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1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This document represents the final stage in the development of the Hawes Service Centre Transportation Strategy (SCTS) as prepared by North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) and their partner consultants Jacobs. The document summarises the key stages in the development of the Hawes SCTS and concludes with details of the findings and recommendations proposed by the Strategy.

The Hawes SCTS is one of 28 transportation strategies to be developed across North Yorkshire during the Local Transport Plan for Period 2 (LTP2) which covers 2006 – 2011. The methodology focuses upon identifying the transport needs of ‘Service Centre’ market towns and their surrounding hinterlands and assisting in the creation of improvement schemes and initiatives aimed at providing safer, better connected and more accessible transport services linking people to key services, jobs, education and health facilities. This process builds upon the success of the Town Centre Traffic Management Studies (TMS) undertaken during the First Local Transport Plan (LTP1) Period, with the key additional focus of the SCTS being to deliver improvements within the surrounding hinterlands as well as within town centres.

The Hawes SCTS Study Area is focused upon the Market Town of Hawes, but also extends across all of Upper Wensleydale and into the western part of Lower Wensleydale, encompassing the villages of Askrigg, Aysgarth, Bainbridge, Burtersett, Carperby, Cotterdale, Gayle, Newbiggin, Thoralby and West Burton, as illustrated in Figure 1.1 below.

Figure 1.1: Hawes SCTS Study Area
1.2 Delivering the Strategy

Within the Local Transport Plan for Period 2, NYCC has an allocated budget set aside for the development and delivery of the Hawes SCTS. This budget covers the design and construction of improvement schemes put forward by the Strategy over a two year period. It will be used to deliver those schemes identified within the Strategy in order of priority. It should be noted that as this is a flexible but finite budget, that not all of the schemes put forward as a result of technical investigation and consultation will be deliverable within the available funds. Those schemes which cannot be delivered within the available budget will join the NYCC Local Transport Plan Capital Reserve List of Schemes. This is discussed in more detail later in this document.

It should also be acknowledged that the SCTS process can identify large scale improvement schemes which exceed the scope of the SCTS allocated budget. In this instance these improvement schemes will still be included within the Strategy, but with an acknowledgement that they cannot be delivered within the limits of the SCTS allocated budget. Such improvement schemes may however be progressed in line with alternative funding mechanisms available and where this is the case this has been identified within the Strategy. Alternative funding mechanisms include (but are not limited to) the following:

- NYCC Improvement Schemes already programmed for delivery within the Strategy period
- Wider Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport and Maintenance Budgets:
  - Capital Reserve List
  - Public Transport Review Process
  - Kickstart Grants
- Developer Contributions (Section 106 Agreements)
- Highways Agency Trunk Road Improvements
- Regional Transport Board / Department for Transport Local Transport Plan (LTP) Major Schemes (capital cost > £5 million)

As the findings of this process are ‘strategic’ in nature all of the Improvement Schemes put forward by the Strategy will be subject to further analysis/feasibility testing and consultation as part of the NYCC scheme development process.

1.3 Report Structure

The following chapters provide details of the SCTS Process, the prioritised list of improvement schemes for delivery within the SCTS budget and schemes identified within the Strategy for delivery subject to alternative funding mechanisms. The structure of the remainder of the document is as follows:

- Chapter 2 – Strategy Development
- Chapter 3 – Prioritised Improvement Schemes
- Chapter 4 – Improvements subject to Alternative Funding/Delivery Mechanisms
- Chapter 5 – Monitoring and Evaluation
- Chapter 6 – Summary and Conclusions
- Appendix A – Improvement Scheme Location Plans
2.1 Introduction

The key stages in the development of the Hawes SCTS are illustrated in Figure 2.1 below along with the dates that each stage was completed. Full details of each of these key stages are provided in the remaining sections of this chapter.

Figure 2.1: Strategy Development – Key Stages

- **DATA COLLECTION** - October 2007
- **FIRST STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP** - November 2007
- **SAMPLE SURVEY OF LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS** - January 2008
- **ANALYSIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES** - March 2008
- **SCHEME ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISATION** - April 2008
- **SECOND STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP** - May 2008
- **PUBLIC CONSULTATION** - July 2008
- **ADOPTION OF STRATEGY**
- **DELIVERY OF STRATEGY**

Legend:
- Phase 1: Identification of Issues
- Phase 2: Scheme Development
- Phase 3: The Strategy
2.2 Data Collection

Data Collection formed the first stage in the development of the Hawes SCTS. The process involved the collation of information and familiarisation of the Study Area and provided an important evidence base for the development and evaluation of the improvement schemes. Full details of the data collection exercise can be found within the following report: Hawes Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Base Data and Analysis Report

2.3 First Stakeholder Workshop

The second stage in the development of the SCTS was the First Stakeholder Workshop held at the Sycamore Hall in Bainbridge on 7th November 2007. Key stakeholders ranging from Parish Councillors to Local Action Groups and emergency services were invited to attend the workshop and provide their insight into the current issues affecting transportation within the Study Area. Views expressed during the workshop were used as one of the key means of driving the SCTS process forward. Full details of the First Stakeholder Workshop can be found within the following report: Hawes Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Workshop 1 Summary Note

2.4 Sample Survey

Following the First Stakeholder Workshop, a Sample Survey Questionnaire was distributed to 728 addresses within the Study Area. A total of 106 households (approximately 14.5%) responded. This survey gave a representative sample of the people living / working within the SCTS Study Area an opportunity to air their views and opinions on any local transportation issues.

