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Stakeholder Engagement
Stakeholder engagement

The Department for Transport’s (DfT) ‘Guidance on Second Local Transport Plan (LTP2) Progress Reports (2008)’ recognises the importance of stakeholder involvement in the LTP process.

Paragraph 2 of the guidance states that:

‘The 2008 report provides an opportunity for broader-based reviews, enabling authorities not only to assess their progress in meeting their objectives and targets during the first two years of these plans, but to consider any opportunities or threats to the effective delivery of the LTP2’s in their remaining years. The reports should in particular review risks to delivery, and identify any mitigating actions required.’

In terms of consultation Paragraph 3 goes on to say:

‘The progress reports also offer an opportunity for engagement with key delivery partners and stakeholders. Indeed, the Department strongly recommends that reports should be presented to Local Strategic Partnerships.’

Paragraph 17 of the guidance states that:

‘Authorities may wish in their reports not only to summarise the difference the authority has made, but also to highlight work with local authority colleagues, partners, other local government bodies and stakeholders to deliver the best possible transport outcomes, given the funding set out in the 2006 local transport settlement. As well as their own views on their relationships with their partners, authorities may also want to take the opportunity to include in their progress reports comments from their partners themselves, for example on partnership working.’

In line with DfT’s guidance North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) has conducted stakeholder consultation in order to solicit opinion as to how they are perceived to be performing and identify future priorities for transport in the County. NYCC issued questionnaires, regarding LTP2, to 944 of their key stakeholders. This included all County Council Members, Parish Councils and a wide range of other key stakeholders including local transport operators, Primary Care Trusts and emergency services representatives and local freight operators. An information bulletin providing a brief outline of LTP2 and an update on the current progress of LTP2 delivery was also included.

The survey aimed to gauge opinion on all aspects of LTP2; respondents were asked to rank what they perceived to be the highest priority for transport in the county and identify whether they had been involved in any discussions relating to transport in their area. The survey also questioned stakeholders on their knowledge and opinion of Service Centre Transport Strategies and how they considered NYCC are performing in the delivery of LTP2. Opinion on the measures being implemented across the county was also sought and stakeholders were questioned as to what they believe is the best way to move forward in relation to transport.
The consultation exercise was held over a five week period from Wednesday 2nd April until Friday 9th May.

In total 944 surveys were distributed to relevant stakeholders. 243 responses were received and used as part of the final report. This represents a response rate of 26%. This level of response rate provides a reliable representative sample from which to draw realistic and reasonable conclusions.

74% of the surveys distributed were to Parish Councils. This correlates with the level of responses from Parish Councils at 72%. The remaining 26% of responses were received from other stakeholders.

Responses to the surveys were then collated and analysed to produce a comprehensive analysis of the views of stakeholders.

**Priorities for Transport**

In order to identify the respondees’ priorities for transport in North Yorkshire, they were asked to rank (where the higher score shows the higher priority) the following five options in order of importance:

1. Protecting the environment
2. Reducing road casualties
3. Improving access to good and services
4. Maintaining a vibrant economy
5. Reducing traffic congestion

The results were as follows:

![Priorities for Transport Chart]

- Protecting the Environment: 27%
- Reducing Road Casualties: 23%
- Improving Access to Goods and Services: 19%
- Maintaining a Vibrant Economy: 16%
- Reducing Traffic Congestion: 15%
The results illustrate that stakeholders believe that the highest priorities for transport are ‘reducing road causalities, improving road safety and improving access to goods and services.’ These priorities account for 50% of the overall priorities ranking score. These two priorities reinforce the County Council’s current ranking of transport priorities.

The overall priority rankings are as follows:

1. Reducing road casualties and improving road safety
2. Improving access to goods and services
3. Reducing traffic congestion and its impacts
4. Protecting the environment
5. Maintaining a vibrant economy

A further level of statistical analysis was undertaken on these results. This analysis consisted of determining the mean, median and mode of the data. The mean refers to the average score, the median refers to the ‘middle value’ when the scores are ordered numerically and the mode is the score that occurs most frequently. The analysis used the same scoring method as previously where the highest score equals the highest priority. The results of this analysis are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Road Casualties</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Access to Goods and Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a Vibrant Economy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical analysis reinforced the viewpoint that ‘Reducing road casualties and improving road safety’ and ‘improving access to goods and services’ are the highest priority to stakeholders achieving the highest results in all statistical analysis.

Perception of the Performance of the County Council.
Respondees were asked for their view on the progress in the following 8 areas of LTP2 delivery across the county:

- Road maintenance
- Road safety
- Public transport provision
- Access to services
- Facilities for cyclists
- Facilities for pedestrians
- Reducing congestion
- Community transport provision

Respondents were asked to indicate which of the following options reflected their opinion of how much progress had been made:
• No progress
• Some progress
• Considerable progress
• Didn’t know if any progress had been made or not in each area.

A summary of the results is shown below.

**Figure 1 – Progress in Road Maintenance**

**Figure 2 – Progress in Road Safety**

**Figure 3 – Progress in Public Transport Provision**
Figure 4 – Progress in Access to Services

Access to Services

- Don't Know
- No Progress
- Some Progress
- Considerable Progress

Figure 5 – Progress in Facilities for Cyclists

Facilities for Cyclists

- Don't Know
- No Progress
- Some Progress
- Considerable Progress

Figure 6 – Progress in Facilities for Pedestrians

Facilities for Pedestrians

- Don't Know
- No Progress
- Some Progress
- Considerable Progress
The responses illustrate that opinions are that progress of varying levels is being made in relation to transport delivery in North Yorkshire.

In relation to the two top priorities, road safety and improved accessibility, respondents gave mixed responses. 59% of respondents believed that some progress had been made in terms of improving road safety however 47% of respondents believed that no progress had been made in improving access to services.

Principally, respondents believed that no progress had been made in the majority of transport issues. This was the case for public transport provision, access to services, facilities for pedestrians and reducing congestion. This suggests that the County Council still has significant work to do to meet the expectations of both the general public and stakeholders.
Respondents believed that some progress had been made in road maintenance, road safety and community transport provision. However this suggests that further focus is still required in these areas to improve LTP2 delivery.

Stakeholders believed that considerable progress had been made in the following areas; facilities for cyclists, road safety and public transport provision. However, the response rate was less than 10% in each instance. Again this demonstrates that a significant level of work needs to be done to meet the expectations of the public in line with the County Council’s excellent rating for LTP1 delivery and LTP preparation.

**Future Action**

Stakeholders were asked to rank in order of importance (where 1 was the most important and 5 the least important) their top five actions from a possible list of eleven. The range of possible future actions is shown below:

- Improving public transport services
- Improving public transport facilities (bus stops etc.)
- Encouraging less car use
- Providing more routes for cyclists
- Providing more facilities to encourage walking (e.g. pedestrian crossings)
- Maintaining roads and pavements in North Yorkshire
- Transferring freight off the road onto alternative modes
- Building more local safety schemes
- Providing more traffic calming
- Helping to provide more community transport
- Carrying out more road safety education

The following chart illustrates the results for what stakeholders believed should be the top priority for future actions for transport in the County.
Improving public transport services and maintaining roads are identified as the two key areas that stakeholders believe should be the priority for future action. The sum of these two options accounts for over 40% of the total score. Improving public transport services correlates with improving access to goods and services, which was identified as one of the top two transport priorities by stakeholders.

Interestingly the future actions related to the other identified top priorities for transport, reducing road casualties and improving road safety, ranked significantly lower, being placed in three of the bottom four rankings for future priority actions. These actions combined accounted for only 13% of the total score. The following list illustrates the overall ranking of all eleven options:

1. Improving public transport services
2. Maintaining roads and pavements
3. Transferring freight off roads onto other modes
4. Helping to provide more community transport;
5. Encouraging less car use;
6. Providing more routes for cyclists;
7. Improving public transport facilities;
8. Providing more traffic calming;
9. Building more local safety schemes;
10. Providing more facilities to encourage walking; and
11. Carrying out more road safety education.

Respondents were given an opportunity to put forward any other suggestions that they may have had for other possible actions for transport in the County. These include improving specific public transport corridors, improved response time to maintenance
issues and installing more pedestrian facilities. A full list of responses is available on request.

**Stakeholder involvement in transport discussions.**
Respondents were asked if they had been involved in any transport related discussions. These discussions could include consultations on Service Centre Transportation Strategies (SCTS) or scheme specific discussions. Forty per cent of respondents indicated that they had been involved in some level of transport discussion with the County Council. A full list of responses is available on request.

Twenty six percent of respondents stated that they were aware of an SCTS in their area. At the time of questioning just over a quarter of the SCTS were at a stage where the public would be aware of them. This demonstrates that the results are in line with the overall process to date.

Encouragingly the vast majority (73%) of stakeholders who were aware of an SCTS believed that it was an effective means of identifying and addressing local transport issues. This suggests that the approach of the County Council to addressing local transport issues is the right one. A range of comments were made by respondents on the SCTS process, a full list is available on request.

A lack of support from stakeholders exists in respect to the measures being implemented. Seventy percent of respondents were of the opinion that the measures being implemented were not the right ones. Suggestions of to why the measures were wrong were wide ranging and a mixture of both more strategic solutions and also more site specific issues. Suggestions included further developing rural accessibility solutions, addressing congestion in urban areas and also the scope of the scope of the transport measures being implemented. A full list of responses to this is available on request.

When asked if they were happy with their level of involvement with the LTP process, the majority (61%) of respondents indicated that they were happy with their level of involvement in the process. Just less than three quarters of respondents indicated that they would like to be involved in future discussions on the development of transport in the County.

**LTP Stakeholder Forum**
Key stakeholders were invited to attend a forum to discuss transportation issues in more depth. A total of 29 stakeholders attended. The forum was held at Hambleton Forum, in Northallerton, on Tuesday 15th April 2008 between 1pm and 5pm.

The forum consisted of three sessions; after a brief introduction presentations were given, by NYCC, regarding Local Transport Plans and the LTP process. The first workshop consisted of a general discussion around stakeholders’ views on NYCC’s performance against LTP2 targets, focussing on scheme prioritisation and future consultation.

On arrival at the forum stakeholders were asked to select a preferred topic for discussion in the second workshop session. Topics for discussion were road safety, accessibility and congestion and environmental issues. Owing to low group numbers,
those who had chosen road safety were given the opportunity to talk with representatives of NYCC and Jacobs. Accessibility and congestion and the environment formed the basis of the workshop groups which were facilitated by NYCC and Jacobs representatives.

The following section outlines the main outputs from the workshops, however is should be noted that the views are not necessarily those of the majority.

**Workshop 1 – How are we performing against the LTP targets?**

This discussion was split into four key elements of the LTP2 process. These were as follows, scheme identification, scheme prioritisation, performance and also consultation. Each element was discussed at length by each of the 3 groups. A summary of the outputs from this workshop is listed below.

**Scheme Identification**
- The SCTS process is generally viewed as being a good idea and consulting local stakeholders and residents was identified as being a positive step;
- The opinion was expressed that ‘the views of the loudest’ were progressed over ‘the views of the many’;
- Stakeholders were of the opinion that the terminology of the SCTS is still too focussed on the service centre itself as opposed to the surrounding hinterlands and that the SCTS process, as with other county processes, is isolated and lacks cohesion with other projects;
- Linked to the comment about the views of the loudest being favoured it was raised that design issues were an area for concern with schemes being implemented in inappropriate locations;
- The level of research going into an SCTS was questioned with comments that there is too much focus on stakeholder views;
- It was felt that there is too much emphasis on cars and road schemes in LTP2; for example the SCTS process seems to address maintenance and road issues rather than the promotion of walking or cycling;
- Some stakeholders were not aware of the SCTS initiative; and
- Stakeholders believe that behavioural shift is necessary and that infrastructure measures are not enough.

**Scheme Prioritisation and Specific Issues**
- Stakeholders suggested that there should be greater emphasis on promoting mobile service providers such as healthcare facilities (healthcare was identified as a key requirement of LTP2);
- Congestion was perceived to have neither increased nor decreased in terms of its level of importance, with stakeholders viewing it as an issue in isolated parts of the County. However, it was felt that North Yorkshire is at a disadvantage due to Central Government defining congestion as only applying to conurbations with a population greater than 250,000 of which North Yorkshire has none;
- There was a general consensus that there is difficulty in measuring congestion and that the actual experience of congestion is not the same as the County Council’s perceptions. It was noted that congestion is recognised as being a
barrier to accessibility and it was felt that processes to improve accessibility could also be used to aid in the reduction of congestion;

• Improving access to employment was identified as a key area for development and it was felt that more emphasis should be placed on measures similar to ‘Wheels to Work’;

• Road safety cameras were identified as a positive step in addressing safety concerns but that greater enforcement would be beneficial;

• It was felt that there is an inadequate level of speed signage and that the number of variations in speed limits along certain routes is confusing;

• Stakeholders were in favour of improving the availability of road safety information as they believed that insufficient information was available to illustrate whether a speeding issue exists;

• Walking and cycling were identified as initiatives that required better promotion;

• It was noted that some stakeholders believe that cost should not be the only consideration in scheme prioritisation as environmental factors should have a higher weighting.

• General opinion was that the standard of carriageway repairs was below the required standard – however it was recognised that NYCC are not necessarily at fault and that the issue is more likely to be inadequate funding;

• Stakeholders believe that many roads in the County are coming to the end of their workable life and substantial investment will be required to maintain them at a suitable standard;

• Opinion was divided over where the majority of maintenance funding should be focussed – while some stakeholders identified service centres as being the most important locations those attending from more rural areas made it clear that they did not want to become ‘the poor relative’ in terms of maintenance;

Performance

• Bus services are perceived to have seen much improvement over the past two years and stakeholder opinion seen as being adequately sought and used;

• Community transport is seen to be a good idea but the common perception is that it is hard to deliver;

• Stakeholder opinion was that the National Park environment should take priority in schemes;

• Carbon footprint is seen to be a high priority for the County and stakeholders are of the opinion that it has the potential to affect travel choice but believe that partners need to work more closely in developments to ensure congestion and the environment are not affected; and

• Stakeholders are generally satisfied overall with the current level of performance of NYCC in delivering LTP2.

Consultation

• Concern was raised about the level of communication and coordination with other partners in delivering the LTP2 objectives. It was noted that residents need to be kept informed as to which schemes are being delivered, how they’re being delivered and when they are being delivered;

• There is a perception among stakeholders that positive views don’t always receive the same level of feedback as negative ones;
Stakeholders believe that significant levels of consultation will be required with Leeds City County on the development of the ‘Leeds City Region’ concept and how this is likely to affect North Yorkshire; and

Communication between officers and Members of NYCC is felt to be poor and stakeholders feel that a better working relationship is required.

Workshop 2 – Accessibility / Congestion and the Environment
The second half of the workshop exercise involved three break-out groups discussing one of two pre-chosen topics, ‘Accessibility’ and ‘Congestion and the Environment’. Two groups were held for ‘Congestion and the Environment’ due to high demand.

A summary of the outputs from these workshops is listed below.

‘Congestion and the Environment’ – Group 1
- Stakeholders believe that it is easy to bypass the environment objective if there is no danger of exceeding Government targets;
- There is a general consensus that there need to be more environmental targets set in North Yorkshire (including visual amenity);
- Stakeholders feel that too much emphasis is placed on air quality and that other forms of environmental pollution should be considered;
- It is perceived that the environment is given a lesser weighting than issues such as accessibility and safety;
- Stakeholders felt that some form of road user charging could be considered in the County;
- Congestion is seen as being detrimental to the tourism of the area – especially in the National Parks;
- The Moors Bus was praised as being a positive initiative;
- It was general opinion that a harder line should be taken on car parking;
- With regards to the development of ‘Park and Ride’ sites, comment was made that there needs to be more partnership working and that it should be made easier for politicians to make bold decisions;
- In terms of congestion the local perception seems to be that the Government has not considered congestion an issue in settlements with populations less than 250,000;
- It was suggested that the impact of diverting traffic onto other routes as an alternative to congestion zones be considered;
- Discussions on National Parks identified an issue for the local area of surrounding villages being used for parking and Park and Ride was mentioned again as a realistic alternative to private car journeys;
- Rail travel was also discussed as a method for easing congestion and it was noted that stakeholders felt that access to rail services was the main barrier to travel via this mode;
- Stakeholders believe that signage and lining is used in too many cases when expensive road schemes cannot be justified; and
- There is a perception that signage is implemented primarily to absolve the Local Authority in terms of liability.
‘Congestion and the Environment’ – Group 2

- Consideration should be given to the materials used in scheme delivery to ensure that they fit the environmental context of the area they’re in, for example National Parks;
- Stakeholders believed that better use of, and improvements to, the current transport infrastructure will help to alleviate some of the problems. An example used was that of the Scarborough ‘Park and Ride’;
- There was a general consensus that there is currently too much focus on highway schemes as opposed to measures to promote other modes;
- It was felt that more should be done to encourage joint funding with unitary authorities for transport initiatives;
- It was suggested that government policy should be influenced through lobbying to encourage people to work nearer to where they live;
- With regards congestion it was felt that effective ‘congestion management’ has the potential to make people consider alternative methods of travel;
- The relationship between bordering Local Authorities was seen as an integral part of successfully managing congestion with a unitary approach needed;
- Stakeholders believe that town planning policies must be sympathetic to LTP2 or the ‘joined up’ approach will fall down – especially with environmental and planning policies; and
- ‘Seasonal congestion’ was identified as an issue and it was suggested that coaches be provided with parking away from the main roads.

‘Accessibility’

- Stakeholders believe that accessibility is still a key priority for NYCC in developing and delivering LTP2;
- A request was made for NYCC to develop their position on the reopening of several rail routes including Skipton to Colne, Malton to Pickering and Northallerton to Ripon to Harrogate. It was suggested that improving these links could improve sustainable access to the National Parks;
- Access to bus and rail services was considered in some areas, to be limited in terms of parking provision and suchlike. It was suggested that by improving this provision public transport would become more attractive and that this would have a knock on effect on reducing congestion and improving accessibility;
- Improvements should be made to the level of integration between road and rail passenger transport – this includes ensuring that a greater number of bus services stop at rail stations;
- It was felt that there is insufficient advertisement and promotion of passenger transport within the county and that NYCC should take the lead role through partnership working, alongside public transport operators to achieve this;
- The forthcoming Passenger Rail Strategy was discussed – stakeholders believed this to be a positive idea and looked forward to being given the opportunity to comment on the document;
- The level of funding for public transport was questioned and it was felt that more should be made available;
Stakeholders recognised that developing public transport, particularly rail, should be a long term project as it is an essential part of improving accessibility to services;

All stakeholders agreed that developing community transport should be a priority for NYCC. It is seen as a ‘lifeline’ for many residents in rural areas away from standard public transport routes. The level of sustainability provided by the community transport services was also praised and it was felt that further investment should be made in this area;

Using existing infrastructure was identified as a key challenge;

Capacity was seen as a potential barrier to progressing community transport and it was stated that many services were struggling to cope with the level of demand. Stakeholders believed that additional capacity should be provided as potential users may be discouraged from using the services if there is little available capacity;

Allowing bus pass holders to use community transport was seen as being a potential method of increasing passenger numbers;

Stakeholders felt that NYCC should take a more active role in leading community transport service coordination through acting as an effective link between providers and the local community;

Securing funding was seen as being key to developing community transport further. Stakeholders felt that although many sources of funding are available they are not always used to their full potential;

Stakeholders suggested that a contact list for all community transport related parties be produced and distributed to the public;

It was felt that some progress has been made in developing links with local NHS PCT’s;

Home to school transport is considered to be good across the county, however it was suggested that it may be possible to incorporate existing community transport services further with home to school transport services to reduce the need for car based travel;

Schemes such as ‘Wheels to Work’ are seen as being effective and potentially more focus should be given to similar initiatives. Stakeholders suggest that NYCC investigate the potential demand for such a scheme elsewhere within the county;

It was recognised that it is not always possible to serve all areas of the county through standard bus services however there was a view that the level of bus service could be increased in certain rural areas;

In areas of low demand for standard bus services, community transport was praised as being a suitable alternative to conventional public transport;

Stakeholders believe that, for routes serving major areas of demand, infrastructure investment and developing quality routes are an appropriate method of encouraging public transport use and improving accessibility; and

Stakeholders acknowledge that the use of footways is an important tool in improving accessibility and believe that NYCC should continue to develop schemes to improve footway access.

A full detailed summary of the Stakeholder engagement event including attendee list and detailed notes from the workshop sessions is available on request.
Appendix 2

SWOT Analysis
SWOT Analysis Process

An internal SWOT analysis was conducted in April 2008 with all members of the HNY partnership. Sessions were held individually with Balfour Beatty Infrastructure Services (BBIS), Jacobs UK, Harrogate Borough Council and Scarborough Borough Council (our partner agents in their respective urban areas) and also key personnel form the County Council.

The SWOT analysis provided an opportunity to identify problems and realistic remedial actions to address weaknesses and threats. Ways in which the partnership could further build on existing strengths and adapt to new opportunities were also discussed. Issues discussed and identified may have been relatively minor or more fundamental; however it was felt important to capture all related issues as they all will ultimately impact on the delivery of LTP2.

Attendees were encouraged to discuss the SWOT analysis with their respective teams prior to attending the workshops so that a wider range of responses and viewpoints could be included in the SWOT analysis.

Sessions were held separately with each respective part of the HNY partnership in order to encourage and develop open discussion so that attendees were able to provide honest view and opinions.

The workshops were designed to be forward looking, giving attendees the opportunity to identify improvements to be put in place to ensure LTP2 delivery is as efficient and effective as possible.

The SWOT analysis sessions were divided into six key sections related to the overall LTP2 process. Attendees were given the opportunity to put forward views relating to each one of these sections;

- Problem identification
- Solution identification
- Prioritisation / programming
- Physical delivery
- Monitoring
- Enabling themes (internal communication / budget control / HR)

Where applicable during the workshops, appropriate solutions and remedial actions were suggested as potential ways for improving the delivery of LTP2. These suggestions, alongside the inputs obtained after the sessions, are illustrated within the output summary table.

