

APPENDIX B: INITIAL SIFT CRITERIA

CONTRIBUTION TO IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVES

A qualitative assessment was undertaken to identify the level of impact each intervention would have in achievement of the Specific Objectives; based upon the following scoring mechanism:

Contribution to Objectives – Scoring Mechanism	
2	Large beneficial impact
1	Beneficial impact
0	Neutral / marginal impact
-1	Adverse impact
-2	Large adverse impact

For each objective a score of between -2 and +2 was allocated to reflect the anticipated level of impact of the intervention; these scores were totalled to determine the overall contribution of the intervention to meeting the Specific Objectives. At this stage, there is no implied hierarchy between objectives and so no weighting was applied to scores for different objectives. A summary of the scores allocated for each intervention is set out in Table 1 to Table 38.

DELIVERABILITY

The assessment of deliverability considered specific challenges relating to implementation of the intervention including acceptability, planning and third parties, in addition to engineering and land issues. Factors that were considered are set out below.

Acceptability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Level of stakeholder/political support. § Level of public support. § Significant resulting environmental impacts.
Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § How far through the planning process is the option under consideration (e.g. not started, part-way through, nearing completion)? § Are there any legal issues/risks?
Third Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Is Third Party land required? § Are there any legal issues e.g. CPO?
Engineering / Land Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Are there any significant physical constraints that could have a direct impact on the costs and risks associated with the option under consideration e.g. existing structures (viaducts, bridges, retaining walls etc.) or structures required within option design? § Will land acquisition be required?



For each intervention, a deliverability rating was determined, taking into account the issues described above. The ratings used are set out below:

Deliverability Ratings
Deliverable with few or no issues
Deliverable but with challenges
Very difficult to deliver

DEPENDENCE UPON OTHER INTERVENTIONS

It is recognised that some interventions may make a significant contribution to desirable outcomes as stand-alone entities, whilst others will be dependent upon other interventions if they are to deliver meaningful results. As such it was necessary to identify, at this early stage, to what degree each intervention is independent, and which would need to be assessed as part of a wider package. The following criteria was used:

Dependency – Criteria
Independent of other interventions
Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions
Wholly dependent on other interventions

No scoring was applied to this element of the sifting methodology, as it is not intended to discount interventions on the basis of their dependency on others; instead, this designation was used to inform the subsequent collation of ‘packages of interventions’.

INDICATIVE COST

For each intervention, a high level assessment was made of the likely cost of implementation, this was categorised as follows:

Indicative Cost – Criteria
Low cost (<£10m)
Medium cost (£10m – £50m)
High Cost (>£50m)

In addition, an assessment was made of any potential on-going operational costs associated with the interventions, such as staffing and maintenance, as well as any potential mitigation costs required as a result of a scheme.

Whilst cost is acknowledged to be an important consideration in determining which interventions are taken forward, it was not considered appropriate to apply scores to the indicative cost in the initial sifting process. This decision was taken for the following reasons:

1. The potential range of capital costs is so great that it was not possible to establish a meaningful scale that would encompass all values;
2. There are important differences between the allocation of capital and revenue costs which would make comparisons difficult. and
3. There is, as yet, no identified funding mechanism that would allow us to determine what is, and is not, deliverable based on cost.

As such, no scoring was applied to this element of the sifting methodology; however, a clear indication of cost was a key factor taken into account in the sifting process.

IMPLEMENTATION TIMESCALES

For each intervention an assessment was made of the likely timescales for implementation; this included consideration of the following factors:

-  The likely implementation timescales for delivery; and
-  Potential funding sources.

Taking the above into consideration, the following criteria was used:

Timescales – Criteria
Short timescale: < 2 years
Medium timescale: 2 to 5 years
Long timescale: > 5 years

No scoring was applied to this element of the sifting process, however this categorisation was an important consideration when assembling the packages of interventions to be taken forward.

The following section sets out the initial sift scoring for each intervention. As previously mentioned the scoring of each objective used a range of -2 and +2. The overall scores were considered relative to each other as such the following score ranges were considered to be poor, reasonable, good.

Score Range	Assessment
Less than 10	Poor
10 to 15	Reasonable
Greater than 15	Good



Table 1 Initial Sift Intervention A1 – Variable Messaging

Intervention Reference		Fit with Objectives																				
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
A1: Variable Messaging		2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	12
Objectives Comments	VMS can alert traffic to possible delays, events etc. and allow travel to be adjusted accordingly helping reduce congestion and improve journey time reliability and efficiency of the network.																					

Deliverability Comments	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
<p>Deliverable but with challenges</p> <p>No significant land, planning and engineering issues.</p> <p>Could be issues relating to installation of relevant technology/infrastructure across the town.</p> <p>Unlikely to be significant acceptability issues</p>	<p>Low capital cost (<£10m)</p> <p>Given the size of the town(s) it is assumed costs would not exceed £5m however, if large scale system is deployed costs could be higher to implement technology/infrastructure to deliver.</p>	<p>Medium timescale (2 to 5 years)</p> <p>Depending on exact scale of intervention to be provided, a medium timeframe is expected as installation of equipment, systems and infrastructure may extend scheme delivery.</p>	<p>Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions</p> <p>Dependent on having associated technology, e.g. CCTV and real-time information capabilities across the town</p>	<p>Area wide signage strategies</p> <p>Network operation</p> <p>Car parking strategy</p> <p>Publicity campaigns</p>	<p>Reasonable score against objectives - it provides benefit through providing real time information to road users enabling areas of congestion to be avoided, improving journey times and reliability as well as resilience and efficiency of the network.</p> <p>Quick delivery/implementation - no real land issues or acceptability concerns.</p> <p>Relatively low cost</p> <p>Enhanced benefit in a package of measures.</p>	<p>Y</p>

Table 2 Initial Sift Intervention A2 – Real Time passenger Information

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
A2: Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) - Public Transport	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	13
Objectives Comments	RTPI provides users of public transport confirmation of when next service will arrive giving confidence of use of the service, it can encourage use of public transport helping reduce car trips into the town and the associated congestion.																				