2.5 Analysis and Development of Improvement Schemes

Information provided by key stakeholders and the responses received from members of the public by way of the Sample Survey, together with data analysis, was then used to develop a range of improvement schemes. Full details can be found within the following report: Hawes Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Options Report

2.6 Scheme Assessment and Prioritisation

Since the SCTS process is driven by the LTP process, it is essential that the improvement schemes put forward by the Strategy are focused upon meeting the objectives of the Government’s Shared Priorities for Transport.

Each of the proposed Improvement Schemes have therefore been appraised using NYCC’s Scheme Prioritisation System which assesses each scheme against the Shared Priorities for Transport.

This appraisal determined an overall assessment score which has been used as one of the means of identifying the Improvement Schemes to be prioritised and delivered. It also ensures consistency within the decision making process across the County.

2.7 Second Stakeholder Workshop

The purpose of the Second Stakeholder Workshop, held at the Sycamore Hall in Bainbridge on 1st May 2008, was to report back to stakeholders on the Improvement Schemes which were
developed following the issues raised at the First Stakeholder Workshop and the Sample Survey. The local stakeholders who were invited to the First Stakeholder Workshop were once again given the opportunity to provide comments and feedback on each of the Improvement Schemes before they were taken forward to the Public Consultation stage. The Second Stakeholder Workshop also gave NYCC the opportunity to feedback on Improvement Schemes which were deemed to be unfeasible due to lack of justification, physical constraints or funding issues. A review of the Second Stakeholder Workshop is contained within the following report: Hawes Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Workshop 2 Summary

2.8 Public Consultation

Following the Second Stakeholder Workshop, a full Public Consultation exercise was undertaken. This process consisted of two elements:

- Public Exhibitions
- Postal Survey of all addresses

The Public Exhibitions referenced above were held at the following locations within the Study Area:

- The Market House, Hawes (Thursday 10th July 2008)
- The Dales Countryside Museum, Hawes (Saturday 12th July 2008)

The Public Exhibitions were attended by a total of 55 people over two separate days and provided details of the SCTS process to date and also of each of the proposed Improvement Schemes put forward. These exhibitions also provided an opportunity for the public and local stakeholders to give their views and discuss any of the schemes put forward in detail with a representative of NYCC.

In addition to the Public Exhibitions, a Postal Survey of all the households and businesses within the Hawes SCTS Study Area was undertaken. This postal survey gave every household within the Study Area the opportunity to comment on the Improvement Schemes and yielded 500 responses (approximately 25% of total households). Full details of the Public Consultation Exercise can be found in: Hawes Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Consultation Results

2.9 The Strategy

Analysis of the views expressed during the Public Consultation exercise have been used to assess the level of public desire / acceptance for each of the improvement schemes put forward. This analysis along with the assessment score produced using the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System, have subsequently been used to inform the list of improvement schemes to be prioritised for delivery. The improvement schemes which have been prioritised for delivery as part of the SCTS are detailed within the following chapter.
3 Prioritised Improvement Schemes

3.1 Introduction

As outlined within the previous chapter, the SCTS process has resulted in the development of a range of improvement schemes and associated options aimed at resolving some of the transportation issues currently affecting people living and working within the Study Area.

These proposals have been developed based upon the views expressed by local stakeholders and the public, technical justification for the scheme and technical \ physical feasibility.

This chapter focuses on those improvement schemes which will be taken forward using the reserved SCTS allocation from the LTP2 and also provides a justification for those schemes discounted from the process. This is discussed in more detail below.

3.2 Methodology

Using the Scheme Assessment score determined by the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System and through statistical analysis of the views expressed through the Public Consultation exercise, a prioritised list of 12 improvement schemes has been developed. These improvement schemes are detailed within Section 3.3 below and are illustrated in the location plan in Appendix A1.

The SCTS process has ensured that these prioritised improvement schemes are focused upon meeting the needs of the people living and working within the SCTS Study Area whilst ultimately assisting in the delivery of the LTP2 objectives, and demonstrating a positive contribution to the aspirations of the Shared Priorities for Transport.

3.3 Prioritised Improvement Schemes

Table 3.1 overleaf details each of the improvement schemes which have been prioritised for delivery as part of the allocated SCTS budget. These schemes are those which demonstrate a significant contribution to the Shared Priorities for Transport and which have demonstrable support from the people living and working within the Study Area.

Those schemes shaded grey in Table 3.1 overleaf were approved by the Corporate Director: Business and Environmental Services as part of the Implementation Plan for the Strategy, as far as the Integrated Transport Capital Programme will provide the funds for their implementation.