The output summary table will form the basis of an action plan for improving the delivery of LTP2. This action plan will include a series of improvements to delivery of LTP2 collated from the SWOT analysis, targets and indicators review and stakeholder engagement elements of the LTP Progress Report.
SWOT Analysis Outputs

The outputs from the SWOT analysis are illustrated in the following table. They have been sorted and categorised into different groups as follows:

- SCTS process
- Management and performance of Partner Organisations
- Communication
- Availability and allocation of resources
- Programming and delivery of LTP schemes
- Scheme prioritisation
- External governance issues
- Management of public perception and expectations
- Local Development Frameworks
- Availability of funding
- Performance monitoring#
- Scheme identification
- Culture
- External influences (weather related etc)

Proposed actions to take forward to the improvement action plan are also identified and recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Type</th>
<th>Output Summary</th>
<th>Action Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>SCTS process is fundamentally sound in principle. Meets objectives of LTP2 and in doing so provides local communities a voice in the plans for transport provision in their area.</td>
<td>Continue to re-evaluate the process as it develops, so that it remains focussed on the principles behind it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>Lack of research and preparation alongside the level of experience and expertise of staff is resulting in low quality output from partner consultants.</td>
<td>Review of SCTS process (SWOT analysis and process evaluation) has taken place in order to ensure that the objectives laid out within LTP2 are being adhered to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of added value that partner consultants contribute to the process is perceived as being low. They are completing a secretarial role only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>SCTS consultation process is too long and open. Insufficient structure and guidance for stakeholders.</td>
<td>Revise stakeholder engagement to better inform public in advance of the workshops sessions of what issues the SCTS will be considering and how the process works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>Insufficient technical knowledge and expertise is being used by Highways North Yorkshire before commencing the process in order to guide stakeholders towards deliverable beneficial schemes.</td>
<td>This consultation process has been reviewed following the 1st phase of SCTS. The revised process will commence with the SCTS starting in summer 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>Insufficient softer measures are being developed through the SCTS process; additionally public understanding of these measures is low.</td>
<td>Develop proposals / ideas to take forward prior to commencement of SCTS. These proposals to be considered as part of SCTS process. Improve public education through consultation process on how softer measures can be of benefit to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>Outputs from SCTS process seem to take the form of a scheme wish list and not an holistic strategy or package for addressing transport issues within a specific area.</td>
<td>As part of process evaluation and SCTS SWOT, the current SCTS process is being amended to ensure that it is developed as an holistic strategy incorporating all transport issues within the SCTS area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge of what happens to proposed schemes that sit outside of available SCTS budget or are unsuccessful in making the final implemented strategy.</td>
<td>Improve education of those involved in SCTS process that realistic solution identification is not constrained by budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>The standard and number of suitable schemes being developed is often below the required level. Schemes put forward are often just public stakeholder requests with minimal engineering / technical input.</td>
<td>Review reserve list and other forms of information (high risk site list) for SCTS area prior to commencing SCTS process and incorporate this in to the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus appears to be on producing schemes to utilise the available budget and not on addressing identified issues.</td>
<td>Amend consultation process to provide more structure guided questions, such as ‘are you able to access your local health centre without a car?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCTS process not being managed effectively and as a result moving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>Lack of cohesion between LDF’s and SCTS’s.</td>
<td>As LDF’s are closer to completion, look to link SCTS process closer to these proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>Develop more flexible funding processes for SCTS money to ensure best value is achieved.</td>
<td>Review funding mechanisms for SCTS to look at promoting more flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>Concerns about how well the SCTS areas interact with one another.</td>
<td>Possible future review once adjacent SCTS have been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>Question of whether SCTS’s attempting to do too much over a restricted timescale. Possibility of them being rushed and not achieving objectives to required standard.</td>
<td>Review timescales for SCTS. Do they need to be completed with LTP2 or can they be extended to ensure quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTS</td>
<td>Staffing levels within special projects team to implement SCTS process.</td>
<td>Look at resource levels and recruitment plans. Can additional resources be moved in from elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Working</td>
<td>High knowledge base and level of commitment to achieving objectives by all members of HNY partnership.</td>
<td>Continue to utilise this knowledge base and fully utilise expertise within partner organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Working</td>
<td>Some examples of good partnership working (PT operators, industry)</td>
<td>Further develop partnership working and improve in all areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Working</td>
<td>Co-location of teams benefits the operation improving partnership working and communication.</td>
<td>Look at further enhancing co-location and further strengthening partnership working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Working</td>
<td>Performance and level of added value supplied by partner consultants is believed to be below the required standard. NYCC staff are having to spend additional time and resource managing consultants.</td>
<td>Improve management of consultants and review of their performance through KPI targets etc. NYCC to provide more examples of areas for partner consultant improvement. Improve dialogue between partnership members at both strategic and local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Working</td>
<td>Level of management of external partners both locally and centrally is sub standard.</td>
<td>More support from Contract Management Unit on specific contract management issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Working</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge and understanding of fees and contracts with partner organisations within the HNY partnership.</td>
<td>Training on fees and contracts to be given by CMU in order to clarify the situation with ref to these points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of support provided by CMU to NS and Areas on fees and contract issues is inadequate at times.</td>
<td>Identify ways in which CMU expertise can be used throughout the partnership to improve delivery of LTP2 (communication, support etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of knowledge regarding contract at a local level. Areas do not see a strategic overview related to fees and costs to fully understand how pain/gain process works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Working</td>
<td>Quality of design of schemes by partner consultants is inconsistent and does not always reflect the requirements of individual situations.</td>
<td>Improve management of consultants and review of their performance through KPIs targets etc and also through NYCC providing more examples of areas for partner consultant improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard of performance of partner consultants is perceived to be below the required level</td>
<td>Additionally improved dialogue between partnership at both strategic and local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Working</td>
<td>Standard of work completed by partner consultants is at times lower than required. Perceived lack of incentive for them to reduce costs whilst maintaining quality.</td>
<td>Review performance management of partner organisations to ensure that they are delivering the required level of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance monitoring framework for measuring performance of partners is insufficient.</td>
<td>Improve contract and quality management to ensure that schemes of the correct level of quality are being delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Working</td>
<td>Concern as to whether partner organisations have sufficient resources available to meet the needs of HNY</td>
<td>Develop forward looking resource plans with HNY partners to establish if resource levels are appropriate for future developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Working</td>
<td>Partner consultants still in relative contract infancy.</td>
<td>HNY to provide support where required to assist in consultants’ development in the contract,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Road Safety Officers provide a good channel of communication out to public.</td>
<td>Where possible further develop this important link with local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Local siting of the Area Offices enables a more localised, area-specific service to be implemented.</td>
<td>Where possible further develop the benefits obtained through local knowledge and expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Working relationship between agent authorities and HNY.</td>
<td>Ensure that good working relationship is maintained during transitional period from agency operation to NYCC operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Co-location of teams benefit the operation, improving partnership working and communication. However internal communication links must be maintained.</td>
<td>Further develop collocation across the county and look at ways of further integrating all members of the partnership through improved communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Relationship with some outside bodies (industry and other district / borough councils) is at times weak and could be improved.</td>
<td>Improve level of engagement and communication with outside bodies in order to try and improve partnership working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Standard of supplied information from external bodies is often weak.</td>
<td>Improve level of engagement and communication with outside bodies in order to try and improve partnership working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Little public awareness of the programme of work that is planned.</td>
<td>Build on use of NY Times and other forms of external communications to try to publicise planned programme of works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>LTP message is not embraced by all staff within HNY.</td>
<td>Publicise the LTP2 principles and objectives to a wider internal audience, not only to HNY but also to the whole of the BES Directorate through presentations at the BES away days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Differing cultures exist within different sectors of the HNY partnership.</td>
<td>Improve communication and empowerment to develop one culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Relationship and level of internal communication within HNY and Integrated Passenger Transport is below the required standard. Partners do not fully appreciate what each other is trying to achieve and what they are doing.</td>
<td>Develop more formalised communication links (forum meetings) between Network Strategy Management Team, IPT and areas to improve information flows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilise and develop new ICT links such as video conferencing,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Type</th>
<th>Output Summary</th>
<th>Action Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Decision making process is too long and too few people can make decisions which slows delivery of LTP2</td>
<td>Establish an HNY “bible” to incorporate contact details for all staff and also for staff at relevant outside bodies. Potential for Countywide expansion. Reassess the decision making process to establish if this can be further devolved down through the management structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Poor communication downwards from Operational &amp; Strategic Management Groups of the outcomes and issues that affect the HNY partnership.</td>
<td>Review process of disseminating information from these groups. Look at developing a newsletter or key messages bulletin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>A communication time-lag exists in many communication channels which affects the relevance of information.</td>
<td>Review communication links and implement new forms of technology and or new forms of communication to reduce the delay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Existing workforce within HNY is hard working and committed to delivering LTP2</td>
<td>Build on experience and commitment within HNY to improve service whilst maintaining sensible, manageable workloads for all staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Lack of available resources can, at times, impact upon the quality of LTP2 delivery.</td>
<td>Review resource levels and prioritise work streams to ensure that resources are used most effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Lack of available resources and requests for resources outside of LTP2 objectives is likely to impact upon delivery of LTP2</td>
<td>Review available resources and develop more flexibility with the partnership so that resource can be moved effectively to meet demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Reduction in available time for</td>
<td>Improve the level of work load prioritisation to ensure that key objectives and outcomes are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Increase the level of assistance</td>
<td>Utilise new working practices and technologies as part of ongoing efficiency agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of resources</td>
<td>managers to manage staff effectively within partnership.</td>
<td>centrally for core functions such as HR/Budgets/Performance Monitoring to enable managers to focus on managing their teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Concern as to whether the full effects of job evaluation have been felt yet?</td>
<td>Review resource planning with partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Questions as to whether BBIS partner resources levels are set at the correct levels and whether they are sustainable and cost effective.</td>
<td>Area offices to promote improved communication within management teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Insufficient crossover, shared knowledge and communication within Area Management Teams</td>
<td>Review provision of ICT resources and how they are being implemented to ensure that they are meeting the needs of the service and are assisting the delivery of LTP2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Recruitment issues including a complex recruitment process and lack of suitable candidates to fill vacancies.</td>
<td>Identify ways in which process can be simplified and incorporate more central HR assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Availability of resources for training and career development is insufficient.</td>
<td>Implementation of new H&amp;T recruitment plan to encourage more suitable applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>High level of bureaucracy and form filling is holding back delivery of LTP2.</td>
<td>Improve use of appraisal system and personal development action plans, to identify and meet training needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Planned 10% cut in staff resources over the next 3 years</td>
<td>Review processes through ongoing efficiency agenda to eliminate any waste and unnecessary tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>End of agency agreements in Harrogate and Scarborough in March 2011.</td>
<td>Review with management team to assess what the implications of this reduction are likely to be and develop specific action plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>Level of management time employed on non-core activities is high, which reduces time available to complete core tasks.</td>
<td>Maintain working relationship with agencies to ensure that transition from agency control to NYCC is smooth and effective and required resource levels for LTP2 delivery are maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the level of assistance from the centre for core functions such as HR/financial management/performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and allocation of resources</td>
<td>High level of resources across the directorate is focussed on managing targets. Review implementation plan and available resources to ensure that it is successfully implemented.</td>
<td>Review implementation plan and available resources to ensure that it is successfully implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>Implementation of EXOR asset management system has been delayed. Two year rolling programme of works allows for improved planning</td>
<td>Further develop focus on adhering to programme and look at the possibility of extending to 3 year rolling programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>Design and consultation process can at times overrun / be incorrect. This can cause delays to delivery of schemes. Review design process to encourage over programming of schemes so that design process is completed and physical delivery can take place</td>
<td>Review design process to encourage over programming of schemes so that design process is completed and physical delivery can take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>IT schemes are often more complex to deliver and as such they are often completed after the easier, more deliverable schemes. Review design process to encourage over programming of schemes so that design process is completed and physical delivery can take place</td>
<td>Review design process to encourage over programming of schemes so that design process is completed and physical delivery can take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>Lack of a coherent implementation plan for key works strategies such as HAKITS</td>
<td>Review design process to encourage over programming of schemes so that design process is completed and physical delivery can take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>Many schemes are slipping from their programmed start and completion dates and consequently there is an impact on resource allocation for all members of HNY partnership. This is resulting in LTP2 objectives not being fully delivered as planned. Improved monitoring of programme to ensure adherence. Lower tolerance of slippage.</td>
<td>Improved monitoring of programme to ensure adherence. Lower tolerance of slippage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>Zero balance on programme causes problems with delivery. Improve adherence to the programme so that less amendments are required to meet zero balance target.</td>
<td>Improve adherence to the programme so that less amendments are required to meet zero balance target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>Redirection of funds from areas that achieve programme requirements to those that do not, when slippage in programme occurs Improve adherence to the program to reduce the amount of slippage. Look at rewarding areas who achieve their programme.</td>
<td>Improve adherence to the program to reduce the amount of slippage. Look at rewarding areas who achieve their programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>Optimism on scheme delivery alongside insufficient time being scheduled in to the programme affects final scheme deliverability Incorporate more realism in to the programme and ensure sufficient time is built in for preparation of schemes and all relevant preparatory work prior to physical delivery.</td>
<td>Incorporate more realism in to the programme and ensure sufficient time is built in for preparation of schemes and all relevant preparatory work prior to physical delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>Improve completion of programme and level of involvement with all related partners involved in delivery.</td>
<td>Ensure all relevant partners are involved throughout the programming process rather than just at the initial programming meeting, so that the progress of the programme can be effectively monitored and that all partners are aware of and involved in progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>External factors and local issues can impact upon programming and delivery. In addition, programme can build up unrealistic public expectations.</td>
<td>Ensure programming is completed impartially and that is realistic and deliverable when made public so as to manage public expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>Programming too rigidly can potentially ‘set HNY up for a fall’.</td>
<td>Ensure a realistic and deliverable program is produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Programming and Delivery</td>
<td>High fluctuation in demand for feasibility studies and associated project work</td>
<td>Attempt to improve the stability of the workload so that structure of partners can be secured and expertise tailored to fit needs. Ensure that all partners fully understand the prioritisation system and are in a position to understand why schemes are being prioritised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Prioritisation</td>
<td>The prioritisation system provides an open, auditable trail to enable all partners to identify the schemes that are being programmed and why they have been selected.</td>
<td>Conduct a sensitivity test to assess how well changes to weightings in prioritisation system both for IT schemes and maintenance schemes would affect what is programmed. Adapt prioritisation system to meet changes in public opinion and policy such as reducing carbon emissions and encouraging shift to more sustainable modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Prioritisation</td>
<td>The objective-based, auditable prioritisation mechanisms for both integrated transport and maintenance can be amended to meet changing requirements</td>
<td>Reassess the reserve list to remove schemes that have a very remote chance of ever being programmed. Develop a standard response to pass to the public and members on how the reserve list works. Look at ways of adapting prioritisation system and schemes being supplied to incorporate additional elements such as.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Prioritisation</td>
<td>Public opinions and views do not always match LTP2 objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Prioritisation</td>
<td>How relevant or useful is the reserve list of schemes and do the general public and elected Members understand its role?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Prioritisation</td>
<td>As the prioritisation system is based on current LTP2 objectives it is restricted in how it can fund future developments and...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement ‘softer’ measures.</strong></td>
<td>Deliverability of schemes has little impact upon the final prioritisation score.</td>
<td>Deliverability and environmental awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability of schemes has little impact upon the final prioritisation score.</strong></td>
<td>Environmental issues, such as sustainability, require increased focus and attention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental issues, such as sustainability, require increased focus and attention.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consider how schemes are likely to impact upon the network valuation and potentially factor this in to the prioritisation system.</strong></td>
<td>Consider how schemes are likely to impact upon the network valuation and potentially factor this in to the prioritisation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prioritisation system does not fully take in to consideration the added value to the network that proposed schemes can achieve.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Develop an LAA plan to ensure that these targets are met in conjunction with other LTP2 objectives.</strong></td>
<td>Consider how schemes are likely to impact upon the network valuation and potentially factor this in to the prioritisation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NYCC is in danger of missing out on significant levels of LAA reward funding if targets in road safety and accessibility are not achieved.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possibly refocus funding towards these targets to ensure that they are achieved.</strong></td>
<td>Consider how schemes are likely to impact upon the network valuation and potentially factor this in to the prioritisation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possibility that these targets become the sole focus of LTP2 and other desired outcomes are not achieved.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Retraining and re-briefing of all staff involved in solution identification to ensure that the correct level of information is provided to ensure schemes can be efficiently and accurately assessed.</strong></td>
<td>Consider how schemes are likely to impact upon the network valuation and potentially factor this in to the prioritisation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard of information on schemes supplied is poor and does not include all required information.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigate possibilities of providing block allocations of funding to specific objectives of LTP2.</strong></td>
<td>Consider how schemes are likely to impact upon the network valuation and potentially factor this in to the prioritisation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No block allocations of funding to target specific areas of LTP funding.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Promotion of North Yorkshire through appropriate bodies and through LTP2 Centre of Excellence status.</strong></td>
<td>Investigate possibilities of providing block allocations of funding to specific objectives of LTP2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived lack of understanding of local issues by central government.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Continue to support and develop external accessibility initiatives across the county.</strong></td>
<td>Investigate possibilities of providing block allocations of funding to specific objectives of LTP2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good working relationships on accessibility with outside bodies.</strong></td>
<td><strong>More communication with Members to improve their level of understanding of the LTP2 processes and objectives.</strong></td>
<td>Investigate possibilities of providing block allocations of funding to specific objectives of LTP2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with specific political requests for issues that do not impact significantly on LTP2 can divert limited resources from core LTP2 objectives.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Utilise the prioritisation system as a means for illustrating the feasibility of schemes to Members.</strong></td>
<td>Investigate possibilities of providing block allocations of funding to specific objectives of LTP2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The geographic and demographic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Continue to build on existing levels</strong></td>
<td>Investigate possibilities of providing block allocations of funding to specific objectives of LTP2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td><strong>nature of NY results in issues specific to the area. These do not readily translate in respect to DfT targets.</strong></td>
<td><strong>of dialogue with GOYH and DfT to promote understanding of issues within North Yorkshire and how they impact upon LTP2 delivery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Governance</td>
<td><strong>Central government is perceived to have a significant urban bias in respect to transport issues within the UK. Changes in government policy and objectives may impact upon LTP delivery.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Continue to build on existing levels of dialogue with GOYH and DfT to ensure that they are aware of the issues with North Yorkshire and vice versa.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Governance</td>
<td><strong>Perception that Highways and Transportation is the ‘poor relation’ in terms of funding compared to other areas of the Council. Questions as to whether the efficiency agenda as rigorously promoted in other directorates?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Continue to raise the profile of Highways and Transportation and promotion of its role as a facilitator in the development of other areas of NYCC activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Road safety grants enable more road safety schemes to be developed.</td>
<td>Fully utilise this grant to address specific road safety issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Level of funding available for major scheme proposals and studies is minimal.</td>
<td>Increase awareness of process involved in obtaining funds from LTP2 budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Not all sources of available funding are utilised to their full potential.</td>
<td>Develop a funding officer role to identify and access all available funding streams such as cycling funding, PROW funding etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>Information flow on performance monitoring results is poor at times.</td>
<td>Improve distribution of performance monitoring results to all staff across the partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>Insufficient process evaluation across the partnership between partners.</td>
<td>Encourage a culture of continuous improvement, where we reassess what we are doing and where it can be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>Development and implementation of HNY business plan provides a strong base and set out how the partnership will work towards achieving its objectives</td>
<td>Challenge our performance more regularly and utilise elements of best practice gained from other authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>Increased focus on performance monitoring can improve how objectives and targets are being met.</td>
<td>Fully utilise this plan alongside LTP2 and the H&amp;T service performance plan in order to establish how we deliver the Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>No Air Quality Management Area within the county</td>
<td>Maintain background monitoring to ensure that an AQMA is not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>SWOT sessions provide an opportunity to review performance of LTP2 delivery</td>
<td>Look at holding SWOT sessions throughout the remaining period of LTP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>Insufficient monitoring of effectiveness of implemented schemes. Means that we are unable to understand what the most effective types of schemes are. Lack of available information on major schemes and major works to prove their effectiveness.</td>
<td>Improve impact analysis of schemes to assess exactly how effective they are in meeting their proposed objectives. Use this information to establish what the most successful types of schemes in addressing LTP2 objectives actually are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Importance of striking the balance between LTP2 objectives and indicators and targets. Danger exists that we become too focussed on hitting targets.</td>
<td>Ensure that LTP2 objectives remain at the heart of the LTP2 delivery and that all efforts are not solely focussed on achieving targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Identification</td>
<td>Area based RSOs provide local focus and address specific local issues using their expertise.</td>
<td>Continue to use local RSO knowledge when addressing road safety issues and involve further where applicable within scheme design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Identification</td>
<td>Not strategic enough in approach to scheme identification. Very reactive to specific issues and do not develop a coherent enough strategy when designing schemes.</td>
<td>Develop more coherent strategies when identifying realistic schemes to look at issues on a wider scale, possible through route studies, network hierarchy and high risk site list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Identification</td>
<td>Accident investigations are taking too long to complete.</td>
<td>Review AIP process to establish if it can be amended to ensure that investigations are completed on time and efficiently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Identification</td>
<td>AIP team is not developing a sufficient number of schemes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Identification</td>
<td>Lack of effective congestion related schemes being developed.</td>
<td>Continue to review congestion issues as part of the various congestion study processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Identification</td>
<td>Softer measures are not fully utilised in tandem with physical measures to publicise the new measures that are being implemented.</td>
<td>Identify ways in which softer measures and physical measures can be packaged together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Identification</td>
<td>Accessibility issues still remain prevalent throughout the county.</td>
<td>Continue to develop the accessibility agenda particularly with respect to accessing health and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Type</td>
<td>Output Summary</td>
<td>Action Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Identification</td>
<td>LTP2 has assisted in further increasing bus patronage and usage across the county.</td>
<td>Continue to promote bus usage and further increase patronage levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Position as a Centre of Excellence for LTP delivery and also the standard and content of LTP2 provides a solid base to work from.</td>
<td>Aim to maintain excellent standard throughout delivery of LTP2 and maintain excellent rating throughout LTP2 whilst continuing to be innovative and forward thinking in our approach to dealing with transport issues across the county. Continue education and improve awareness of new issues affecting LTP2 delivery and transport issues in general across the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>No common culture exists across the HNY partnership. Still relatively segmented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>NYCC is reluctant to change and embrace new working practices and new innovations such as recycling in construction etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Lack of business focus and financial responsibility can impact upon delivery.</td>
<td>Identify ways of improving the awareness of staff of their financial responsibilities as part of ongoing efficiency agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Political and institutional structure of NYCC restricts ability to change and develop to meet new challenges.</td>
<td>Ongoing efficiency agenda may develop ways in which the service can evolve and become more dynamic to meet the needs of a changing North Yorkshire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Transition from LTP1 to LTP2 has not been fully completed. Some employees are still working within LTP1 mindset.</td>
<td>Develop more training and development initiatives to raise awareness of LTP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Events</td>
<td>Unplanned major events such as flooding / adverse weather</td>
<td>Utilise action plans and react accordingly to specific situations if and when they do occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Indicators and Targets Review
Introduction and Background

In light of changes to national performance methodologies, NYCC undertook a study of progress against our targets and indicators. The review also considered whether the targets selected remain relevant in light of changing government initiatives.

Comparator Authorities

In order to provide some comparison and context on NYCC’s LTP targets, Authorities were selected on the basis of being comparable to North Yorkshire, either in terms of their being a ‘best practice’ authority or a ‘nearest neighbour’.

The ‘Best Practice’ authorities were selected on the basis of having been scored as ‘Excellent’ in the Performance Management Section of their LTP2 and also having some affinity with North Yorkshire - either with similar demographics or relatively close geographically. In total 8 authorities were identified:

- Cornwall
- East Riding of Yorkshire
- Derbyshire
- Kingston-upon-Hull
- Leicestershire
- Norfolk
- North Nottinghamshire
- York

Fourteen ‘Nearest Neighbour’ authorities were identified from the CIPFA website. Two of these (Cornwall and Norfolk) were also included in the group of ‘Excellent’ authorities. The full list comprises:

- Cornwall
- Norfolk
- Cambridgeshire
- Cheshire
- Cumbria
- Devon
- Dorset
- Gloucestershire
- Lincolnshire
- Shropshire
- Somerset
- Warwickshire
- Wiltshire
- Worcestershire


The Department for Transport (DfT) issued a document ‘Guidance on Second Local Transport Plan (LTP2) Progress Reports (2008)’, which described the approach to be used for reporting on targets.

Paragraph 3 of Annex 1 of the guidance states:

‘All reports should include information on the 17 mandatory and Best Value Performance Indicators and on progress against other locally determined targets. When reflecting on their performance against these targets and indicators, some authorities may in exceptional cases decide that the targets themselves or the trajectories towards them require review. This is a matter for the authority, but the Department will expect that any assessment of the LTP2 in 2011 will consider achievement against the original targets of the plan unless there are very exceptional circumstances which have been discussed in advance with the Government Office.’
Although the above suggests that any revision to targets will need to have a sound justification, it also implies that any proposed change should be discussed with GOYH as far in advance as possible.

**National Indicator Set**

The new National Indicator Set partly replaces the set of 17 Mandatory and Best Value Performance Indicators for LTP2. The DfT’s ‘Guidance on Second Local Transport Plan (LTP2) Progress Reports (2008)’ describes this change as follows in paragraphs 25 and 26:

“9 of the 17 mandatory and Best Value Performance Indicators have been included in the set of 198 national indicators, which local authorities must monitor and report on to central Government from April 2009.

Of the remaining 8, the Department will continue to produce statistics related to two: total slight casualties and change in area wide road traffic mileage. As part of the review in 2008 of local transport plans, local authorities should consider which of these eight indicators they anticipate continuing to monitor during the LTP2 period.”

The effect of these changes is shown in Table 2.1.

Although this suggests that there will be some freedom for local authorities to discontinue monitoring those indicators which are no longer in the National Indicator set, elsewhere in the guidance it is stated that all reports should describe progress against the original indicators (see para 1.2.2 above).

