

Active Travel Capability Ratings 2025 - Local Authority Self-Assessment Survey

Introduction

Please provide your contact details:

Name:

Email:

Role:

Section 1 - Organisational Context

1) What is the name of your authority?

North Yorkshire

2) What is the total budget (£) your authority holds for transport this financial year?

140043562

3) What is the total budget (£) your authority holds for Active Travel this financial year?

43673012

4) What is the total Full Time Equivalent staffing working on transport at your authority?

545.22

5) What is the total Full Time Equivalent staffing working on Active Travel at your authority?

43.48

Section 2 - Leadership and organisational capability

1a) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in leadership support (including leader and transport portfolio lead) for active travel policies:

Level 2 - Has members who are highly supportive of active travel policies

1b) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in adoption of appropriate design quality standards and assurance systems:

See here for descriptions of levels of complexity.

Level 2 - Has documented design quality approaches and a track record of completing low and medium complexity LTN1/20 / MfS compliant active travel schemes

1c) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in breadth of policies and approaches (as outlined in the introduction to Section 2 above):

Level 2 - Has policies and approaches in place to support and deliver an increase in active travel, covering between 5 and 8 of the policies and approaches listed

1d) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in assessing the value for money of capital schemes:

Level 2 - Facilitates production of VFM analysis for active travel capital schemes, in which both costs and benefits are expressed in monetary terms. Uses appraisal tools such as the Active Modes Appraisal Toolkit (AMAT), the DfT uplift tool, or other similar tools and approaches.

1e) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in assessing the monitoring and evaluation of capital schemes:

Level 2 - Facilitates production and delivery of M&E Plans for all active travel capital schemes less than £2m. Aligned with good practice from the ATE M&E guidance or similar guidance (e.g. Magenta Book)

1f) Please choose the level that best represents your authorities commitment to relevant officers and elected members participating in active travel training delivered by/on behalf of Active Travel England or equivalent training:

Level 2 - Officers working in relevant active travel roles or elected members with portfolios or membership of relevant transport and planning committees are encouraged to attend active travel training delivered by Active Travel England or other training provider, and participation is recorded.

1g) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in use and dissemination of active travel guidance during the development management process:

Relevant toolkit and guidance are listed below. Please refer to these when assessing the statements for each authority level below.

Local highway adoption standards which incorporate the principles set out in Manual for Streets Local Travel Plan guidance Local Transport Assessment guidance and advice or signposting Local cycle parking standards/supplementary planning guidance ATE's planning

application assessment toolkit LTN 1/20 (or relevant local guidance that is equivalent to, or stronger than) Inclusive Mobility Manual for Streets 1 and 2.

Level 2 - Uses between 4 and 6 of the guidance listed above when assessing planning applications and reaching decisions on post planning highway matters, to support and deliver an increase in active travel. Guidance is used by a minority of developers when submitting planning applications for significant developments.

2) Based on your responses to Q1a to Q1g, please select an overall level for leadership and organisational capability that best represents your authority.

Level 2

3) Please describe the evidence you have to support your assessment in Q2. Maximum 750 words.

Q1a) Full Council recently backed a motion to develop an Active Travel Strategy as part of the Y&NY LTP, following recommendations from the Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The report (published evidence – 'Active Travel Strategy development full council') states a Member-led Working Group will be formed to align Active Travel values with the Council Plan and the new LTP.

In February 2025, NYC's Executive Member for Highways and Transportation approved Beechwood Grove School Street as a permanent scheme after a successful 18-month trial. Former Executive Member Cllr Keane Duncan joined a Bike Bus event to celebrate North Yorkshire's first permanent school street. A BBC article (within published evidence) highlights his support for active travel, reinforcing leadership backing. NYC's ATF5 bid further demonstrates this commitment, proposing four additional school streets (published evidence 'ATF5 Environment Executive approval of schemes', section 5).

