Local Highway Maintenance Challenge
Fund Tranche 2a

Rural Tourism in the National Parks
Local Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund

Application Form (for Tranche 2A)

The level of information provided should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme proposed. Note that DfT funding is a maximum of £5 million per scheme. An individual local authority may apply only for one scheme.

For schemes submitted by components of a Combined Authority a separate application form should be completed for each scheme, then the CA should rank them in order of preference.

Applicant Information

Local authority name:  North Yorkshire County Council

Bid Manager Name and position:  Andrew Bainbridge – Team Leader Transport Planning

Name and position of officer with day to day responsibility for delivering the proposed scheme.

Contact telephone number:  01609 532382

Email address:

Postal address:  Business and Environmental Services
                County Hall
                Northallerton
                North Yorkshire
                DL7 8AH

Combined Authorities

If the bid is from a local highway authority within a Combined Authority, please specify the contact and ensure that the Combined Authority has submitted a Combined Authority Application Ranking Form.

Name and position of Combined Authority Bid Co-ordinator:

Contact telephone number:  

Email address:

Postal address:

When authorities submit a bid for funding to the Department, as part of the Government’s commitment to greater openness in the public sector under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, they must also publish a version excluding any commercially sensitive information on their own website within two working days of submitting the final bid to the Department. The Department reserves the right to deem the business case as non-compliant if this is not adhered to.

Please specify the weblink where this bid will be published:

http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/article/26182/Transport-policies-plans-and-schemes
SECTION A - Scheme description

A1. Scheme name: Rural Tourism in the National Parks

A2. Headline description:

Please enter a brief description of the proposed scheme and its timetable including the completion date (in no more than 50 words)

Provide an increased level of highway maintenance on the upland rural roads serving the main visitor attractions in the North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales National Parks to improve visitor access and boost the rural visitor economy (see appendix 1)

A3. Geographical area:

Please provide a short description of area covered by the bid (in no more than 50 words)

The geographical area of the North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales National Parks in North Yorkshire and links from the A class roads on the edge of the National Parks (see appendix 1)

OS Grid Reference: n/a
Postcode: n/a

Please append a map showing the location (and route) of the proposed scheme, existing transport infrastructure and other points of particular interest to the bid e.g. development sites, areas of existing employment, constraints on land use, planning etc.

A4. Type of scheme (please tick relevant box):

Small project bids (requiring DfT funding of up to £5 million)

Major maintenance, strengthening or renewal of bridges, tunnels, retaining walls or other structures

Major maintenance or renewal of carriageways (roads)

Major maintenance or renewal of footways or cycleways

Major maintenance or renewal of drainage assets

SECTION B – The Business Case

B1. The Financial Case – Project Costs and Profile

Before preparing a scheme proposal for submission, bid promoters should ensure they understand the financial implications of developing the scheme (including any implications for future resource spend and ongoing costs relating to maintaining and operating the asset), and the need to secure and underwrite any necessary funding outside the Department’s maximum contribution.

Please complete the following tables. Figures should be entered in £000s (i.e. £10,000 = 10).
### Table A: Funding profile (Nominal terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>£000s</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfT Funding Sought</td>
<td>£3,600k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Contribution</td>
<td>£500k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(£2,500k including works already programmed for 17/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Third Party Funding</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1) Department for Transport funding is only for the 2017-18 financial year.
2) A minimum local contribution of 10% (by the local authority and/or third party) of the project costs is required.

### B2 Local Contribution / Third Party Funding

Please provide information on the following points (where applicable):

a) The non-DfT contribution may include funding from organisations other than the scheme promoter. Please provide details of all non-DfT funding contributions to the scheme costs. This should include evidence to show how any third party contributions are being secured, the level of commitment and when they will become available.

**£500k - NYCC Civil Parking Enforcement Surplus**

**£3,700k – Works already programmed by NYCC for 17/18 and 18/19 on the ‘in scope’ network.**

b) Where the contribution is from external sources, please provide a letter confirming the body’s commitment to contribute to the cost of the scheme. The Department is unlikely to fund any scheme where significant financial contributions from other sources have not been secured or appear to be at risk.