In the body of the report, the indicators are referred to by their original names, as referred to in LTP2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP / BV Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ind. Nat. Ind.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 99a</td>
<td>Total Killed Seriously Injured (KSI) Casualties</td>
<td>NI 47</td>
<td>People killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 99b</td>
<td>Total Child Killed Seriously Injured (KSI) Casualties</td>
<td>NI 48</td>
<td>Children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 99c</td>
<td>Total Slight Casualties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 102</td>
<td>Bus Patronage</td>
<td>NI 177</td>
<td>Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 104</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Local Bus Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 187</td>
<td>%age of the category 1, 1a and 2 footway network where structural maintenance should be considered</td>
<td>NI168</td>
<td>Principal Roads where maintenance should be considered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 223</td>
<td>%age of the PRN where structural maintenance should be considered</td>
<td>NI 169</td>
<td>Non-principal roads where maintenance should be considered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 224a</td>
<td>%age of the non-PRN where structural maintenance should be considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 224b</td>
<td>%age of the Unclassified Road Network where structural maintenance should be considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP1</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>NI 175</td>
<td>Access to services and facilities by public transport, walking and cycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI 176</td>
<td>Working age people with access to employment by public transport (and other specified modes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP2</td>
<td>Change in Area Wide Road Traffic</td>
<td>NI 176</td>
<td></td>
<td>DfT will continue to produce statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP3</td>
<td>Annualised Index of Cycling Trips</td>
<td>NI 198</td>
<td>Children travelling to school – mode of travel usually used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP4</td>
<td>Mode share of journeys to School</td>
<td>NI 178</td>
<td>Bus Services Running on Time</td>
<td>DfT Guidance - If cycling or footways are important local issues, it would be incongruous to discontinue monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP5</td>
<td>Bus Punctuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 – Best Value and National Indicators
Road Safety Indicators (BVPI 99a, 99b, 99c, L1)

Status of Indicators
In LTP2 there were three Road Safety related National Indicators (BVPI 99a, BVPI99b, BVPI99c) and one Local Indicator (L1).

- BVPI 99a is now NI 47 – People killed or seriously injured in Road Traffic Accidents
- BVPI 99b is now NI 48 – Children killed or seriously injured in Road Traffic Accidents
- BVPI 99c (Total Slight Casualties) is not included in the National Indicator set – however DfT will continue to produce statistics.
- L1 is a Local Indicator – Number of Fatalities in York and North Yorkshire.

NYCC LTP Targets and Rationale
- For BVPI 99a, the current target is 622 by 2010 – a 40% reduction over the 1994-8 baseline of 1037.
- For BVPI 99b, the current target is 43 by 2010 – a 60% reduction over the 1994-8 baseline of 108
- For BVPI 99c the current target is 2947 by 2010 – maintaining the 1994-8 baseline.
- For L1, the current target is 56 by 2010 – a one-third reduction from the 1999-2003 baseline of 85.

The targets for both BVPI 99a and 99c were set on the basis of achieving the DfT’s ‘satisfactory’ target definitions. For BVPI 99b, the original target of a 50% reduction was met during the LTP1 period – a more stretching target of a 60% reduction was therefore set for LTP2. The target for L1 is based on maintaining a similar level of improvement in casualty numbers to that achieved during LTP1 – where there was a 32% reduction by 2004 compared with the 1994-8 average.

Local Area Agreement Indicators
NYCC have also agreed road safety targets as part of their Local Area Agreement (LAA) up to 2009. The four LTP indicators are therefore closely related to LAA indicators SAF/4/(a), SAF/4/(b), SAF/4/(c) and SAF/4/(d). For the first of these, a more stretching target of 25 fewer KSIs than the equivalent LTP indicator over the period 2007-9 was set. For the others, targets equivalent to the LTP targets were agreed.

During May 2008, a revised LAA target has been agreed for SAF/4/(a) beyond 2009, and for 2010 this is the same as the original LTP2 target of 622.

‘Excellent’ authority Targets and Rationale
Of the eight ‘Excellent’ comparison authorities, six have set targets for BVPI 99a beyond the ‘satisfactory’ level of a 40% reduction over 1994-8, and three
of these have set new baselines based on 2001-4. When compared with the 1994-8 baselines for these authorities, the target reductions range between 42% (Leicestershire) and 50% (Hull and Norfolk). The two authorities not exceeding the ‘satisfactory’ level (East Riding and North Nottinghamshire) have set 40% reductions in the same way as North Yorkshire. This is shown in Figure 3.1 below.

![Figure 3.1 – BVPI99a Target Reductions – NYCC & Excellent Authorities](image)

For BVPI 99b, 5 of the 8 ‘Excellent’ comparison authorities have also set more stretching targets than the DfT reduction of 50%. Of the other two, one (North Nottinghamshire) has set a less stretching target and the other two (York and East Riding) have set a 50% reduction, as shown in Figure 3.2 below.

![Figure 3.2 – BVPI99b Target Reductions – NYCC & Excellent Authorities](image)
For BVPI 99c, 6 of the 8 ‘Excellent’ comparison authorities have set targets of a reduction of around 10% in the number of slight casualties as shown in Figure 3.3 below. The other two (Norfolk and Cornwall) have either set a target of maintaining the 1994-8 baseline or a very small increase (shown as below the line on the chart).

![Figure 3.3 – BVPI99c Target Reductions – NYCC & Excellent Authorities](image)

In general, it appears that NYCC’s Road Safety targets are slightly less challenging than the ‘Excellent’ authorities.

The rationales used by other authorities have included a number of concepts not mentioned in NYCC’s LTP (though in reality these may have been used). These include:

- Use of Mass Action Plans where accidents are not clustered (East Riding)
- Extensive accident analysis used to set local safety targets (Cornwall)
- Better partnership with HA’s casualty reduction programmes and initiatives (Leicestershire)
- Rolling averages preferred option for target comparison where numbers small (BVPI 99b) (Derbyshire, Leicestershire, North Nottinghamshire.)
Of the fourteen ‘Nearest Neighbour’ comparison authorities 8 have set targets for BVPI 99a beyond the ‘satisfactory’ level of a 40% reduction over 1994-8 as shown in Figure 3.4 below. Two of these have set new baselines of the 2001-4 average. When compared the 1994-8 baselines for these 8 authorities, the target reductions range between 43% (Cheshire) and 55% (Devon). Of the six authorities not exceeding the ‘satisfactory’ level, five have set 40% reductions in the same way as North Yorkshire, and only one (Somerset) has set a lower target (35%).

For BVPI 99b, 6 of the 14 ‘Nearest Neighbour’ comparison authorities have also set more stretching targets than the DfT reduction of 50%, while another 4 have set target reductions of 50% as shown in Figure 3.5 below. The other 4 have set target reductions between 43% and 48%. North Yorkshire is 4th out of the 15 authorities in this group.
For BVPI 99c, 7 of the 14 ‘Nearest Neighbour’ comparison authorities have set targets of a reduction in the number of casualties compared with 2001-4. Four others have a target of maintaining the 1994-8 baseline, while three are targeting small increases (the largest being Cambridgeshire with an increase of 3.2%). This indicator was not mandatory for LTP1, so the 1994-8 averages are not known for all authorities. As a result it is not possible to represent the comparison graphically.

**NYCC Progress to date during LTP2 period**

BVPI 99a is slightly behind trajectory. The totals for calendar years 2004 through 2007 are 709, 697, 717 and 699 (estimated). These suggest that the previous sustained improvement has stalled. The related Local Indicator L1 is similarly slightly behind trajectory.

BVPI 99b is also slightly behind trajectory. However, due to the low numbers involved this may be misleading. If rolling averages were used, this indicator would be on track.

BVPI 99c is significantly ahead of trajectory.

![Graph](image_url)

**BVPI 99a - Number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents**

The target for this indicator is to reduce the number of killed or seriously injured casualties by 40% by 2010 compared with a 1994 -1998 average baseline. Casualties in 2005 were slightly below the 2005 stretched target which resulted in us achieving the stretched target associated with the Local Public Service Agreement. However in 2006 an increase was seen in the numbers of KSI casualties in North Yorkshire. Though this is a concern, the longer term and 3 year averages demonstrate that the target for 2010 is still achievable. We are also confident that through the extra finance available for road safety we will meet our 2010 target. Current figures for 2008 suggest that we are on track to achieve our target this year.
BVPI 99b - Number of children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents

The target for this indicator is a stretched target to reduce the number of killed or seriously injured child road casualties by 60% by 2010 compared with a 1994 to 1998 average baseline. The national target is a 50% reduction. Casualties for 2005 were 1 above the trajectory of 50. However the casualty numbers for 2006 of 44 was significantly below trajectory of 48, but in 2007 the figure was again over the target figure. However, early indications for 2008 suggest that we are likely to fall well below the trajectory for this year.

BVPI 99c - Number of people slightly injured in road traffic accidents

The target for this indicator is to not exceed the number of slight casualties per annum compared to the 1994 -1999 average despite traffic growth. Actual figures for 2005 and 2006 are significantly reduced indicating that we are on track to achieve this target. The proposed new target will be to reduce the number of slight accidents to 2585 based on the 2003 to 2008 average.
The target for this indicator is to reduce the number of fatal road casualties by one third by 2010, compared to a 1999-2003 average. This equates to the saving of 95 lives, hence the title of the ‘95 Alive’ strategy. Fatalities in 2005 were slightly above the trajectory however fatalities for 2006 are 8 below trajectory. Since 2005 we have therefore saved 16 lives compared to the 2000-2003 baseline average, to contribute towards our ‘95 Alive’ target, the falling trend indicates that we are be on track to achieve the target by 2010.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The LTP2 target for BVPI 99a was slightly less ambitious than the ‘Excellent’ group, many of which targeted reductions of more than 40% when compared with 1994-98. However, the subsequent LAA target of achieving a further cumulative reduction of 25 KSIs between 2007 and 2009 brings North Yorkshire into line with the more ambitious authorities. As the LAA target has now been agreed for 2010 at 622, in line with the original LTP2 target, this effectively sets both the trajectory and target for BVPI99a up to 2010. It is recommended that the target for BVPI99a is unchanged.

The LTP2 target for BVPI99b was broadly in line with the ‘Excellent’ group. There seems little reason to change the target, particularly as it is currently slightly behind trajectory. It is recommended that the target for BVPI99b is unchanged.

The LTP2 target for BVPI99c of maintaining the 1994-8 average appears rather undemanding when compared with the ‘Excellent’ authorities, and even more so when compared with current performance. It is recommended that a revised target of 2534 be set for BVPI99c, representing a 14% reduction over the 1994-98 average. This is equivalent to maintaining the annual average for 2004-7 through to 2010.

Being a Local Indicator, it is not possible to compare L1 directly with other authorities. As this target is closely related to BVPI 99a, it is recommended that the target for L1 is unchanged. The target of a one-third reduction is
already highly ambitious and NYCC would be challenged to stretch it further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Maintenance Indicators (BVPI 223, 224a, 224b, 187)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status of Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 223 is now NI 168 – Principal roads where maintenance should be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 224a is now NI 169 – Non-principal roads where maintenance should be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 224b (Percentage of the Unclassified Road network where structural maintenance should be considered) is not in the National Indicator Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 187 (Percentage of the category 1, 1a and 2 footway network where structural maintenance should be considered) is not in the National Indicator Set.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NYCC LTP Targets and Rationale**

The Target Lead Officer for Highway Maintenance is Doug Huzzard.

For BVPI 223, the target is 4%, maintaining the 2005/06 Scanner value of 4.4%.

For BVPI 224a, the target is 11% by 2007/08, maintaining the 2005/06 Scanner value of 11.8%.

For BVPI 224b, the target is 14% by 2007/08, improving on the 2005/06 CVI value of 16.9%. These are taken from the Performance Indicator Reference report provided by NYCC – but use a different base year from that quoted in the LTP2, which used the 2004/05 figure of 21%.

For BVPI 187, the target is 8% by 2010/11, improving on the 2003/04 baseline of 24%.

The rationale for all of these indicators is based on improvements in line with Transport Asset Management Plan and Service Centre Management Strategies.

**‘Excellent’ authority Targets and Rationale**

It has not been possible to compare the BVPI 223 and BVPI 224a targets for the comparator authorities with North Yorkshire as, with one exception, their LTP2 targets do not make use of the SCANNER methodology. This was only used by NYCC for the first time in 2005/06 and was reported in the LTP1 Delivery Report but not in the final NYCC LTP2 submitted slightly earlier. The current SCANNER-based targets differ significantly from the TTS-based targets used in the LTP2.

For BVPI 224b, there is a wide variety of targets for the comparator authorities, with 2 out of the 8 forecasting deterioration. These are East Riding and Kingston-upon-Hull, which both quote funding issues as the justification. The range of targets is shown in Figure 4.1 below.
For BVPI 187, there is also a wide range of targets from 7% (Leicestershire) to 69% (Kingston-upon-Hull) as shown in Figure 4.2 below. Only Leicestershire of the comparator authorities has a more ambitious target.

‘Nearest Neighbour’ authority Targets and Rationale

Similarly, it has not been possible to compare the BVPI 223 and BVPI 224a targets for the ‘Nearest Neighbour’ comparator authorities with North Yorkshire.
For BVPI 224b, there is a wide variety of targets for the ‘Nearest Neighbour’ authorities, with 3 out of the 15 forecasting deterioration, although two of these are from an already ‘above average’ position. North Yorkshire is ranked 6th out of 15 in this group both in terms of absolute target and level of improvement – i.e. both target performance and level of improvement are slightly better than the median. This is shown in Figure 4.3 below.

![Figure 4.3 – BVPI 224b Targets – NYCC & CIPFA ‘Nearest Neighbours’](image)

For BVPI 187, there is also a wide range of targets from 5% (Cumbria) to 57% (Worcestershire). North Yorkshire is 4th lowest out of 15 in this group, as shown in Figure 4.4 below.

![Figure 4.4 – BVPI 187 Targets – NYCC & CIPFA ‘Nearest Neighbours’](image)
NYCC Progress to date during LTP2 period
NYCC are on target for BVPI 223, 224b and 187, but slightly behind for BVPI 224a.

Feedback from Target Lead Officer

Although all indicators are broadly on target, the maintenance funding allocation has been reduced significantly since the original Planning Guidelines issued by DfT in 2005. The effect over the full LTP2 period is significant (around £18M). As a result there is concern whether the on-target performance can be maintained through to 2010.

There are also a number of features of North Yorkshire’s road network which result in expenditure higher than that allowed for by the funding formula. These include the 700km of 'unclassified, un surfaced' road and other 'non-blacktop' areas, such as cobbled areas, back streets and steps which have high maintenance costs.

In the case of BVPI 187, there is a specific problem in that the threshold condition index to indicate that maintenance 'should be considered' is set at a level where it is difficult to justify expenditure in engineering terms. Significant improvement beyond the 2007/8 level of 19% may therefore be difficult to achieve.

BVPI 223 - Principal Road Condition: % where structural maintenance should be considered.

Due to a change in methodology required by DfT for monitoring and reporting BVPI 223 the Target and Trajectory set in LTP 2 has been superseded. We are now required to report the '% length of the principal road network which is in poor overall condition and is likely to require maintenance soon (the "red" length)'.

Therefore, we are currently preparing a new target and trajectory based on the DfT requirements for this indicator and proposed changes to the funding mechanism for maintenance allocations.

BVPI 224a - Non-Principal Classified Road Condition: % where structural maintenance should be considered.

As with BVPI 223 (above), the monitoring and reporting requirements for BVPI 224a have been changed by DfT. We are now required to report on '% length of their non principal classified road network which is in a poor overall condition and is likely to require planned maintenance soon (the "red" length)'.

A baseline of 11.8% in 2005/06 has been established with a figure of 14% in 2006/07. We are currently preparing a new target and trajectory for this indicator based on the DfT requirements and proposed changes to the funding mechanism for maintenance allocations.
**BVPI 224b - Unclassified Road Condition:** % where structural maintenance should be considered.

As with BVPI 223 (above), the monitoring and reporting requirements for BVPI 224a have been changed by DfT. We are now required to report on ‘% length of their non principal classified road network which is in a poor overall condition and is likely to require planned maintenance soon’.

A baseline of 16.87% in 2005/06 has been established with a figure of 13.9% in 2006/07. We are currently preparing a new target and trajectory for this indicator based on the DfT requirements and proposed changes to the funding mechanism for maintenance allocations.

**BVPI 187 - Footway Condition**

This indicator is currently significantly ahead of trajectory. We will however need to consider revising the target and trajectory in the light of proposed changes to the DfT funding mechanism which may result in significant changes to the funding available for maintenance.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

The targets and trajectories will be developed after considering a variety of funding and network strategy options.
Public Transport Indicators (BVPI 102, 104, LTP5, L2, L3, L4)

Status of Indicators
BVPI 102 is now NI 177 – Local Bus passenger journeys originating in the local authority area.
BVPI 104 (Satisfaction with Local Bus Services) is not a National Indicator. DfT query many authorities will be able to afford to collect it.
LTP5 is now NI 178 – Bus Services running on time.
L2, L3 and L4 are local indicators, as follows:
L2 is Bus Patronage on Quality Commercial Routes.
L3 is Bus Patronage on Premier Specification (supported) Routes.
L4 is Public Satisfaction with Public Transport Information.

NYCC LTP Targets and Rationale
The Target Lead Officer for Public Transport is John Laking.

For BVPI 102, the original target was 17.066m – an increase of 6% over the 2004/5 base of 16.100m.

For BVPI 104, the original target was 70% and remaining within the upper quartile - an increase of 4% over the 2003/4 base of 66%

For LTP5 no target was set when the LTP2 was initially published. A target of 75% has now been set, based on a baseline figure of 63%.

For L2, the original target was an increase of 30% between 2003/4 and 2010/1. This is based on the principle that the routes with the greatest patronage growth will be those where there is an effective partnership between NYCC and the operator. Monitoring this indicator will provide a better understanding of this relationship.

For L3, the original target was an increase of 15% between 2003/4 and 2010/1. As these routes are more rural in nature there is less scope for modal shift than the on the inter-urban routes covered by L2.

For L4, the original target was 75% and remaining within the upper quartile - an increase of 2% over the 2003/4 base of 73%.

‘Excellent’ authority Targets and Rationale
With two exceptions the comparator authorities have similar targets for BVPI 102 to North Yorkshire – i.e. in the range 4.0% (Cornwall) to 9.7% (Norfolk), as shown in Figure 5.1 below.

The exceptions are East Riding – whose target is for patronage to change (decline) at the same rate as bus usage in England (outside London) and York – who are targeting a 46.5% increase.

The rational for most authorities appears to be based on reaching the DfT’s 12% target increase by 2012.
East Riding’s rationale is that due to the nature of the area bus service provision is more difficult than in many others and it is unreasonable to expect a better than average performance.

York’s rationale is based on maintaining the strong performance during LTP1. It is understood that planned expansion of the Park & Ride scheme will be a major driver for growth.

For BVPI 104, satisfaction is already relatively high at 66% - only three of the peer authorities are better – Hull (81%), York (71%) and Derbyshire (71%).

‘Nearest Neighbour’ authority Targets
Most of the ‘Nearest Neighbour’ authorities have similar BVPI 102 targets to North Yorkshire – i.e. in the range 4.0% (Cornwall) to 10.3% (Dorset) as shown in Figure 5.2 below. However, three have much higher targets (Cambridgeshire 33.8%, Gloucestershire 22.7% and Devon 20%), three have lower increases (Somerset 3%, Cheshire 2.5% and Cumbria 1.2%) and one is targeting a reduction (Lincolnshire – 12.1%). In the latter case, this combines an increase of 5% due to free concessionary fares, combined with an underlying reduction of 1.5% per annum.
NYCC Progress to date during LTP2 period

NYCC has already made good progress towards the target for BVPI 102. Total 2006/7 patronage was 16.633m, 3.3% above the 2003/04 baseline and 0.53m ahead of trajectory, and 2007/08 looks set to exceed the 2006/07 total.

However, this apparently good progress masks significant changes during the period – with an apparent 9% reduction from 2003/4 to 2005/6 followed by a 12% increase in 2006/07. It seems likely that this is related to the introduction of free concessionary travel.

Local Indicators L2 and L3 have both made excellent progress and have exceeded the original 2010/11 targets – L2 having increased by 46% and L3 by 29%.

Feedback from Target Lead Officer

The increase in BVPI 102 in 2006/7 is linked to the introduction of local free concessionary travel in April 2006. Up to that time, 15% of all North Yorkshire bus passengers were concessionary pass holders – for 2007/08 the figure is 30%. A further increase is expected in 2008 with the introduction of National free concessionary travel.

The increases in L2 and L3 are also partly linked to changes in concessionary travel arrangements – although the higher percentage rises in these indicators suggests that other factors also have an effect.

As BVPI 104 is no longer a National Indicator it will no longer be collected in the same way as previously. Although North Yorkshire are able to gather this information through their ‘citizen’s panel’, the results will not be consistent with those from the BV survey. This is due to the citizen’s panel consisting of
volunteers, who tend to be less satisfied than a ‘random sample’. Reporting this indicator based on a different methodology would not be appropriate.

L4 was also previously collected using the BV survey, and the same considerations apply as to BVPI 104.

The Punctuality Indicator is based on two heavily-used corridors in the Harrogate area (101/2 to Knaresborough and 36 to Leeds). These are measured on eight Fridays in June and July which provide sufficient observations to meet the DfT guidance on this indicator and will represent relatively congested conditions. However, they will not be representative of punctuality in North Yorkshire as a whole.

**BVPI 102 - Public Transport Patronage: Total local public transport passenger journeys per year by registered local bus services**

This indicator has performed well and patronage has continued to grow in the first two years of LTP2. The indicator is on track to achieve the original 2010/11 outturn. It should be noted that the introduction of free concessionary fares has contributed to this growth. Consequently the target and trajectory have been revised upwards accordingly.
BVPI 104 - Bus Satisfaction: % of all users satisfied with the local bus service

This target is broadly on track to achieve the outturn figure. The result places the council in the upper quartile of county councils in England, and 3rd amongst our nearest neighbour family of authorities. This indicator is no longer a BV indicator, but will be measured through the Place Survey which is being introduced.

LTP 5 - Bus Punctuality: Percentage of services one minute early to five minutes late.

The County Council is currently working with Bus Operators to establish a methodology for collecting the data for this indicator with a view to setting a target later in 2008.

L2 - Patronage on Quality Commercial Bus Routes

Strong partnership working with bus operators continues to deliver significant growth on these selected corridors. The outturn figures for 2006/07 and
2007/08 exceed the projected target end year figure. In view of this, a revised target and trajectory has been set to achieve a 52% increase by 2011.

![Graph showing L3 - Bus Patronage on Premier Specification Routes](chart1)

**L3 - Patronage on Premier Specification Bus Routes**

Strong partnership working with bus operators continues to deliver significant growth on these selected corridors. The outturn figures for 2006/7 and 2007/08 exceeded the projected trajectory and 2011 figure and consequently we have set a revised trajectory and target.

![Graph showing L4 - Satisfaction with Public Transport Information](chart2)

**L4 - Satisfaction with Public Transport Information**

This result exceeds the challenging target we set for 2010, and maintains the council’s position in the upper quartile of all English County Councils. Since 2000/1 when this indicator was first measured in the Best Value User Satisfaction Survey, we have improved our position relative to all county councils, from 17th to 5th last year. This indicator is no longer part of the national indicator set. However, we will retain it as a local indicator and track it through the new Place Survey.
Conclusions and Recommendations

BVPI 102 showed a significant increase to a total of 16.63m bus passenger journeys in 2006/07 – which was 0.53m ahead of the trajectory of 16.10m for that year. It is generally agreed that much of this increase is due to the introduction of Local free concessionary travel in April 2006. The introduction of National free concessionary travel in April 2008 is also likely to result in an increase – though the extent of this is less certain. Other factors, such as increased fares due to rising fuel prices are likely to have a negative effect on patronage.

It is proposed that the BVPI 102 target be increased to 17.6m bus passenger journeys, thus taking account of the 0.53m increase over the trajectory in 2006/07.

As it will not be possible to collect data consistent with previous years, it is recommended that BVPI 104 be re-classified as a Local Monitoring Indicator, but not reported in future Delivery Reports.

It is recommended that the current target for LTP5 be retained, as the baseline and target have only recently been set. However, it is noted that the methodology is unusual in being based on days when buses are expected to be delayed; as a result it does not give an accurate impression of the punctuality of buses in North Yorkshire on a day-to-day basis. It is recommended that an additional Local Monitoring Indicator be set up to measure Bus Punctuality on these routes for the whole of a ‘neutral’ week (as might be used for traffic counts). This would provide both an indication of day-to-day punctuality and a comparison with the peak days when LTP5 is measured.

As both L2 and L3 have already met their targets, they need to be reviewed. Using the same principle as BVPI 102, it is recommended that the L2 target be increased to 51% and the L3 target to 33%. This is based on the same planned growth between 2007/8 and 2010/11 as in the original trajectory.

Similarly to BVPI 104, it is recommended that L4 be re-classified as a Local Monitoring Indicator, but not reported in future Delivery Reports.

