Kildwick to Silsden + Airedale (Craven)	Cycling and Walking	2km (for NY towpath)	£900k	1	Y (Airedale links part of priority route, towpath identified as strategic route)	ATF 3
Scheme	Ripon West Sustainable Travel Corridors	Cycling and Walking	Area covering west of Ripon	£550k	1	LCWIP in preparation	ATF 3
Scheme	A59 (Maple Close, Harrogate to Knaresborough)	Cycling and Walking	1.2km	£250k	1	Y	ATF 2
Scheme	Victoria Avenue, Harrogate	Cycling and Walking	0.1km	£250k	1	Y	ATF 2
Scheme	Guisborough Road (Whitby)	Cycling and Walking	1km	£250k	1	N	ATF 2
Scheme	Cinder Track Connections (Scarborough)	Walking and Cycling	TBC through FBC Process	£3.09m	1	Y	Towns Fund
Scheme	Harrogate TCF	Walking and Cycling	1km cycling, public realm improvements	£10.9m	1	N	TCF
Scheme	Selby TCF	Walking and Cycling	Public realm improvements	£20m	1	N	TCF
Scheme	Skipton TCF	Walking and Cycling	Public realm improvements	£7.8m	1	N	TCF
Scheme	A64 Eastfield to Mere (Scarborough)	Cycling and Walking	1.5km (approx)	TBC	4	Y (identified as secondary route)	

Scheme	Link between North Bay and South Bay (Scarborough)	Cycling and Walking	TBC	TBC	4	Y (identified as secondary route)	
Scheme	Connecting A171 Tranche 2 scheme with Whitby Town Centre	Walking and Cycling	1.5km	TBC	4	N	
Scheme	Carrs Road to Town Centre (Whitby)	Walking and Cycling	5.4km	TBC	4	N	
Scheme	Helmsley Marketplace to Kirkbymoorside	Walking and Cycling	9km	TBC in feasibility study	4	N	Feasibility – ATF 3
Scheme	Knaresborough to Flaxby Green Park Industrial site	Walking and Cycling	TBC (approx. 7km)	TBC in feasibility study	4	Part of LCWIP indicative corridor	Feasibility – ATF 3
Scheme	Pannal to Rosset Green (Harrogate)	Cycling	2.3km	£0.9m	4	Y	
Scheme	Cardale Park to NPIF Scheme start (Otley Road) (Harrogate)	Cycling and walking	1km	TBC	4	Identified in LCWIP	
Scheme	Nidderdale Greenway (Harrogate)	Cycling and walking		TBC	4		
Scheme	Whinney Lane to Rosset Green (Harrogate)	Walking and cycling	4.3km	TBC	4	Identified in LCWIP	
Scheme	Eastfield to Scarborough	Cycling and Walking	4.42km	£7.335m	4	Y	
Scheme	Eastfield & Cayton Central Spine (Scarborough)	Cycling and walking	0.83km	£4.53m	4	Y	

Scheme	Scarborough Central Corridor	Walking and Cycling	2.96km	£13.34m	4	Y	
Scheme	Brayton to Selby Corridor	Walking and Cycling	2.5km	£4.87m	4	Y	
Scheme	Trans Pennine Trail Connections (Selby)	Walking and Cycling	2km	£8.865m	4	Y	
Scheme	Selby South East Routes	Walking and Cycling	3.86km	£11.43m	4	Y	
Scheme	Selby North Area	Walking and Cycling	0.77km	£2.05m	4	Y	
Scheme	South Milford to 'Sherburn 2' Industrial Estate	Walking and Cycling	3.76km	£3.73m	4	Y	
Scheme	Staynor Hall to TPT Southern Link	Walking and Cycling	1.4km	£0.72m	4	Y	
Scheme	Bilton to Starbeck (Harrogate)	Cycling and walking	3.56km	£5.903m	4	Y	
Scheme	Bilton to Hornbeam Park (via Town Centre) (Harrogate)	Cycling and walking	4.32km	£4.11m	4	Y	
Scheme	Jennyfield to Harrogate town centre	Cycling and walking	3.23km	£1.723m	4	Y	
Scheme	Hornbeam Park to Starbeck (Harrogate)	Cycling and walking	3.77km	£3.819m	4	Y	
Scheme	Skipton Town Centre	Walking and Cycling	Skipton Town Centre area	TBC in LCWIP (In progress)	4	Y	