Deliverability Comments	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable but with challenges No significant land, planning and engineering issues. Could be issues relating to installation of relevant technology/infrastructure across bus stops in the town and on all of the bus fleet. Unlikely to be significant acceptability issues	Low capital cost (<£10m) Cost is dependent on size of system in place (i.e. RTPI in all bus stops or select few?) Given the size of the town(s) it is assumed costs would not exceed £5m. However, if large scale system is deployed costs could be much higher to implement.	Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Depending on exact scale of intervention to be provided, a medium timeframe is expected as installation of equipment, systems and infrastructure may extend scheme delivery.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Dependent on having real-time information capabilities across the town and on all bus services	Variable messaging Area wide signage strategy QBC Bus station improvements Incentives for sustainable travel	Reasonable score against objectives - it provides benefit through providing real time information to bus passengers enabling journeys to be planned accordingly and provide confidence and information on service availability. Quick delivery/implementation - no real land issues or acceptability concerns. Relatively low cost Enhanced benefit in a package of measures	Y



Table 3 Initial Sift Intervention A3 – Area Wide Signage Strategy

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
A3: Area wide signage strategy - potentially including tourist, HGV and wayfinding signage	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	13
Objectives Comments	Effective signage can reduce trips in town centres helping reduce congestion issues. Wayfinding can also aid pedestrian and cycle travel providing confidence to those who are unfamiliar with routes to specific destinations.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues No significant land, planning or engineering issues. Unlikely to be significant acceptability issues	Low capital cost (<£10m) Low cost to formulate a strategy.	Short timescale (< 2 years) Relatively quick to provide a strategy and associated signage if funding and resourcing available.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions. This would need to coordinate with other strategies such as walking and cycling strategies	Variable messaging Bus station improvements Cycle strategy Walking strategy	Reasonable score against objectives. Effective signage can reduce trips in town centres helping reduce congestion issues. Wayfinding can aid pedestrians and cyclists. Deliverable with few issues. Low cost to develop Short timescale to develop	Y

Table 4 Initial Sift Intervention A4 – Publicity Campaigns

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
A4: Publicity campaigns and incentives for more sustainable travel	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	2	0	0	18
Objectives Comments	Incentives and greater awareness of options can 'nudge' people to travel by other more sustainable modes, helping reduce congestion through reduction in car trips as well as providing environmental benefits.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues. Likely to have stakeholder support and no land requirements or planning issues expected.	Low capital cost (<£10m). Low cost to fund campaign	Short timescale (< 2 years) Relatively quick to implement with publicity campaigns running for generally shorter timeframes	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions. Effectiveness will be enhanced through other sustainable travel interventions culminating to an overall package	Personalised journey planner Car club (Electric Vehicles) Focus on new developments providing sustainable transport options Area wide cycling strategy Area wide public realm strategy	Good score against objectives. Overall campaign will help in the education process of sustainable travel and an overall general shift towards these options. Deliverable with few issues Low cost to fund campaign Relatively low time scale	Y



Table 5 Initial Sift Intervention A5 – Improved Digital Provision

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
A5: Improved digital provision - Open Harrogate website and app, gamification/sustainable travel challenges	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	14
Objectives Comments	Encourages use of sustainable modes through greater awareness and incentivisation, as well as improving ease of access to travel information through app usage. This can reduced dependence/reliance on the car for trips, encouraging use of non-car modes helping reduce congestion and associated impacts.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues Unlikely to have public/stakeholder resistance with no land or planning restrictions	Low capital cost (<£10m) Open Harrogate App has previous investment so foundation already exists minimising costs.	Short timescale (< 2 years) Open Harrogate App is in operation so can be added to in relatively short timeframes.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions. Other digital interventions and provision would help improve the effectiveness of this intervention. Also greater publicity of app will enhance uptake.	Variable messaging Real time passenger information Publicity campaigns and incentives for more sustainable travel Public realm and cycling strategies	Reasonable score against objectives - it will provide awareness of and incentive to use sustainable travel options, such as walking and cycling. Improved community cohesion as a result of sustainable travel challenges, will further help to support the public modal shift. App has the ability to reach a large proportion of the public and will be effective in a package of measures. The costs and time are low as well as deliverability easy.	Y

Table 6 Initial Sift Intervention A6 – Personalised Journey Planner

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
A6: Personalised Journey Planner	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	17
Objectives Comments	This can encourage use of sustainable travel through providing information and awareness of how to travel by different modes, increasing confidence in doing so. This can help reduce car travel and associated congestion and other traffic impacts and in turn help reduce impacts to the environment.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues Little/no stakeholder resistance likely. No land or planning restrictions are associated with this interventions	Low capital cost (<£10m) Setting up of systems and provision of journey plans will have a relatively low cost.	Short timescale (< 2 years) Relatively quick to produce and distribute	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions. Publicity and marketing of the PJPs with other digital interventions e.g. App and coordination with other strategies e.g. public transport and active modes will help improve the effectiveness of this intervention	Real time passenger information Publicity campaigns and incentives for more sustainable travel Encouraged use of rail for internal journeys Public realm and cycling strategies	Good score against objectives and relatively simple to deliver in coordination with other interventions. Marketing is required to raise awareness of the intervention in order to encourage people to take part in the scheme, as well as improving public transport/sustainable modes as incentives.	Y



Table 7 Initial Sift Intervention B1 – Extend pedestrianisation of Harrogate central core

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
B1: Extend pedestrianisation of Harrogate central core (potentially peak time only - controlled by rising bollards)	0	0	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	20
Objectives Comments	Large beneficial impacts in achieving objectives, in particular in the town centre through reducing numbers of vehicles (particularly HGVs) that impact the townscape, improving modal shift to active modes, improved access for pedestrians, improved safety and improved health of residents.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable but with challenges Public/stakeholder acceptability unknown. Consultations required and relevant permissions and consents will be required to make the change and scheme enforceable	Medium capital cost (£10m – £50m) Costs may be medium as small scale infrastructure changes may be required as well as implementation of high quality materials to identify/highlight extent of pedestrianised area.	Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Obtaining consents and permissions may extend timeframe to deliver scheme.	Independent of other interventions. Can be provided independently	Variable messaging Area wide signage strategy Traffic Management /Low Emission Zone	Good score against objectives, in particular in the town centre through reducing numbers of vehicles (particularly HGVs) that impact the townscape, improving modal shift to active modes, improved access for pedestrians, improved safety and improved health of residents. Deliverable in terms of provision of bollards and signage but public/stakeholder acceptability may be an issue.	Y