### Accessibility Indicator (LTP1)

**Status of Indicator**

LTP1 is covered by two National Indicators:

- NI 175 – Access to services and facilities by public transport, walking and cycling
- NI 176 – Working age people with access to employment by public transport (and other specified modes)

**NYCC LTP Targets and Rationale**

The Target Lead Officers for Accessibility are John Laking and Phil Broomhead.
NYCC’s target is based on the number of community transport journeys. In LTP2 two potential targets were defined – a 50% increase by 2010/11 with the ‘Future Builders’ project or a 25% increase without.

This indicator has been chosen on the basis that due to the sparsely populated nature of much of North Yorkshire the increased provision of Community Transport is the most effective way of improving accessibility. This has been agreed with DfT and GOYH.

Local Area Agreement Indicators

NYCC has also agreed a similar Accessibility target as part of their Local Area Agreement (LAA). This is STR/3/(c), but as a result of different treatment of journeys made on community buses operating on registered local bus services was defined slightly differently from LTP1.

Following discussions with GOYH, LTP1 has been brought in line with STR/3/(c) so that it excludes journeys operated as registered local bus services (in which case the patronage is included in BVPI 102).

A stretched target has now been set for STR/3/(c) of a 60% increase by 2009/10. A growth of 2.5% has been proposed for 2010/11.

‘Excellent’ authority Targets and Rationale

Other authorities have a range of different Accessibility Indicators and targets. These are typically based on the DfT guidelines and are of the form ‘Proportion of Households within 60 minutes of a major centre in the morning peak’.

NYCC Progress to date during LTP2 period

NYCC appears to be just on target to achieve a 50% increase by 2010.

Feedback from Target Lead Officer

The original target covered three districts – Harrogate, Craven and Ryedale. However, GOYH is looking for wider coverage and roll-out to other districts. However, there can be implementation issues where there is not an established Community Transport operator willing to work in conjunction with NYCC. There are also concerns about the financial sustainability of some CT operations, and hence their ability to offer the level of provision required to achieve this target.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The results from the Stakeholder Consultations have confirmed that safety and accessibility remain the two key priorities for LTP2.

This indicator needs to be brought into line with the LAA indicator STR/3(c), for which a stretched target of 60% in 2009/10 has recently been agreed, along with proposed growth of 2.5% for 2010/11. It is recommended that the LTP1 target be increased to an increase of 62.5% in the number of Community Transport journeys by 2010/11 for consistency with STR/3.

With the development of the Service Centre Transport Strategies, it would be appropriate for NYCC to develop a measure of accessibility for each
centre for example the ‘Proportion of Households within 30 minutes of a Service Centre during the morning peak’. This could take account of Community Transport provision and be the basis for an additional accessibility indicator for the LTP3 period, which would be comparable with that used by other authorities. The improved accessibility achieved through the implementation of capital schemes e.g. footways and cycleways could also be measured.

This indicator is well on track deliver the anticipated performance by the end of the plan period. Planned investment in 2007/8 will see a stronger growth in the number of passengers carried and accessing services. Consequently, the target has been increased to 62.5% by 2011 which includes a 2.5% increase in addition to the LAA target. This target has been included as an accessibility indicator for the Local Area Agreement (LAA).

Road Traffic Indicator (LTP2)

Status of Indicator
This is not a National Indicator, but DfT will continue to collect the necessary statistics.

NYCC LTP Targets and Rationale
The Target Lead Officer for Road Traffic is Andrew Bainbridge.

NYCC’s target is to limit traffic growth to 1.5% per annum. This is based on Integrated Transport Schemes in Scarborough, Harrogate and Knaresborough, and Service Centre Transportation Strategies in other towns providing alternatives to the car.

‘Excellent’ authority Targets and Rationale
Most other authorities have targets in the range 1.25% per annum (North Nottinghamshire) to 1.8% per annum (Leicestershire) as shown in Figure 7.1
below. The exception is again East Riding with a target growth of 3% per annum.

Figure 7.1 – LTP2 Target annual increases – NYCC & Excellent Authorities

‘Nearest Neighbour’ authority Targets
Most of the ‘Nearest Neighbour’ authorities have similar LTP2 targets to North Yorkshire – i.e. in the range 1.2% per annum (Somerset) to 1.8% (Cornwall and Wiltshire) as shown in Figure 7.2 below. However, three have rather higher targets (Devon 2.4% per annum, Lincolnshire 2.3% per annum and Worcestershire 2.7% per annum) and one a lower increase (Cambridgeshire 0.8% per annum.

Figure 7.2 – LTP2 Target annual increases – NYCC & ‘Nearest Neighbour’ Authorities
NYCC Progress to date during LTP2 period

After 2 years, the increase in road traffic appears to be higher than the target. i.e. After 2 years target increase was 3.03%, actual increase is 3.82%.

Feedback from Target Lead Officer

Annual traffic data is generally available around November of the following year. For 2007, traffic growth is expected to be low (partly because of poor summer). For 2008, could be lower because of effect of fuel prices. There may also be some effect due to free concessionary travel.

Overall, there seems to be little or no reason to increase the forecast growth.

LTP 2 - Change in area wide road traffic mileage

Data for monitoring this indicator is provided by the DfT and is not usually available until autumn of the following year. The 2007 data is therefore not yet available. The target for this indicator was to limit traffic growth to less than 1.5% p.a. For the 2005 the actual traffic was almost 1.9% above 2004 levels. Whilst this is disappointing it is too early to determine a clear trend. It is anticipated that ongoing LTP and national initiatives will bring this target back on trajectory by the end of 2010.

Conclusions and Recommendations

There are several factors affecting Road Traffic growth in North Yorkshire – some resulting in an increase and some a decrease. The identified targets are line with DfT TEMPRO Traffic Growth for North Yorkshire (excluding fuel adjustment and optimum bias). There is no evidence that the combined effect will result in significant change from the original forecast and it is therefore recommended that the LTP2 target remain unchanged.
Cycling Indicators (LTP3, L5)

Status of Indicators
LTP3 is not a National Indicator, but DfT’s guidance suggests that authorities with an emphasis on cycling and walking would continue to collect it.

L5 is a local indicator, measuring the number of Cycling to Work Trips

NYCC LTP Targets and Rationale
The Target Lead Officer for Cycling is Andrew Bainbridge.

NYCC set an original target of a 1% increase per annum through to 2010 – i.e. a 7% cumulative increase. This is based on a small increase to reflect some investment in cycling schemes during the LTP2 period, while taking account of the long-term trend over the LTP1 period being relatively flat.

No target was set for L5 in the original LTP2.

‘Excellent’ authority Targets and Rationale
There is a wide range of targets for this indicator. Authorities with a high level of cycle usage have set the lowest targets - Hull having a target of maintaining the current level of usage and York a relatively small increase of 3%. Most authorities have set targets in the range between 5% (Norfolk) and 15% (Derbyshire) as shown in Figure 8.1 below. Only East Riding (30%) is above this range.

![Figure 8.1 – LTP3 Target increases – NYCC & Excellent Authorities](image)

‘Nearest Neighbour’ authority targets
Eight of the fifteen authorities have set targets in the range 5% to 15% as shown in Figure 8.2 below. Four have set high targets – the highest being Devon (55%), with others being Worcestershire (30%), Dorset (20%) and Lincolnshire (20%). On the other hand, three have set low or zero targets – Wiltshire (2%) and Gloucestershire and Warwickshire (both 0%). Authorities
with high targets appear to be monitoring at a targeting funding on a small number of schemes expected to have a significant impact.

![Figure 8.2 – LTP3 Target increases – NYCC & ‘Nearest Neighbour’ Authorities](chart)

**NYCC Progress to date during LTP2 period**

Cycling data appears not to have been collected until 2005/06, but actual figures reported during 2007/08 seem to show very large increases (around 50%-75%) when compared with the base year.

**Feedback from Target Lead Officer**

LTP1 contained specific cycle schemes – but LTP2 uses a different approach of scheme prioritisation, and there are no new large cycle schemes planned for the LTP2 period.

Setting a zero target increase would have been seen as ‘admitting defeat’ – so a nominal 1% increase was seen as reasonable.

For local indicator L5 a new target has been developed which monitors the percentage of journeys made to industrial estates, what proportion are made by cycle. The baseline and target for this indicator have now been set, but the trajectory is still being developed.
LTP 3 - Number of cycling trips

The target for this indicator is to increase the number of cycling trips by 1% per year from an 03/04 baseline. Following a rise in 05/06, and then a fall in the subsequent year back to the baseline, cycling figures for 2007/08 rose significantly to 141. It is however too early to establish a clear trend for this indicator which experience has shown is subject to large annual swings often dependant on the weather. The target has been increased for the final two years of LTP to a 3% increase each year until 2010/11.

Baseline data for this was collected in September 2008 and a new baseline figure has now been set. A target has been set of 7.2 journeys to industrial estates being made by cycle, by 2015; the current average figure is 2.7. A trajectory is currently being developed for this target.
Conclusions and Recommendations

In view of the existing observed increase, a target of a 1% per annum increase in LTP3 appears undemanding. Therefore, the target has been amended to 3% growth from 2008/09 to 2010/11.

A new methodology for calculating number of cycle journeys to work has been devised and the data for the indicator will be collected every 2 years. The target is for the percentage of cycle accessing industrial sites to increase from the current figure of 2.72% to 7.2% in 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Travel Indicator (LTP4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status of Indicator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP4 is now NI 198 – Children travelling to school – mode of travel usually used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NYCC LTP Targets and Rationale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Target Lead Officer for School Travel is Allan McVeigh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The target had not been set at the time of LTP2 submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer authority Targets and Rationale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the comparator authorities (both ‘Excellent’ and CIPFA ‘Nearest Neighbours’) were in the same position and had not set a target at the time of LTP2 submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback from Target Lead Officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No target was defined in the LTP2 – as at that time the output from the PLASC (Pupil Level Annual School Census) survey was awaited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results from the first PLASC survey are now available – and currently show a figure of 28-29%. This compares with previous results from ‘Hands-up’ surveys of 32-34%. Both are based on the same dataset of schools within the statutory age-band of 5-14 years. As a result, there is some uncertainty over what figure to use for a baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCC has very good coverage of School Travel Plans, and there is a toolkit of measures included in Annex D of the LTP (e.g. 5 minute walking zones, walking buses and cycle parking) to implement along with these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, the effect of increasing parental choice results in children being more likely to attend schools further from home, with fewer options for walking, cycling or use of public transport and consequent increase in car use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result, the Travel Awareness officer is recommending a target of ‘No Change’, with travel awareness initiatives broadly counteracting the effects of greater parental choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The view is that due to a number of factors, the ability to influence this indicator further is minimal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LTP 4 - Modal share of journeys to school (Car, Bus, Cycle, Walk)

The data to monitor this indicator is supplied by the Department for Education and Skills annual PLASC survey of schools. The baseline figure set in 2007 is 30% and the target is to reduce the percentage of children travelling by car by 1% year on year.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As this indicator will be measured using the PLASC survey in future years, it is recommended that the baseline be set to the first year’s PLASC survey results. This will ensure a consistent methodology, even if the results are not consistent with other approaches.

Relationship between funding and targets

Funding for the ‘Integrated Transport Block’ for the period 2006-2011 took into account both performance during the LTP1 period and the quality of an authority’s Second Local Transport Plan. NYCC was assessed as ‘Excellent’ both for its LTP1 Delivery Report and its LTP2. As a result Integrated Block funding was increased by 25% from the original Planning Guideline of £7.220m to £9.025m.

In the 2008 Delivery Report, it seems reasonable to assume that DfT will be looking for evidence of how this additional funding has enabled more challenging targets to be set.

Funding for the ‘Maintenance Block’ is assessed on a different basis, and is allocated according to the quartile in which performance lies – with the greatest funding allocated to the areas with the greatest need.

As a result of the above there is no ‘reward’ element for maintenance – in fact the converse applies, as moving into a higher quartile will generally result in a reduction in funding.
Taking account of the different approaches used, this section will look at funding relationships for Integrated Block and Maintenance separately.

**Integrated Transport Block**

Integrated Transport schemes are included in the LTP2 programme based upon the Scheme Prioritisation System, which uses the following scoring formula:

\[
\text{Score} = 6\times\text{(Safety)} + 6\times\text{(Accessibility)} + 3\times\text{(Congestion)} + 3\times\text{(Environment)} + 1\times\text{(Added Value)} \log(\text{Whole life Cost in £})
\]

As this formula gives the biggest weightings to Safety and Accessibility, the schemes it prioritises will lead directly to improvements to related indicators. For Accessibility, this will also include indicators related to Public Transport, Cycling and Travel to School.

The Scheme Prioritisation System (SPS) is a rolling process – with schemes which just ‘miss the cut’ in one year being rolled forward to the next. At the end of the LTP2 period it will therefore be possible to directly identify those schemes which have been implemented because of the uplift in funding. Broadly speaking, as the funding uplift is 20% of the total, the ‘additional’ schemes will be those implemented during 2010/11.

Clearly, at the time of writing the 2008 Delivery Report, the above schemes cannot be identified. It is therefore recommended that a similar approach be used for the first two years of LTP2 to identify those schemes which have been brought forward because of the additional funding. The benefits of these schemes will already have been identified for SPS, enabling a direct link to be made between the additional funding and expected improvements in outcomes.

**Maintenance**

There is a much more direct relationship between Maintenance spending and resulting outcomes than in other areas, as fewer external factors are involved. NYCC have a clear understanding of the relevant issues, and have identified the cost of improving each indicator by 1%, as follows:

- BVPI 187: £0.125M
- BVPI 223: £3.2M
- BVPI 224a: £6.8M
- BVPI 224b: £3.3M

Note that these figures are based on the formula:

\[
\text{Cost of 1% improvement} = (\text{Improvement Cost per km} \times \text{Length of network in km})/100
\]

Using existing internal systems, NYCC are in a position to target maintenance spending to have the optimum effect on indicators. However, as stated in Chapter 4, given the reduction in available funding it would seem sensible to re-calculate targets based on the revised funding available.
Summary

Mandatory Indicators

Table 11.1 summarises proposed changes to targets and rationales for Mandatory Indicators. Where the proposed Target is different from that in the original LTP2, this is highlighted in bold type in the table.

The proposed changes are described below.

Road Safety Indicators (BVPI99a, 99b, 99c)

The only proposed change is to BVPI99c (Total Slight Casualties), where a revised target of 2585 (based on a rebased figure) is recommended. This reflects the excellent progress made in reducing slight casualties during the LTP2 period.

Highway Maintenance Indicators (BVPI 187, 223, 224a, 224b)

It is recommended that the targets for BVPI 223, 224a and 224b be recalculated based on the revised funding available and following consideration of a set of options relating to network strategy.

Public Transport Indicators (BVPI 102, BVPI 104, LTP5)

It is recommended that the target for BVPI 102 (Bus Patronage) be increased to 17.6m. This reflects the progress to date during the LTP2 period, partly associated with introduction of local free concessionary travel.

It is recommended that BVPI 104 (Bus Passenger Satisfaction) be removed as a Mandatory Indicator and retained as a Local Monitoring Indicator, not reported in the Progress Report. This is due to the previous methodology (Best Value Surveys) no longer being available and there being no alternative giving consistent results.

The target for LTP5 (Bus Punctuality) was not set in LTP2. However, a target of 75% has recently been agreed.

Accessibility Indicator (LTP1)

It is recommended that the LTP1 target be changed to an increase of 62.5% in the number of Community Transport journeys by 2010/11 for consistency with LAA Indicator STR/3.

With the development of the Service Centre Strategy, it would be appropriate for NYCC to develop a measure of accessibility for each centre such as ‘Proportion of Households within 30 minutes of a Service Centre during the morning peak’. This could be the basis for a new indicator for the LTP3 period.

Road Traffic Indicator (LTP2)

It is recommended that this target remain unchanged at 1.5% per annum.
**Cycling Indicator (LTP3)**

It is recommended that the target be increased from 1% per annum to 3% per annum to reflect the progress already made during the LTP2 period and that the new target and trajectory for cycle journeys to work be adopted.

**Travel to School Indicator (LTP4)**

The target for LTP4 was not set in LTP2. A target of ‘No Change’ has been proposed reflecting the counteracting factors affecting this indicator. It is recommended that this be adopted.

**Relationship between Funding and Targets**

Integrated Block Funding was increased by 25% during LTP2 because of NYCC’s Excellent LTP1 Delivery Report and Second Local Transport Plan. DfT will be looking for evidence of how the uplift in funding has enabled more challenging targets to be set.

NYCC’s Scheme Prioritisation System is used to identify schemes for implementation based on a formula taking account of the impact on safety, accessibility, congestion, the environment and added value. Approximately 20% of schemes implemented over the first two years of LTP2 using this system have been brought forward because of the funding uplift. The benefits associated with bringing forward these schemes, as identified by the Scheme Prioritisation System, should be documented in the first LTP2 Delivery Report to demonstrate the effect of the additional funding.
Appendix 4

City Regions
INTRODUCTION

The Eddington Review highlighted the growing influence of the City Regions as key economic drivers for the country and parts of North Yorkshire fall within the sphere of influence of two City Regions. The Leeds City Region (LCR) incorporates parts of the Craven, Harrogate and Selby districts of North Yorkshire and the Tees Valley City Region (TVCR) has strong linkages to parts of the Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough districts of North Yorkshire.

The Local Transport Bill, which is expected to become legislation in the near future, changes the role of the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Authorities to become Integrated Transport Authorities (ITA) and take on more strategic transport functions for their areas. The Bill enables a review of transport governance in any part of the country and allows the setting up of new ITAs. This review also allows the boundaries of a new ITA to be changed to better reflect travel patterns.

This Progress Report provides an opportunity to emphasise the County Council’s contribution to achieving the transport objectives of the City Regions through effective and enhanced partnership working with the respective neighbouring authorities.

LEEDS CITY REGION

What did LTP 2 say about the Leeds City Region?

Local Transport Plan 2 (LTP2) highlighted that over 26000 people commute to work in West Yorkshire from North Yorkshire every day and over 13,000 commute from West Yorkshire into North Yorkshire. Additionally, over 11,000 people commute to work in York from North Yorkshire every day and over 6000 commute from York into North Yorkshire. The main issues associated with these cross boundary flows were identified as follows:

- High peak hour traffic flows on the main roads from North Yorkshire into Leeds, Bradford and York
- Limited rail capacity and frequency on rail routes into Leeds and York.
- Traffic and parking problems at Metro stations just outside North Yorkshire caused by commuters driving just over the boundary to take advantage of cheaper rail fares.
- Impact of commuters of the sustainability and house prices in local villages.
- Impact of cross boundary freight traffic

LTP 2 points to the fact that it is vital that local and regional bodies work together to ensure that economic development in both Leeds and York do not adversely impact on North Yorkshire. In order to achieve this, a number of actions were identified in LTP 2 (and Annex N – Cross Boundary Commuting Action Plan). These included:
- Improved provision of public transport (rail and bus) and encouragement of modal shift
- Influence development patterns through Local Development Frameworks and the Regional Spatial Strategy
- Encourage sustainable freight transport

**What is the Current Situation?**

Following the Leeds City Region Summit in 2004, the Leaders of the eleven Partner Councils (which includes North Yorkshire County Council who have strategic responsibilities in three of the Districts) made a collective commitment to work together for the benefit of the Region and to deliver sustainable economic growth and improved competitiveness. Since then the Partners have been working together to look at how policy and delivery at a City Region level could be configured to achieve these aims. A first iteration of the City Region Development Programme (CRDP) was submitted to the Northern Way in November 2005, with a second iteration launched in November 2007.

A key part of the CRDP was the inclusion of a City Region Transport Vision which included the key transport priorities across the city region. Since 2005, work has been undertaken around developing an implementation plan, prioritising activities into achievable outcomes, and preparing a Multi Area Agreement to deliver specific outcomes. A City region Leaders Board, comprising the Leaders of each partner authority, which is constituted as a Joint Committee has been set up. The first meeting of the Board was held in April 2007.

The Leaders Board is supported by a series of advisory Panels, grouped around Transport, Skills and Labour Market, Economic Development and Investment and Housing and Sustainable Communities. A Business Leadership Group has also been established comprising of business representatives from a range of business sectors and types of companies across the city region. A Connectivity Partnership, bringing together local authority officers, transport providers, business representatives, the DfT, Government Office, Yorkshire Forward and officers from the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly has also been established.

**Leeds City Region MAA**

We are also fully engaged in preparation of the Leeds City Region Multiple Area Agreement (MMA). The MMA is considered to have potential to create value as a mechanism for implementing key City Region Development Programme priorities and is in line with PSA7 which is governments’ framework for making sustainable improvements in relative regional economic performance. The MMA includes Transport and Skills ‘Asks’ and Outcomes was submitted to government during the summer of 2008. This has been agreed and signed by all City Region Leaders and work on further development and negotiations with government are ongoing.
Leeds City Region Transport Vision

The Leeds City Region transport Vision aims to enable the City Region to function as a single economic space by providing a high quality transport system that will:

- Connect all the core centres within the city region to each other.
- Connect population to core centres, to employment sites, education, training, retail and leisure within the City Region.
- Connect the core centres to other City Regions in the UK – most importantly Sheffield, Manchester and London.
- Connect the core centres to international airports and port services in the city region.
- Provide choice and ensure that the growth in car use is minimised.

There is a general recognition that the Transport Vision needs updating. It is anticipated that the City region will commence a refresh of the Transport Vision in the near future. North Yorkshire County Council will play a full part in assisting with and guiding this process.

Travel to work patterns

A key issue is the number of commuting to work trips between North Yorkshire and in particular Harrogate and Leeds. There are significant capacity constraints on the York – Harrogate – Leeds rail network. Additional capacity has been provided at peak times with longer trains, however growth has outstripped the additional capacity and overcrowding at peak times is a daily occurrence. The Ripon, Harrogate Leeds bus service has seen continued increases in patronage. There are however constraints on the A61 corridor that adversely affect the bus operations as well as car borne commuters.

Access to Services

Other than Airedale Hospital, located on the A658 in close proximity to the border between Craven District and Bradford Metropolitan District key services are generally provided respectively within North Yorkshire and Leeds. Consequently, there is no emphasis given in the Transport Vision to cross boundary access to services other than to Leeds Bradford airport. The vision mainly focuses on access to jobs to support the growth in the economy. The County Council continues to be engaged in the Leeds Bradford Airport Service access strategy. Improvements in access to the airport were introduced in LTP1 with the introduction of direct bus services to the airport from Harrogate and York.

Connectivity to other regions

The strategy notes the need to improve connectivity to other regions in particular Sheffield, Manchester and London, and ports serving the City Region. Rail improvements are seen as key drivers in improving connectivity between regions. The rail improvements are longer term and will not be delivered within the horizon of the current Local Transport Plan, for example, the Horseshoe scheme would enable additional trains to operate between
Leeds and London by electrification between Neville Hill and Hambleton Junctions. This would alleviate congested sections from Doncaster to Leeds, delivering noticeable benefits and create opportunities to introduce electrified services between Leeds – York and Selby.

**Leeds City Region - Transport Governance**

In advance of the Local Transport Bill the Leaders Board has commissioned consultants to carry out a review of transport governance arrangements for the City Region. A final report is expected to be presented to the Leaders Board in December 2008.

The County Council fully supports the need for closer working with the other partners of the Leeds City Region to deliver the Transport Vision and wider economic aims and is fully engaged in the Governance Review. For the reasons set out below we consider that the most appropriate solution would be enhanced partnership arrangements with the newly formed ITA.

Table 1 shows travel to work patterns between the 3 Districts of North Yorkshire in the Leeds City Region and the rest of the Leeds City Region. Whilst approximately 20% of trips from these 3 districts travel to West Yorkshire the vast majority of trips are local and remain within North Yorkshire. Additionally most of the key transport issues in the three districts (accessibility, safety, congestion) are local rather than City Region issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>North Yorkshire - (LCR districts only Craven, Harrogate and Selby)</th>
<th>West Yorkshire</th>
<th>Barnsley</th>
<th>York</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire - (LCR)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1 - Percentage of Work Trips between LCR Authority Areas**

On the basis that cross boundary travel is only one relatively small element of the transport in the 3 districts it would seem most appropriate that transport governance arrangements for North Yorkshire are unchanged with the County Council remaining local transport authority and City Region objectives being delivered through closer partnership working with a West Yorkshire ITA. The Council therefore considers that the Integrated Transport Authority should not extend to include the 3 Districts within North Yorkshire.
In addition to the mismatch between the local transport issues in the 3 districts and the possible city region governance structure there are a number of other issues which make an ITA which covers the whole of the City Region inappropriate. These include:

- Rurality and remoteness of much of the 3 NY districts in the CR
- Affordability of an ITA levy in North Yorkshire
- Value for Money.
- Transport governance arrangements for the remaining 4 districts of North Yorkshire.
- Introduction of a further tier of bureaucracy in the county.