Have you appended a letter(s) to support this case?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ✅ N/A

c) Please list any other funding applications you have made for this scheme or variants thereof and the outcome of these applications, including any reasons for rejection (e.g. through the Access Fund or similar competition).

None

### B3. Strategic Case (Maximum 50 words for each section a) to g)

This section should briefly set out the rationale for making the investment and evidence of the existing situation, set out the history of the asset and why it is needs to be repaired or renewed. It should also include how the scheme it fits into the overall asset management strategy for the authority and why it cannot be funded through the annual Highways Maintenance Block Funding grant.

a) What are the current problems to be addressed by your scheme? (Describe economic, environmental, social problems or opportunities which will be addressed by the scheme).

The tourist industry is an important element of the North Yorkshire economy especially the case in the two upland National Parks. Between them the two National Parks attract in excess
of 16 million visitors per year with an annual spend of almost £950m (STEAM reports (Scarborough Tourism Economic Activity Monitor)). Tourism depends on travel and traffic by various modes (car, bike, coach) including in many cases travel being the purpose of the journey itself. Poor road condition deters this travel and has a resultant negative impact on the tourist economy as well as local people.

b) Why the asset is in need of urgent funding?

This higher level of maintenance need is as a result of the more extreme weather conditions (in terms of both winter weather and rainfall) due to the exposed upland nature of the area. This issue is exacerbated by the fact that many of the main tourist attractions are situated on lower category roads which, as a result of the visitor attraction experience higher than normally expected levels of traffic.

c) What options have been considered and why have alternatives have been rejected?

A continuation of our normal highway maintenance regime using Highways Maintenance Block Funding Grant. This will lead to continued deterioration of these sections of the network with a potential negative impact on the visitor economy.

d) What are the expected benefits / outcomes?

A high standard of highway maintenance on the roads serving many of the main tourist destinations and routes in the National Parks helping to maintain and grow the visitor economy in the areas.

e) Please provide information on the geographical areas that will benefit from your scheme.

The geographical area of the North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales National Parks both upland rural areas with sparse population and high levels of tourist traffic especially in the summer months (see appendices)

f) What will happen if funding for this scheme is not secured - would an alternative (lower cost) solution be implemented (if yes, please describe this alternative and how it differs from the proposed scheme)?

No.

g) What is the impact of the scheme?

A Good or Very Good network condition on 620km of rural route leading to more than 20 of the main visitor destinations and/or visitor ‘driving as an activity’ routes helping to maintain and grow the visitor economies in these areas

B4. Affordability and Financial Risk (maximum 50 words for each of a) to c)

What is your Authority’s most recent total outturn annual capital spending on highways maintenance (Year 2015/16) £45,989 figures should be entered in £000s (i.e. £10,000 = 10)

(including pothole fund, LGF funding and additional NYCC funding from capital reserves)

What is the DfT contribution sought as a % and that annual total 7.828% (to 3 decimal places)

(12.142% of the DfT Block Allocation of £29.650m)
This section should provide a narrative setting out how you will mitigate any financial risks associated with the scheme.

Please provide evidence on the following points (where applicable):

a) What risk allowance has been applied to the project cost?
   
   10%

b) How will cost overruns be dealt with?

NYCC has a robust programme management system in place including a Significant Scheme Variation Form (Sig SVF) process for all highways capital works. This requires staff delivering the schemes to seek approvals at Assistant Director level to incur significant cost overruns with oversight provided by the Capital projects Board which is chaired by the Corporate Director. Overall programme costs are generally balanced however any costs overruns on the overall programme will be accommodated from additional allocations from the Civil Parking Enforcement surplus or other County Council funds.

c) What are the main risks to project delivery timescales and what impact this will have on cost?

As these are all tourist routes the time period for implementation of these improvements is limited by the need to not undertake works in the main tourist season. It is unlikely that delays to the implementation as a result of this will impact on costs however, the NYCC local contribution is available to carry forward to 2018/19 if necessary to mitigate against the impacts of programme delay.

