

Messages from the Engagement Group - meeting 3

	Comment/Query	Project team response
1	Clarification was requested on why the report would be taken to both Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee and Skipton and Ripon ACC – some group members felt this was unnecessary and that only Harrogate and Knaresborough ACC should receive the report. This would be consistent with the study area. Comments from the Skipton and Ripon ACC should be given less weight than those from Harrogate and Knaresborough.	The request for the report to be taken to both committees had been made by elected members. Officers recognised the concerns raised and said they would discuss with Committee Services the best approach on recording the comments made at the committee meetings.
2	Clarification sought on the meaning of ‘possible public consultation’ as mentioned in the presentation slides. Asked for the slides to be updated accordingly.	This was noted. Officers explained that where the slides talked about possible consultation, this was in the context of receiving approval from the Executive to go out to consultation, not with regards to whether or not consultation should be undertaken at all. Officers sought to clarify again that the decision they would be seeking from the Executive, would be approval to undertake extensive public consultation based on the findings of the OAR Addendum.
3	Clarification requested on whether disbenefits and negative impacts would be calculated as well as benefits and positive impacts.	The project team responded that the transport model looks at traffic movement across the network, and therefore will show decreases and increases. In addition, the intervention summary sheets detail potential barriers or potential negative impacts. Further detail on this is contained in the EAST in the OAR, and should schemes progress, there would be further consideration of these impacts in the appraisal summary table and also that an environmental impact would be undertaken. Explanation was also given that in terms of DfT reporting, ‘benefits’ can be positive or negative, so in fact what is actually being analysed is the impact of the intervention.
4	Explanation was sought on the comparison of uplifts between schemes, area wide (relief road) vs area specific (reallocation of road space for example). How is this comparable when one targets two streets and one targets the whole district?	Project team explained that all of the testing at this stage is intended to be indicative, but it is based upon the further option development work for which the purpose was to be less generic about interventions and look at where they could realistically be delivered. Much more detailed and extensive modelling and appraisal would be undertaken should options be progressed. The limitations and caveats on this analysis will all be set out in the OAR addendum. Also to note that the Harrogate town centre interventions will be subject to an overall uplift, which takes the specific focus in this area into account.
5	Is lack of data (i.e., detailed cycle count data/active travel model) a disadvantage?	Project team explained that the level of data, particularly with regards to active modes (walking and cycling) is poor, but this is not unusual, and that only two areas in the UK have operational walking and cycling models. Also

		set out that for this stage of scheme development, it would not be proportionate to undertake wide scale data collection at significant cost. This would be undertaken if necessary at a later stage. WSP advised that they are using all available data to ensure that the modelling is as accurate as possible.
6	How are packages going to be developed to form the optimum solution? And how will active travel be locked in to those packages.	Project team again reiterated that there was absolutely a degree of flexibility on the package contents, and that the purpose of this further stage of this option development is to provide a greater level of analysis which can, if approved, be put to the public to illustrate the various options which could deliver congestion relief.
7	Question was asked as to why are only 2 streets identified in road space reallocation.	See above – further, the project team further explained that the testing of this was considered to be indicative and the streets chosen were selected in light of the other complementary package measures that have been put forward. Further work had been undertaken to localise interventions where possible as a key deliverable of this additional work. And packaging had been challenged and reviewed as part of the baseline review. And packaging of measures is appropriate given the complex transport issues in Harrogate.
8	Clarification was sought on how the relief road would be modelled and whether one alignment or all three will be tested.	The project team explained that three existing relief road alignments would be tested through the model. Whilst these have been tested already through initial modelling (as set out in the OAR) they have not been tested in combination with other package elements. Analysts will be running the model three times to test the three relief road options plus the other interventions, and this will give an early indication of package performance.
9	One group member suggested that a more definitive alignment of the relief road had been promised for this meeting.	Project team set out that this must be due to a misunderstanding, as there was no element within the commission relating to further design development of the relief road. The main aim of the analysis being undertaken in development of the addendum was to further development of the non-relief road interventions. Project team also advised that it would be highly unusual to confirm any further details on the alignment at this stage as a consequence of the extent of additional analysis that would be required in advance of selecting a preferred option. Relief road assessment can be made without a defined route – because the model used at this stage is a strategic model.
10	Clarification was requested on why some of the relief road options have been discarded if development was indeed in such early stages.	Explanation was given that the decision taken to discard most northern relief road option was due to two aspects; a development site location and NYCC's inability to defend the northern alignment as reason for refusal of