**What does the Future Hold?**

North Yorkshire County Council will, through its membership of the Leeds City Region Leaders Board and Transport Panel continue to play an active role in achieving the transport objectives of the City Region.

This includes completing and implementing the review of transport governance, assisting with the refresh of the Transport Vision and delivering schemes and initiatives that contribute to achieving the transport vision.

The Council is currently looking to revise the Integrated Transport Scheme prioritisation scheme assessment to provide additional priority to those schemes within North Yorkshire that contribute to the delivery of the City region Transport Vision.
What did LTP2 say about the Tees Valley City Region?

Local Transport Plan 2 (LTP2) highlighted that over 8,000 people commute to work in Teesside from North Yorkshire every day and just over approximately 6,000 commute from Teesside into North Yorkshire. The main issues associated with these cross boundary flows were identified as follows:

- Commuter traffic contributing to peak hour traffic in Teesside
- Rail frequency and capacity issues on services from Thirsk and Northallerton to Darlington and Middlesbrough
- Impact on sustainability of village communities and affordability of homes.

LTP2 points to the fact that it is vital that local and regional bodies work together to ensure that economic development in both Leeds and York and also in Teesside in the North East Region, do not adversely impact on North Yorkshire. In order to achieve this a number of actions were identified as follows:

- Continue working with Richmondshire and Hambleton District Councils to ensure that LDFs reflect the need to reduce cross boundary travel
- Improved bus services to Darlington and Teesside
- Teesside Rail Links
- Work with Northern Rail
- Increase the capacity and frequency of rail services

Annex N of LTP 2 contains details of the County Council’s Cross Boundary Commuting Action Plan which seeks to address issues relating to cross boundary travel. The plan does not contain specific actions for Teesside due to ‘significantly lower’ volumes compared with Harrogate to Leeds. However the plan does identify individual action plans being developed as part of Service Centre Transportation Strategy (SCTS) development. All of the issues identified in LTP 2 listed above require partnership working particularly with the Tees Valley authorities and, with this in mind, the County Council welcomed the opportunity to become a member of the Transport for Tees Valley Board.

What is the Current Situation?

Transport for Tees Valley Board

In order to facilitate closer joint working between the Tees Valley Authorities and with neighbouring authorities at a City Region level proposals were developed for a new Transport Board, Transport for Tees Valley, which was inaugurated in July 2007. The Board is a public-private partnership that involves all parties with responsibility for delivering transport at all levels and through all modes,
together with those representatives for whom transport is essential for economic and social well-being. The Board brings together the diverse range of organisations, encompassing traditional “competitors” such as the two principal bus operators, the rail industry and the City Region’s airport. The aim of the Board is to co-ordinate resources, both physical and fiscal, across a defined, multi-modal, City Region transport network, in order to support the wider economic regeneration proposals for the City Region. Through its membership of the Board the County Council seeks to ensure that its work recognises, and takes account of, the impact of developments in the Tees Valley upon travel patterns in North Yorkshire. The County Council will seek to ensure that its transport proposals complement those being developed by the Tees Valley authorities to ensure the best possible outcomes.

Tees Valley Regional Transport Strategy
The Tees Valley Regional Transport Strategy was produced in 2007/08 and there are three main issues identified in the strategy which have a significant impact on North Yorkshire. These are:

- Travel to work patterns
- Access to services (particularly James Cook University Hospital)
- Connectivity to other regions

Travel to work patterns
A key issue is the number of commuting to work trips between North Yorkshire and the Tees Valley and many of these trips have origins or destinations in or around the communities of Richmond, Northallerton, Stokesley / Great Ayton and Whitby. The County Council will continue to emphasise the importance of improved public transport links from these communities into the Tees Valley when considering travel to work issues. This should include improved bus services to Darlington and Middlesbrough and rail services from Northallerton to Darlington and Middlesbrough and from the Esk Valley Line (Whitby and Great Ayton) to Middlesbrough.

Access to Services
Two key issues are highlighted in the Strategy that are of importance to North Yorkshire. Most importantly, the South Tees Acute Hospitals NHS Trust area covers significant areas of Hambleton and Richmondshire Districts and is responsible for the running of the Friarage Hospital in Northallerton and the James Cook University Hospital. With the centralisation and specialisation of hospital services many residents of North Yorkshire (from as far away as Hawes in Wensleydale) need to travel to the James Cook hospital to access medical care. Public transport links from North Yorkshire to the hospital are poor and we will continue to emphasise the importance of improving these linkages and will continue to be a member of the Tees Health and Transport Partnership. The strategy includes a proposal to provide a new station (on the Middlesbrough – Whitby Line) at the James Cook hospital and this is supported in principle.
The second access to services issue is that of surface access to Durham Tees Valley Airport. NYCC is currently represented on the Durham Tees Valley Air Transport Forum and will continue that membership to seek to improve access to the airport from North Yorkshire.

Connectivity to other regions
The strategy notes the need to improve connectivity to other regions. Most of the journeys from the Tees Valley heading to the south and west pass through North Yorkshire. In terms of road traffic much of this is on the trunk road network however the LTP 2 identified a significant number of heavy commercial vehicles using the unsuitable A165 / A171 coast road through Scarborough and Whitby to travel between Teesport and the Humber ports.

In order to designate core freight routes a Tees Valley Freight Quality Partnership has been formed. To allow us to address the issue of lorries using the coast road and ensure consistency across the authority boundaries into North Yorkshire the County Council has requested to join the partnership.

The strategy identifies access to and the growth of Teesport as a priority and has proposals to improve rail links to the port. One of the key routes to Teesport leaves the East Coast Main Line (ECML) at Northallerton and crosses the A167 Darlington Road at the Low Gates Level Crossing. The strategy also identifies a desire to improve passenger rail links between the ECML at York and Middlesbrough and Hartlepool. It is likely that these improvements will also use the line that joins the ECML at Northallerton and also therefore the Low Gates Level Crossing. The Low Gates level crossing is on one of the main radial routes into Northallerton. Currently this can be closed for up to 20 minutes in the peak hour. This causes significant congestion problems on this route and backs up to the town centre. The need to consider the impact upon the Low Gates level crossing of any increased frequency of trains is recognised.

What does the Future Hold?

North Yorkshire County Council will, through its membership of the Transport for Tees Valley Board, continue to play an active role in achieving the transport objectives of the City Region through effective and enhanced partnership working. We have provided input to the Tees Valley Regional Transport Strategy to ensure that the issues for North Yorkshire are recognised and will continue to do so as the strategy is implemented. A key role will be to ensure co-ordination of County Council initiatives with those of the City Region to achieve maximum outcomes in the projects briefly discussed below.

The Tees Valley Bus Network Improvements is a major local transport scheme that seeks to provide longer term stability within the Tees Valley bus network combined with a step change in public transport provision to the passenger in terms of frequency, reliability, quality and convenience, with a co-ordinated approach to public transport provision across the City Region.
Whilst the bus network improvement proposals themselves are contained within the area covered by the Tees Valley authorities the sphere of influence of these measures is recognised and we will look to possible complementary improvements within North Yorkshire.

Proposals have been developed for a high quality, fast and reliable City Region rail-based solution to assist regeneration and help to avoid the transport problems that would otherwise arise as economic activity gathers pace. A detailed examination of engineering feasibility is being undertaken in partnership with Network Rail with implementation of an agreed scheme currently planned for 2013.

The Tees Valley Authorities are also working with the Highways Agency to bring forward development sites by developing an Area Action Plan that will set out the agreed long term requirements for the City Region highway network to support the levels of development envisaged. We will play a positive role in these road and rail based projects to ensure that the work takes full account of any impacts for North Yorkshire.

Building on the results from the Sustainable Towns Demonstration project in Darlington, the Board is currently considering how Partners can take forward the “Smarter Choices” agenda at a City Region level. Darlington has found a reduction of up to 9% in peak hour traffic flows within the city centre, with significant environmental benefits. We will seek to ensure that the benefits of “Smarter Choices” work within North Yorkshire as part of SCTS development and our more specific scheme implementation complement those of the Tees Valley City Region.
Appendix 5

Integrated Transport Capital Programmes
During 06/07 and 07/08 the County Council completed over ?? integrated transport capital schemes either fully or partially funded form LTP allocations. Brief details of theses schemes together with an indication of their contribution towards the shared priorities (LTP 2 Objectives 1 to 4) are given in Table 1 and 2 below.

In addition to these schemes the County Council also made a number of block allocations for other interventions. These include:

- Signing, lining and TRO’s (Traffic Regulation Orders) – small scale road sign and road marking schemes often accompanied by a TRO such as speed limits or weight restrictions to address localised issues. Usually costing less than £2k to £3k per scheme a block allocation allows flexibility to deliver solutions quickly.

- Transport studies – A small block allocation to allow the commissioning of transport studies to allow the detailed investigation of identified local issues. Typically these may be studies into localised accident or congestion problems.

- Dropped kerbs and tactile paving – In addition to specified schemes to put in place flush kerbs and tactile paving in towns the Council have a block allocation for installation in smaller locations such as villages and where necessary in rural areas. This block allocation also allows the Council to react to disabled access issues identified by the public.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Congestion</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>A170 East Ayton to Scarborough</td>
<td>Signing, lining and traffic calming scheme</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>B6161 / C238 junction at Leathley Bridge (signs)</td>
<td>Signing improvement at junction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>A6108 Junction with B6267 Low Burton (Nr Masham)</td>
<td>Junction improvement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Harrogate, Station Parade/Cheltenham Parade</td>
<td>Safety scheme on town centre road adjacent to bus / rail station</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Knaresborough, North Park Road, York Place</td>
<td>Junction improvement in town centre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Harrogate, Prince of Wales Roundabout</td>
<td>Improvements at main town centre roundabout</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Scarborough, Filey Rd Route Treatment (Signs &amp; Lines)</td>
<td>Safety improvements on main route to town centre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Contributed to Shared Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Scarborough, Scalby Rd Route Treatment (Signs &amp; Lines)</td>
<td>Safety improvements on main route to town centre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>A 59 Beamsley Hill Schemes</td>
<td>Signing and junction improvement</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>B6161 Travellers Rest to County Boundary Study/Schemes</td>
<td>Signing and lining</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>A61 Ripon Road Coppice Drive, Harrogate</td>
<td>Improvement to visibility at junction</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>A 59 Skipton Road/ Woodfield Rd. Junc, Harrogate</td>
<td>Junction Improvement in town outskirts</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>A59 Skipton Rd/Dragon Rd Junc. Imp., Harrogate</td>
<td>Junction and pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Calming Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Scarborough, Green Lane/Cross Lane Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Traffic Calming on residential distributor road</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>A6108 Darlington Rd. Richmond</td>
<td>Extensive traffic calming in the vicinity of the secondary school.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>A684 Aysgarth</td>
<td>Traffic calming on A class road through village</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>C351 Langton Road, Norton</td>
<td>Town centre traffic calming</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>A174 Sandsend</td>
<td>Traffic calming along busy seafront</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>A170 Wykeham</td>
<td>Traffic calming of A class road through village</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>B1222 Stillingfleet</td>
<td>Traffic calming of B class road through village</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>B1223 Ulleskelf</td>
<td>Traffic calming of B class road through village</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Norby Front Street, Thirsk</td>
<td>Traffic calming on residential distributor road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>A6055 Ferrensby</td>
<td>Traffic Calming in village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>A1039 Flixton</td>
<td>Traffic Calming in village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>A170 SBC Stepney Rd (Scalby Rd-Sandybed Lane), Scarborough</td>
<td>Traffic Calming including pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Harrogate, Cold Bath Road Traffic Management Scheme</td>
<td>Enhances pedestrian and bus infrastructure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Skipton, Pedestrianisation of Sheep Street</td>
<td>Pedestrianisation of shopping street</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Skipton, Dropped Kerbs</td>
<td>Installation of flush pedestrian crossing points</td>
<td>✓️</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Skipton, Water Street, Mill Bridge</td>
<td>Improvement to assist pedestrian movements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Bedale, Dropped Crossings and Tactile Paving</td>
<td>Installation of flush pedestrian crossing points</td>
<td>✓️</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Bedale, Firby Road new footway outside schools</td>
<td>New footway to improve pedestrian access to school</td>
<td>✓️</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Easingwold, Raskell Road Footway</td>
<td>Footway to properties on Raskell Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Northallerton, Dropped Kerbs &amp; Tactile Paving</td>
<td>Installation of flush pedestrian crossing points</td>
<td>✓️</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Northallerton, Applegarth Footway and crossing</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian access to town centre car park</td>
<td>✓️</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Northallerton, Experimental Order for Applegarth Service Road</td>
<td>Experimental town centre traffic management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Northallerton, Malpas Road, residents parking ( traffic calming)</td>
<td>Residents parking scheme and traffic calming on edge of town centre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Northallerton, Malpas Road / Romanby Rd Junction Improvement</td>
<td>Junction improvement on edge of town centre distributor road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Catterick, Range Road, Signing &amp; lining</td>
<td>Signing and lining safety improvements in Catterick Garrison</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Catterick, A6136 Longwood Bank signing &amp; Improving</td>
<td>Signing and lining safety improvements in Catterick Garrison</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Catterick, Tunstall Village Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Village traffic calming on rat run from Catterick Garrison</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Leyburn, Zebra Market Place and Commercial Sq.</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian facilities in Market Place</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Leyburn, Footway Harmby Rd, Cinema to PROW</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian facilities on town centre road</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Leyburn, extended 40mph Harmby Road C/O</td>
<td>Speed limit through village</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Leyburn, Signing and Lining 30mph Moor Road C/O</td>
<td>Extension of speed limit on residential road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Leyburn, Parking outside the Sandpiper</td>
<td>Improved parking arrangements in town centre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Leyburn, Signing audit, implementation</td>
<td>Improved warning and direction signs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Richmond, Area wide traffic calming 20mph</td>
<td>Town centre traffic calming and speed limit</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Richmond, Footway Improvements The Batts to Lower Market Place</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian access from town centre to riverside</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Helmsley, Bondgate Puffin</td>
<td>New edge of town centre puffin crossing</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Pickering, ext 30mph A170 Thornton Road</td>
<td>Extension of speed limit to slow traffic approaching the Thornton Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Pickering, New Footway Whitfield Avenue/ Eastfield</td>
<td>New footway on residential road</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Pickering, Pickering to Thornton le Dale Cycle Route</td>
<td>Improved footway to footway / cycle route linking communities</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Pickering, Dropped Crossing</td>
<td>Installation of flush pedestrian crossing points</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Thornton le Dale, Speed Limits and Gateways</td>
<td>Extended speed limits and gateway feature to slow traffic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Thornton le Dale, Dropped Crossings</td>
<td>Installation of flush pedestrian crossing points</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Whitby, Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td>Advance design work on seasonal P&amp;R scheme</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Whitby, Puffin Crossing Stakesby Road</td>
<td>New puffin crossing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Selby, Dropped Crossings</td>
<td>Installation of flush pedestrian crossing points</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Skipton TMS, Junction Imps Newmarket St/Otley Rd. Investigation</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Bedale TMS, Dropped Crossings and Tactile Paving</td>
<td>Installation of flush pedestrian crossing points</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Northallerton TMS, Dropped Kerbs &amp; Tactile Paving c/o</td>
<td>Installation of flush pedestrian crossing points</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Northallerton TMS Railway Station Puffin Crossings</td>
<td>Town centre puffin crossing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Catterick TMS Traffic Sign Rationalisation</td>
<td>Improved warning and direction signs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Contributed to Shared Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Thornton le Dale TMS, Maltongate Improvement Scheme</td>
<td>Traffic Calming and signing/lining scheme</td>
<td>✓ [✓ ✓ ✓]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Thornton le Dale TMS, Southlane footways</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Stokesley &amp; Great Ayton SCTS Study</td>
<td>Development of SCTS schemes</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Whitby TMS, New Quay</td>
<td>Parking bay changes and improved traffic management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Hookstone Chase Puffin Crossing</td>
<td>Puffin crossing in town centre</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Selby TMS, Traffic Sign Rationalisation</td>
<td>Improved warning and direction signs</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safer Routes To School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Contributed to Shared Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Scarborough, Scalby School Safety Scheme</td>
<td>Signing and lining on pedestrian routes to the school</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Thirsk, 20mph Hambleton estate</td>
<td>Area wide 20mph limit on large housing estate</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Croft on Tees, Northallerton Road</td>
<td>New footway link from isolated houses to village</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Spennithorne, C of E Primary School</td>
<td>New footway near school</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Ruswarp, High St</td>
<td>20 mph zone and traffic calming</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Filey Junior School, West Road</td>
<td>Improved signing and footpath improvements on pedestrian route to school</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Egton Primary School</td>
<td>New footway outside primary school</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>East Whitby School VAS on Helredale Rd</td>
<td>Vehicle Activated Sign on pedestrian crossing point of main road on route to primary school</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Langton CP School, Footway</td>
<td>New footway on approach to school</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Cononley, 20mph</td>
<td>Speed limit and traffic calming in village to assist safe access to school</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Selby TMS, Brayton Schools Safety Zone</td>
<td>Traffic Calming in school location</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Nidderdale High School - Ped Island</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian access and safety</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Graham School</td>
<td>Introduction of cycle route for school</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Muston SRTS</td>
<td>Provision of pedestrian buildout near school</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Sessay SRTS</td>
<td>Footway link between villages</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>St. Martins School</td>
<td>Traffic Calming around location of two schools</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Crakehall Ped Refuge</td>
<td>Provision of pedestrian buildout near school</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Glusburn Primary School</td>
<td>Safety scheme near school including VAS signs</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedestrian Schemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Congestion</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>C272 Barden Bridge</td>
<td>Off highway footway adjacent to country road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Health Walks</td>
<td>Contribution to Health Walks initiatives in Craven, Hambleton and Harrogate</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Implementation of Pateley Bridge Ped. Action Plan</td>
<td>Dropped kerbs and footway improvement in busy village centre</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Implementation of Ingleton /Settle Ped Plan</td>
<td>Dropped kerbs and footway improvement in busy village centre</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>C144 Ainthorpe Lane, Ainthorpe</td>
<td>Provision of missing footway link in village</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>North Cowton</td>
<td>New length of footway linking village to local garage / shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>A162 Barkston Ash</td>
<td>Footway linking housing estate to village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>A59 Crossing Point near to Bolton Abbey Rail Station</td>
<td>Crossing point of A59 linking Bolton Abbey to steam railway station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Harrogate, Pannal Ash Footway</td>
<td>New footway on residential road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Catterick TMS Richmond Road/ Hipswell Road Junction footway</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Catterick TMS Catterick Rd- Colburn Footway</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Pickering TMS, prohibition vehicles on Goslipgate</td>
<td>Improved traffic management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>C274 Hookstone Road Railway Bridge, Harrogate</td>
<td>New footway on town centre railway bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>B6270 Market Place, Reeth</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian facilities in village centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Leyburn Footway Lighting Ginnels</td>
<td>Study to assess feasibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>A61 Parliament Street pedestrian improvements, Harrogate</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian facilities in town centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>A645 Kellington Lane, Eggborough</td>
<td>Footway link between villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>B 6274 Gilling West</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian facilities in village centre</td>
<td>✓✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Health Walks</td>
<td>Contribution to Health Walks initiatives in Craven, Hambleton and Harrogate</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycling Schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Whitby to Sandsend, Cycle Route</td>
<td>Cycle route between two adjacent seaside resorts</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>North York Moors Cycle Schemes</td>
<td>Recreational cycle route in National park</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Lumby Crossroads to South Milford Cycle Route</td>
<td>Cycle route linking with other cycle routes</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Scarborough, Columbus Ravine Cycle Route (Northway - Dean Rd - Peasholm Gap)</td>
<td>Edge of town centre cycle route</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Scarborough, A64 Cycle Route (Eastfield - Falsgrave)</td>
<td>Cycle route to large housing and industrial estates</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>B1261 SBC Footway/Cycle Musham Bank-Crossgates/Seamer</td>
<td>New cycleway linking with other cycle routes</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>UTMC System Upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrade to traffic signal controls in Harrogate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Harrogate &amp; Knaresborough Bus Punctuality Plan</td>
<td>Signal and junction improvements in the urban area to assist with bus punctuality and reliability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Skipton Bus Station Refurbishment</td>
<td>Refurbishment of bus station infrastructure (pending building of a new bus station)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>York / Easingwold</td>
<td>Infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Pickering/ Sleights Quality Corridor</td>
<td>Upgrading of infrastructure on bus route in cooperation with the service operator</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Richmond to Northallerton Quality Corridor</td>
<td>Upgrading of infrastructure on bus route in cooperation with the service operator</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Ripon Boroughbridge York Quality Bus Corridor</td>
<td>Upgrading of infrastructure on bus route in cooperation with the service operator</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Scarborough, Bus Boarder Kerbs</td>
<td>Raised kerbs at bus stops to allow access to low floor buses</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>UTMC System Upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrade to traffic signal controls in Harrogate with improved bus prioritisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>A64 Staxton - Braham Crossroads QBC</td>
<td>Upgrading of infrastructure on bus route in cooperation with the service operator</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Bus Stops</td>
<td>Upgrading of infrastructure on miscellaneous bus routes in cooperation with the service operators</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Access to Rail</td>
<td>Improve access to rail services for people with mobility issues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Platform extensions</td>
<td>Contribution to increase platform sizes on main line routes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP) Progress Report**

The following information is an extract from the current draft TAMP and is representative of the scope and extent of the work already undertaken, an acknowledgement that it is incomplete and directions for its improvement and enhancement.

**APPENDIX E**

**Lifecycle Plan – Carriageways**

**Review & Summary of Missing Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Information Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OVERVIEW &amp; ISSUES</td>
<td>Section currently missing. Create once plan completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DEMANDS</td>
<td>Section Completed; but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Can specific detail be added for the demands noted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GOALS, OBJECTIVES &amp; POLICIES</td>
<td>- Confirm if corporate and local transport plans have any specific objectives relevant to this asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This section still to be populated. In particular, need a summary of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LEVELS of SERVICE</td>
<td>- Current carriageway Service Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Summary of current carriageway activities that support corp. and LTP objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Require a summary of inventory by road class or maintenance hierarchy (which ever is applicable). This needs to be broken down (e.g. by urban / rural) to represent how the asset is maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>INVENTORY</td>
<td>- Add a summary on the key carriageway attributes currently stored (their reliability) and those being picked up by the DCL survey. Are there any significant data gaps remaining?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yet to be Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ASSET VALUATION</td>
<td>- GRC calculated, but on what inventory figures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- DRG and ADC yet to be calculated. Was it intended to include these figures in the first draft of the plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This section to be completed; need to discuss:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Assessing condition (any local methods?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Current Condition - provide data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Desired Condition - provide data &amp; discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Performance Gaps – provide information that supports argument on maintenance backlog. How was this calculated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CONDITION</td>
<td>Section to be updated:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Has the level of reactive maintenance been quantified and is this information used to influence planned maintenance works?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OPTION IDENTIFICATION &amp; APPRAISAL</td>
<td>- Provide further details on the treatment selection process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Can you provide quantities (by treatment type) of the historical renewals undertaken on the asset?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FINANCE &amp; VALUE for</td>
<td>A break-down of historical expenditure (by cost type/maintenance activity) and a summary of anticipated future budget required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yet To be Developed:
“Generic” risks to be reviewed and updated for those that are directly applicable to operating and maintaining this asset in NY:

- What are the current significant risks affecting this asset?
- How is each risk managed, i.e. identified, analysed, controlled, and monitored (reported)?
- How are significant risks reported to the relevant decision makers?
- How do current budgets and work practices mitigate against these risks?
- Are the risks included in an asset based or service wide risk register?
- What are the significant residual risks remaining after mitigation measures?

Section to be updated:

- Add summary details of the 1 and 5 year (renewal) plans
- How are the FWPs evaluated, reported & approved?
- How does these FWP compare to a “desirable” renewals programme based on the expected service lives of asset components. (A Forward Funding Needs assessment?)

Section to be updated:

- How does the current works and service delivery approach affect / support best asset management practice?