Table 8 Initial Sift Intervention B2 – Traffic Management / Low Emission Zone

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
B2: Traffic Management / Low Emission Zone	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	25
Objectives Comments	Large beneficial impacts in achieving objectives, in particular in the town centre through reducing numbers of vehicles (particularly HGVs) that impact the townscape, improving air quality through reduced vehicular travel in the centre, improving modal shift to active modes, improved access for pedestrians and cyclists, improved safety and improved health of residents.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Very difficult to deliver. Public/stakeholder acceptability issues as there is likely to be large opposition. North Yorkshire (as a whole) has a high dependency on car travel and there will likely be concerns this could significantly adversely impact business in the town centre. Additionally, consultation and relevant permissions and consents will be required to make the change and scheme enforceable as well as coordination of systems to govern its operation.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Costs likely to be less than £5m	Long timescale (> 5 years) Obtaining support and relevant consents and permissions may extend timeframe to deliver scheme.	Independent of other interventions Can be provided independently	Signage strategy Extended pedestrian core High occupancy lanes Cell system Car sharing Car clubs Walking strategy Cycling strategy	Good score against objectives, in particular in the town centre through reducing numbers of vehicles (particularly HGVs) that impact the townscape, improving air quality through reduced vehicular travel in the centre, improving modal shift to active modes, improved access for pedestrians and cyclists, improved safety and improved health of residents. Deliverable in terms of provision of infrastructure to set up and operate the system (i.e. it has been done elsewhere e.g. London, Durham) but public/stakeholder acceptability may be an issue. Suggest it is taken forward but may prove to be unacceptable/unfeasible.	Y



Table 9 Initial Sift Intervention B3 – High occupancy (2+) lanes

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
B3: High occupancy (2+) lanes	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	10
Objectives Comments	Encourages reduction in single occupancy car trips and therefore reduces numbers of vehicles travelling through the area and eases congestion and associated adverse impacts of traffic. Scores are relatively low due to impracticalities of provision of a wide ranging system in the town(s).																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable but with challenges Lack of road space to designate lanes specifically for this use, with sufficient coverage across the town whilst maintaining access for all. Land acquisition may be needed and if so public/stakeholder acceptability is likely to be low.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Costs may vary, dependent upon whether new lanes need to be constructed or existing lanes converted	Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Timescale may vary, dependent upon whether land required for implementation of new lanes. This would require obtaining relevant consents, possible CPO and design and build.	Independent of other interventions Can be implemented independently	Signage strategy Cell system Car sharing Car clubs Improve the connectivity and accessibility of Leeds Bradford Airport from Harrogate and Knaresborough	Poor score against objectives. Although traffic volumes may be reduced overall impact expected to be small. Difficulties in implementing an appropriate scheme and could have relatively high costs if land and even property acquisition required in the urban areas and possible resistance from public/stakeholders.	N

Table 10 Initial Sift Intervention B4 – Area wide travel planning - workplace travel plans, event management

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
B4: Area wide travel planning - workplace travel plans, event management	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	17
Objectives Comments	Likely to reduce internal work place trips and reduce the impact of large events in Harrogate.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues No land or planning permissions are likely to be required. No physical constraints are likely and public/stakeholder support is likely	Low capital cost (<£10m) Relatively low cost associated with journey planning	Short timescale (< 2 years) Journey planning does not have long timescales associated	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Journey/event planning will need to coordinate with other strategies and mode strategies e.g. walking and cycling, public transport schemes/operation	Publicity campaign and incentives for more sustainable travel Personalised journey planner Car sharing Encouraged use of rail for internal journeys Bus/rail station interchange development and public realm improvements Network optimisation	A good score against objectives through helping 'nudge' trips to more sustainable modes. The intervention has the potential to reach a large proportion of people helping reduce reliance upon car travel. Stakeholder resistance is unlikely due to the minimal impact it is likely to have upon third parties. The relative low cost and short timeframes makes it suitable to form part of a package of measures to be considered further.	Y



Table 11 Initial Sift Intervention B5 – Create cell system in Harrogate town centre - potential routing subject to vehicle type

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
B5: Create cell system in Harrogate town centre - potential routing subject to vehicle type	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	20
Objectives Comments	Dependent on how the scheme operates but has potential for a large impact on reducing traffic and increasing a modal shift towards sustainable measures																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Very difficult to deliver Public/stakeholder 'buy-in' to the system may be low, strategies will need to be developed for operation of systems and changes to signage and junctions, additionally consents and legal issues would need to be resolved to make system enforceable.	Medium capital cost (£10m – £50m) Potential relatively high costs associated with amending road layouts and/or junctions, amending lines and signs, setting up enforcement regimes.	Long timescale (> 5 years) Long times expected in relation to various consultations required and obtaining relevant permissions, consents and legal agreements.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Cell system could be delivered independently but would be more effective in accordance with other interventions such as a relief road to bypass the area.	Traffic Management/Low Emission Zone High occupancy (2+) HGV ban at peak times/loading restriction Network optimisation Bus priority on key routes	Good score against objectives. Congestion could be reduced in certain locations and may encourage use of sustainable modes with environmental benefits. However, it will require large amounts of planning and there may be public/stakeholder resistance. Additionally it was considered it would be very difficult to ensure all land uses were adequately served by the cell system and there may be unintended adverse impacts, such as severance, arising where the routing of transport may not be suitable for particular land uses. Physical constraints could also potentially create issues.	N

Table 12 Initial Sift Intervention B6 – Management of side road access to improve main route efficiency

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
B6: Management of side road access to improve main route efficiency	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Objectives Comments	Will improve traffic flow on main routes, though will impede residential connectivity on side roads.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable but with challenges Residents/businesses located adjacent to main routes are likely to oppose as this will impede upon their connectivity to main routes.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Side road access management is likely to have low cost.	Short timescale (< 2 years) Side road access management could be implemented in a short timeframe, minimal land and planning requirements necessary.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Efficiency improvements could be enhanced in accordance with other strategies, e.g. network optimisation.	High occupancy lanes (2+) Network optimisation Bus priority on key routes .	Poor score against objectives and likely to cause disruption for residents adjacent to the main routes. Other interventions will be required in order to fully improve the efficiency.	N