B5. Equality Analysis

Has any Equality Analysis been undertaken in line with the Equality Duty? ✓Yes ☐ No

B6. Value for Money

a) For all scheme bids, promoters should provide, where available, an estimate of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of the scheme.

No BCR for this specific scheme has been calculated. However recent experience as part of the County Council bid for the Local Growth Fund – Category 4 Road Maintenance major scheme business case (http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/article/32076/Local-growth-fund---category-4-road-maintenance) using the DfT / TRL Highways Maintenance Appraisal Tool (HMAT) indicates that a BCR of over 2.0 (high value for money) is realistic when assessed over 30 years for a similar approach to increased highway maintenance.

Where a BCR is provided please be aware that DfT may wish to scrutinise the data and assumptions used in deriving that BCR.

b) Please provide the following data will form a key part of our assessment:

Note this material should be provided even if a BCR estimate has been supplied and has also to be entered and returned as an MS Excel file in the VfM Annex MS Excel file).

| A description of the do-minimum situation (i.e. what would happen without Challenge Fund investment). | The condition of the network on these key tourist routes in the National Parks would continue to deteriorate leading to a likely reduced number of visitors and resultant negative impacts on the high number of SME’s which form the important visitor economy of the National Parks |
Details of significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of the scheme (quantified where possible)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of scheme (km)</th>
<th>Approx. 21.8km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Number of vehicles on affected section (Average Annual Daily Traffic in vehicles and if possible split by vehicle type) – to include details of data (age etc.) supporting this estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YDNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6255 Ribblehead</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6479 Ribblehead</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6160 Buckden</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6270 Grinton</td>
<td>2303</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYMNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.171 Scaling Dam</td>
<td>8408</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.174 Hinderwell</td>
<td>4071</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All flows from permanent Automatic Traffic Counters

Due to the wide extent of the network traffic flows are not available on all the in scope roads. However traffic flows on the rural C class and Unclassified road networks are typically less than 1000 vpd. Traffic flows on key A and B class roads are detailed above.

Typically summer Sunday traffic flows on the in scope network are between 25% and 50% above AADT levels indicating the highly recreational nature of these roads.

c) Other VfM information where relevant - depending on type of scheme bid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of required restrictions/closures if funding not provided (e.g. type of restrictions; timing/duration of restrictions; etc.)</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of any diversion route, if closure is required (over and above existing route) (km)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularity/duration of closures due to flooding: (e.g. number of closures per year; average length of closure (hrs); etc.)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and severity of accidents: both for the do minimum and the forecast impact of the scheme (e.g. existing number of accidents and/or accident rate; forecast number of accidents and or accident rate with and without the scheme)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of existing cyclists; forecasts of cycling usage with and without the scheme (and if available length of journey) | Due to the extent of the network to be addressed it is not feasible to undertake detailed cycle use surveys.

B7. The Commercial Case

This section categorizes the procurement strategy that will be used to appoint a contractor and, importantly for this fund, set out the timescales involved in the procurement process to show that delivery can proceed quickly.

What is the preferred procurement route for the scheme? For example, if it is proposed to use existing framework agreements or contracts, the contract must be appropriate in terms of scale and scope.

- Framework Contract
- Council Contractor
- Competitive Tender

*It is the promoting authority’s responsibility to decide whether or not their scheme proposal is lawful; and the extent of any new legal powers that need to be sought. Scheme promoters should ensure that any project complies with the Public Contracts Regulations as well as European Union State Aid rules, and should be prepared to provide the Department with confirmation of this, if required. An assurance that a strategy is in place that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcomes is required from your Section 151 Officer below.*

B8. Delivery (maximum 50 words for a) and 100 words for b)

a) Are any statutory procedures required to deliver the project, if yes please provide details below;

- Yes  ✔No

Details of statutory procedure (50 words maximum)

b) Please summarise any lessons your authority has learned from the experience of delivering other DfT funded programmes (such as Challenge Fund tranche 1, pinch point schemes, local majors, Local Sustainable Transport Fund, Better Bus Areas) and what would be different on this project as a result.