The cost estimates included within Table 3.1 are based upon the information available at the time of investigation and as such may be subject to change at later stages of scheme development.

It is acknowledged that the allocated budget may not be sufficient to deliver all of the improvement schemes identified based upon their cost estimates. Therefore those schemes which are not delivered will join the NYCC Reserve List of Capital Schemes and will instead be delivered using the wider LTP Integrated Transport and Maintenance Budget, subject to prioritisation against the existing schemes already on the list.
Table 3.1: Prioritised Improvement Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Extension of the existing 20 mph speed limit throughout Hawes Town Centre along</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>25.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Lane, the Market Place and the northern end of Gayle Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Infrastructure Improvements outside the Creamery, Hawes</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>18.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Repositioning of the existing 30 mph speed limit signs on the eastern side of</td>
<td>£3,047</td>
<td>17.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the existing footpath between Gayle Lane Car Park and the Creamery</td>
<td>£21,000</td>
<td>16.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*** Introduction of a pedestrian crossing in the Town Centre, Hawes</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>16.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of secure cycle parking facilities on Penn Lane close to the bus stop</td>
<td>£1,292</td>
<td>16.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the Medical Practice, Hawes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road signed circular cycle route through Wensleydale and Bishopdale</td>
<td>£10,886</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road signed linear cycle route between Wensley and Hardraw</td>
<td>£21,773</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of the missing section of footway between Dale Grange and the existing</td>
<td>£30,482</td>
<td>11.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footway from Askrigg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**** Introduction of Rippleprint surfacing traffic calming measures to the west</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Askrigg Primary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a footway along Holmbrae, north of Bainbridge</td>
<td>£42,730</td>
<td>9.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a missing section of footway between the Youth Hostel and</td>
<td>£14,000</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Lane, Hawes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This proposal may necessitate the introduction of physical traffic calming measures in order to keep the speed of vehicles low. As part of the proposal to reduce the speed limit within the centre of Hawes, an alternative option which involved reducing the speed limit on Penn Lane only was also investigated. However, this option, despite it having a lower implementation cost, also generated a lower prioritisation score, and as such will not be taken forward as a scheme.

** Repositioning of the existing 30 mph signs on the eastern side of Bainbridge demonstrated particularly strong support from those who responded to the questionnaire.
As part of the detailed design stage, further investigation/localised consultation will be undertaken in order to determine the exact nature of the crossing facility required. In this instance the cost estimate may be subject to change.

As part of the proposal to reduce speeds through Askrigg, the introduction of pinch point traffic calming measures to the west of Askrigg Primary School was also investigated. Although this scheme had a lower implementation cost and a higher prioritisation score than the introduction of Rippleprint surfacing, it did not prove to be as well supported by the general public as the Rippleprint surfacing option. The introduction of pinch point traffic calming measures should be reconsidered however as part of the detailed design stage and local consultation, to determine which traffic calming option is the most viable in this area. A third additional option investigated to assist in reducing speeds through Askrigg was the introduction of a 20 mph speed limit throughout the village of Askrigg. This option was included in the Public Consultation and gained overall support from respondents. However, this option recently had its prioritisation score reassessed and did not demonstrate a significant contribution to The Shared Priorities for Transport. Therefore, this option will not be taken forward as a scheme.

The Improvement Schemes identified and prioritised within Table 3.1 above are all subject to further detailed analysis as part of the future design / build process. This may necessitate further localised consultation and detailed physical / technical feasibility assessments undertaken by the NYCC Area Highway Teams to establish their ultimate deliverability.

Table 3.2 below details the schemes that did not obtain support from the people living and working in the study area, and as such will not be taken forward for delivery as part of the Strategy.

Table 3.2: Improvement Schemes not supported by people living and working within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a formalised pedestrian crossing at the northern end of Gayle Lane, Hawes, without a full width speed table</td>
<td>£52,000 (£60,000)</td>
<td>10.13 (10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(figures for pedestrian crossing with a speed table in brackets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a formalised pedestrian crossing 35m south of the Gayle Lane Car Park Entrance, Hawes, without a full width speed table</td>
<td>£52,000 (£60,000)</td>
<td>10.13 (10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(figures for pedestrian crossing with a speed table in brackets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Improvements Subject to Alternative Funding / Delivery Mechanisms

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides details of those Improvement Schemes identified during the SCTS option development process which exceed the scope of the SCTS budget and therefore would be subject to alternative delivery and funding mechanisms. These include both Capital and ‘Non’ Capital Improvement Schemes and Initiatives.

Although it is recognised that such Improvement Schemes cannot be progressed in line with the SCTS budget, they have still been included within the Strategy, to be progressed in the future via alternative funding / delivery mechanisms. This acknowledges that in order to solve a number of the problems and issues identified by the SCTS process, access to all available NYCC funding streams and departments is required.

Those ‘Capital’ Improvement Schemes which cannot be delivered within the SCTS budget and thus are subject to alternative funding are detailed within Section 4.2 of this chapter.

Section 4.3 of this chapter provides details of the issues raised as part of the development of the SCTS which are external to, or cannot be directly resolved by, the SCTS delivery process. These have however still been included within the Strategy as recognition of their importance and to ensure joined up thinking between other departments within NYCC. These are predominantly ‘Non’ Capital Improvement Schemes and Initiatives that would need to be taken forward and delivered by a number of NYCC departments.

4.2 Capital Improvement Schemes Subject to Alternative Funding

As detailed within the introduction there are a number of Capital Improvement Schemes and Initiatives which have been identified / developed during the SCTS process which cannot be progressed within the available SCTS budget. These include:

- Improvement Schemes with a High Capital Cost
- Maintenance Budget Improvements

Full details of these schemes are provided in Section 4.2.1 below and 4.2.2 overleaf.

4.2.1 Improvement Schemes with a High Capital Cost

As detailed within Chapter 1, Improvement Schemes developed as part of the SCTS process which have a particularly high estimated Capital Cost have been deemed to be beyond the scope of the SCTS budget and as such their future delivery is dependent upon alternative funding mechanisms being available. This is to ensure that the best use is made of the available budget for the delivery of schemes as part of the SCTS process.

Three such Improvement Schemes have been identified as part of the development of the Hawes SCTS and are detailed in Table 4.1 overleaf and shown on the location plan in Appendix A2.
### Table 4.1: Improvement Schemes with a High Capital Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a footway over the existing bridge and alongside the A684 between Bainbridge and the cemetery</td>
<td>£114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a footway running parallel to the A684 between Hawes and Appersett</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a footbridge adjacent to the road bridge carrying Church Bank over the River Ure, east of Aysgarth. This footbridge would provide a much safer Non-Motorised User Route between the Yorkshire Dales National Park Visitor Centre and the A684</td>
<td>£290,000 - £440,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this stage, the only funding mechanism identified for the delivery of these schemes is the Wider Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Budget. The above schemes will therefore join the County’s Reserve List of Capital Schemes and will be subject to prioritisation against those already included within the Reserve List, which incorporates Improvement Schemes from across the County.

It is however acknowledged that during the scheme delivery stage of the SCTS, lower cost alternatives to the above schemes may be identified, which may then have the potential to merit inclusion within the prioritised list of improvement schemes.

#### 4.2.2 Maintenance Budget Improvements

Although not developed as a specific improvement scheme, one issue was raised which could potentially be taken forward in line with the NYCC Maintenance Budget. In this instance the NYCC Highways Area Manager will take ownership of this issue and consider its merit for inclusion within the forward programme of works for the area. As such there is no guarantee that improvements will be delivered within the available Maintenance Budget.

The issue raised concerned the current state of much of the white lining and junction marking on roads across the Study Area. It was therefore requested that a central white lining and junction marking audit be carried out. This would require a survey to take place across the Study Area in order to measure and assess the existing conditions of the lining and marking. Improvements could then be programmed according to the findings of the survey.

#### 4.3 ‘Non’ Capital Schemes and Initiatives

This section provides details of additional issues / concerns raised through engagement with stakeholders and the public which have not been investigated / developed as part of the SCTS. These issues are considered to be outside of the scope of the SCTS budget; however, their importance is recognised and as such they are included within the Strategy for further consideration under alternative funding / delivery mechanisms within the County Council.
These include issues relating to ‘Non’ Capital Schemes and Initiatives and are discussed under the following headings:

- Passenger Transport
- Parking
- Freight Issues

### 4.3.1 Passenger Transport

The development of the Hawes SCTS has raised a number of issues with regard to Passenger Transport within the Study Area. In particular, stakeholders have expressed specific concerns relating to existing bus services.

As identified within the LTP, such improvements are subject to cooperation between both the County Council and the Service Providers and thus are deemed to be external to the SCTS process. The opportunity does however exist for these issues to be considered as part of the NYCC Passenger Transport Review process and through ongoing investigations.

The key concerns raised as part of the stakeholder / public consultation exercises are summarised below, with comments following an initial review by the NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport Unit (IPTU) provided beneath each issue. The issues listed are derived from views expressed by stakeholders and the public and have been included for further consideration / investigation by the NYCC IPTU Unit. As such they have not undergone detailed analysis as part of the SCTS process.

- Better integration of community transport routes with walks and trails within the Study Area are needed. Utilise links better between the Little Red Bus and the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority
  - IPTU encourage organisations to co-operate in developing and improving the availability of transport links

- A Little Red Bus serving Gayle Mill would likely be very popular, due to the rejection of planning permission for a car park at the Mill
  - The County Council has a limited amount of resources at its disposal. As with all service teams within the Authority, there is a need to balance the provision of services with the need to secure value for money overall. There is already a regular daily bus service between Bedale and Gayle, and a Summer Sunday return journey to Gayle Mill

- It was suggested that bus services be better co-ordinated with medical services provision
  - Bus services in the area meet a wide variety of passenger needs and co-ordination may require changes in practice by other organisations
• The future reinstatement of the Wensleydale railway line from Redmire to Garsdale Station through Aysgarth, Askrigg, Hawes and Appersett
  o This scheme would incur very high development costs well beyond the scope of the Hawes SCTS. However, in the NYCC Local Transport Plan 2006-2011, it is acknowledged that this is an aspiration of the Wensleydale Railway Company

• Bus services within the area are too inflexible, with people only using them as a last resort
  o Although it may be possible to revise services to operate under a flexible local bus scheme, this would require all journeys to be pre-booked. The current Hawes Village Bus operates on a demand responsive basis

• Will services within the Study Area be affected by changes to bus driver working hours legislation
  o The service from Bedale to Hawes does fall within the EU drivers hours regulations

• Poor bus service provision at present between Hawes and Garsdale Station
  o There are four timetabled return journeys per day (Monday to Saturday) between Hawes and Garsdale Station. The Hawes Village Bus also operates on a demand responsive basis between 0930-1700 hrs Monday to Saturday when the bus is not operating between Hawes and Garsdale Station

• Residents of the Study Area who use the Settle to Carlisle Railway have called for increased passenger service provision on the route
  o This is currently under consideration by the rail operator (Northern Rail)

• Lack of an early afternoon bus service provided between Bainbridge and Gayle
  o There is a regular afternoon bus service at present between Bainbridge and Gayle departing Bainbridge at 1215, 1318, 1518 & 1635

• It currently takes 2 hours to get to Northallerton from Hawes by public transport, but just 1 hour (or less) by private car. Can this situation be improved via a more direct express bus service?
  o A more direct service would be possible but would reduce available services to other communities en route

• Lack of public transport provision between Hawes and Sedbergh
  o Services between Hawes and Sedbergh were withdrawn owing to extremely poor passenger numbers and high costs

With regard to requests for additional bus services and community transport services, NYCC undertake a review of contracted bus services every four years and are continually monitoring existing service contracts.
It is important that the Council strikes an appropriate balance between the need to address social exclusion by improving access and the need to secure value for money overall, whilst best utilising the limited amount of resources at its disposal.

All contracted services must meet the criteria of the Bus Strategy, which forms part of NYCC’s Local Transport Plan for 2006-2011, in that services should carry more than three passengers a journey on a regular basis and that the subsidy per passenger journey is less than £7.50.

Improvements to bus infrastructure are mainly undertaken on a corridor basis. Corridors within the District of Richmondshire will be addressed in the near future.

These improvements will include marking stops with poles, flags and timetable cases and investigating shelters at main towns and villages.

Other requests for infrastructure will be considered subject to availability of funding and the contribution to LTP priorities.

The County Council is working to improve the standard of vehicles on contracted journeys through the contract renewal process.

4.3.2 Parking

As part of the SCTS consultation process, a number of issues were raised with regard to parking provision within the Study Area. Parking on the whole has not been investigated in detail as part of the SCTS process as it is largely dependent upon Revenue Funding and responsibility is split between the County Council for on-street parking and Richmondshire District Council for off-street parking.

Where specific concerns have been raised relating to the effects of on-street parking, these have been investigated as appropriate.

Specific issues raised as part of the Stakeholder consultation process have therefore been included within the Strategy as an acknowledgement of public concerns to be considered as part of future studies / proposals. These are detailed below:

- Blue badge parking was highlighted as an issue, due to the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority charging for disabled blue badge holders to park, whereas Richmondshire District Council allows free parking for blue badge holders. Stakeholders suggested that a consistent policy be devised.

- It was highlighted that on-street parking within the Study Area is resulting in streets and routes becoming clogged up. Specific villages named were West Burton and Carperby. Stakeholders suggested designated off-street car parking facilities be introduced at both West Burton and Carperby.

- Cycling through Hawes was identified as being made more difficult due to illegal on-street parking by vehicles in certain locations, giving motorists, cyclists and pedestrians poor forward visibility of road traffic. It was also stated that a lack of enforcement of parking restrictions is prevalent in Hawes.
• It was identified that some people park their vehicles at the roadside straddling both the road and pavement, forcing pedestrians and other vulnerable road users into the road. Stakeholders wanted to see stronger enforcement of parking regulations, through traffic warden presence.

• It was highlighted that parking for residents on the Little Ings housing estate west of Gayle Lane is difficult, with parking for residents taken up during the daytime by visitors parking in front of houses. It was felt that the area should be a resident only parking area.

• It was identified that it is often difficult for residents to park within Hawes Town Centre during the daytime. Stakeholders suggested that a resident disc parking scheme be introduced following the Northallerton method, with the Market Place being set up such that residents’ parking is free on presentation of a disc, with visitors to the area having to pay to park their vehicles.

4.3.3 Freight Issues

As part of the development of the SCTS one of the key issues raised by local stakeholders and residents was the concern over heavy goods vehicle/freight traffic along the A684.

Specific concerns identified by local stakeholders during the Issue Identification process included:

• Concerns over safety within village centres and notably near Town Head in Hawes, due to large numbers of HGVs travelling along the A684

• Suggestion that a review of HGV policy through the area is needed, and that the introduction of a permit scheme be investigated

• Suggestion that HGVs be banned from travelling through Hawes on Market Days between 10am and 4pm

• Concerns over HGV traffic on the A684 at Thwaite Bridge, west of Appersett

• Suggestion that HGVs be banned from driving along the A684 through the Study Area with the exception of HGVs serving local businesses

Specific concerns raised following the Scheme Development process included:

• Suggestion that signs are provided on both the M6 (20 miles west of Hawes) and the A1(M) 29 miles east of Hawes, advising HGVs which are purely passing through between these roads to use the A66/A685 for access, rather than the 49 mile route from Leeming Bar along the A684 through Bainbridge, Hawes and Sedbergh. The A1(M)/A66/A685 route from Leeming Bar via Kirkby Stephen to Tebay is only an additional 6 miles in distance compared to the A684 through Bainbridge, Hawes and Sedbergh.

• Suggestion that traffic calming measures similar to those recently put in place at Bainbridge and Aysgarth are considered along the A684 at the western end of the village of Worton. Traffic calming here would assist in reducing vehicle speeds and improve safety at existing road junctions.
4.4 Summary

This chapter has provided details of those Improvement Schemes and Initiatives which are considered to be external to the SCTS budget and as such are subject to alternative funding and/or delivery mechanisms.

The importance of these Improvement Schemes and Initiatives has been acknowledged and as such they are still included within the Strategy along with recommendations on how they may be taken forward.
5 Monitoring and Evaluation

5.1 Introduction

This chapter details the process to be adopted in order to monitor and evaluate the Improvement Schemes delivered by the Hawes SCTS.

As stated within the LTP, it is important to identify the local outcomes which can be effectively measured following the implementation of the Improvement Schemes contained within the Strategy. This approach enables their contribution, and ultimately the whole Strategy’s contribution to the Shared Priorities to be effectively measured.

5.2 Monitoring Improvement Schemes

In this context, monitoring and evaluation is about objectively monitoring and assessing the impacts of implementing individual Improvement Schemes recommended within the Strategy. This will provide NYCC with valuable information to inform future decision making in the locality and also regarding Improvement Schemes of similar scale and nature throughout the County.

As part of the SCTS process, Improvement Schemes will be monitored pre- and post-implementation, to assess their impact on the issues which drove their development and to assess their contribution to the Shared Priorities. This will be undertaken as part of the Local Transport Plan process, with the level of assessment influenced by the size and scale of the Improvement Scheme in question. To assist in this process, a set of local indicators have been derived to act as a means of measuring the performance of the individual Improvement Schemes which are implemented.

The local indicators which have been derived to measure the performance of each of the Improvement Schemes are detailed in Table 5.1 below with definitions provided within the following sections.

Table 5.1: Improvement Scheme Local Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Local Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension of the existing 20 mph speed limit throughout Hawes Town Centre along</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Lane, the Market Place and the northern end of Gayle Lane</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Bicycle Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Infrastructure Improvements outside the Creamery, Hawes</td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patronage Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repositioning of the existing 30 mph speed limit signs on the eastern side of</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge</td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the existing footpath between Gayle Lane Car Park and the Creamery, Hawes</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Bicycle Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Description</td>
<td>Local Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a pedestrian crossing in the Town Centre, Hawes</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of secure cycle parking facilities on Penn Lane close to the bus stop and the Medical Practice, Hawes</td>
<td>Increased Bicycle Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road signed circular cycle route through Wensleydale and Bishopdale</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Bicycle Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road signed linear cycle route between Wensley and Hardraw</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Bicycle Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of the missing section of footway between Dale Grange and the existing footway from Askrigg</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of Rippleprint surfacing traffic calming measures to the west of Askrigg Primary School</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a footway along Holmabrae, north of Bainbridge</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a missing section of footway between the Youth Hostel and Gayle Lane, Hawes</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway over the existing bridge and alongside the A684 between Bainbridge and the cemetery</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A footway running parallel to the A684 between Hawes and Appersett</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway in Aysgarth adjacent to Church Lane connecting the Yorkshire Dales National Park Visitor Centre to the A684. Requires traffic light control on bridge or separate footbridge</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central white lining and junction marking audit, to improve the current state of much of the white lining and junction marking on roads across the Study Area</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of each of the Local Indicators are provided below. It is however noted that these should only be treated as a guide and each case will be assessed in detail on a site by site basis by the NYCC Highways Area Manager in order to determine whether the local
indicators will clearly demonstrate the contribution the Improvement Scheme has had towards the Shared Priorities. In accordance with the LTP, monitoring of performance against these Local Indicators and their contribution to the Shared Priorities will be a key part of the annual review process carried out by the Steering Group once the Strategy is adopted.

**Accident Reduction** – In order to assess the impact a particular Improvement Scheme has upon the accident numbers at a specific location, historical accident figures supplied by North Yorkshire Police from the ‘Stats 19’ database will be compared to those post-construction from the same source. It is however recognised that the implementation of some Improvement Schemes can be seen to only demonstrate accident savings over a limited period of time following their introduction. Accidents will therefore be monitored over a period of years to ensure that short term trends do not give a false representation of the situation.

**Increased Pedestrian Use** – Before and after footfall surveys will be used to assess whether the introduction of Improvement Schemes have assisted in encouraging pedestrian use.

**Increased Bicycle Use** – Before and after cycle counts will be used to assess whether the introduction of Improvement Schemes have assisted in encouraging cycling.

**Speed Reduction** – Measurements of traffic speed will be recorded prior to and post-implementation, to assess the level of impact the Improvement Scheme has had on overall vehicle speeds. Again, as in the case of the Accident Reduction indicator detailed above, trends will be analysed over an extended period of time to ensure initial benefits do not fall away over time.

**Attitudinal Indicator** – As the SCTS process has been driven by the needs / desires of local stakeholders and the public, an indication of the success of individual Improvement Schemes can be measured through local attitudes. The methodology to be adopted and appropriateness of this indicator would be determined on a site by site basis by the NYCC Highways Area Manager. Possible methodologies include face-to-face interviews and leaflet / questionnaire drops.

**Observational Surveys** – The greatest understanding of a situation is often gained through observation. This is particularly true of instances where the problems which an Improvement Scheme is aiming to address are not easily quantifiable and tend instead to be derived from local experience and perception.

**Patronage Numbers** – Any change in patronage numbers will be used to assess whether the introduction of a particular Improvement Scheme is having a positive contribution to encouraging people to move away from private transport towards public transport.

**Traffic Surveys** – Pre and post implementation traffic count surveys will be used in order to assess how the introduction of an improvement scheme has affected both traffic numbers and routing in order to establish whether the desired objectives are being achieved.

### 5.3 Monitoring the Strategy

The implementation of the Improvement Schemes within the Strategy will be monitored over the next 2 years. This element of the monitoring process will be ‘owned’ by the NYCC
Highways Area Manager who is responsible for the design and implementation of the Improvement Schemes contained within the Strategy. As above, this will be reported through the NYCC Local Transport Plan process. An annual report will be produced by the Area Manager for the Service Centre for consideration by the County Council’s Area Committee. This will report progress on Improvement Scheme implementation, forthcoming projects and any new projects suggested for inclusion within the Strategy.

In addition the Strategy will be treated as a ‘live’ document which is flexible in nature and able to accommodate changes in local, regional and national policy as well as available funding and third party influences such as developer contributions. Significant changes in these areas may trigger the need to revisit the Strategy and update its findings to accommodate changes.

The Strategy will also be revisited in its entirety and updated as part of the Local Transport Plan for Period 3 which covers the period April 2011 to March 2016.
6 Summary and Conclusions

6.1 Introduction

This final chapter of the document presents the Strategy for the Hawes Service Centre Study Area, provides a qualitative comment on the perceived benefits of the Strategy in the context of the Governments Shared Priorities and finally outlines the next stages in the process and how the Strategy will be adopted and then delivered.

6.2 The Strategy

Table 6.1 overleaf outlines the Prioritised Improvement Schemes to be taken forward for delivery as part of the Hawes SCTS. The Improvement Schemes have been categorised by the anticipated funding source which will be used to secure their delivery. As indicated within the introduction these include but are not limited to the following:

- SCTS budget
- NYCC Improvement Schemes already programmed for delivery within the Strategy period
- Wider Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport and Maintenance Budgets
  - Capital Reserve List
  - Public Transport Review Process
  - Kickstart Grants
- Developer Contributions (Section 106 Agreements)
- Highways Agency Trunk Road Improvements
- Regional Transport Board / Department for Transport LTP Major Schemes (capital cost > £5 million)

Again it should be noted that as there is a flexible but finite budget available for the delivery of the SCTS, not all of the Improvement Schemes put forward in the Table 6.1 overleaf will be deliverable within the available funds. In addition, as the Improvement Schemes are further developed / designed by NYCC it may be determined that some Improvement Schemes should be omitted from the process as they are not deemed to be technically feasible or have sufficient local public support.

In order to determine the anticipated benefits of the Strategy as a whole, the anticipated contribution of each of the Improvement Schemes to the Shared Priorities and hence the aspirations contained within the LTP, this information has also been provided within Table 6.1 overleaf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Contribution to Shared Priorities and LTP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCTS Allocated Budget Improvement Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of the existing 20 mph speed limit throughout Hawes Town Centre along</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Lane, the Market Place and the northern end of Gayle Lane</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Infrastructure Improvements outside the Creamery, Hawes</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repositioning of the existing 30 mph speed limit signs on the eastern side of</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the existing footpath between Gayle Lane Car Park and the</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamery, Hawes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a pedestrian crossing in the Town Centre, Hawes</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of secure cycle parking facilities on Penn Lane close to the bus stop</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the Medical Practice, Hawes</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road signed circular cycle route through Wensleydale and Bishopdale</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road signed linear cycle route between Wensley and Hardraw</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of the missing section of footway between Dale Grange and the</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing footway from Askrigg</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of Rippleprint surfacing traffic calming measures to the west of</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askrigg Primary School</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a footway along Holmbræ, north of Bainbridge</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a missing section of footway between the Youth Hostel and Gayle</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane, Hawes</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Capital Cost / Wider Local Transport Plan and Maintenance Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway over the existing bridge and along side the A684 between Bainbridge and</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the cemetery</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Description</td>
<td>Contribution to Shared Priorities and LTP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A footway running parallel to the A684 between Hawes and Appersett</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway in Aysgarth adjacent to Church Lane connecting the Yorkshire Dales National Park Visitor Centre to the A684. Requires traffic light control on bridge or separate footbridge</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central white lining and junction marking audit, to improve the current state of much of the white lining and junction marking on roads across the Study Area</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Anticipated Benefits of the Strategy

Reference to Table 6.1 above reveals that the Strategy will, in accordance with the aims and aspirations contained within NYCC’s Local Transport Plan for Period 2, deliver anticipated benefits for the Hawes SCTS Study Area against the following Governments’ Shared Priorities for Transport. The Strategy can be viewed as:

- Helping to deliver **Safer Roads** within the Study Area
- Improving **Accessibility** within the Study Area
- Helping to alleviate **Congestion** within the Study Area
- Assisting in improving **Air Quality** within the Study Area

The Strategy is a reflection of public perceptions and priorities within the Study Area and indicates a desire to focus on schemes that deliver safety and accessibility improvements. The safety schemes that have been identified indicate a desire to improve existing problem areas, whilst the accessibility improvement schemes put forward reflect the remote nature of the Study Area and a desire for increased connectivity amongst all users.

Some congestion and air quality improvements will also occur within the Study Area through the implementation of the above schemes. However, the Hawes Service Centre Transportation Strategy is predominantly a **Road Safety** and **Accessibility** Strategy, which reflects the nature of the Study Area.

The Hawes Service Centre Transportation Strategy can also be seen to support the overarching aims of NYCC’s Local Transport Plan for Period 2, which seeks to make North Yorkshire a better place by:

- Providing equality of opportunity for all
- Improving the safety and health of residents and visitors
- Increasing economic prosperity
- Building sustainable communities
Reducing the need and demand for travel

6.4 Next Steps

The next stage in the process will be for this Strategy to be submitted to the Area Committee for approval. Following its adoption, the Improvement Schemes will be taken forward for implementation by the NYCC Highways Area Manager and the success of the Strategy monitored against the approach identified within Chapter 5.

For those Improvement Schemes which lie outside the remit of the NYCC Highways Area Manager, for example revenue dependent public transport improvements, these Improvement Schemes will be allocated to the relevant part of the County Council for further investigation and, as appropriate, delivery. These Improvement Schemes will also be monitored in line with the approach identified within Chapter 5.
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Appendix A1: Prioritised Schemes Location Plan

Appendix A2: Wider LTP Integrated Transport and Maintenance Budgets
Schemes Location Plan
Prioritised Improvement Schemes within Hawes:

1. Extension of the existing 20 mph speed limit throughout Hawes Town Centre along Penn Lane, the Market Place and the northern end of Gayle Lane
2. Bus Stop Infrastructure Improvements outside the Creamery
3. Improvements to the existing footpath between Gayle Lane Car Park and the Creamery
4. Introduction of a pedestrian crossing in the Town Centre
5. Provision of secure cycle parking facilities on Penn Lane close to the bus stop and the Medical Practice
6. Introduction of a missing section of footway between the Youth Hostel and Gayle Lane, Hawes

Anticipated Contribution to Shared Priorities:

- Helping to deliver Safer Roads within the Study Area
- Improving Accessibility within the Study Area
- Assisting in improving Air Quality within the Study Area
- Tackling Congestion within the Study Area
Prioritised Improvement Schemes:

1. Repositioning of the existing 30 mph speed limit signs on the eastern side of Bainbridge
2. On-road signed circular cycle route through Wensleydale and Bishopdale
3. On-road signed linear cycle route between Wensley and Hardraw
4. Provision of the missing section of footway between Askrigg and the existing footway from Askrigg
5. Introduction of Rippleprint surfacing traffic calming measures to the west of Askrigg Primary School
6. Provision of a footway along Holmbrae, north of Bainbridge

Anticipated Contribution to Shared Priorities:

- Helping to deliver Safer Roads within the Study Area
- Improving Accessibility within the Study Area
- Assisting in improving Air Quality within the Study Area
- Tackling Congestion within the Study Area
Anticipated Contribution to Shared Priorities:

- Helping to deliver Safer Roads within the Study Area
- Improving Accessibility within the Study Area
- Assisting in improving Air Quality within the Study Area
- Tackling Congestion within the Study Area
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Footway over the existing bridge and alongside the A684 between Bainbridge and the cemetery

Footway in Aysgarth adjacent to Church Lane connecting the YDNP Visitor Centre to the A684.

Requires traffic light control on bridge or separate footbridge
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Anticipated Contribution to Shared Priorities:

- Helping to deliver Safer Roads within the Study Area
- Improving Accessibility within the Study Area
- Assisting in improving Air Quality within the Study Area
- Tackling Congestion within the Study Area

14 A footway running parallel to the A684 between Hawes and Appersett

A footway running parallel to the A684 between Hawes and Appersett