Table 13 Initial Sift Intervention B7 – HGV ban at peak times/loading restrictions

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
B7: HGV ban at peak times/loading restrictions	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	19
Objectives Comments	Will reduce HGV traffic and flows in peak times reducing congestion, which will in turn contribute towards some environmental benefits.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues Possible that public/stakeholders will resist due to perceived impacts upon businesses.	Low capital cost (<£10m) HGV restrictions relatively low cost to implement	Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Legal consents / requirements to be resolved could impact timeframe for delivery.	Independent of other interventions Can be delivered independently	Network optimisation Town Centre 20mph speed limit	Good score against objectives. However there could be issues associated in terms of stakeholder/public support given perceived impact upon businesses. Other network changes will be required in order to enhance the effectiveness of the intervention and reduce congestion issues.	Y

Table 14 Initial Sift Intervention B8 – Town centre 20mph speed limits/zone

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
B8: Town centre 20mph speed limits/zone	0	2	0	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	14
Objectives Comments	Safety will improve for pedestrians and cyclists and injuries may be reduced as a result of speed limit reduction, possible environmental improvements associated with slower, smoother flow of traffic.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues Public/stakeholder acceptability is unknown. Consultations required and TRO processes to be completed.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Relatively low costs with some signage being required	Short timescale (< 2 years) Consultations and formal procedures to be undertaken to implement.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Further focus on sustainable modal shift will further benefit the 20mph limit	Area wide cycling strategy Area wide public realm strategy Public campaigns and incentives for more sustainable travel	Reasonable score against objectives and it would work well in coordination with other interventions to enhance and improve effectiveness of sustainable transport interventions. Public/stakeholder acceptability is unknown and providing it is supported could be implemented relatively quickly.	Y



Table 15 Initial Sift Intervention B9 – Car sharing

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
B9: Car sharing	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9
Objectives Comments	Car sharing will help to reduce the number of car trips to/from the town helping ease congestion and provide associated environmental benefits. Uptake likely to be low so benefits will unlikely reach full potential.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues Public/stakeholder resistance likely to be minimal and unlikely to require significant implementation costs/issues e.g. planning and legal constraints not expected.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Very low cost	Short timescale (< 2 years) Small timescale for promotion (particularly if systems already available e.g. through Harrogate App)	Independent of other interventions Car sharing can operate independent of other interventions using existing infrastructure	Publicity campaign and incentives for more sustainable travel High occupancy (2+) lanes Area wide travel planning-workplace travel plans and event management	Although this intervention has a low score, it would be low cost and quick to deliver with some promotion within Harrogate. Although it can be independent of other interventions, it could tie in well with some other sustainable solutions, such as workplace travel plan strategies and would work well in a package of measures.	Y

Table 16 Initial Sift Intervention B10 – Car clubs (Electric vehicles)

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
B10: Car clubs (Electric vehicles)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	10
Objectives Comments	Electric car club could reduce reliance on owning and using a private car and encourage use of more sustainable vehicle use reducing impacts on environment. Harrogate has a relatively high car ownership and in reality uptake may not be sufficiently large for full potential of benefits to be realised.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues Systems to be set up to operate the club but relatively few issues to be resolved i.e. no significant permissions, consents, and legal issues to be resolved.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Cost of setup not expected to be significant given relatively small size of town and number of vehicles to be made available - also opportunity for revenue generation to offset costs.	Short timescale (< 2 years) Relatively short timeframes to set up - system set up and vehicle acquisition could be undertaken in less than 2 years.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Car club can operate independent of other interventions with some minor infrastructure improvements/changes but is more effective in a package of measures.	Car sharing Improved digital provision Demand responsive services	Reasonable score against objectives but an (electric) car club would allow for the public to have a wide variety of travel options and the choice to only use a car when it is necessary. This would help reduce the overall traffic flows and increase the modal shift towards more sustainable methods of travel. Some small issues would need to be addressed in terms infrastructure requirements, though overall costs could be reduced through revenue generation.	Y



Table 17 Initial Sift Intervention B11 – Work with schools to ameliorate the impact of school run

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
B11: Work with schools to ameliorate the impact of school run (e.g. encourage sustainable school travel, review start/end times etc.)	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	14
Objectives Comments	School contributes to a large proportion of peak time travel congestion and there will already be school travel plans in place. This intervention will look to identify other additional ideas to help reduce congestion associated with the school run.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Depending on detail of intervention there are no significant deliverability issues expected i.e. planning, land and engineering constraints Low capital cost (<£10m)	Relatively low costs associated with process Medium timescale (2 to 5 years)	Depending on exact intervention provided medium timeframes expected e.g. consultation on school time changes and implementation of schemes may extend scheme delivery. Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions	The intervention could benefit from packaging with other sustainable measures	Real time passenger information Publicity campaigns and incentives for more sustainable travel Encouraged use of rail for internal journeys Personalised journey planner Car sharing Area wide public realm and cycling strategies	Reasonable score against objectives, and it is recognised that the school run has a significant impact on AM peak hour traffic. The intervention is deliverable with minimal issues and can be done so over a reasonable timeframe. It would benefit from other sustainable interventions and general shift towards more sustainable modes.	Y

Table 18 Initial Sift Intervention C1 – Relief Road

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
C1: Relief Road	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	-1	0	-1	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	17
Objectives Comments	Relief road can provide benefit by reducing congestion, improving efficiency etc. Also benefits to pedestrians and cyclists if infrastructure is provided as part of the scheme and/or removal of traffic elsewhere on the network can improve safety and overall attractiveness of use. Provision of new road likely to increase vehicle emissions.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable but with challenges Level of support unknown but likely to be challenges (differing views), Planning issues - CPO and Public Inquiry very likely to be required. Physical construction possible but likely to require structures and impact on environmental designations	High capital Cost (>£50m) Costs will exceed £50m	Long timescale (> 5 years) Planning, design and build as well as attaining sufficient funding is likely to involve a long timeframe.	Independent of other interventions Can be delivered independently.	Variable Information Real time passenger information Demand management e.g. Traffic Management/Low Emission Zone Reallocation of road space Network optimisation Public realm and cycling strategies	Good score against objectives. In particular in terms of reducing congestion on key routes through the study area and improving journey times, reliability and efficiency. It can also encourage greater uptake of walking and cycling through improvements in conditions for these modes. Deliverability - physical construction possible but structures likely required over watercourses etc. as part of design, scheme likely to adversely impact designated environmental sites and CPO to be required. Public/stakeholder acceptability likely to be an issue.	Y