Detailed management of the programme as a whole as well as for individual schemes is required to ensure that the programme as a whole is delivered on time and budget. This approach is now fully embedded into all NYCC highways capital works including for specifically funded DfT programmes such as the Local Growth Fund, Pothole Action Fund and Winter damage Funding.

B9. Stakeholder Support (maximum 50 words for a) and 100 words for b)

c) Does this proposal have the support of the Local MP(s);

- Yes  ☐No

NYCC are currently seeking letters of support from the 4 MP’s covering the National Parks

Name of MP(s) and Constituency

1 Rishi Sunak – Richmond (Yorks)
2 Julian Smith – Skipton and Ripon
3 Robert Goodwill – Scarborough and Whitby
4 Kevin Hollinrake – Thirsk and Malton

d) List other stakeholders supporting the Scheme:
1 Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority
2 York North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership
3 North Yorkshire Federation of Small Businesses
4 York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce

SECTION C: Declarations

C1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [scheme name] I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that North Yorkshire County Council will have all the necessary powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.

Name: Barrie Mason
Position: Assistant Director Highways and Transportation
Signed:

C2. Section 151 Officer Declaration

As Section 151 Officer for [name of authority] I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that [name of authority]

- has allocated sufficient budget to deliver this scheme on the basis of its proposed funding contribution
- will allocate sufficient staff and other necessary resources to deliver this scheme on time and on budget
- accepts responsibility for meeting any costs over and above the DfT contribution requested, including potential cost overruns and the underwriting of any funding contributions expected from third parties
- accepts responsibility for meeting any ongoing revenue requirements in relation to the scheme
- accepts that no further increase in DfT funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested
- has the necessary governance / assurance arrangements in place
- has identified a procurement strategy that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome
- will ensure that a robust and effective stakeholder and communications plan is put in place

Name: MICHAEL LEAH
Signed:

Submission of bids:

The deadline for bid submission is 5pm on:
31 March 2017 for Challenge Fund Tranche 2A (2017/18 funding)

An electronic copy only of the bid including any supporting material should be submitted to:
roadmaintenance@dft.gsi.gov.uk copying in Paul.O'Hara@dft.gsi.gov.uk
Local Highway Maintenance Challenge
Fund Tranche 2a

Rural Tourism in the National Parks

APPENDICES
APPENDIX 1

Scheme Title
Additional Maintenance of National Park Visitor Routes

Background
The vast majority of the Yorkshire Dales National Park (YDNP) and North York Moors National Park (NYMNP) lie within the county of North Yorkshire. These are both major upland areas reaching maximum elevations of 736m and 454m respectively with roads at over 500m and 400m respectively.

Highway deterioration is exacerbated in these areas by the impacts of more regular and more extreme bad weather events as a result of their altitude. The Local Transport Plan ‘Needs Funding Element’ formula does not take into account geographical or meteorological influences on road condition hence the allocated funding for roads in these areas is identical to similar classes of roads in more benign lowland rural areas.

The visitor / tourist economy is an important element of the economy of North Yorkshire and even more so in the National Parks. The YDNP attracts approximately 9.5 million visitors per year with an annual estimated spend of around £400m the NYMNP attracts around 7 million visitors with an annual spend of over £500m.

Problems to be addressed
The additional impacts of the extreme weather in these upland areas has resulted in significantly increased deterioration in the condition of the highway network.

Tourism depends on travel including in many cases travel being the purpose of the journey itself (going for a drive). Poor road condition deters this travel and has a resultant negative impact on the tourist economy as well as local people.

This is the case for all modes of transport. Many of the roads in the National Parks are heavily used by recreational and sportive cyclists attracted by the beauty of the area and the challenging terrain. Roads in the National Parks have been used by the 2014 Tour de France and subsequent Tour de Yorkshire international road race events. This attracts additional recreational cyclists wanting to ride the same routes as the professionals.

Local experience and stakeholder feedback suggests that the poor road condition in the National Park is deterring visitor trips to the many visitor attractions and where travel is the activity itself.