Yet To Be Developed:

- Add details on the current performance management system and measures are in place, (what PIs there are, how these are recorded and reported etc)
- What other (local) performance measures are in place in addition to the national BVPI indicators shown?
- Note actual performance results, trends and future targets
- Identify any gaps or issues with the current approach

Review and update once plan completed
CONTENTS:

1.0 Overview and Issues
2.0 Demands
3.0 Goals, Objectives & Polices
4.0 Levels of Service
5.0 Inventory
6.0 Asset Valuation
7.0 Condition
8.0 Option Identification & Appraisal
9.0 Finance and Value for Money
10.0 Risk Management
11.0 Forward Works Programme
12.0 Works and Service Delivery
13.0 Performance Management
14.0 Improvement Actions
1.0 Overview & Issues

2.0 Demand

The demand on the carriageway asset is to have sufficient capacity to cater for vehicles and prevent undue delay and congestion. It should allow these movements to take place in a reasonably safe manner and in such a way as to prevent unnecessary costs to the economy.

There are also competing demands for carriageway usage from minority users such as cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians.

The carriageway asset can also be required as a conduit for underground services. Intervention by utility companies can have a direct impact on the residual life of elements of the carriageway and should be accounted for as impairment to the asset.

Future demands on the carriageway network will come from increased population, traffic growth, vehicle size and weight, the aspirations of minority users and those of the communities through which important transport corridors pass.

Changes in regulatory requirements may also impact upon the carriageway asset and to a large extent these cannot be predicted for the life of the asset management plan.

Can specific details be added for:

- Community Aspirations
- Government legislation & Requirements
- Growth in traffic & composition of HGVs
- Quantity of utility activity and subsequent impairment to carriageway

3.0 Goals and Objectives

The carriageway asset contributes to the provision of the highway transport network and to the fulfilment of corporate, directorate and business unit objectives.

The Local Transport Plan 2 vision is to provide better access and sustainable communities for all. A list of seven objectives has been identified to promote this vision as follows:-

- Accessibility
- Safety
- Environment
- Congestion
- Quality of Life
- Economy
- Efficiency

The provision of a carriageway network to satisfy customer expectation, comply with safety requirements, be available, accessible and in reasonable condition, to provide value to the community over time and maximise environmental contribution is at the core of highway maintenance policy.

The carriageway asset has a pivotal role in achieving the above objectives.
Maintenance strategies and hierarchy along with inspection regimes, condition standards investigatory levels and performance indicators for carriageways are defined within the current Highway Maintenance Plan.

In addition, the County Council is obliged:

- To exercise the rights, duties and responsibilities placed upon the County Council as highway authority under the provisions of the New Roads and Streetworks Act 1990 (and its codes of practice). To protect the structural integrity of the carriageway, whilst recognising the important role carriageways have as conduits of essential service apparatus. To co-ordinate these works and to:
- Comply with the Traffic Management Act 2004 where there is a duty to minimise disruption and reduce congestion.

The current primary issue for the carriageway asset is that of condition further to the Central Government’s Ten Year Transport Plan and performance monitoring. The target for 2004 was to arrest decline in condition and for 2010 to eliminate the backlog in carriageway condition.

Other current issues are the extension of the network by the addition of de-trunked routes from the Department of Transport and the difficulty in managing the extensive unsurfaced unclassified carriageway network.

### 4.0 Levels of Service

In this section provide an overview of those carriageway specific activities (management, maintenance and operations) that contribute to and deliver the corporate ad LTP goals and objectives discussed in the previous section.

What service standards currently exist for the carriageway asset in relation to the specific LTP objectives of:

- Accessibility
- Safety
- Environment
- Congestion
- Quality of Life
- Economy
- Efficiency

And in addition for other (corporate) objectives such as:

- Carriageway Condition (if not included above)
- Any others?

#### a) Safety

**Safety Inspections:** The frequencies of safety inspections are determined by the carriageway hierarchy and are carried out by divisional highways staff either on foot or as a passenger within a
moving vehicle. The Highway Maintenance Plan defines the scope of a “category 1 defect” which is to be made safe within 24 hours. Any other defects that do not represent an immediate risk to the road user are recorded and dealt with at the discretion of the Highways Officer dependant upon his assessment of the severity of the defect.

5.0 Inventory

The asset consists of a network of carriageways of differing construction standards, primary purpose and usage. The County Council has therefore designated a hierarchy of road types based on Well maintained Highways extended to include separate categories for back streets (category 5) and unsurfaced unclassified roads (category 6).

A breakdown of the lengths of carriageway asset by class of road and hierarchy is as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Category / Environment</th>
<th>Length / Km Urban</th>
<th>Length / Km Rural</th>
<th>Total Length / Km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.574</td>
<td>214.751</td>
<td>277.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>154.262</td>
<td>460.317</td>
<td>614.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>289.036</td>
<td>835.732</td>
<td>1124.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>321.495</td>
<td>1516.577</td>
<td>1838.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>1270.531</td>
<td>3096.386</td>
<td>4366.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48.878</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>49.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2146.776</td>
<td>6124.323</td>
<td>8271.099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Class / Environment</th>
<th>Length / Km Urban</th>
<th>Length / Km Rural</th>
<th>Total Length / Km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>189.091</td>
<td>607.491</td>
<td>796.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>122.844</td>
<td>533.61</td>
<td>656.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>388.889</td>
<td>2356.173</td>
<td>2745.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>1470.412</td>
<td>2844.475</td>
<td>4314.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2171.236</td>
<td>6341.749</td>
<td>8512.985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between overall road length (241.886 Km) can be explained by the as yet to be determined extent of surfacing on the 'Unsurfaced' Unclassified Road network.

In general, much of the county’s network of roads is “evolved” construction with little or no engineering design and hence little statistical data can be utilised when assessing deterioration trends. The exceptions are large parts of the detrunked network which have had major improvements undertaken by the Highways Agency. Local bypass and improvement schemes undertaken by the highways authority are built as flexible pavements with a 20 year design life. Industrial and estate roads constructed to the County Council Residential Highway Design Guide and Specification are built as flexible pavements with 20 year design life.

Information on the inventory of carriageway infrastructure is under development with recent video surveys of the network by survey contractor DCL. Inventory data has been derived from the surveys but awaits entry into the Highways Management Information System.

6.0 Asset Valuation
The carriageway asset valuation is to be defined in accordance with the Guidance Document for Highway Infrastructure Asset Valuation.

The gross replacement cost based on regional average rates is £5,571 million.

The Renewals Accounting method is used to estimate the depreciated replacement cost (DRC), which assumes that the carriageway is to be maintained at a specified level of service by the continuing replacement and refurbishment.

The annual depreciation charge calculated under the renewals accounting method will reflect the level of expenditure identified within the asset management plan to maintain the asset in a steady state, or that required to meet necessary improvements to achieve agreed service levels, minus the annual expenditure on maintenance.

The annual change in asset value (net book value) is thus calculated:

\[
\text{Depreciation charge based on AMP requirement} - \text{Actual annual expenditure on maintenance}
\]

Provided the levels of service are maintained, as assessed through performance measures (BVPI'S, and other PI's) then if the actual annual expenditure on maintenance is equal to the depreciation charge there will be no change in the asset value. However if the actual expenditure is less than the depreciation charge, then the asset value decreases. Additional expenditure incurred in improving the current level of service to an agreed desired level of service is regarded as an enhancement of the asset and will result in an increase in the depreciated replacement cost and in the net book value of the asset.

7.0 Condition

In this section we need to discuss:
- Assessing condition
- Current Condition
- Desired Condition
- Performance Gaps

Assessing Condition:

Scanner Surveys: A machine based SCANNER (Surface Condition Assessment for the National Network of Roads). The term SCANNER was chosen in 2004 to replace TTS for surveys after April 2005. SCANNER surveys have replaced CVI surveys for BVPI calculations for the Principal and Non Principal Road networks.

10m sub-sections are characterised according to their overall points score as:

"RED" = lengths in poor overall condition which are likely to require planned maintenance soon (i.e. within a year or so) on a "worst first" basis (Although there may be justification for postponing major repairs, and only carrying out minor repairs to keep the road safe and serviceable, in order to minimise whole life costs. i.e. "economic prioritisation").

"AMBER" = lengths where some deterioration is apparent which should be investigated to determine the optimum time for planned maintenance treatment. (Where there may be
justification for carrying out a lesser maintenance treatment sooner, rather than more extensive treatment later, in order to minimise whole life costs. i.e. "economic prioritisation").

"GREEN" = lengths where the carriageway is generally in a good state of repair.

**Coarse Visual Inspection (CVI):** Introduced in 2000/2001, CVI surveys were the mandatory UKPMS survey for monitoring the whole (surfaced) carriageway network, however with the introduction of SCANNER surveys on the Principal and Non Principal Road networks CVI has been relegated to the Unclassified Road network for which it provides the input for BVPI 224b (previously BVPI 97b).

The length of unclassified carriageway for which at least one of the UKPMS Rules and Parameters 8.01* Condition Index thresholds shown in the following table have been equaled or exceeded, divided by the total length of unclassified carriageway network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UKPMS RP8.01* Condition Index</th>
<th>Threshold Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural CI</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge CI</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearing Course CI</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data collected from these surveys is processed using an accredited UKPMS (United Kingdom Pavement Management System) package for BVPI purposes and via specialist scheme identification software to compile scheme identification and prioritisation lists.

**Detailed Visual Inspection (DVI):** Introduced in 2000/2001 primarily for monitoring BVPI 187, the condition of the Category 1a, 1 and 2 Footways but also for undertaking detailed carriageway surveys following analysis of the CVI data. All carriageway R and R schemes are assessed using UKPMS DVI survey data, the current scheme parameters for Carriageways are:

- **UKPMS Defect:** Structural, Wearing Course, Surface, Edge
- **Lower CI Threshold:** Principal 50, Non Principal 60, Unclassified 70
- **Merge Buffer Length:** 50 metres, (i.e. the next defect must be within 50 metres of the last or the scheme identification process re-starts)
- **Minimum Scheme Length:** 80 metres (or 40% of the total section length)
- **Scheme efficiency:** as a %age

**SCRIM Surveys:** are routinely carried out on the category 2, 3a and 3b network to identify lengths that may have a potential for skidding resistance problem. This survey work is conducted with one pass in each direction (approx 4,000 Lane Km) each summer using the single annual survey with benchmark method to provide a characteristic SCRIM coefficient.

SCRIM surveys commenced in 2004 originally for the Principal Road network before being extended to the above hierarchies (which cover all road classes). Grip Tester surveys are carried out as part of accident investigations or ad hoc requests from Area / Agent Offices. Sites are identified as being either SCRIM 'Green' sites (above Investigatory Level), 'Amber' sites (on and up to 0.09 SCRIM below Investigatory Level) or 'Red' sites (0.1 SCRIM or more below Investigatory Level).

Those sections of the network identified as being 0.1 SCRIM or more below Investigatory Level (SCRIM ‘Red’ sites) are deemed ‘Dangerous’ Defects and are signed accordingly whilst SCRIM ‘Amber’ sites are subject to further investigation which may result in the sites being identified as either SCRIM ‘Red’ or ‘Green’ sites (no action required beyond routine monitoring).
Current Condition:

Principal ‘A’ Roads (BVPI 223):

The carriageway condition is monitored by undertaking a UKPMS accredited machine based SCANNER survey. The performance indicator is produced by processing the condition data using the designated rule set (Rules and Parameters) within a Tranche 3 accredited UKPMS. The report is a standard delivery report of the UKPMS software and contains details of the length of network surveyed together with the length contributing to the BVPI which is reported as a percentage. The DfT have required year on year adjustments to the analysis software hence the step changes in reported outturn and apparent inconsistency between years.

Results calculated from the analysis of the condition data collected during the annual UKPMS SCANNER survey which covers 100% of the Principal ‘A’ Road network in one direction per annum, outturn is based upon data collected during the last 2 years.

Non-Principal ‘B & C’ Roads (BVPI 224a):

The carriageway condition is monitored by undertaking a UKPMS accredited machine based SCANNER survey. The performance indicator is produced by processing the condition data using the designated rule set (Rules and Parameters) within a Tranche 3 accredited UKPMS. The
report is a standard delivery report of the UKPMS software and contains details of the length of network surveyed together with the length contributing to the BVPI which is reported as a percentage. The DfT have required year on year adjustments to the analysis software hence the step changes in reported outturn and apparent inconsistency between years.

Results calculated from analysis of the condition data collected during the annual UKPMS SCANNER survey which covers 100% of the Non Principal 'B' Road and 100% of the Non Principal 'C' Road networks in one direction per annum, outturn is based upon data collected during the last 2 years.

Unclassified Roads (BVPI 224b):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% in poor condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>25.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>20.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>16.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The carriageway condition is monitored by undertaking a UKPMS Coarse Visual Inspection carried out and audited by UKPMS accredited survey inspectors. The performance indicator is produced by processing the condition data using the designated rule set (Rules and Parameters) within a Tranche 3 accredited UKPMS. The report is a standard delivery report of the UKPMS software and contains details of the length of network surveyed and the length contributing to the BVPI which is reported as a percentage.

Results calculated from the analysis of the condition data collected during the annual UKPMS CVI survey which covers 25% of the Unclassified Road network per annum, the outturn is calculated from data collected during the last 4 years.

Scrim Results:

An analysis of the 2007/08 SCRIM data for Category 2, 3a and 3b roads indicates the following deficiency levels:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCRIM band / Road Category</th>
<th>Category 2</th>
<th>Category 3a</th>
<th>Category 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCRIM 'Red' sites</td>
<td>Km</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRIM 'Amber' sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRIM 'Green' sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Network Length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Desired Condition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCRIM band / Road Category</th>
<th>Category 2</th>
<th>Category 3a</th>
<th>Category 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCRIM ‘Red’ sites</td>
<td>Km</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRIM ‘Amber’ sites</td>
<td>Km</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRIM ‘Green’ sites</td>
<td>Km</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Network Length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Gaps with Current Condition:

There is an estimated performance gap in the current level of condition (maintenance – carriageway structure and surface friction) and that identified as necessary to attain the acceptable level of condition.

Current funding is based on allocation by central government and the Council but not based on condition or need.

An estimated £400m backlog of highway maintenance (carriageway and footway) was estimated in 2005 using the BVPI condition data available at that time.

8.0 Option Identification & Appraisal

Available budgets are largely targeted by means of condition data to the areas of the network most in need.

There also remains an element of budget allocation for reactive and emergency work.

Renewal by Resurfacing and Reconstruction has been identified using CVI and DVI techniques. Work is ongoing to implement the use of SCANNER data for scheme identification and forward programming.

Highway maintenance schemes are identified by one of two methodologies.

1 Analysis of network condition data by UKPMS using an automatic pass rules and parameters technique. Additional specialist scheme identification software is utilised to identify schemes / projects for practical remediation on site. Two lists are produced:-
   a) a list of schemes ranked by Road Category and Condition Index.
   b) a list of isolated locations (sub-scheme length) ranked by Road Category and Condition Index.

2 Schemes are promoted by Area/Agent office further to routine safety inspection and public demand / requests. Surveys area carried out by DVI and processed by UKPMS automatic pass rules and parameters technique to produce a similar list to 1(a) above.

Lists from 1(a) and 2 are combined to produce one composite scheme list ranked by Condition Index and Road. Treatment options are selected on the basis of the most economically advantageous option and a cost estimate prepared.
Treatment options are categorised into:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect Type</th>
<th>UKPMS Provisional Treatment</th>
<th>NYCC Options (economic assessment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>CP&amp;RS surface plus upper structural bituminous layer. CN&amp;RS surface plus upper and lower structural bituminous layers. Structural overlay plus surface course. Reconstruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge</td>
<td>Haunch</td>
<td>CP&amp;RS surface plus upper structural bituminous layer. CP&amp;RS surface plus upper and lower structural bituminous layers. Structural overlay plus surface course. Edge reconstruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearing Course</td>
<td>Resurface</td>
<td>CP&amp;RS surface course. CP&amp;RS surface plus upper structural bituminous layer. Surface course overlay with minor regulating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Treatment</td>
<td>Surface Treatment</td>
<td>Surface treatment (surface dressing, high friction surfacing, Micro-asphalt surfacing and slurry seal). CP&amp;RS surface course. Surface course overlay with minor regulating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option Appraisal:**
Current budget levels are based on historical precedence and do not reflect that required to bring the carriageway network up to the defined level of service.

9.0 Finance and Value for Money

*Can you provide a break-down of historical expenditure (by cost type / maintenance activity?)*

*Commentary on the proves for allocating budget and*

*Provide a summary of anticipated future budget required*

10.0 Risk Management

Failure to maintain the carriageway asset in an acceptable and steady state condition will involve increased risk to the authority. These risks can be broken down into the following categories:-

**Physical Risk/Health and Safety**
- An increased number of accidents resulting from structural defects, or failure to maintain adequate surface texture/skidding resistance.

**Business Risk**
- Possibility of intervention by central government, as a failing authority.
- Possibility of legal proceedings being issued upon the authority for failing in its duty of care under the various statutes including the Highways Act, Health and Safety at Work Act, Traffic Management Act, Corporate Manslaughter Act etc.

**Financial Risk**
- Increase in compensation payouts due to increased number of accidents and third party claims.
- Substantial fines imposed upon the authority as a result of legal proceedings.
• Recycled options can be more costly to deliver with an uncertain level of long term performance.
• A reduction in the net book value of the carriageway asset.
• Increasing the maintenance backlog needing to be addressed by future generations.
• Increased costs to the economy, both locally and nationally/additional maintenance to vehicles, increased journey times etc.

Corporate Image
• The public of North Yorkshire see the condition of highways as an important issue.
• A continued deterioration in the condition of the carriageways would reflect badly upon the County Councils’ corporate image. Subsequently the competence of members and officers would be called into question.

Environmental Risks
• Increased noise pollution, particularly from heavy goods vehicles.
• Increased air pollution due to increased journey times and congestion.
• Significant weather events and climatic change e.g. flash flooding and drought damage becoming more frequent.

Network Risks
• An increase in unplanned disruption to the network owing to sections being unavailable attributable to a heightened level of reactive maintenance works.

11.0 Forward Works Programme

Historically R/R (Renewal) schemes have been developed on an annual basis although effort is currently being made to develop a two year plus programme with the ultimate intention of developing a ten year forward programme.

The Local Transport Plan 2 five year capital indicative settlement is subject to change based on performance assessed by Best Value Performance Indicators.

Financial projections are made within the budget bid process to identify growth areas.

12.0 Works Delivery

The Highways North Yorkshire partnership comprises North Yorkshire Business and Environment Highways and Transportation, Jacobs (consultant 2006-2012) partnered contract with payment based on scale fees/time charge and unit rates and Balfour Beatty Infrastructure Services (contractor 2002-2012) partnered contract with payment based on unit rates and target cost with pain / gain.

13.0 Performance Management

The key performance indicators by which the carriageway asset is measured are as follows:

Proposed Network Indicators to be implemented or developed during 2008/09 – 2010/11

Annual LAA Network Performance Indicators
- NI 168 Principal roads where maintenance should be considered (SCANNER survey)
- NI 169 Non-principal roads where maintenance should be considered (SCANNER survey)

Annual NYCC TAMP Network Performance Indicators

- NYCC PI 105 Number and %age of Carriageway Dangerous Defects made safe or repaired within 24 hours by Road category (2, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b and 5)
- NYCC PI Cat 2 Carriageways where maintenance should be considered (SCANNER survey)
- NYCC PI Cat 3a Carriageways where maintenance should be considered (SCANNER survey)
- NYCC PI Cat 3b Carriageways where maintenance should be considered (SCANNER survey)
- NYCC PI Cat 4a Carriageways where maintenance should be considered (CVI survey)
- NYCC PI Cat 4b Carriageways where maintenance should be considered (CVI survey)
- NYCC PI Cat 5 Carriageways where maintenance should be considered (CVI survey)

14.0 Improvement Actions

- Improve asset inventory data to ensure fundamental details are captured and recorded – location information/age/type pf surfacing etc.
- Develop ..........
Appendix 7

Network Management Duty (NMD)

Introduction

In accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) the County Council is developing its Network Management Plan (NMP) in conjunction with two regional Traffic Manager Groups (Yorkshire and the North of England).

Specific Network Management Actions:

1. Cross Boundary Activities
2. Highway Licensing
3. Planned Event Procedure
4. Emergency Planning
5. Street Works Coordination
6. Winter Service Review
7. Collection of Traffic Data

1. Cross Boundary Activities:

1.1 Highways Agency

Agreement with the Highways Agency on tactical diversion routes from the Motorway and Trunk Road network onto the County Council’s road network. Beginning with the M62.

1.2 Tees Valley Authorities
Cross boundary arrangements are being reviewed with neighbouring authorities (currently Durham, Darlington, Stockton on Tees, Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland Borough Councils) focussing on:

- Consistency of road hierarchies.
- Route management strategies.
- Traffic management arrangements at boundaries.
- Operational arrangements for highway maintenance (e.g. highway inspections, winter service, routine and cyclical maintenance).

2 Highway Licensing
A review of existing Highways Act 1980 licensing activities:

- The development and implementation of new skip licensing procedures (in conjunction with the Environment Agency).
- The development of new scaffold/hoarding licensing procedures (in conjunction with the Health and Safety Executive) which will be introduced from October 2008.
- The development of new storage of building materials licensing procedures which will be introduced from October 2008.

3 Planned Event Procedure
We are currently considering a review of the procedures we have in place regarding planned events, e.g. street fairs, shows, sporting events etc. Future review will include liaison with Parish, City and District Councils, The Police and emergency Services and the Council’s Emergency Planning Team.

4 Emergency Planning
North Yorkshire County Council has a Major Incident Plan which outlines the procedures to be followed during emergency events. There are also individual ‘daughter’ documents which detail responses to specific incidences e.g. Road Traffic Accidents, Flooding etc.

5 Street Works Coordination
Early in 2008/09 the County Council procured a new integrated Highway Management Information System (HMIS), the ‘Insight’ suite of programmes from Symology. The HMIS, provided as a hosted service by Symology, includes an EToN4 compliant Streetworks Register (SWR) that has been operational since June. The SWR exports current data to the public facing ELGIN (ELectronic Government INformation) web-site and is a valuable additional tool available for Streetworks coordination purposes. The provision of a web-based HMIS has provided improved access to the SWR for each of the seven Area and two (Harrogate and Scarborough) Agent Offices and will facilitate the implementation of mobile and remote working for the Streetworks Inspectors who can access ‘real time’ Streetworks data via the internet.
The preparation of data sets for use on the ELGIN website will improve network ‘availability’ information for highway network users, e.g. weight restrictions, height restrictions, winter gritting routes. Future considerations will include the provision of ‘diversion routes’ associated with planned works and the potential to incorporate ‘emergency’ diversion routes as a consequence of major accidents / incidents on the network.

The ELGIN website is administered on behalf of the Government by Jacobs UK and can be accessed by anyone with a web browser. The webpages provide a map of the country and is searchable to provide details of planned works on the highway. This information allows the user to plan alternate route to minimise journey disruption.

6 Winter Service Review

A review of the winter service has been undertaken. The routes designated as priority 1 and priority 2 have been compared with / analysed against the Highway Maintenance Road hierarchy which is based upon traffic flows / volumes and forms the basis for the network of Traffic Sensitive Streets.

7 Collection of Traffic Data

Late in 2007/8 the County Council procured a new traffic data collection contract through Jacobs UK. As well as the monthly collection of data from permanent sites and the collection of data from ‘temporary’ sites the contract also requires the provision of ‘C2Web’, an internet based traffic database, which has enabled both historic and new traffic data to be both viewed and analysed by the operational Area Offices as well as staff based at H&T head office. Future developments will provide partner organisations, such as North Yorkshire Police, and the North Yorkshire Moors and Yorkshire Dales National Park Authorities with ‘read only’ access to the data.