Table 19 Initial Sift Intervention C2 – Inner Ring Road

Intervention Reference		Fit with Objectives																				
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
C2: Inner Road		2	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	-1	0	-1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	14
Objectives Comments	<p>Intervention can help alleviate congestion and improve journey times and reliability. It can also provide benefits to pedestrians and cyclists if infrastructure is provided as part of the scheme and/or removal of traffic elsewhere on the network can improve safety and overall attractiveness of use.</p> <p>Provision of new road likely to increase vehicle emissions.</p> <p>Inner ring road could sever access for active modes either side of the road.</p>																					

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
<p>Very difficult to deliver</p> <p>Level of support unknown but likely to be challenges (differing views),</p> <p>Planning issues - Environmental designations impacted, CPO and Public Inquiry very likely to be required.</p> <p>Physical construction possible but impact on environmental designations, greenbelt etc. and possible removal of residential properties in the urban area.</p>	<p>High capital Cost (>£50m)</p> <p>Costs will exceed £50m</p>	<p>Long timescale (> 5 years)</p> <p>Planning, design and build as well as attaining sufficient funding is likely to involve a long timeframe.</p>	<p>Independent of other interventions</p> <p>Can be delivered independently.</p>	<p>Variable Information</p> <p>Real Time Passenger Information</p> <p>Demand management e.g. Traffic Management/Low Emission Zone</p> <p>Reallocation of road space</p> <p>Network optimisation</p> <p>Public realm and cycling strategies</p>	<p>Reasonable level of achievement of objectives. In particular in terms of reducing congestion in the town centre and improving journey times, reliability and efficiency. It can also encourage greater uptake of active modes in the town centre if traffic flows are reduced. There may be issues of severance in the town as a result of an inner ring road.</p> <p>Deliverability - physical construction possible but CPO of residential areas may be required to provide land for the road, which may make the scheme unacceptable to public/stakeholders.</p>	N

Table 20 Initial Sift Intervention C3 – Network Optimisation

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
C3: Network Optimisation	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	12
Objectives Comments	Intervention can help alleviate congestion and improve journey times and reliability. It can also provide benefits to active modes if facilities are provided as part of the scheme. Optimised network flow can improve vehicle efficiency and therefore reduce vehicle emissions and improve localised air quality benefits.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues No significant land, planning or engineering issues Unlikely to be significant acceptability issues.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Relatively low costs to upgrade systems	Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Likely to take a few years to implement optimisation.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Linkage with other schemes can enhance benefits e.g. linking with public transport network services and demand management regimes e.g. HGV bans etc.	Demand Management schemes will impact on network operation. All highway infrastructure schemes will impact network operation Public Transport - bus schemes will interact with network operation. Pedestrians and cyclist facilities can interact with network operation.	Reasonable level of achievement of objectives. In particular in terms of reducing congestion in the town centre and improving journey times, reliability and efficiency. Deliverability - no land or engineering issues. Relatively low cost to deliver but effectiveness will be enhanced by other interventions, so suggest it is taken forward as part of a package of measures.	Y



Table 21 Initial Sift Intervention C4 – Area wide signal strategy review

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
C4: Area wide signal strategy review	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
Objectives Comments	Intervention can help alleviate congestion and improve journey times and reliability. It can also provide benefits to active mode users if facilities are provided as part of the scheme. Improvements to the signals can improve network flow and vehicle efficiency and therefore reduce vehicle emissions and improve localised air quality benefits.																					

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues No significant land, planning or engineering issues Unlikely to be significant acceptability issues.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Relatively low costs to review	Short timescale (< 2 years) Short timescale to review	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Review would be effective as part of a package of measures including network operation.	Signal operation/strategy would need to consider Demand Management schemes, potential new infrastructure schemes and changes to public transport operation including Real Time Passenger Information. Also impacts of pedestrian and cycling facilities e.g. Advanced Stop Lines will need to be considered as part of a signal strategy review.	Relatively low score against objectives as a stand-alone scheme. Its effectiveness can be enhanced through provision with other schemes such as network operation, so suggest it is taken forward as part of a package of measures.	Y

Table 22 Initial Sift Intervention C5 – Reallocation of Road Space

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
C5: Reallocation of Road Space	2	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	14
Objectives Comments	Intervention can help alleviate congestion and improve journey times and reliability through prioritising non-car modes and public transport. It can provide benefits to pedestrians and cyclists if infrastructure is provided as part of the scheme and/or removal of traffic elsewhere on the network can improve safety and overall attractiveness of use and therefore provide some environmental benefits through mode shift.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Very difficult to deliver Scheme is difficult to deliver due to lack of available highway space to reallocate to other modes especially in town centres.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Low cost to reallocate road space (if using existing highway land) Costs would be expensive if CPO of non-highway land in urban areas is required.	Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) dependent on amount of reallocation of space. Access strategies, legalities and consultations required for reallocation of road space.	Wholly dependent on other interventions Intervention will need to be considered as part of public transport (bus) priority schemes and cycling/walking strategies.	QBCs Real time passenger information Park and Ride Public realm and cycling strategies	Reasonable score against scheme objectives in theory - the intervention can help reduce congestion in the town centres through removal of traffic in certain areas however, may limit accessibility to town centre for all modes. Deliverability is questionable given the lack of road space available for reallocation, especially in town centres. Low cost to reallocate space (if additional land is not required). High	<p style="text-align: center; color: red; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em;">N</p> <p style="color: red; font-size: 0.9em;">(this will however, be considered as part of C3 Network Optimisation and F1: Implementation of the Cycling Infrastructure Plan)</p>