		development, and in addition, its poorer performance through the initial modelling undertaken on various relief road options. Details on this process and the reasons for recommendation of the rescinding of the route are set out clearly in the Executive committee report relating to this matter, which can be found on the County Council's website.
11	Question as to whether, as last time, there will there be a press conference when the Committee report is published. Feeling that the press release in advance of the committee report last time was unhelpful and therefore should be avoided this time.	Project team suggested that no decision has been made on this as yet but noted the comments.
12	Question asked as to whether the recommendations made in the OAR Addendum will be based only on the economic case.	Project team explained that the OAR addendum will set out potential recommendations based on the outcome of the cost benefit analysis. To have got to this stage in the process, measures will have been sifted through the EAST, considered by officers during the long list to short list, and then assessed qualitatively, in addition to the quantitative analysis undertaken. Should measures be further developed, as part of any business case preparation, significant assessment of their wider impacts will be undertaken, to ensure that implications are understood.
13	Project team were asked why only large cities seems to have been used in the comparative studies.	Project team responded that where a suitable comparator towns existed, this data has been used. However, for many interventions, these comparable towns do not exist, and as a consequence, data from elsewhere has been used that looked at locations both larger and smaller than Harrogate. It was reiterated that in all cases, professional judgement of the application of figures has been applied and the resulting potential uplifts/reductions have been agreed upon following dialogue between WSP's specialists, the project team at NYCC, and also specialists from other disciplines within NYCC. This approach is commensurate with the stage of scheme development and again, is a standard approach in option development, in line with webTAG guidance.
14	Clarification was sought on whether tourism / retail benefits etc. are included in the assessment at this stage. Similarly, the group asked for details of the stage at which public health / air quality etc. would be considered and assessed.	Project team responded that tourism and retail had been considered qualitatively, as part of the OAR case for intervention. In addition to that, if the scheme progressed to the stage where a business case be developed, then wider impacts would be appraised. It was confirmed that TUBA software, being used as part of this appraisal, provides quantification of impacts in relation to Greenhouse Gases and that Active Mode Appraisal considers health related to physical activity.

15	Question as to whether the ARUP report produced for HBC been considered?	Project team confirmed that all available data sources had been reviewed and fed into the project through the stage one report and the OAR. Project team also noted that HBC have commissioned a review and refresh of the Arup report.
16	One group member reiterated that the study relates to Harrogate and Knaresborough, yet there was no mention of Knaresborough in the summary sheets included in the presentation today.	Project team responded that the examples chosen were only 5 of 24 interventions, and that as had been discussed at the previous workshops, many of the interventions are relevant to Knaresborough. Project team said that to cover every intervention in turn would have taken at least 2-3 hours and that the examples chosen were intended to be illustrative of the various approaches to assessment being undertaken.
17	Public consultation should present AQ and public health benefits / dis-benefits.	Project team reiterated that should approval be given to go to consultation, the materials produced for consultation will be extensive and thorough, and will set out the various impacts, positive and negative, of the interventions. This will be commensurate to the stage of the study which, as above, considers high level appraisal of Greenhouse gases and health.
Feedback and comments on the process overall		
Thanks to the project team for listening and noting views. Having a more genuine and transparent consultation is key to engendering support for projects		
Has been an informative and helpful process, so thanks again to the project team.		