Scheme	Central Skipton to Snaygill Industrial Estate	Walking and Cycling	2km (approx.)	TBC in LCWIP (In progress)	4	Y	
Scheme	Gargrave Rail Station (Skipton)	Walking and Cycling	Gargrave Rail Station access	TBC in LCWIP (In progress)	4	Y	
Scheme	Snaygill to Cross Hills (Skipton)	Walking and Cycling	4.5km (approx..)	TBC in LCWIP (In progress)	4	Y	
Scheme	Northallerton LCWIP	Walking and Cycling	Scheme details TBC	In Progress	1,4,10		
Scheme	Malton & Norton LCWIP	Walking and Cycling	Scheme details TBC	In Progress	1,4,10		
Scheme	Catterick LCWIP	Walking and Cycling	Scheme details TBC	To begin 21/22	1,4,10		
Scheme	Ripon LCWIP	Walking and Cycling	Scheme details TBC	In progress	1,4,10		
Scheme	Flaxby to York	Cycling and walking	TBC	TBC	10	N	
Scheme	Kirkbymoorside to Pickering	Cycling	TBC	TBC	10	N	
Scheme	Embsay to Skipton Town Centre	Walking and Cycling	TBC	TBC	10	Y	
Scheme	Skipton to Computershare	Walking and Cycling	TBC	TBC	10	Y	
Scheme	Endeavour Way (Stokesley to Guisborough)	Walking and Cycling	TBC	TBC	10	N	

Scheme	Tadcaster	Walking and cycling	TBC	TBC	10	Y	
Scheme	Seamer to Cayton corridor (Scarborough)	Walking and Cycling	TBC	TBC	10	Y	
Scheme	Malton to Amotherby	Walking and Cycling	TBC	TBC	10	Y	

24. LCWIP - Extra information

273. If you have a LCWIP(s): Where possible, please submit a copy of your updated LCWIP(s), highlighting any updates to prioritised routes and/or prioritised schemes; or If this is not possible in the time available, please provide a note of key changes since your LCWIP was agreed, (.e.g. to take into account ATF schemes, Covid-19 recovery plans etc, or plans to make changes / develop further) *

For the Harrogate to Flaxby Green Park Scheme work has taken place through delivery of our Harrogate Transport Improvement Plan to re-evaluate the priorities of the Harrogate Cycle Improvement Plan and confirmed that the priorities are still appropriate.

We have recently received an allocation of funding through the Capability Fund which will be used to refresh the LCWIP's in Harrogate, Selby and Scarborough to ensure that the identified schemes are LTN1/20 compliant. These will be updated by March 22.

274. For all bidders, where possible, please provide a link to, or copy of a map of your local/combined authority or key locations covered by LCWIPs, highlighting existing and planned cycling and walking networks (ideally a network map showing 1/4/10-year scheme delivery, where known). *

<https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/Transport%20and%20streets/funding/LCWIP/Skipton%20LCWIP.pdf>

- Skipton – Figure 7-1 – Final Cycling Network, Page 165 of Phase 1 LCWIP
- Skipton – Figure 7-2 – Final Walking Network, Page 166 of Phase 1 LCWIP

<https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/Transport%20and%20streets/funding/LCWIP/Harrogate%20Cycling%20Infrastructure%20Plan.pdf>

- Harrogate – Figure 44 – Final Cycling Network, Page 93 of Phase 1 LCWIP

[https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/Transport and streets/funding/LCWIP/Selby LCWIP.pdf](https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/Transport%20and%20streets/funding/LCWIP/Selby%20LCWIP.pdf)