Q1b) NYC developed a North Yorkshire-specific cycle design guide to complement LTN 1/20, used alongside other industry standards for designing active travel schemes (published evidence 'NYC Cycle Design Guide'). Pending the establishment of a formal Design Review Panel by the Y&NY Combined Authority, NYC ensures all consultant commissions reference LTN 1/20 and relevant guidance in their scope of works.

NYC has utilised ATE design surgeries, including one for the A59 scheme attended by NYC staff, consultants, and ATE inspectors (Evidence '1. Records and Correspondence – item 1').

When LTN 1/20 was released, NYC had already produced two LCWIPs. NYC commissioned Sustrans to review both LCWIPs, reviewing against LTN 1/20 to support refreshment of the priority corridors.

Evidence '2. Scarborough LTN 1/20 refresh report' (page 10). This reflects NYC's commitment to LTN 1/20 compliance from concept to delivery.

Evidence - '3. Capability Rating Evidence' spreadsheet (Delivered schemes tab) shows 14 schemes delivered within the last 3 years. A mix of low (8 schemes) and medium (4 schemes) are shown. In terms of governance arrangements and assurance and decision making/approval of schemes, the Kildwick to Silsden FBC demonstrates this clearly. Evidence – '4. FBC – Kildwick to Silsden Missing Active Travel Link' - page 32 explains the management of the project including working group, project board and project executive. Gateway review points are evident and on page 18 key activities include 'Internal Stakeholder design review' (also a milestone on page 35). LTN 1/20 is referenced

throughout.

Q1c) '3. Capability Rating Evidence' (Policies and Approaches tab) shows 18 policies/approaches with a direct link to Active Travel. From the 18, six directly cover the policies listed above.

Q1d) NYC's approach to schemes follows the TAG Transport Appraisal Process. Evidence – '1. Records and Correspondence' item 5 presents a good example of this and VFM analysis approach (page 79-94). In terms of tools used, NYC officers are trained to utilise PCT, DfT uplift, AMAT, cost benchmarking analysis, Strava Metro, Datashine and others to enable in house early stage assessment of VfM. Evidence - '3. Capability Rating Evidence' spreadsheet (LCWIP progress tab) shows initial BCRs for all priority corridors and county wide work on short, medium and long term prioritisation (published evidence 'Harrogate Cycle Network Development – Prioritisation Outcomes') shows further VfM assessments completed to help inform decision makers (section 3.7). A more complex appraisal example is evidenced within '6. Harrogate Station Gateway Economic Assessment Report' (page 44-46). The VfM assessment (public realm and active travel improvements) included ambience benefits calculator and wider economic benefits.

Q1e) Evidence – '7. Selby TCF M&E Plan'. The £25.4m scheme's M&E plan aligns with DfT evaluation guidance and follows Magenta Book standards, as demonstrated in the Theory of Change (Appendix A), Active Travel Evaluation (p.20), and Dissemination Plan (p.29).

Q1f) Evidence '1. Records and Correspondence' item 2 confirms an email from the Executive Member for Highways and Transport inviting all 90 Councillors to an online Active Travel training session. 20 NYC Councillors attended, including Council Leader Carl Les—22% of Members. Attendance is recorded within evidence '1. Records and Correspondence' item 3. Additionally, 15 Officers and consultants attended an Active Travel Design workshop led by Sustrans for ATE (Evidence – '1. Records and Correspondence' item 4). An in-house active travel 'Travel Well' training package was also developed for frontline staff like Living Well social prescribers.

1g) Evidence '3. Capability Rating Evidence' (Policies and Approaches tab – row 16) shows development management approaches and current use of 5 of the guidance documents listed above.

- Local highway adoption standards which incorporate the principles set out in MfS
- Local Travel Plan guidance
- Local Transport Assessment guidance

3) Please describe the evidence you have to support your assessment in Q2. Maximum 750 words.

- Local cycle parking standards/supplementary planning guidance
- MfS 1 and 2

4) Please provide a maximum of 6 links to any published evidence referred to in Q3.