**Intervention Criteria Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>To consider the needs of all road users.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>To co-ordinate and plan works and known events affecting the highway network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>To gather information and provide information needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4</td>
<td>To develop contingency plans for managing incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5</td>
<td>To effectively monitor and manage traffic growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6</td>
<td>To consult and involve stakeholders and other interested parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7</td>
<td>To ensure parity between the local highway authority and others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 1: To consider the needs of all road users.**

Summary Table of Intervention Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criterion</th>
<th>Substantiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) How does the Authority manage road space for everyone?</td>
<td>North Yorkshire’s arrangements for managing road space for everyone are set out within the Local Transport Plan 2006 – 2011 (LTP2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Has the Authority set out a clear understanding of the problems facing the different parts of their network?</td>
<td>North Yorkshire has evidenced a clear understanding of the problems facing the different parts of our network through the first Local Transport Plan. The Authority is aware of the needs of different road users and has specified both national and local Performance Indicators to demonstrate this. These indicators demonstrate a clear awareness of the needs of different road users and the balanced policies in place for addressing these needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Is the Authority aware of the needs of different road users?</td>
<td>The LTP2 has identified the need for a further 28 ‘Service Centre Transportation Strategies’ (SCTS) which will focus on stakeholder engagement to establish a prioritised list of transport improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Are there balanced policies for addressing of the problems and needs?</td>
<td>North Yorkshire has established a network hierarchy based on the recommendations of the Code of Practice for Maintenance Management. In addition to this we have identified a traffic sensitive road network and have taken into consideration issues of local congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Has the local Authority identified and grouped roads according to their location and activities on them?</td>
<td>The authority has taken effective action to aid pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and motorists through the SCTS process which will lead to an improved transport infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) How has the Authority shown it has balanced competing demands while continuing to manage its network effectively?</td>
<td>Capital schemes emerge from the LTP2, which has a balanced approach to management of the highway network. All schemes identified through the LTP2 are subject to the Objective Based Scheme Prioritisation System which rates all schemes against each other and the LTP2 wider objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Is the Authority working together with local businesses, retailers and representatives of the freight and road transport industry?</td>
<td>The Local Strategic Partnership has representatives from North Yorkshire’s business community, voluntary and public sector agencies. NYCC has appointed an engineer with specific responsibilities for close working with the freight industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is the Authority developing means for ensuring economic and efficient servicing of premises and deliveries, whilst mitigating adverse problems?</td>
<td>Although NYCC is not the Planning Authority, as a statutory consultee we provide expert Highway advice on all relevant new developments through use of the NYCC Specification and Design Guide which ensures that developers’ designs allow efficient servicing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Existing Situation**

The North Yorkshire County Council Local Transport Plan 2006 - 2011 (LTP2), sets out a clear analysis of the factors influencing the County’s transport network, pinpoints the issues that will need to be addressed over the coming years and identifies the desired outcomes. It is supported by a series of annexes, all of which are complementary to the LTP2. The full set of annexes is as follows:

A Local Transport Strategy;
B Accessibility Strategy;
C Road Safety Strategy for York & North Yorkshire 2005-2010 ('95 Alive');
D Shared Priorities Initiative;
E Bus Strategy;
F Bus Information Strategy;
G Highway Maintenance;
H Transport Asset Management Plan Progress Report;
I Targets & Indicators methodology;
J Transport & Sustainable Tourism Guidelines;
K Rights of Way Improvement Plan Progress Report;
L LTP Strategic Environmental Assessment Environmental Statement;
M Congestion & Air Quality Action Plan; and,
N Cross Boundary Commuting Action Plan.

A further supporting document to the LTP2 is the Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP). The County Surveyors Society defines asset management as “a strategic approach that identifies the optimal allocation of resources for the management, operation, preservation and enhancement of the highway infrastructure to meet the needs of current and future customers”. The TAMP is at a draft stage at present. The Council is working in conjunction with Durham and Northumberland County Councils to further develop the TAMP and with the Yorkshire and Humber Authorities Network valuation Group to ensure a consistent approach to network valuation.

Driving both the LTP2 and its suite of supporting annexes is the Local Transport Strategy, which considers the key influences on the local network and uses a combination of existing evidence and predicted trends to develop the Council’s vision for transport within the County over the next fifteen to twenty years. This vision is based on a set of key Aims and Objectives and forms part of the Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire the Humber.

Poor management of the highway network results in congestion, delays and disruption. The Council already manages the highway network well, through co-ordination of road and street works, careful planning of events on the highway, effective traffic signal co-ordination, the effective use of traffic regulation orders and the implementation of highway improvement schemes.

**Issues**

Competing demands for network usage require that we adopt a balanced approach to ensure highway related activities are accommodated with the minimum disturbance and disruption to the general public.

It is accepted that the key pedestrianised areas and main pedestrian access routes, particularly in the town centres, must be given specific priority in the context of the network hierarchy. The Council
has established a highway network hierarchy based upon the “Code of Practice for Highway Maintenance”. The hierarchy relates to carriageways/footways and cycleways. This hierarchy was also used to determine traffic sensitivity for routes on the network.

Whilst there are some congestion ‘hot spots’ on the local road network these few are generally in the urban areas and only at peak times, although there is also some congestion at local tourist destinations through the holiday season. The most congested corridors within the County are the Trunk Roads. Accordingly, the Council is currently working with its partner, the Highways Agency, to identify the potential impact of future development on the Trunk and local road networks.

The Traffic Manager is well placed to ensure that the various Divisions of the Council work closely with partners and stakeholders to minimise disruption and to manage demands around the highway network.

Opportunities

The strong regeneration agenda of the District Councils has led to major redevelopments across the County. This gives opportunities to address existing problems on the highway network and to progress with the Council’s aspirations for accessibility for vulnerable road users to key sites.

The TMA has led to changes in the co-ordination and management of street works as is documented in the following section. It is also giving greater powers to enforcement activities.

It is intended to continue to raise awareness, at corporate level, of the impact on the network of future developments in the County. The current establishment permits the Traffic Manager’s representatives to analyse the impact, develop strategies and ensure network considerations are included in planning stages of all regeneration proposals.

Risks

As NYCC is not the Planning Authority we cannot insist on the improvements to be included within new development proposals. However, as statutory consultee the Traffic Manager’s representatives are included at an early stage in developers’ proposals to the Planning Authorities. It is essential that this process is strengthened and continues to be effective.

Network Hierarchy

It is important that North Yorkshire defines its network carefully in terms of network management. It is not appropriate or practical, to apply the same level of network management to the whole of the network and therefore a hierarchical approach has been taken. It is intended that a network management hierarchy will been established that reflects a usage hierarchy in terms of all traffic, including pedestrians and cyclists.

The hierarchy that will be developed for network management divides the network into three categories – high/medium/low. The different designations are colour coded; high = red; medium = amber; low = green, where;

Red: roads where works/incidents/events would have a serious detrimental impact on the efficiency of the network if not coordinated

Amber:roads where works/incidents/events would have a reduced detrimental impact on the efficiency of the network if not coordinated, but are considered to be of lower priority

Green: roads where works/incidents/events would have little detrimental impact on the efficiency of the network if not coordinated.
In developing this hierarchy the authority needs to consider its priorities in respect to the duty. Issues that could determine the development of the network may include existing hierarchies (highway maintenance/winter maintenance/reinstatement category), classification, traffic sensitivity, tourist routes, abnormal load routes, public transport routes, emergency services strategic routes, cross-boundary issues, modal consideration (vehicle/pedestrian/cyclist), and diversion routes.

It is the Council’s intention, in order to develop a sensible and practical approach to managing the network, to actively pursue the duty on that part of the network with a ‘high’ designation initially, with the intention of reviewing the hierarchy and refining the designations to meet changing aspirations and to reflect any best practice derived from the regional cooperation with the other north of England and Yorkshire and the Humber LTAs.

In developing the hierarchy consideration has been given to the Council’s wider objectives and policies. It also recognises the needs of our partners and stakeholders, for example the Police and public transport operators. Liaison has also taken place with our neighbouring authorities to ensure actions taken by ourselves do not have a detrimental effect on the network of others, and vice versa. This has also ensured that, as far as is reasonably practicable, cross boundary consistency exists with the networks of adjacent authorities and users have the certainty that the standards of network management roll out across the region.
**Objective 2: To co-ordinate and plan works and known events affecting the highway network**

**Summary Table of Intervention Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criterion</th>
<th>Substantiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) To what extent has the Authority promoted pro-active co-ordination of activities on the network? | Appointment of Streetworks Manager.  
A series of regular co-ordination meetings to plan and manage activities on the highway.  
Events and Road Works are coordinated as part of the regular meeting held with the Traffic Manager’s representative in the seven Area Office (and two Agency) teams. |
| b) To what degree has the Authority adopted a planned, evidence-led approach to known events? | Electronic Noticing of street works using EToN 4 system.  
Transport Asset Management Plan being drafted.  
Annual Maintenance Programme and Capital Works Programme produced and circulated. |
| c) Has the Authority developed or is it developing contingency plans for unforeseen events? | Major Incident Plan and Business Continuity Plan provide the overarching policy of emergency action.  
A Minor Emergency Operational Plan is to be developed for use during Minor incidents on the Highway which will include formal procedures for traffic sensitive routes. |
**Existing Situation**

The planning and co-ordination of activities is essential in minimising the disruption to traffic on the network. Works need to be undertaken by many groups for specific purposes, local authorities need to maintain, repair and renew roads; utility organisations need access into the highway to place and maintain their apparatus to ensure they meet the statutory requirements placed on them to provide domestic and business customers with their services.

Major events impact on the use of the highway. North Yorkshire hosts the prestigious Great Yorkshire Show annually, which requires extensive traffic management measures. There are many other events that affect the highway including Christmas celebrations and country fairs. These events are included in co-ordination of highway works.

Other service providers may be required to place objects on the highway; skips, scaffolding, hoardings etc. at the request of a customer. Again, these highways related activities need to be co-ordinated and managed to minimise impact and disruption to the general public.

There is a series of meetings to control roadworks in the area. Strategic matters are dealt with at NEHAUC and YHAUC meetings attended by representatives of Highway Authorities and Utility Companies.

Quarterly meetings are held between North Yorkshire County Council officers and all statutory undertakers. These are arranged and spreadsheets of activities prepared by the Council’s Streetworks Manager. At the meetings, programmes of works are exchanged, potential conflict in works or projects identified and co-ordinated accordingly. Works and projects are also identified on strategic roads and routes require detailed planning and timing.

These works have the potential to cause most disruption and delay by virtue of the volumes of traffic using these locations.

There are also monthly meetings to consider the co-ordination of known events taking place in the immediate future. These are attended by various stakeholders such as Police, Traffic & Transport, emergency services and representatives of public transport providers. Following from these meetings, a weekly Roadworks Report is prepared.

The TMA gives local authorities additional powers to those of existing legislation, to manage all activities undertaken on the highway, especially in the timing of works on specific roads and routes, these powers are to be introduced and used equally to ensure an unbiased approach between internal (local authority) and external parties. There is also the opportunity to operate a Permit scheme for street works. This would require additional administration to assess applications and issue permits. However, it would give the Local Traffic Authority (LTA) more direct control of street works and reduce further the risk of traffic disruption and congestion.

**Issues**

There is extensive co-ordination and planning of events affecting the highway network. This ranges from the strategic level with NEHAUC and YHAUC, through quarterly co-ordination with utilities to preparation of a weekly Roadworks Report.

All known events are included on the street works register. The software package used to manage notices is ‘Symology: Insight’. This has been updated to meet the requirements of the TMA.

The Council’s Major Incident Plan can be used to manage unforeseen incidents on the highway. However, they are not appropriate for minor unplanned works such as emergency entries.
for gas leaks. Currently these events are managed by the procedures in the Winter Maintenance Policy (WMP) in association with North Yorkshire Police however a Minor Emergency Operational Plan is to be developed for use during minor incidents on the Highway.

The improvements arising from the TMA build on the existing operation of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA) arrangements. It is possible to extend the Council’s powers further by introducing a Permit scheme for street works. This would require utilities to apply for a permit before any street works operation. The Council could put conditions on the dates and times of operation and any other matter that could reasonably be expected to reduce the impact of the street works. Penalties can already be imposed on street works operators if the work is poorly managed. The penalties could be imposed by Fixed Penalty Notices under the TMA. These would be operative for works that were not properly notified or did not comply with conditions imposed.

Any Permit scheme would need to show that the County Council’s highway works were treated with parity. All minor roadworks would need to be issued with a permit. Similarly, arrangements similar to Fixed Penalty Notices would need to be imposed for contraventions of any conditions put on the operations of Balfour Beatty Infrastructure Services Limited (BBISL) who are the Council’s partner provider for highways works.

**Opportunities**

The requirements of the TMA have led to the street works management software being upgraded to ‘Symology: Insight’. The upgrade will allow better co-ordination of works by the BBISL and improved co-ordination of noticed works.

This leads to opportunities to improve communications between interested parties on the highway network. An early benefit would be improved cross-boundary arrangements. It is expected that neighbouring Authorities will also be seeking improved contact and there will be a common ambition to set up cross-boundary arrangements. This should include the Highways Agency who are responsible for managing the Trunk Roads.

**Risks**

The new arrangements depend upon the successful operation of the upgraded ‘Symology: Insight’ software. Symology are under great pressure to deliver the improved software to existing users. Problems with delivery or operation of the software would significantly delay the full compliance with the TMA. At present, Symology are using their servers to ‘host’ run the software.

As the management of street works is considered to be satisfactory at present and is expected to improve with the introduction of EToN 4 systems, it is not considered necessary to move immediately to a Permit scheme. The additional administration needed for the Permit schemes would apply additional pressure on the changes currently underway. The same principles apply to Fixed Penalty Notices. The current penalty scheme is considered to be a sufficient deterrent to utilities.

Highways North Yorkshire has well-established processes for identifying and repairing minor defects on the highway. New processes will be adopted to give notice of minor repairs in the same way that Utilities currently operate.
### Objective 3 – To gather information and provide information needs

**Summary Table of Intervention Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criterion</th>
<th>Substantiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) How effective are the arrangements the authority has in place to gather accurate information about planned works and events?</td>
<td>The Council liaises with North Yorkshire Police/District Councils regarding planned events and has a proven track record of minimising disruption on the highway (Great Yorkshire Show). Planned Streetworks and road works are coordinated by the Streetworks Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) How does the authority organise planned works and events to minimise their impact and agree or stipulate their timing to best effect?</td>
<td>Use of updated street works management software. Consultative meetings with interested partners including local stakeholders (Parish/City Councils)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the authority provide access on demand to information, from the authority’s systems for recording and co-ordinating utilities works and road works, to utility companies, contractors and adjoining authorities?</td>
<td>The spreadsheet of highway activities is available to utilities, neighbouring authorities and contractors and is accessed via the Council’s website. Street works are uploaded (by Jacobs UK) to the ELGIN website where anyone can access the data. The weekly Roadworks Public Disruptions Report (RPD) is circulated to stakeholders including local media, emergency services, District and Parish Councils, contractors, utility companies, local Ministry of Defence establishments, Highways Agency and motoring organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Does the authority have, or aim to have, a good and timely source of information for road users?</td>
<td>The Council’s website has a weekly RPD page and links to public transport providers. Street works are uploaded (by Jacobs UK) to the ELGIN website where anyone can access the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Does this allow road users to choose a different route or mode of travel or to delay or defer their proposed journey?</td>
<td>The ELGIN website provides information to allow travellers to make informed choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Does the authority work with a range of travel information providers and does it communicate through a wide range of channels?</td>
<td>The Integrated Passenger Transport team work with all local public transport operators to provide up to date travel information. Communication of this information is via NYCC website, press and published timetables. The RPD is circulated to local media and motoring organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) What evidence has been provided to show how well the authority is meeting existing statutory obligations such as its contribution to the national street gazetteer?</td>
<td>‘Symology: Insight’ software automatically updates the national street gazetteer at monthly intervals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Existing Situation**

North Yorkshire County Council has developed a robust system for gathering roadworks information and co-ordinating works on the highway. This has been built upon existing legislation for utilities to give notice of any planned roadworks to the Highway Authority. All planned roadworks events are entered onto a spreadsheet. The Council’s planned works and events on the highway are also entered onto the spreadsheet. Meetings of all interested parties are held quarterly to co-ordinate the works and reduce the traffic impact of roadworks.

The spreadsheet is distributed to utilities, BBISL, neighbouring authorities, contractors and other stakeholders via email. The roadworks spreadsheet is discussed regularly and a weekly Roadworks Public Disruptions report is published on the Council’s website. This advises road users of disruption to the highway network and, if necessary, advises on alternative routes. This is available to all users of the Council website and is passed to the media for publication.

Timetables of local bus and rail services are maintained on the Council’s website at ‘northyorkstravel.info’ this includes links to the ‘Traveline’ regional public transport information portal and ‘Transport Direct’ the journey planning website.

There is information readily available to allow travellers to make informed choices about the route and mode of any journey they wish to make. Anticipated delays are published on the Council’s website along with links to public transport providers. However, there is little ‘real time’ information to advise on changes to the network and consequent delays. ‘Real time’ bus timetable information is provided via a small number of on-street displays. It is anticipated that ‘real time’ information will be rolled out across the County through the provision of SMS text messaging facilities over the coming years.

The County Council has a network of over 250 permanent Traffic Data Collection sites where data is collected on a 24/7 basis. This information is used for monitoring the network, progress reporting and as part of improvement schemes. This data is available to external sources ie members of the public and consultants.

To meet national reporting requirements, particularly those relating to the new national indicator relating to traffic congestion, there is a need to gather more robust and timely data on travel times on the County’s highway network. Data is currently being obtained through the ITIS system from a relatively small number of vehicles fitted with tracker devices, with this data becoming more useful as the number of vehicles contributing to the ITIS system increases.

**Issues**

Gathering and disseminating accurate information is a key element of Network Management. Effective decisions about planning and co-ordinating works and activities cannot be achieved without having the right information and systems in place.

The Council is working to share this information in order to shape our approach to network management. This will enable our partners to help us achieve the network performances that we are aiming for.

Without the right information neither our transport service providers nor our travelling public will be able to make informed decisions about their travel choices.

The Council collects extensive data, for its own purposes. This needs to be presented in a form that the travelling public will find useful.

The Council receives and shares information every day with stakeholders, in an attempt to ensure that street works are well
planned and co-ordinated. There are co-ordination groups meeting on a regular basis to share information about planned events but limited energy is focussed on preparing and agreeing actions for the unplanned events.

All of our actions and decisions can either be termed ‘proactive’ or ‘reactive’ depending upon the activity or the incident. We now have to demonstrate that we are issuing this information effectively for the benefit of travellers.

The management of the information, its dissemination and its accessibility or ‘fit-for-purpose’ formatting are fundamental tasks in discharging our Network Management Duty.

**Opportunities**

The implementation of parts 3 and 4 of the TMA in April 2008 has required an upgrading of the street works management software to ‘Symology: Insight’. New systems are required which will lead to improved procedures.

Existing working groups and information management will be reviewed to ensure that they are still fit-for-purpose.

The list of key contacts has been reviewed and provides additional new contacts.

Existing schedules and the Council’s website to be reviewed to ensure that street works activities and information is accessible to all and is fit-for-purpose.

New technology to be appraised in partnership with stakeholders across the region to develop appropriate intelligent transport information. This could provide ‘real time’ information to travellers and indicate alternative routes or modes when congestion occurs.

**Risks**

Without the right information and the appropriate systems to manage and disseminate this information, the Council is at risk of failing in its Network Management Duty. ‘Symology: Insight’ has been upgraded to cater for ET0N 4 notices. This is being introduced on Symology’s own servers to minimise any risk of disruption.

Without the appropriate provisions and channels for accessing the street works spreadsheet and key contacts across the area, service providers and travellers cannot make informed choices about their journeys and operations. Extensive information is being made available to travellers using the Council’s website and published media.

Without the establishment of contingency plans based on accurate information, traffic congestion will not be minimised. Contingency plans will be developed as a consequence of the Network Management Plan.

Cross boundary agreements must be set up to deliver the Network Management Duty.

A cross boundary forum has been set up and is being organised by Middlesbrough Borough Council. Initial discussions are focusing on Winter Service Activities.
**Objective 4 – To develop contingency plans for managing incidents**

**Summary Table of Intervention Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criterion</th>
<th>Substantiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) Has the authority established contingency plans for dealing with situations outside the authority’s control promptly and effectively, as far as reasonable practical? | Major Incident Plan and Business Continuity Plan provide the overarching policy of emergency action.  
A Minor Emergency Operational Plan is to be developed for use during Minor incidents on the Highway which will include formal procedures for traffic sensitive routes.  
Procedures for the trunk road network have been prepared by Highways Agency. |
| b) Has the authority provided evidence to demonstrate that all parties involved in making these contingency arrangements work have been, or are, fully consulted during their development? | The Major Incident Plan was subject to stakeholder engagement before implementation.  
The Traffic Manager is represented on the Emergency Planning Team. |
| c) Have these parties the information they need to put the plans in to practise quickly? | Major Incident Plan and Winter Maintenance Policy are published as public documents and promoted by the Council’s Press Office.  
The standard procedures are well used by all parties including North Yorkshire emergency services and County Council Officers. |
**Existing Situation**

North Yorkshire County Council deals with many unplanned incidents on the highway network each year. Such incidents include:

- Emergency utility works e.g. major gas leak.
- Road Traffic Accidents.
- Flooding incidents or other weather related incidents.
- Accelerated damage to the highway network assets.
- Fallen trees.
- Diesel or chemical spillage.
- Traffic signals failure.
- Dangerous structures adjacent to the highway.

Although diverse in nature, the common feature is that incidents such as these affect traffic conditions, and invariably lead to temporary traffic management or road closures and so need to be dealt with quickly to minimise disruption and inconvenience to highway users.

Although the Council is in a position to respond to unplanned incidents, there is not yet a formal contingency plan documenting procedures that need to be followed in dealing with unplanned incidents on the highway network other than the Major Incident Plan.

Notification of unplanned incidents may come from a number of sources, for example through the emergency services, utility companies, members of the public etc and the timing of the notification is variable. Utility companies are required to serve notice to the Highway Authority within 2 hours of emergency work commencing.

However, the Police do not always let the Highway Authority know immediately if they have had to close a road due to an accident. When the Council receives notification it is in a position to respond quickly to unplanned incidents through referral to the appropriate officers. In normal working hours resources can be re-directed to deal with incidents. For “out-of-hours” incidents, staff and operatives need to be called out, and the Council has formal standby arrangements in place.

As unplanned incidents vary in nature, location and severity, the nature of the response depends on each specific circumstance. The response options will generally fall into one of the following categories:

- Erection of warning signs.
- First time repair.
- Temporary traffic signals.
- Road closure and establishing diversion routes.

The response may be a combination of the above and is likely to be progressive, depending upon the nature and timescales of the incident.

Apart from the Major Incident Plan the Council has no formal plans or procedures for dealing with unplanned incidents on the highway. This has lead to incidents being dealt with in an ad-hoc way, utilising the local knowledge and experience of the highways staff and workforce. While this usually works well, there is the potential for this reactive approach to cause road safety issues for network users and delays to businesses, emergency services and residential people.

The WMP sets out the Council’s response to winter conditions. For instance, highways are prioritised as 1, 2 or 3 with priority 1 roads getting immediate response to adverse weather. Other extreme
weather conditions (wind, fog, heat etc.) are not specifically covered in the WMP although the procedures undertaken follow the principles of the WMP.

Procedures for the trunk road network have been prepared by the Highways Agency. These include agreed diversionary routes on the local road network during closures of sections of the trunk roads. This allows temporary signage to be erected immediately when an incident requires a carriageway closure.

**Issues**

The Council’s highways form part of a dynamic framework. People make many thousands of journeys and service providers undertake hundreds of activities to enhance and maintain the infrastructure throughout the day.

Having such a complex and diverse network of activities and events it is inevitable that occasionally, things do not go to plan. How the Council respond to these incidents, especially, when they occur on traffic sensitive routes, will be critical to effective network management.

Incidents might be an emergency utility repair, traffic signals fault, traffic accident, footway/carriageway collapse, oil spillage on the road etc.

It is important that the Council can quickly obtain details of any unplanned incidents from those people who actually report the incident. The likely traffic impact of the incident can then be assessed.

Having effective contingency plans are critical to the successful management of the network function. The provision of such plans will be particularly important on our cross boundary strategic corridors.

**Opportunities**

The formulation of a Minor Emergency Operational Plan, which is agreed by stakeholders, should be prepared. This would cover highway operational incidents below the Major Incident Plan level. This will ensure that incidents can be quickly and appropriately responded to in order to minimise delays and congestion for all users of the network.

Agreed effective and comprehensive procedures will improve resource efficiencies within the Council. Diversions for the traffic sensitive network, will allow such routes to be properly signed and put into use with the minimum of delay. Cross boundary diversions would require the agreement of neighbouring Authorities.

**Risks**

Reactive approaches to unplanned events could cause road safety issues for network users and delays to businesses, emergency services and residents.

There may be a reputation impact, through negative public perception of service delivery, if there are delays, increased congestion and disruption due to inefficient responses or delays in dealing with unplanned incidents, especially those that occur during the peak traffic hours.
Objective 5 – To effectively monitor and manage traffic growth.