					<p>cost if land required. Medium, timescale as depending on level of reallocation access strategies and consultations will be required. Dependency - it would need to work as part of a wider package of measures such as walking and cycling strategies and public transport (bus) strategies. Large scale reallocation of road space not taken forward but will be considered further as localised schemes as part of network optimisation.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Table 23 Initial Sift Intervention D1 – Reallocation of Road Space

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
D1: Area wide review of car parking management, supply and charging and development of area wide strategy	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	18
Objectives Comments	Review of car parking strategy can reduce vehicle trips into the town centres by restricting attractiveness of driving there. This can improve safety and attractiveness of use of more sustainable modes and help meet environmental objectives.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable but with challenges Relatively short timeframe to deliver a strategy and review of parking. Acceptability of a review unlikely to be an issue but the findings may not have full stakeholder/public support.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Low cost to implement strategy and likely initiatives.	Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Relevant consultations, consents and legal issues required to change parking costs and supply etc. likely to extend beyond 5 years	Independent of other interventions It can be delivered independently but would also work well with other initiatives	Parking strategy and initiatives will relate to Demand management schemes also, in particular car clubs/sharing, Traffic Management/Low Emission Zone etc.	Good score against scheme objectives - the intervention can help reduce congestion in the town centres through discouraging car traffic in certain areas and encouragement of shift to sustainable modes. Deliverability of a review/strategy is relatively straightforward but there may be some public/stakeholder acceptability issues for some recommendations particularly regarding increased costs. Low cost to reallocate space (if additional land is not required)	Y



					<p>Medium, timescale as depending on initiatives proposed there may be some consultations and legal processes creating delays to implementation. Dependency - it can be delivered independently but would complement other demand management interventions</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 24 Initial Sift Intervention D2 – Bus Park and Ride (Standalone Intervention)

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
D2: Park and Ride (bus - standalone intervention)	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	7
Objectives Comments	Park and Ride (P&R) services can reduce congestion within and along the key routes into the town centre as well as promoting promotion of the use of public transport which can have environmental benefits from reduced traffic levels. P&R can improve air quality in the centres due to fewer vehicles but adversely impact it elsewhere with people driving to the P&R site. It can also discourage use of rural bus services with people opting to drive to the P&R site. Adverse environmental impacts can also be experienced from the construction and operation of the site(s).																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Very difficult to deliver Planning and land issues likely to arise, possible CPO requirement. Likely to be some public/stakeholder opposition, particularly for those living near to suggested sites.	Medium capital cost (£10m – £50m) Creation of infrastructure and improvements likely to be high end of medium cost banding	Long timescale (> 5 years) Consultations, planning consent, CPO, legal issues, design and build etc. likely to extend beyond 5 years	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Enhanced by working as part of package of parking measures and bus improvement measures.	QBCs Real time passenger information Reallocation of road space Parking Strategy	Relatively low score against objectives. Scheme may be difficult to deliver due to requirement of appropriate sites for delivery. Park and ride services can reduce congestion within and along the key routes into the town centre with associated environmental benefits. However, P&R can introduce issues elsewhere from people driving to the P&R site, it can also discourage use of rural bus services with people opting to drive to the P&R site. Adverse environmental impacts can also be experienced from the construction and operation of the site(s), particularly if built on a greenfield site. Benefits would be better realised as part of a parking strategy.	N (P&R is to be considered as part of the Parking Strategy D1)



Table 25 Initial Sift Intervention E1 – Bus/rail station interchange development and public realm improvements

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
E1: Bus/rail station interchange development and public realm improvements	2	1	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	18
Objectives Comments	Public realm improvements can encourage pedestrian travel and improvements to bus/rail interchange can encourage travel by those modes - reducing car usage and associated congestion and delay, with associated environmental benefits.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable but with challenges Planning and land issues likely to arise, possible CPO requirement. Public/stakeholder acceptability unlikely to be an issue.	High capital Cost (>£50m) Creation of infrastructure and improvements likely to exceed £%0m	Long timescale (> 5 years) Consultations, planning consent, CPO, legal issues etc. likely to extend beyond 5 years	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Enhanced by working as part of package of rail and bus improvement measures.	Any bus and/or rail improvement scheme including: QBCs Real time passenger information Park and Ride Public realm and cycling strategies	Good score against objectives. Deliverability is possible but challenges relating to need for planning consent, land issues and funding High cost to implement Implementation would be a relatively long period of time. Its effectiveness would be enhanced with a number of other public transport initiatives.	Y

Table 26 Initial Sift Intervention E2 – Bus priority on key routes

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
E2: Bus priority on key routes	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	13
Objectives Comments	This can encourage bus use at the expense of car use, reducing the volume of traffic travelling to/from the town centres, therefore reducing congestion and providing some safety and environmental benefits.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Very difficult to deliver Depending on what the scheme involves - difficult to deliver due to lack of available highway space to provide adequate bus priority, changes to signals allowing bus priority would be easier but road space required to make it work.	Medium capital cost (£10m – £50m) Costs likely to be at the high end of the medium banding due to need to acquire land for implementation	Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Consultation to gauge public/stakeholder acceptability would be required also legalities for acquiring land to deliver	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions It would work better with a package of bus public transport measures e.g. QBC, RTPI, Park and Ride	QBCs Real time passenger information Park and Ride	Reasonable score against objectives. Scheme is difficult to deliver due to lack of available highway space to provide adequate bus priority. Signal improvements to give bus priority at key locations could be incorporated as part of network optimisation intervention.	N (this will however, be considered as part of C3: Network Optimisation)