- Selby – Figure 7-1 – Final Cycling Network (Selby), Page 149 of Phase 1 LCWIP
- Selby – Figure 7-2 – Final Cycling Network (Sherburn), Page 150 of Phase 1 LCWIP
- Selby – Figure 7-3 – Final Cycling Network (Tadcaster), Page 151 of Phase 1 LCWIP
- Selby – Figure 7-4 – Final Walking Network (Selby), page 153 of Phase 1 LCWIP
- Selby – Figure 7-5 – Final Walking Network (Sherburn), page 154 of Phase 1 LCWIP
- Selby – Figure 7-6 – Final Walking Network (Tadcaster), page 155 of Phase 1 LCWIP

25. Additional Information

In addition to this proforma, please also ensure that you submit a letter from the leader of your local/combined authority, confirming long term commitment to delivery of the schemes to walking.cycling@dft.gov.uk

For any schemes with a value greater than £2 million, please also attach:

Scheme drawings for schemes above £2 million

Value for money evidence, including Active Mode Appraisal Tool (AMAT) outputs

A map of your local/combined authority or key locations covered by LCWIPs, highlighting cycling and walking networks (ideally a network map showing 1/4/10-year pipeline build out, where known)

26. Declaration and Contact Details

Please read the following declaration:

I confirm I have read and understood all the details in the accompanying letter, including the terms and conditions.

I confirm that the Senior Responsible Officer and the Section 151 Officer (or equivalent with delegated authority) have also read and understood the letter.

I declare that the information given is, to the best of my knowledge, correct.

I understand that funding is conditional on the Section 151 Officer's confirmation that the schemes offer value for money.

I confirm that the authority will have all the necessary statutory powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.

I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that the authority:

- has allocated sufficient budget to deliver the scheme(s) on the basis of its proposed funding contribution;
- accepts responsibility for meeting any costs over and above the DfT contribution requested, including potential cost overruns and the underwriting of any funding contributions expected from third parties; accepts responsibility for meeting any ongoing revenue and capital requirements in relation to the scheme(s);
- accepts that no further increase in DfT funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested and that no DfT funding will be provided;
- confirms that the authority has the necessary governance/assurance arrangements in place.

I also understand DfT may request further details as to the scheme(s) and costs therein.

275. Are you able to confirm all of the statements above? *

- Yes
- No

276. Please provide the following contact information for the Reporting Officer at your authority: *

277. Please provide the following contact information for the Senior Responsible Officer at your authority: *

278. Please provide the following contact information for the Section 151 Officer (or equivalent) at your authority: *

279. Please provide any further details or clarification of your submission that you wish the Department to consider: *

The cross-boundary Kildwick to Silsden route will be delivered by the Canal & Rivers Trust (CRT), in close partnership with Bradford Metropolitan District Council, West Yorkshire Combined Authority, Craven District Council and NYCC. All partners are committed to the development of this route as demonstrated in the letters of support (attached) from CRT and, additionally, Sustrans who have highlighted the importance of the canal route as part of the future of the National Cycle Network.

NYCC is seeking funding to deliver the 2km stretch of the towpath that lies within the North Yorkshire boundary. Within our request for funding we have included the cost to deliver the scheme independently of the Bradford section, however, if delivered together economies of scale, in the region of £240k (for the total cost of the scheme), can be realised. Working together, we can also develop a long-term strategic vision for the area, better representing the views and values of local people, as we work towards improving access to cross-boundary opportunities and key services and decarbonising our transport system.

Delivery of this scheme will provide continuous high quality towpath connectivity between West Yorkshire and the Yorkshire Dales National Park by adding value to the previous improvements delivered recently in the Craven district covering Gargrave to Kildwick, totaling 15km to date.

Delivery of this scheme will also enhance connectivity to Airedale Hospital, Steeton & Silsden rail station and Silsden itself and facilitate mode shift for some of the 26% of workers crossing the border into North Yorkshire as well as those travelling for leisure purposes.

Scheme delivery for the Kildwick to Silsden link will take 5 months from start to completion. The complimentary Airedale improvements need to be designed therefore will not be delivered within the same timeframe but will be delivered within the funding window.

27. Confirmation Page

280. You have now reached the end of the proforma questionnaire. Are you happy for your responses to be submitted to the Department? *

Yes

No