Scheme Objective
To improve the condition of the main routes used by visitors to the National Parks to help support the local visitor economy.

The Proposal
The County Council has identified for each National Park the visitor attractions and tourist routes. Details are shown in table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YDNP Attraction</th>
<th>NYMNP Attraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tan Hill / Buttertubs Pass</td>
<td>Runswick Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton Castle</td>
<td>Robin Hoods Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aysgarth Falls</td>
<td>Grosmont and the North York Moors Railway (NYMR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malham</td>
<td>Gothland (Aidensfield) and the NYMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingleton</td>
<td>Rosedale Abbey &amp; Chimney Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 - National Park Visitor Attractions and Routes

Based on the above the main networks of routes that are used by visitors to either access these attractions or to ‘go for a drive’ have been identified specific. These ‘in scope’ routes are shown on Figures 1 and 2 below.
For the financial years 2017/18 and 2018/19 the County Council has already programmed 25 highway maintenance schemes and a comprehensive programme of surface dressing on the in scope road shown on Figures 1 and 2. The total value of this programme is approximately £2.0m in 2017/18 and £1.7m for 2018/19.

Based on the highway condition surveys the County Council has identified 32 additional locations for potential resurfacing schemes to be funded from the Highway Maintenance Challenge Fund (see annex 1) with a total value of £4.1m (including fees and risk). These include:

- The A684 Market Place and Penn Lane, Hawes. One of the main towns and visitor attractions in the YDNP and home to the only 'real' Wensleydale cheese.
- The A684 through Leyburn the main access route to Wensleydale.
- The B1257 main access road to Rievaulx Abbey and one of English Heritages main sites in North Yorkshire.
- The A174 Upgang Lane, Whitby. One of the main access routes to Whitby town centre and harbour and onwards to Whitby Abbey one of English Heritages most important visitor attractions nationally.