Table 27 Initial Sift Intervention E3 – Quality bus corridors

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
E3: Quality bus corridors	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	14
Objectives Comments	This can encourage bus use at the expense of car use, reducing the volume of traffic travelling to/from the town centres, therefore reducing congestion and providing some safety and environmental benefits.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Very difficult to deliver Difficult to deliver due to lack of available highway space to provide bus corridor priority, changes to signals allowing bus priority would be easier but road space required to make it work. Large scale CPO unlikely to be publically/politically acceptable.	Medium capital cost (£10m – £50m) Costs likely to be at the high end of the medium banding due to need to acquire land for implementation	Long timescale (> 5 years) Consultation to gauge public/stakeholder acceptability would be required also long timeframes relating to legal issues for acquiring land (CPO) to deliver.	Independent of other interventions Can be delivered independently but would work well as part of wider public transport review/strategy.	Bus priority Real time passenger information Park and Ride	Reasonable score against objectives. Scheme is difficult to deliver due to lack of available highway space to provide bus corridors. Significant CPO of residential areas would likely be required.	<p style="text-align: center; color: red; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em;">N</p> <p style="color: red; font-size: 0.9em;">(Bus priority on particular sections of roads and at specific junctions will be considered as part of C3: Network Optimisation A2: RTPI is also being progressed in the sift)</p>

Table 28 Initial Sift Intervention E4 – Focus on new developments providing sustainable transport options

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
E4: Focus on new developments providing sustainable transport options	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	17
Objectives Comments	Provision of sustainable transport options can encourage their use over the private car reducing number of vehicles in the town centres, improving journey times, resilience and safety and environmental improvements.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues Can be incorporated with planning conditions	Low capital cost (<£10m) Relatively low cost to implement. Developer's provide as part of their proposals	Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Proposals to be included in policy documents, Local Plans etc. which could take a long timeframe to be agreed.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Dependent on strategy/policy being adopted by planning authorities to ensure developers' provide the measures.	Links to wider strategy required to ensure a coordinated approach for the proposed sustainable transport options	Good score against objectives and deliverable with relatively few issues. Relatively low cost to include as part of a package of sustainable measures.	Y



Table 29 Initial Sift Intervention E5 – Demand responsive services

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
E5: Demand responsive services	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8
Objectives Comments	Services can encourage sharing of trips but lack of convenience may prevent significant uptake.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues Unlikely to be considered unacceptable Feasible to deliver, it will not require land or planning consents.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Costs unlikely to exceed £5m	Short timescale (< 2 years) Possibly expand existing services (if available)	Independent of other interventions Can be delivered independently	Can link to travel planning initiatives e.g. Open Harrogate App, public transport improvement initiatives e.g. new parkway stations	Relatively low score against objectives. Uptake may not be sufficient to meet scheme objectives. It can be delivered with few issues and for a relatively low cost. Timescales are dependent on availability or not of existing services (which could be enhanced)	N

Table 30 Initial Sift Intervention E6 – Reopen disused railway lines

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
E6: Reopen disused railway lines	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	13
Objectives Comments	Increased rail services could encourage greater use at the expense of car trips in the area - reducing congestion in the town and providing improved safety and environmental benefits.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Very difficult to deliver Public/Stakeholder acceptability unknown but reinstating lines/stations could be very costly and involve land issues	High capital Cost (>£50m) High costs incurred in making lines operational, obtaining rolling stock for additional services, provision of relevant infrastructure	Long timescale (> 5 years) Likely to be time consuming to resolve land and legal issues as well as providing relevant infrastructure and timetabling to provide a suitable service	Independent of other interventions Not dependent on other intervention	Can link to other rail based interventions	Reasonable score against objectives. The scheme is very difficult to deliver due to significant costs involved in reinstating the lines and provision of relevant infrastructure, timetabling etc. CPO may also be required.	N



Table 31 Initial Sift Intervention E7 – Shuttle bus from railway stations

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
E7: Shuttle bus from railway stations	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	9
Objectives Comments	Services can encourage sharing of trips from the station and improve seamless travel improving confidence for visitors to the station/town. This can reduce car trips in the towns but level of uptake is dependent on accessibility, awareness, convenience and breadth of destinations covered.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable with few issues Unlikely to have acceptability issues Feasible to deliver, as it will not involve significant land or planning issues.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Unlikely to cost more than £5m	Short timescale (< 2 years) Can be quick to implement if operator available	Independent of other interventions Not dependent on other intervention but would work better with integration with rail services	Can link to bus priority interventions.	Poor score against objectives but can be delivered relatively easily, quickly and with relatively low cost. Unlikely to have a significant uptake given the small size of Harrogate and Knaresborough.	N

Table 32 Initial Sift Intervention E8 – Relocation of Starbeck railway station

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
E8: Relocation of Starbeck railway station	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
Objectives Comments	Moving the station could relieve the issue relating to the congestion associated with the level crossing - improving network flow efficiency and resilience as well as environmental and safety improvements.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Very difficult to deliver Public/stakeholder acceptability issues likely. Requirement for planning consents, land requirements etc. will likely make this scheme difficult to deliver	High capital Cost (>£50m) Relocation of station would have a very high cost	Long timescale (> 5 years) Obtaining relevant permissions, consents, land as well as design and build will involve long timeframes	Independent of other interventions Not dependent on other intervention but would work better with integration with rail services	This would relate to other rail initiatives so a new station could link to the other relevant networks also walking and cycling strategies to ensure coordination.	Poor score against objectives. Scheme is difficult to deliver due to land requirements and likely high cost of CPO. Stakeholder/public acceptability support unlikely due to the high cost and impact of CPO in urban area potentially including residential buildings. High cost to deliver.	N



Table 33 Initial Sift Intervention E9 – Parkway stations

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
E9: Parkway stations	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	13
Objectives Comments	Encouraged use of rail travel to the towns reducing congestion, also through removing vehicle trips to the town centre station for trips out of Harrogate - encouraging environmental improvements through use of more sustainable travel modes. It can however create congestion at the parkway sites.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Very difficult to deliver Difficult due to requirement for various permissions and consents as well as land requirements. Public/stakeholder acceptability is unknown.	Medium capital cost (£10m – £50m) Costs likely to be at the high end of the medium banding due to needing to plan, design and build new rail stations	Long timescale (> 5 years) Long timeframes expected to plan, design and build new rail stations and factor in timetabling.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Can be delivered independently but would work well with connection to other strategies e.g. walking and cycling strategies to ensure coordinated and joined up thinking	Rail improvement schemes Walking Strategy Cycling strategy Bus/rail interaction schemes	Scores reasonably well against objectives through encouraging sustainable mode use but very high costs and deliverability issues likely. It can also redistribute some local traffic creating congestion elsewhere.	N

Table 34 Initial Sift Intervention E10 – New rail halts

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
E10: New rail halts	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	12
Objectives Comments	Encouraged use of rail travel to Harrogate and Knaresborough can reduce congestion in the town by removing vehicle trips within the town centre - encouraging environmental improvements through use of more sustainable travel modes. However, given the size of the towns and surrounding settlements the practical take up would likely be small and hence the contribution to achieving objectives small.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Very difficult to deliver Difficult due to requirement for various permissions and consents as well as land requirements. Public/stakeholder acceptability is unknown.	High capital Cost (>£50m) High costs expected to plan, design and build new rail stations	Long timescale (> 5 years) Long timeframes expected to plan, design and build new rail stations and factor in timetabling.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Can be delivered independently but would work well with connection to other strategies e.g. walking and cycling strategies to ensure coordinated and joined up thinking	Rail improvement schemes Walking Strategy Cycling strategy Bus/rail interaction schemes	Scores reasonably well against objectives through encouraging sustainable mode use but very high costs and deliverability issues likely with a requirement for appropriate permissions, consents and land acquisition in urban areas which will likely have very high costs and adverse impacts to businesses and residents. Provision of additional halts would also likely impact timetabling and operation of the lines.	N



Table 35 Initial Sift Intervention E11 – Improved access to stations

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
E11: Improved access to stations	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	16
Objectives Comments	Encouraged use of rail travel to/from Harrogate and Knaresborough can reduce congestion in the town by removing vehicle trips within the town centre. Improved access for pedestrians and cyclists in particular can help reduce car travel to/from the stations. This mode shift in turn can encourage safety and environmental improvements.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable but with challenges Likely to receive support from public and stakeholders. Depending on level of works required could be possible with limited consents and permissions required	Medium capital cost (£10m – £50m) Costs dependent on proposals to be implemented.	Short timescale (< 2 years) Dependent on proposals suggested but some initiatives could be implemented in relatively short timeframes	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions This would need to work with other strategies such as public transport, walking and cycling strategies to ensure coordination and joined up thinking across strategies	Rail improvement schemes Walking Strategy Cycling strategy Bus/rail interaction schemes	Good score against objectives through encouraging sustainable mode use and could be effective as part of a package of measures.	Y

Table 36 Initial Sift Intervention E12 – Encouraged use of rail for internal journeys

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
E12: Encouraged use of rail for internal journeys	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	11
Objectives Comments	Encouraged use of rail travel within Harrogate and Knaresborough can reduce congestion in the town by removing vehicle trips within the town centre, however given the size of the towns the practical take up would likely be small and hence the contribution to achieving objectives small.																					

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
<p>Deliverable with few issues</p> <p>Unlikely to be considered unacceptable</p> <p>Land issues unlikely to be an issue</p> <p>No issues relating to engineering feasibility</p>	<p>Low capital cost (<£10m)</p> <p>Relatively low cost marketing campaigns and initiatives</p> <p>Possible ongoing revenue costs</p>	<p>Short timescale (< 2 years)</p> <p>Can be implemented relatively quickly.</p>	<p>Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions</p> <p>Improved services and facilities connected with rail use would help encourage usage</p>	<p>Any Harrogate and Knaresborough rail scheme/intervention would link with this intervention</p>	<p>Reasonable score against objectives as, although it can encourage sustainable mode use, given the size of the towns the practical take up for travel by rail within the town would likely be small and hence the contribution to achieving objectives is small. When considering the short distances involved it was considered the overall costs of travel including time of travel to/from stations (at either end) time waiting for trains and financial implications may make this impractical for many short journeys. Consequently it is not considered to be taken forward.</p>	<p>N</p> <p>(However, interventions to encourage sustainable travel are included in A4: Publicity Campaigns, A5: Digital provision and A6: Personalised journey planners).</p>



Table 37 Initial Sift Intervention F1 – Implementation of Cycling Infrastructure Plan

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
F1: Implementation of the Cycling Infrastructure Plan for Harrogate, Knaresborough and surrounding area	1	1	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	19
Objectives Comments	Encouraged use of cycling for short trips in Harrogate and Knaresborough can reduce congestion in the town by removing vehicle trips within the town centre. This mode shift in turn can encourage safety and environmental improvements as well as provide health benefits.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable but with challenges Delivery of a strategy may have challenges due to implementing adequate provision of infrastructure may present challenges.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Costs likely to be less than £5m	Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Implementation of a strategy and design and build of infrastructure can extend timeframes for delivery.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Can be delivered independently but will be enhanced if coordinated with other sustainable transport measures and strategies.	Pedestrian strategy Signage strategy Publicity campaigns Digital technology	Good level of contribution to achievement of objectives. Deliverability of a strategy unlikely to be an issue but may be challenges in delivering some of the proposals Low cost to implement Can be delivered in relatively short timescales and not dependent on other interventions but would work well in a package of walking and cycling interventions.	Y

Table 38 Initial Sift Intervention G1 – Area wide public realm strategy

Intervention Reference	Fit with Objectives																				Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
G1: Area wide public realm strategy	1	1	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	20
Objectives Comments	Encouraged use of walking for short trips in Harrogate and Knaresborough can reduce congestion in the town by removing vehicle trips within the town centre. This mode shift in turn can encourage safety and environmental improvements as well as provide health benefits.																				

Deliverability	Indicative Cost Comments	Timescale Comments	Dependency Comments	Relationship to other possible interventions	Assessment Comment	Include in a package to take to EAST?
Deliverable but with challenges Delivery of a strategy may have challenges due to implementing adequate provision of infrastructure may present challenges.	Low capital cost (<£10m) Costs likely to be less than £5m	Medium timescale (2 to 5 years) Implementation of a strategy and design and build of infrastructure can extend timeframes for delivery.	Effectiveness enhanced by other interventions Can be delivered independently but will be enhanced if coordinated with other sustainable transport measures and strategies.	Pedestrian strategy Signage strategy Publicity campaigns Digital technology	Good level of contribution to achievement of objectives. Deliverability of a strategy unlikely to be an issue but may be challenges in delivering some of the proposals Low cost to implement Can be delivered in relatively short timescales and not dependent on other interventions but would work well in a package of walking and cycling interventions.	Y