1. Active Travel Strategy development full council -
<https://edemocracy.northyorks.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=23485>
2. Leadership support for active travel policies – school streets -
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/ckg8l9wlz1jo>
3. Harrogate Cycle Network Development – Prioritisation Outcomes-
<https://edemocracy.northyorks.gov.uk/documents/s28549/Harrogate%20Cycle%20>

0Network%20Developm ent%20Prioritisation%20Outcomes.pdf

4. ATF5 Environment Executive approval of schemes -
<https://edemocracy.northyorks.gov.uk/documents/s51614/Active%20Travel%20Fund%205%20Submission%20of%20schemes.pdf>
5. NYC Cycle Design Guide -
<https://edemocracy.northyorks.gov.uk/documents/s12350/NYCC%20Cycle%20Design%20Guide.pdf>

5) Please upload any unpublished evidence here referred to in Q3, up to a maximum of 6 files.

- File: 1. Records and Correspondence.pdf
- File: 2. Scarborough LTN 1.20 refresh report.pdf
- File: 3. Capability Rating Evidence.xlsx
- File: 4. FBC - Kildwick to Silsden Missing Active Travel Link.docx
- File: 6. Harrogate Station Gateway Economic Assessment Report.pdf
- File: 7. Selby TCF M&E Plan.pdf

Section 3 - Network Planning

1a) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in development and publication of LCWIPs:

Level 4 - Has finalised and published LCWIP(s) for all population centres above 10,000.

1b) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in stakeholder engagement on LCWIPs and individual schemes:

For reference: Equality Act 2010

Level 2 - Has completed engagement with stakeholder groups representing people with protected characteristics under the Equality Act

1c) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in pipeline development and funding:

Level 2 - Has a mature draft or agreed long term (greater than 5 year) pipeline of active travel schemes ready for funding

1d) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in requiring developers to fund, deliver schemes and contribute to LCWIP development in compliance with legal and policy tests:

Level 1 - Has started identifying places where new strategic active travel routes can be delivered through new development to help unlock development sites. Occasionally (5%-20% of relevant planning applications) seeks contributions through section 106 obligations and/or section 278 agreements for the delivery of planned active travel infrastructure and

isolated schemes are being funded.

2) Based on your responses to Q1a to Q1d, please select an overall level for network planning that best represents your authority.

Level 2

3) Please describe the evidence you have to support your assessment in Q2. Maximum 500 words.

Q1a) NYC has finalised and published ten LCWIPs covering all population centres above 10,000. Published evidence - 'Completed and published LCWIPs'.

Q1b) Stakeholder engagement in LCWIPs happens at key stages. All 10 completed LCWIPs included early input from public interest groups/ delivery partners. Thirsk LCWIP (published evidence 'Thirsk LCWIP' - page 26) is a recent example. Engagement with groups with protected characteristics is evidenced in '8. Harrogate TCF Seldom Heard Groups Engagement Actions', which outlines a clear plan.

Q1c) Following completion of the LCWIPs and identification of priority corridors, officers have drafted a delivery pipeline for six LCWIP areas, spanning short, medium and long-term delivery. While consultation is ongoing, the Harrogate example—approved by the Environment Executive and within published evidence 'Harrogate Cycle Network Development – Prioritisation Outcomes'—illustrates proposed schemes, network layout, and delivery timeframes (Appendix A). The report also outlines indicative BCRs, cost estimates, and design status. Further evidence is provided in '9. Appendix B – Harrogate LCWIP Segment Prioritisation Jan 24' (summary tab), including a summary of the Multi Criteria Assessment Tool and analysis of required improvements.

A full list of LCWIP priority corridors is evidenced within '3. Capability Rating Evidence' (LCWIP Progress tab), detailing forecast uplift, costs, BCR, and design stage. The 10 completed LCWIPs span 80+ corridors, valued at circa £265 million, and all are included in our Major Projects Pipeline.

Q1d) Following LGR North Yorkshire Council is creating a new Local Plan for development through 2045. With the call for sites open until November 2025 and a new Transport Plan in progress, no county-wide strategy is currently in place. However, former district plans still inform infrastructure assessments, and NYC is temporarily addressing needs on a site-by-site basis.

West Harrogate is progressing through previous local plans. Over the past two years, the council has collaborated with promoters on the West Harrogate Parameters Plan (published evidence), guiding the development of approximately 2,500 homes with a focus on cohesive, sustainable growth and infrastructure needs. NYC has also completed the West Harrogate Infrastructure Strategy (WHIDS), detailing infrastructure delivery timelines. Key highlights include Otley Road phase 3 (walking and cycling improvements) and a VivaCity monitoring sensor (pages 24–26), with Otley Road phase 3 marked as the top delivery priority on page 30.

Over the past 3 years, NYC secured £1,556,719 in developer contributions for active travel - £58,900 for travel plan monitoring at 15 sites, and £1,497,819 for infrastructure improvements at 15 sites. This is detailed in '3. Capability Rating Evidence' under the 's106 agreements last 3 years' tab.

NYC has secured developer contributions from sites in Thorpe Willoughby and Brayton to

support cycling improvements outlined in the Selby LCWIP. The aim is to build a connected network linking these areas to Selby. Five separate requests for funding are shown in the document '10. Active Travel developer contributions in Thorpe Willoughby and Brayton'. A feasibility study, funded through Capability Funding, helped justify the contributions and links to the Brayton–Selby priority corridor, which is at detailed design and awaiting funding.

4) Please provide a maximum of 5 links to any published evidence referred to in Q3.

1. Completed and published LCWIPs - <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/roads-parking-and-travel/major-transport-schemes-and-plans/local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plans-lcwips>
2. Harrogate Cycle Network Development – Prioritisation Outcomes - <https://edemocracy.northyorks.gov.uk/documents/s28549/Harrogate%20Cycle%20Network%20Development%20Prioritisation%20Outcomes.pdf>
3. West Harrogate Parameters Plan <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/planning-and-conservation/planning-policy/planning-policy-your-local-area/harrogate-planning-policy/harrogate-local-planning-guidance-and-supplementary-planning-documents/west-harrogate-parameters-plan>
4. Thirsk LCWIP - <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2025-05/Local%20Cycling%20and%20Walking%20Infrastructure%20Plan%20Thirsk%20full%20report.pdf>

5) Please upload any unpublished evidence here referred to in Q3, up to a maximum of 5 files.

- File: 8. Harrogate TCF Seldom Heard Groups Engagement Actions.xlsx
- File: 9. Appendix B - Harrogate LCWIP Segment
- File: 3. Capability Rating Evidence.xlsx
- File: 10. Active Travel developer contributions in Thorpe Willoughby and Brayton.docx

Section 4 - Delivery

1a) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in capital scheme delivery (complexity):

See here for descriptions of levels of complexity.

Level 2 - Has delivered a mix of low and medium complexity LTN1/20-compliant schemes

1b) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in network integration:

Level 2 - Has delivered a mix of low and medium complexity LTN1/20-compliant schemes

1c) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in capital schemes delivery:

Level 3 - Has delivered most capital schemes (greater than 66%, up to 90%) on time

1d) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in revenue activity delivery:

Level 2 - Has delivered most revenue activities (55% to 90%) on time

1e) Please choose the level that best represents your authority in Bikeability delivery:

Level 1 – Has a Bikeability programme in place, with 50-65% of Year 6 pupils level 2 trained and decreasing, or 33.3-50% of Year 6 pupils level 2 trained and increasing.

2) Based on your responses to Q1a to Q1e, please select an overall level for delivery that best represents your authority.

Level 2

3) Please describe the evidence you have to support your assessment in Q2. Maximum 750 words.

Q1a) Evidence '3. Capability Rating Evidence' (Delivered schemes tab) shows 14 active travel schemes delivered within the last three years. The complexity level of these schemes is split with six (43%) medium and eight (57%) low complexity. Overall, 32.7km of active travel improvements have been delivered, including 2km of the Kildwick to Silsden Canal Towpath improvements. This scheme was submitted to ATE as part of the final inspections programme. The final report confirms that the scheme was delivered in full compliance with Government guidance and represents a 'significant improvement' over the previous condition of the towpath. Zero critical issues were identified in the ATE report, and whilst three policy conflicts were identified we believe the rural nature of the route, the topographic restrictions and consultee views address the identified policy conflicts. CRT and NYC have been invited to submit additional information, as the scheme is under consideration as an exemplar case study for inclusion in the Rural Design Guidance.

NYC classified the project as a medium complexity scheme, based on several key factors. Firstly, the scheme posed considerable challenges from both technical and political perspectives. It involved upgrading a 3.2km stretch of towpath, with 2km within North Yorkshire and 1.2km in Bradford. NYC secured initial funding in early 2024 via the Y&NY Net Zero Fund. To enable a unified delivery approach, the project working group delayed procurement while awaiting confirmation of funding from Bradford Metropolitan District Council (BMDC). Following BMDC's successful ATF4e bid (January 2025) and to ensure the project could be delivered as one, NYC secured an extension to the Net Zero Fund deadline, allowing completion by the end of June 2025. The scheme was delivered within a tight 16-week programme, concluding on 25 June 2025.

Secondly, delivery challenges required the use of marine plant along a heavily trafficked section of canal transporting materials and equipment along the 3.2km of works. Public access had to be maintained throughout construction period (along the towpath which is a PROW) and special care was taken to minimise disruption to a local business reliant on pedestrian footfall along the route.

Lastly, according to Active Travel England (ATE) guidance (Annex B: Table of Intervention Types), a new shared-use facility qualifies as medium complexity not only due to political and delivery challenges, but also when it provides a traffic-free rural or suburban link between settlements as an alternative to hostile road conditions. This scheme connects Kildwick and Silsden, offering a safe alternative to the A629 and Skipton Road, both of which lack footways and have 60mph speed limits. The upgraded 3km section has long been referred to as “the missing link”. Its completion now enables 47km of continuous towpath suitable for walking, wheeling, and cycling between Skipton and Leeds.

Analysis of a VivaCity sensor on the route shows encouraging early signs just two months after the improvements were completed. Data compared to last year shows 309 (64%) additional pedestrian and cycle trips per day, 210 (52%) increase in average pedestrian trips per day and 99 (129%) increase in average cycle trips per day.

NYC have 40+ Vivacity sensors assisting scheme development and monitoring impacts of improvements. Evidence '12. Network of Vivacity sensors in NY'.

Q1b) NYC has ten LCWIPs in total. From the 14 schemes delivered in the last three years 12 are part of an integrated network. This encompasses LCWIP priority corridors, key strategic routes and primary and secondary LCWIP routes. Evidence provided within '3. Capability Rating Evidence' (Delivered schemes tab).

Q1c) Externally funded Active Travel schemes:

Kildwick to Silsden – Net Zero Fund – Delivered on time
Victoria Avenue Pedestrian Improvements – ATF2 – Completed, but beyond original deadline
Skipton Canal towpath improvements – TCF – Delivered on time
Cinder Track (Burniston and Cloughton) – Dft via Sustrans – Delivered on time
Cinder Track (Scarborough to Scalby) – Dft via Sustrans – Delivered on time
Malton and Pickering Market town cycling route – EAFRD – Delivered on time

Given the above, within the last three years 83% of active travel capital schemes have been delivered on time.

Evidence to support this is provided in '3. Capability Rating Evidence' (Delivered schemes tab).

Q1d) '11. ATE Capability Ratings Self-Assessment 2025 Data Evidence Pack – North Yorkshire Council' shows revenue total spend at 67.87% which indicates a level 2.