Completion of these works in 2017/18 together with the already identified NYCC programmes would ensure that by the end of 2018/19 the vast majority of the in scope road network was in a Good or very Good condition for visitors and local people to use.
## Locations for potential resurfacing schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Estimate* (£k)</th>
<th>Hierarchy</th>
<th>Survey Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A684/2/05</td>
<td>MARKET PLACE</td>
<td>HAWES</td>
<td>350.56</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>88409</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>10/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A684/2/10</td>
<td>PENN LANE</td>
<td>HAWES</td>
<td>240.36</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>60618</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>10/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A684/3/20</td>
<td>MAIN STREET</td>
<td>AYSGARTH</td>
<td>377.03</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>95085</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>12/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A684/3/70</td>
<td>WENSLEY TO LEYBURN</td>
<td>WENSLEY</td>
<td>591.6</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>104725</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>12/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A684/4/40</td>
<td>RAILWAY STREET</td>
<td>LEYBURN</td>
<td>209.54</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>52845</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>13/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A684/4/60</td>
<td>HARMBY ROAD</td>
<td>LEYBURN</td>
<td>909.59</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>229394</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>13/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1257/3/20</td>
<td>RIEVAULX BANK TO NEWGATE BAN</td>
<td>RIEVAULX</td>
<td>639.66</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>93150</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>29/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1257/3/25</td>
<td>RIEVAULX BANK TO NEWGATE BAN</td>
<td>RIEVAULX</td>
<td>707.6</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>103044</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>29/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1257/3/35</td>
<td>RIEVAULX BANK TO NEWGATE BAN</td>
<td>RIEVAULX</td>
<td>988.14</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>143897</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>29/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1257/3/55</td>
<td>NEWGATE BANK TO RYEDALE BOUN</td>
<td>LASKILL</td>
<td>771.87</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>112403</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>29/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1257/3/60</td>
<td>NEWGATE BANK TO RYEDALE BOUN</td>
<td>LASKILL</td>
<td>700.05</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>101944</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>29/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1257/3/65</td>
<td>NEWGATE BANK TO RYEDALE BOUN</td>
<td>LASKILL</td>
<td>709.16</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>103271</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>29/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1257/3/70</td>
<td>FANGDALE BECK TO DISTRICT BO</td>
<td>CHOP GATE</td>
<td>763.11</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>111128</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>30/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1257/3/75</td>
<td>FANGDALE BECK TO DISTRICT BO</td>
<td>CHOP GATE</td>
<td>850.55</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>123861</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>30/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1257/4/60</td>
<td>HIGH STREET</td>
<td>GREAT BROUGHTON</td>
<td>879.55</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>202094</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>09/02/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1257/4/80</td>
<td>CRICKET FIELD TRAFFIC CIRCUS</td>
<td>STOKESLEY</td>
<td>502.07</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>73114</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>13/02/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6265/3/35</td>
<td>RIPON ROAD</td>
<td>PATELEY BRIDGE</td>
<td>810.18</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>204323</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>23/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6265/3/45</td>
<td>RIPLEY BANK</td>
<td>PATELEY BRIDGE</td>
<td>1358.8</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>240534</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>23/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6479/2/50</td>
<td>SELSIDE BUNGALOW TO SELSIDE</td>
<td>HORTON IN RIBBLESDALE</td>
<td>829.21</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>120753</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>19/12/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1/5/35</td>
<td>HOULSYKE BRIDGE TO LAWNS FAR</td>
<td>HOULSYKE</td>
<td>381.38</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>39639</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>02/11/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1/5/80</td>
<td>RAKE LANE TO HIGH FARM</td>
<td>LEALHOLM</td>
<td>592.81</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>61614</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>02/11/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24/1/50</td>
<td>CARLTON IN CLEVELAND TO LITT</td>
<td>CARLTON IN CLEVELAND</td>
<td>120.08</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>12481</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>27/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27/1/20</td>
<td>NORTH END</td>
<td>OSMOTHERLEY</td>
<td>419.81</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>70247</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>18/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27/1/45</td>
<td>COALMIRE LANE</td>
<td>SWAINBY</td>
<td>1345.46</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>139842</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>26/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35/3/85</td>
<td>MIDDLEHAM TO COVERHAM ROAD</td>
<td>MIDDLEHAM</td>
<td>1227.04</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>127534</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>06/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C393/1/60</td>
<td>HELLIFIELD ROAD TO CARSEYLAN</td>
<td>AIRTON</td>
<td>478.65</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>69703</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>22/12/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C57/1/60</td>
<td>SCAWTON TO CROSS GREEN</td>
<td>SCAWTON</td>
<td>890.44</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>92549</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>17/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C60/1/25</td>
<td>ONAMS LANE</td>
<td>FADMOOR</td>
<td>676.16</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>70277</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>06/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C60/1/90</td>
<td>BRANSDALE ROAD TO COCKAYNE</td>
<td>COCKAYNE</td>
<td>260.07</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>27031</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>05/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C60/1/95</td>
<td>BRANSDALE ROAD TO COCKAYNE</td>
<td>COCKAYNE</td>
<td>1215.94</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>126380</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>06/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2252/1/30</td>
<td>STAITHES LANE</td>
<td>STAITHES</td>
<td>511.89</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>85506</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>04/11/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21781.82</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£3,396,182</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Works estimate excluding design fees and risk contingency
APPENDIX 2

Letters of Support
Mr Andrew Bainbridge  
Business and Environmental Services  
North Yorkshire County Council  
County Hall  
Northallerton  
North Yorkshire  
DL7 8AD

16 March 2017

Dear Andrew,

Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund

I am writing in support of North Yorkshire County Council's bid to the Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund for additional maintenance of National Park visitor routes.

The vast majority of our visitors travel to the Yorkshire Dales National Park along our road network whether by car, or cycle, and this is often their first experience of the National Park. The National Park Management Plan, for the National Park area, specifically lists the minor roads along the dales, bordered by drystone walls or hedgerows and flower-rich verges, and higher up, unfenced roads cross open moorland which offer dramatic views, as one of the special qualities of the area. To this end, a well maintained road network is an essential part of the visitor experience that underpins the local economy. However, we recognise that maintaining this road network presents many challenges from a Highway's perspective.