Summary Table of Intervention Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criterion</th>
<th>Substantiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) What evidence has been given to show an authority has identified trends in traffic growth on specific routes?</td>
<td>Congestion is not currently a major issue, with the exception of certain hot spots and major seasonal tourist destinations which are identified in LTP2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) What policies have been put into place for managing incremental change?</td>
<td>LTP2 Annex M: Congestion and Air Quality Action Plan details the measures which to manage the predicted traffic growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Existing Situation**

Measures to deal with congestion are at the heart of the Government’s transport strategy. The Council recognises that it will need to work closely with its partners in the region and those in the north east and west regions to manage the impacts of congestion at regional, sub-regional and local level. Strong cross boundary working relations have been established over the first LTP period, and these relationships will be further developed.

As far as North Yorkshire County Council is concerned, congestion is not currently a major issue with the exception of certain ‘hotspots’.

It is likely that the increase in ‘background’ traffic levels due to rising car ownership and the growth of the local economy will result in more widespread congestion within the County unless effective action is taken. This situation will be further exacerbated by increases in traffic flow due to the Council’s regeneration proposals.

In addition, the trunk road network is forecast to be operating at or close to its practical capacity in the near future. This is likely to result in the diversion of traffic onto the local road network, with corresponding adverse effects in terms of accessibility, road safety and air quality as well as congestion.

**Issues**

It should be the aim of every Traffic Authority to reduce road congestion, to improve accessibility and manage demands and transport networks to support the economy. This can only be done if there is a strategic approach to monitoring and managing traffic growth.

There are many other influences that will affect traffic growth, some of these being demographic influences, travel to work patterns, land use planning (through the District Council’s Local Development Framework proposals), bus patronage, cycle and walking initiatives and demand management measures such as car parking strategies. Each LTA must have the framework in place that will enable them to identify measure and control these influences and, ultimately, control traffic growth.

Traffic growth across the region is being tackled at a strategic level in partnership with the Highways Agency and the Traffic Authorities. The Council is actively engaged in this work. Traffic growth was measured across several cordons over the life of the First LTP and the results published in the Council’s LTP Annual Progress reports. It was found that overall traffic growth within the County was restricted with zero traffic growth being achieved in Scarborough and Harrogate, our busiest urban centres.

**Opportunities Traffic Data Collection**

The Council has recognised that the increase in congestion and the demand for travel will need to be addressed by a range of interventions, as set out in LTP2. The work already completed will, together with the traffic data being collected on an ongoing basis, provide detailed and reliable data for monitoring the level of congestion within the County, thereby contributing to the tools the Traffic Manager will use performing the Network Management Duty.

The Council, together with its partner Local Authorities and the principal bus operators, is working to improve the local bus network, both within the County and across the wider sub-region. The extension and sustainability of the bus network is a key element of the Local Transport Strategy for the region.

The Council also works with numerous partner organisations to improve and develop the County’s rail, pedestrian and cycle
networks, thereby widening travel choices and offering attractive alternatives for journeys currently made by car.

The Council’s approach to reducing traffic growth is based on two themes:

- Demand management (discouraging unnecessary travel)
- Modal shift (encouraging walking, cycling and public transport use.)

**Risks**

Despite the Council’s success in restricting traffic growth, it is accepted that traffic levels across the County will continue to grow because of District Council programmed regeneration schemes. The Traffic Manager is well placed to influence the design of regeneration projects and mitigate the effects of increasing traffic due to development.

The programme of public transport improvements depends on partnership working with the bus and rail operators.
**Objective 6 – To Consult and Involve Stakeholders and Other Interested Parties**

**Summary Table of Intervention Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criterion</th>
<th>Substantiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) What evidence is there to show that those responsible within the authority for exercising any power to regulate or co-ordinate the uses made of any road or part of a road in the road network are aware of, and act upon, the authority’s responsibilities arising in relation to the Network Management Duty?</td>
<td>Processes to coordinate and monitor Authority’s road works have been agreed in line with those of the utility companies including issue of Fixed Penalty Notices. Monitoring of highway disruption caused by roadworks. Considering comments from stakeholders and local residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do authorities that are in two-tier areas liaise with all relevant departments in the second-tier organisations whose work affects the road network?</td>
<td>Two-way liaison with District Council officers is undertaken when there is proposed works with an impact on the Highway network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Do authorities ensure that other types of authorities (eg. Planning Authorities) are aware of the duty and their impact on the movement of traffic?</td>
<td>North Yorkshire County Council is not the Planning Authority. The Planning Authorities are the seven District Councils and the two National Parks. NYCC have regular meetings with all of these. Representatives of the Traffic Manager are present throughout the planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) What evidence is there to show that the authority takes actions that include consultation on initiatives, the sharing of information needed to meet the duty, processes for ensuring that policies are consistent and agreeing joint working arrangements, including the Highways Agency?</td>
<td>Attendance at NEHAUC and YHAUC meetings Regular meetings with stakeholders North Yorkshire Strategic Partnership is made up of public, private, voluntary and community organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Has the authority involved the police, bus operators, the Traffic Commissioners, residents,</td>
<td>See above. There is regular liaison between the Council, North Yorkshire Police and the principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

local businesses and different road users where appropriate in decision-making processes?

bus operators.

Police Traffic Management Officers are present at detailed scheme specific meetings.

Existing Situation

North Yorkshire County Council has developed a number of systems to manage and monitor activity on the highway. These systems have been developed in an organic fashion to meet needs as they arise. However, they do allow all stakeholders in the highway network the opportunity to become involved in decision making processes.

Roadworks cause the most common disruption to the highway. There is a statutory requirement on utilities and contractors to prepare notices of the intention to open a highway. These are set out in the street works register along with other planned incidents on the highway such as sports, entertainment or civic events. These are discussed and co-ordinated at regular meetings of all stakeholders, with additional scheme specific meetings as required. A spreadsheet of works is available to all interested stakeholders.

Members of the public are informed of activity on the highway to allow them to alter their travel arrangements or to comment on proposed works. For major schemes, all frontage properties are informed directly of the scheme by letter drop. Prior to commencement of major schemes signage is erected to warn travellers of the possible disruption. A weekly roadworks report is published and included on the Council’s website. In addition, it is proposed to ask local residents after completion of road work schemes to seek their views on the manner in which the work was carried out.

The Council is not the Planning Authority for the County. This responsibility is carried out by the seven District Councils and two National Parks. However the Highway Authority is a statutory consultee for planning applications which affect the road network and is involved at an early stage in the planning of major developments. Expert comment is provided to all planning applications affecting the highway.

Issues

The scope of the Network Management Duty extends far beyond the traditional organisational boundaries of local authority highways departments. The efficient operation of the road network is therefore not necessarily under the direct control of the LTA or the Traffic Manager. It is incumbent upon the LTA to:

- Establish control over the many stakeholders who undertake activities on the road network or which affect the road network.
- Collaborate with adjacent LTA’s to ensure that the efficient operation of the network is seamless across organisational boundaries.
- Work with stakeholders using the road network to ensure their needs are understood and taken into account.
- Work with other local authority departments – internal and external – to raise awareness of the Network Management Duty and to secure their co-operation in delivering the required outcomes.
- Monitor the highway disruption caused by works and events on the highway. Consider comments from stakeholders and local residents. Seek improved procedures to address any problems that are identified.
**Opportunities**

The implementation of the TMA has led to the systems for co-ordinating of works on the highway being refreshed. An upgrade in the ‘Symology: Insight’ software has been carried out to meet the Network Management Duty and enhanced processes to monitor work by BBISL are being developed.

It has been recognised that more needs to be done to improve the road user interface by providing better services that clearly demonstrate co-ordination and planning of street works.

Whilst good connections do exist, it is accepted that these can be improved to ensure that there is a clear focus and strong culture of performance monitoring on the operations of the highway network. Every service provider involved in works on the highway can contribute to the aim of the Network Management Plan.

Good communication and collaboration between relevant stakeholders and other interested parties will result in the best use being made of the existing road network for the benefit of all road users.

**Risks**

Much of the Network Management Duty objectives rely on the co-operation of others not within the direct control of the LTA. Whilst all means may be used to encourage co-operation, there is a risk that it may not be forthcoming.

The Traffic Manager is well placed to direct resources, both internally and externally to promote the Network Management Duty.
**Objective 7: To ensure parity between the local highway authority and others.**

Summary Table of Intervention Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criterion</th>
<th>Substantiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) Does the authority apply the same standards and approaches to their own activities as they do to those of others and do they provide evidence of this, particularly in relation to utilities street works and developer’s works? | Utility Companies provide advance notice of all work (except emergencies).  
BBISL provides details of planned work. However, unplanned, reactive work is not entered onto the street works register at this time. Improved processes mean that reactive works will shortly be entered onto the street works register. |
| b) Do they use locally determined indicators and where relevant any centrally developed key performance indicators? | DfT have established a Working Group to develop a suite of Performance Indicators for the noticing regime.  
Several local Performance Indicators are proposed including %ages of major and minor works notified in accordance with street works procedures and a number of times that road works result in sequential working with street works. |
**Existing Situation**

The TMA gives local authorities additional powers, over and above existing legislation, to manage all activities undertaken on the highway, especially in the timing of works on specific roads and routes, these powers are to be introduced and used equally to ensure an unbiased approach between internal (local authority) and external parties.

Local street authorities have, for a long time, criticised utility companies on their performance when undertaking street works, both in terms of the accuracy of and compliance with information supplied on notifications. However, to date it has not been possible to undertake a comparison of the performance of highway authorities when undertaking road works as the level of information available on the street works registers, with respect to those road works, is significantly less.

The Department for Transport (DfT) have established a working group, chaired by Halcrow, and consisting of street authority and utility representatives to develop a suite of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for the noticing regime. Northumberland County Council represents the north of England on this group.

**Issues**

In order for the KPI’s to be meaningful in creating a level playing field authorities must register the same level of information with respect to the local authority’s road works as utility companies include on notices for street works.

The current level of information supplied by local authorities varies substantially and is often very sparse. Utility companies are well advanced in providing notices of their planned work. It will take considerable effort for BBISL to achieve parity with them.

**Opportunities**

Continue to influence national debate through representation on the DfT working group. Developments to be fed back through the north of England and Yorkshire Traffic Managers Groups.

Participate in the national trial of the KPIs in 2008/9

Develop improved local systems for noticing in-house works. This will be helped by the development of the enhanced ‘Symology: Insight’ software.

**Risks BBISL**

If it is not mandatory for local authorities to notice their works in the same way as utility companies, it will be difficult to enforce notification and therefore it will be very difficult to demonstrate parity of treatment. Regardless of this, BBISL have agreed to begin the process of “noticing” work including minor schemes.

DfT decision making process may materially affect progress toward the KPI’s.

Continued changes to street works legislation results in changes to the Streetworks management software. Traffic Authorities are very much dependant upon the software developers ability to sustain improvements to their systems in line with operational needs.
Performance and Review

Overview - It is predicted that traffic growth will increase over the next 10 years. This will increase the potential for traffic congestion. However, with a proactive approach to network management, many of the adverse effects of the congestion can be mitigated.

An Improvement Plan will be developed in line with the LTP2 to provide suitable procedures to meet the Network Management Duty. The performance of the Council in meeting its Network Management Duty will be monitored using both the DfT KPI's and local PI's. The Network Management Plan itself, when complete, will be a 'live' document under continual review.

The two Traffic Managers Groups will monitor the effects of the duty in regional terms and will co-operate in the interests of best practise. This will facilitate the sharing of information to benchmark their performances and ensure, as far as is reasonably practicable, that continual improvement occurs across the regions.

It will also make efforts to disseminate their experience outside the regions in order that best practise can be shared across the country and lessons learned from other regions can be embraced within the continual improvement culture developed in the north of England and Yorkshire.

Improvement Plan - The current management of events on the highway has been shown to be successful in keeping disruption and congestion in check. However, the Network Management Duty requires the management of the highway to be demonstrated.

Processes - The TMA imposed stricter regulations for "noticing" street works. In order to comply with the requirements, North Yorkshire has updated its management system. Notices are accepted using the EToN 4 format and managed by ‘Symology: Insight’ software.

The TMA also requires parity between the way that utility companies and the Council organise their street and road works. As the new processes are integrated into BBISL work programmes, notices should be provided for all planned work on the highway. Utility companies have many years experience of “noticing” street works and it will take a considerable effort for BBISL to match their performance. Progress towards parity will be carefully monitored by the Traffic Manager.

There is also the possibility of introducing Permit schemes, enforced by Fixed Penalty Notices. However, the proposed, improved practices using EtoN 4 systems are considered to provide a good service. There is no need at present to radically change the existing systems and bear the additional administrative burden of providing a Permit system.

Network Hierarchy - A system of traffic sensitive routes has been established.

The network of traffic sensitive streets needs updating as conditions (particularly bus routes) have changed. The new traffic sensitive routes, including consultation with utilities, will be processed by the Highway Asset Manager. The opportunity will be taken to advise utilities of the category of traffic sensitivity.

There are occasions when unplanned incidents occur on the highway. These could occur for emergency road works, road traffic accidents or extreme weather conditions. The Major Incident Plan is inappropriate for the management of these incidents and at present they are dealt with using the processes from the WMP.

In order to overcome the inconsistencies of this approach and allow swifter responses to incidents, a Minor Emergency Operational Plane (MEOP) will be prepared for the management of unplanned incidents. This will include internal and external contacts, traffic management requirements and media notification.

The council is currently negotiating, with the Highways Agency, a series of pre-agreed diversion routes for each section of the trunk road network. It is proposed to prepare a similar set of agreed diversions for each section of the traffic sensitive routes. This will
enable diversion signing to be quickly arranged and erected in the case of a road closure. The benefits will be simpler procedures for agreeing street works on traffic sensitive routes and less disruption when the routes are unexpectedly obstructed.

Monitoring - In order to fully meet the Network Management Duty, the Traffic Manager will continuously monitor the effectiveness of the organisation and its decision making processes. Where issues arise, the Traffic Manager will make an assessment to determine how the organisation could be made more effective. A range of indicators and processes will be regularly considered to allow decisions to be made with confidence.

Processes - All meetings concerned with managing the Network Management Duty will be properly attended and minuted. These range from regional meetings to determine strategy such as the two Traffic Managers Groups and HAUCs to internal meetings with individual Area Managers. Cross-boundary arrangements will be discussed at local level. Streetworks Coordination and monthly co-ordination of road works meetings will discuss detailed arrangements for events on the highway and ensure that disruption is kept to a minimum. Minutes from these meetings will be copied to the Traffic Manager.

All planned works on the highway will be properly “noticed”. The data from these notices will be monitored by the Traffic Manager. There will be targets set for various activities such as extensions to the programmed work, overruns of programmed work, early starts

- Updated plans or schedules of the network hierarchy whenever changes are made.
- Comment on the results of the performance indicators.
- Recommendations for changes to the management of events on the highway to better meet the Network Management Duty.

of programmed work, necessary remedial works and works that would be liable to attract a Fixed Penalty Notice. Action would be taken to correct any aspect of street works that was shown to be causing disruption.

Performance Indicators - A set of performance indicators has been compiled to help to monitor the Network Management Duty. The indicators selected are National Indicators, mandatory and local LTP2 indicators as published. Some supplementary LTP2 indicators have been included for completeness. All the indicators relate to aspects of the Network Management Duty and can be measured. Most of the indicators have existed for some time and targets have been agreed for them. These targets will be retained and monitored for the Network Management Plan.

The NI 167 “Congestion” indicator is reliant on journey time data that is not currently available to the Council. The data should be provided by DfT from information collected by tracking information of vehicles fitted with suitable equipment. The use of this indicator must be treated with caution until sufficient data is available.

Review

Once complete, the Network Management Plan will be a live document under continuous review which will focus on the following:

- Evidence of the co-ordination and planning of roadworks processes being performed adequately.
- Data required for the various performance indicators.
Appendix 8

Powered two wheelers position statement
North Yorkshire County Council Powered Two Wheelers position statement.

The purpose of this statement is to set out how North Yorkshire County Council, in conjunction with its partners, will promote Powered two wheelers (P2W) as a sustainable mode of travel whilst improving the safety record for this mode, which currently is featured disproportionately in the accident statistics. The term ‘powered two wheelers’ (P2W) covers motorcycles, scooters and mopeds but casualty data shows that collision involvement is largely confined to larger sports bikes of 500cc and above. The involvement of scooters, mopeds and smaller motor bikes is much lower and is not currently a cause for concern. The majority of commuting journeys by motor bike use these lower capacity motorbikes and scooters, therefore the safety concern does not apply to all powered two wheelers, only to the largest sports bikes.

In North Yorkshire, over the last seven years, motorcyclists have accounted for approximately 23% of all road accident related fatalities in the County each year and therefore contribute a disproportionate number of KSI accidents, in relation to their proportion as road users overall. However, a determined effort and significantly increased programme of publicity, education, training and targeted enforcement through the 95 Alive Road Safety Partnership has seen a reduction in casualties of almost 30% as at end August 2008.

| North Yorkshire Motorcycle KSI Casualties GT 125CC |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|                | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| KSI Casualties  | 184  | 128  | 123  | 136  | 123  |
| % Change Since Previous Year | -30.4% | -3.9% | 10.6% | -9.6% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSI Casualties</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change Since Previous Year</td>
<td>-26.2%</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>-29.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of P2W’s can help to reduce congestion and reduce emissions, whilst improving personal mobility. This position statement will aim to show how NYCC aims to encourage the safer use of P2W’s, whilst contributing to the local transport plan priorities of reducing congestion, improving the environment, delivering accessibility and improving safety. Encouragement of the use of powered two wheelers does however need to be balanced with the encouragement of other modes as we do not wish to encourage people to use powered two wheelers who currently walk or cycle.
Policy Background

The 1998 White Paper ‘A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone’ outlined the potential benefits from increased motorcycle use for the environment and for reducing congestion, as well as recognising motorcycles as an affordable alternative to cars. However, the paper also recognised that the use of P2W raised some important and complex issues. Consequently an advisory group was set up to investigate how relevant policy could be developed, particularly to encourage further improvements in safety and environmental impacts. The advisory group submitted its final report in August 2004, which made a full analysis of progress since the White Paper and some key recommendations. Many of these recommendations relate to issues that can only be progressed at a national level, however, wherever appropriate they have been incorporated into this strategy.

The Government’s National Motorcycling Strategy, 2005, sets out a main theme for motorcycling strategy as being:

‘To facilitate motorcycling as a choice of travel within a safe and sustainable transport framework.’

It also sets out a comprehensive overview of motorcycling issues nationally and detailed action plan to address issues over a 5-year period.

In addition, following the publication of the Eddington and Stern Reports and the recent consultation on the ‘Towards A Sustainable Transport System’ an even greater emphasis has been placed on reducing carbon emissions and the various ways in which transport can help to achieve this aim.

Use of powered two wheelers can help to achieve this aim whilst also increasing personal mobility, particularly for those living in more isolated, rural areas where public transport may not be a viable option.

Facts and Figures

Nationally

The DfT’s Transport Trends 2007 publication showed that:

- Between 1980 and 2006, the distance travelled by motorcycle fell by 30%, whilst conversely, the distance travelled by car rose by 77%.

- There was decline in the number of trips made to work by pedal cycle or motorcycle from 5% to 4%.

- Between 1996 and 2005, the fatality rates for motorcyclists remained stable at a level significantly higher than other modes (average of 111 fatalities per billion passenger kms in comparison with an average of 2.7 for car, 36 for pedal cyclists and 46 for pedestrians.)

The National Motorcycle Compendium 2007 shows that between 2004 and 2006, the greatest number of motorcycle trips was made during the week, with the
fewest trips being made on a Sunday. This would appear to indicate that the majority of trips are made for commuting or personal business purposes rather than for leisure. Data also shows that between 2004 and 2006, the majority of trips in the UK are for work, education or business purposes and that these trips account for over half of the motorcycle mileage (62%).

North Yorkshire Perspective

The 2001 census showed that motorcycling accounted for approximately 0.54 of journeys to work in comparison to 0.58 for Yorkshire and the Humber and 0.70 for England as a whole.

In North Yorkshire, between 2001 and 2007, powered two wheelers accounted for 10% of all the casualties in North Yorkshire. However, motorcyclists only make up less than 1% of the overall split of the traffic mix. On average, over the last seven years, motorcyclists have accounted for approximately 23% of all road accident related fatalities in the County each year. This situation has changed during 2008 following a step change in the measures and programmes being delivered through the 95 Alive Partnership to counter this trend.

As North Yorkshire is predominantly a rural county, which features two national parks and two areas of outstanding natural beauty, as well as some of the best loved coastline in the UK, it is very popular with visitors and has an economy predominantly founded on tourism. North Yorkshire’s roads are very popular with motorcyclists, with some towns acting as popular meeting places for recreational bikers and scooter riders. Many bikers travel from outside of North Yorkshire to enjoy the County’s scenery and the challenging roads, which are a characteristic of the rural area. However, there is also a negative aspect to the large numbers of motorcyclists attracted to the area.
There are some concerns in parts of the county such as the Dales and the North Yorkshire Moors National Parks about the speed and noise that motorbikes can cause. Large sports bikes above 500cc are involved in a disproportionately high number of road accidents.

However, in some of the most isolated rural parts of our county, people without access to a car or van may have difficulties in fully engaging in society, whether it be by accessing employment, education or healthcare. The sparsely populated nature of North Yorkshire makes provision of public transport in some areas not viable and consequently, some residents of the most rural areas may feel isolated and disengaged from society.

For the last 7 years, North Yorkshire County Council, in conjunction with Hambleton District Council and the Northallerton and District Voluntary Services Association has operated a very successful Wheels 2 Work project helping 315 young people to access work and education. The scheme has been rolled out across most of North Yorkshire. It operates by way of offering mopeds and training to people who otherwise would not be able to access education and training opportunities. All of this is done at a minimal cost. The scheme is open to all over the age of 16, but has been particularly well used by young people who are trying to get onto the first rung of the employment ladder.

Wheels 2 work is an excellent example of how P2Ws can provide a sustainable alternative to car use in line with Local Transport Plan objectives. In addition, for many people in North Yorkshire who live in rural areas, there are few opportunities to work close to home, and so in order to take up employment many people have to travel outside of their local area.

One of the stated aims of the project is to:

"to engender people’s self esteem by broadening their horizons and giving them a feeling of empowerment through mobility. Wheels 2 Work also aims to help bolster the sustainability of rural communities by reducing the pressure on people to move away to get work."

The urban areas in North Yorkshire are comparatively small, but are subject to peak hour congestion which in some areas is a direct result of tourism. Scarborough and Selby have the highest number of the NY districts of people who use a motorcycle to travel to work. Whilst there are currently no lengths of bus lane in North Yorkshire which could be used by motorcyclists to beat congestion, there remains significant advantage in motorcycle use for the urban commute, particularly from the rural to urban or inter-urban journeys.

Safety

The ‘95 Alive Partnership’ was founded in 2005 in order to develop a partnership framework which could allow NYCC and its partners to work together to deliver a reduction in KSI accidents. The aim of the partnership is to save 95 lives by 2010. The action plan for 2008 includes an action to promote the ‘Bikesafe’ and ‘Handle it or lose it’ skills training and assessment programmes for 2008-09.
Bikesafe training courses are offered on several occasions through the year and offer bikers the chance to bridge the gap between the skills they need to handle a powerful motorbike with the skills they learnt on their motorcycle test. The County Council has also promoted safer riding through the Shiny Side Up campaign which has targeted specific routes which have seen high levels of motorcycle accidents. There are also a variety of publicity events and campaigns planned for the year that are supported by North Yorkshire Police.

Working with North Yorkshire Police the County Council has continued to provide technical and financial support to the high profile enforcement campaign. The latest operations, Helical and more latterly Anvil have expanded activity from focussing purely on motorcyclists (Operation Halter) to target all motorists. The campaign is carried out on a network of roads that have been identified, through detailed casualty analysis, as having a high number of instances of motorcyclist killed and seriously injured casualties.

The 95 Alive Partnership has been selected as a case study and example of good practice on the Audit Commission website.

The Authority has purchased a promotional trailer with bespoke branding, which is used to promote road safety at local special events and can be used throughout the County. The 95 Alive Partnership have also held special events targeted at sports motorcyclists, which feature guest speakers from the world of motor sports, such as British Superbikes racers, who are able to describe their experiences of competing at the highest level whilst also promoting safer riding on our roads. Further events are planned during the winter in preparation for the next “biking” season.

Future actions

NYCC will look at ways in which powered two wheelers may be promoted as more sustainable motorised modes of travel.

NYCC will continue to identify and use appropriate ways to engage with users of powered two wheelers to allow effective communication between the Authority and users, and representative groups.

NYCC will continue to work with motorcyclists to encourage and promote safe riding.

NYCC will continue to work with partners through the 95 Alive Road Safety Partnership to coordinate their combined efforts to reduce motorbike crashes and casualties.