Q1e) '11. ATE Capability Ratings Self-Assessment 2025 Data Evidence Pack – North Yorkshire Council' shows NYC is at a level 1 for delivery of Bikeability. Delivery is only 2% from a level 2 rating. In tandem with the Bikeability grant, NYC have contributed £53,000 in 2024/25 to assist delivery of Bikeability.

5) Please upload any unpublished evidence here referred to in Q3, up to a maximum of 6 files.

- File: 3. Capability Rating Evidence.xlsx
- File: 11. ATE Capability Ratings Self-Assessment 2025 Data Evidence Pack – North Yorkshire Council.pdf
- File: 12. Network of Vivacity sensors in NY.jpg

Section 5 - Overall Capability Rating

1) As part of Sections 2 to 4 you have provided the following ratings:

Leadership and organisational capability - Level 2 Network
Planning - Level 2
Delivery - Level 2

Please find your current Capability Rating as published September 2024 [here](#).

Based on your responses to Sections 2 to 4 and the criteria below, please provide your own assessment of your current capability. We will validate this as part of the process to derive updated Capability Ratings.

Level 2 - Strong local leadership and organisational capability, with clear plans that form the basis of an emerging network with a few elements already in place.

2) If your selected level is different from your current Capability Rating as published in September 2024, please summarise the key evidence supporting the change in level. Maximum of 500 words.

North Yorkshire Council is pleased to report significant progress across all areas of this year's Capability Ratings submission. Most notably, 2025 has marked the successful delivery of three major active travel schemes:

- Kildwick to Silsden Active Travel Link (£583k)
- Victoria Avenue Pedestrian Improvements (£808k)
- Skipton Canal Towpath Enhancements (£1.6m)

These projects form part of a broader programme, with 14 active travel schemes delivered over the past three years, funded through a combination of Department for Transport (DfT) grants, Combined Authority support, and developer contributions.

Construction is also advancing on Transforming Cities Fund initiatives in Selby, Harrogate and Skipton, which are set to significantly enhance active travel connectivity in these key urban centres.

To support a level increase in our Capability Rating, the Kildwick to Silsden scheme was submitted for inspection by Active Travel England (ATE). The resulting report confirmed full compliance with Government guidance and identified no critical issues—affirming the scheme's quality and delivery standards.

In addition, NYC has completed and published two new Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) for Thirsk and Whitby, bringing the total to ten. These LCWIPs now cover every population centre in North Yorkshire with more than 10,000 residents.

Looking ahead, over 80 priority corridors have been earmarked by NYC for future development. Pending funding availability, these corridors are poised to advance through the design phase and be positioned for upcoming delivery opportunities.

A key opportunity to support this ambition is the Local Transport Grant. For the 2025/26 funding cycle, a substantial capital request of £11.2 million is being made to support existing scope and/or add value to Transforming Cities Fund projects in Selby, Skipton and Harrogate. These locations have progressed sufficiently in design and have secured delivery partners, making them ideal candidates for investment. It is anticipated that future

rounds of LTG funding will support the delivery of LCWIP priority corridors, further strengthening the region's commitment to sustainable and inclusive transport development.

NYC's Capability Ratings submission highlights a strong track record in active travel delivery over the past three years, underpinned by a comprehensive network plan featuring ten LCWIPs and clearly defined priority corridors. It showcases the introduction of new policies/approaches, strong leadership support for active travel schemes, a firm commitment to high-quality design standards, and clear evidence of ongoing professional development through relevant training undertaken by both members and officers.

Section 6 – Feedback

Thank you for completing this survey. We would appreciate your time to provide feedback below.

1 – very easy 2 3 – medium 4 5 – very difficult

How easy was it to complete this survey? X

Are there any improvements you would recommend for future self-assessment surveys?

Increase number of available evidence attachments
Increase word count

Finalise your response

Please confirm that your response has been agreed by the Senior Responsible Officer for walking and cycling.

Yes