These minor roads are heavily used by visitors to access natural attractions such as Malham Cove and Tarn. In addition, the topography and geology combined with the weather means these roads suffer from extremes of weather, particularly flooding, leading to a faster deterioration and need for maintenance.

Funding of road maintenance in and around the National Park through this bid, will bring real benefits to visitors and local community alike.

Yours sincerely,

K. Beardmore

KATHRYN BEARDMORE  
DIRECTOR OF PARK SERVICES
Your ref: NYCC Highway Maintenance Challenge Fund

James Farrar COO
York, North Yorkshire & East Riding Enterprise Partnership
County Hall, Northallerton
North Yorkshire
DL7 8AH
Tel: 01609 535660
Fax: 01609 779722
E-mail: james.farrar@businessinspiredgrowth.com

Our ref:

Contact: James Farrar

Date 30.03.2016

To Whom it may concern

Highway Maintenance Challenge Fund – Rural Tourism in the National Parks

I am writing in support of North Yorkshire County Council’s bid to the Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund for additional maintenance of National Park visitor routes.

The importance of the visitor economy to the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership area is recognised in our Strategic Economic plan. The visitor economy and particularly SME’s is particularly important in the two National Parks in North Yorkshire.

The vast majority of our visitors to the Parks travel along our road network whether by car, or cycle and as such a well maintained road network is an essential part of the visitor experience that underpins the local economy. However, we recognise that maintaining this road network presents many challenges from a Highway’s perspective.

These minor roads are heavily used by visitors to access the many natural and man-made attractions in the two parks. In addition we recognise that the topography means that these roads suffer from extremes of weather, particularly flooding and frost, leading to a faster deterioration and a greater need for maintenance.

Funding of road maintenance in and around the National Park through this bid, will bring real benefits to visitors and local community alike.

Yours sincerely

James Farrar
Chief Operating Officer
Dear Mr Bainbridge,

I write on behalf of the Federation of Small Businesses regarding your bid to the Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund – Tranche 2a and to support North Yorkshire County Council’s bid for funding.

We are pleased that even given the tight deadlines imposed by DfT that North Yorkshire County Council have in place projects that would be eligible for the fund including projects that can be completed in 2017/2018.

We would note that whilst we cannot comment on the elements regarding funding proposals for the bid (specifically the use of CPE Surplus), and in addition would want to note that we would support all of the options highlighted, given the explanation within your report, we would support the rationale to bid to this fund for the “Additional Maintenance of National Park Visitor Routes”

North Yorkshire’s National Parks are crucial to economic viability of the tourism and visitor economy businesses within their geography. Between them the two National Parks attract approximately 16.5 million visitors per year spending over £900m per year in the National Parks. This number of visitors and level of spending demonstrates the importance of the visitor economy to the National Parks and indeed to the wider North Yorkshire economy.

We also agree with your assertion that “the proposal will also benefit local people both directly through additional highway maintenance and less directly through strengthening the local economy.”

Kind Regards

Simon Williams
North Yorkshire Regional Chairman.
Mr A Bainbridge  
Team Leader Transport Planning  
Highways and Transportation  
North Yorkshire County Council  
County Hall  
Northallerton  
DL7 8AH

30 March 2017

Dear Andrew

Department for Transport, Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund – Tranche 2a

As President of the York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce I am writing to confirm the Chamber’s support for a bid from North Yorkshire County Council to the Department for Transport’s Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund – Tranche 2a. The two national parks, North Yorkshire Moors and Yorkshire Dales, which are the focus of the bid both fall within the geography covered by this Chamber of Commerce and both are crucial to economic viability of the tourism and visitor economy within the county. Between them the National Parks attract around 16.5m visitors per year with a spend of over £300m, which amply demonstrates their importance to the local and regional economies.

The funding from the bid will help in the maintenance and upkeep of routes to the many visitor attractions in the parks as well as benefiting residents in the parks.

If I can be of further assistance then do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Ed Everard  
President  
York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce