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1. Introduction

North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC), in its role as the Highway Authority for Skipton, has traditionally targeted local issues and problems by introducing appropriate remedial measures. This approach has generated some success, but it is felt that the time has been reached where the traffic problems demand the development of a long-term comprehensive strategy. To do nothing is not a viable option if the future prosperity of Skipton is to be assured.

The overall aim of the study is to produce an integrated Traffic Management Strategy for Skipton, aimed at securing long lasting improvements, especially for vulnerable road users, whilst maximising economic and environmental well being and minimising existing or potential sources of detrimental impact.

A copy of the consultants brief for the study is included as Appendix 1. While not totally prescriptive, it sets out stages included in the study process. These have been used to establish the structure of this report, which has been developed within the framework set by the NYCC Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2001–2006 dated July 2000, and the Craven District Local Plan adopted in July 1999.

Transport and access issues have been afforded a high priority within Skipton for a number of years. Oscar Faber undertook a Traffic Management Study of the town in 1994 and more recently NYCC’s Area Highway Sub-Committee agreed that a comprehensive review was required. The NYCC officers undertook initial groundwork towards the production of this new Traffic Management Strategy. This included the distribution and processing of a residents and business survey in March 2001, the results from which are discussed in Section 3.14.

The development of the strategy continued with a participatory approach building on the foundations laid by the aforementioned survey. Such an approach was deemed to be essential in order to ground the strategy in reality, develop a consensus on the way forward and generate a sense of ownership amongst local business and residents. The attendees of workshops held as part of this process are listed in Appendix 2.

The strategy proposed within this document identifies costs and prioritises a programme of schemes for implementation. The Pedestrian Action Plan and Cycling Plan for Skipton can be read as separate documents, but form an integral part of the strategy and have been included as Appendix 3 and 4 respectively.
2. The Skipton Study Area

2.1 Location

The study area is highlighted on Figure 1, which also sets the town within the wider spatial context. The study area is bounded by but does not include the A629 to the West and A59 to the North. To the East it includes the entire urban area and to the South it extends beyond that adopted in the 1994 study to encompass the Snaygill Industrial Estate.

Figure 1: Location Plan and Study Area
2.2 Character of the Town

Skipton is characterised by its historic core surrounded by more recent industrial and residential development. It is a main service centre and contains shopping facilities including:

- An open-air market located along the High Street
- The Victorian style shopping arcade of Craven Court
- Rackhams and Sunwin (Co-op) department stores
- Numerous national chain stores and
- Small local specialist shops on Coach Street, Newmarket Street and Otley Street.

Skipton also attracts large numbers of tourists, being a gateway to the Yorkshire Dales and home to a number of tourist attractions including Skipton Castle, the Craven Museum and the Leeds and Liverpool Canal, which is popular for narrow boat cruises.

Extensive residential areas have been developed to three sides of Skipton, the northern quadrant between Skipton Castle and the bypass remaining undeveloped. These areas vary greatly in character from the traditional terraced housing of Middletown, off Broughton Road and off Granville Street, to the large detached properties off Grassington Road. To the East of the town and within Burnside, semi-detached houses and linked-terraces dominate. Within the residential areas, facilities with the exception of small shops and primary schools are minimal, residents having to visit the town centre to meet most needs. Segregated pedestrian footpaths between the residential areas and town centre are limited, and thus, the core of the highway network fulfils this role.

There are 10 schools located within Skipton and one Further Education College. Craven College, the three secondary schools - Aireville School, Skipton Girls’ High School and Ermysted’s Grammar School are all located on Gargrave Road, as is St. Stephen’s Catholic Primary School. Whilst a large number of pupils travel by bus to the High School and Grammar School, Gargrave Road remains a key pedestrian route for school children. Additional pedestrian traffic is generated on Water Street from the Water Street Community Primary School, (located on Elliot Street) adding to numbers accessing the North end of the High Street from Gargrave Road. To the East of Middletown, Skipton Parish Church CE Primary School, is located on Brougham Street, used locally as a rat-run between Otley Road and Keighley Road. Other primary schools include Brooklands School (located at the end of a cul-de-sac), Greatwood Community Primary School (within a traffic calmed area), Christ Church CE Primary School (on Craven Street) and Skipton Ings Community Primary and Nursery School (on Broughton Road).
In addition to the numerous employees working in the town centre, the Skipton Building Society with headquarters on The Bailey, Kingsley Cards at Belle Vue Mills and the Snaygill Industrial Estate off Keighley Road are the main employment centres. To a lesser extent, a number of industrial units are located on Engine Shed Lane and on the Sandylands Business Park.

Other facilities include, Skipton General Hospital, two medical surgeries located close to the town centre, a swimming pool facility, two leisure centres, a fitness studio, a dance studio, a bowling club, various football / rugby facilities, numerous public houses and restaurants, a cinema, a nightclub, Town and District Council offices, a post office, numerous banks and other business/personal services.

2.3 Demography

14000 people are resident in the six wards that comprise the urban area of Skipton and its immediate hinterland. Of these:

- 2800 are aged under 16;
- 7800 are aged between 16 and 59; and,
- 3400 are aged 60 or over.

There are 9000 jobs in the town and 830 people are claiming some form of disability related benefit. The population is evenly distributed between the ABC1 and C2DE socio-economic groupings

2.4 Access

Skipton is a crossroads for a number of routes and thus can be accessed from both its immediate hinterland and also quickly from further away. The main roads are:

- The B6265 from the Yorkshire Dales National Park and the North
- The A59 from Harrogate and York in the East and Gisburn, Clitheroe and North East Lancashire in the West
- The A65 from Ilkley, Otley and Leeds in the East and Gargrave and Settle in the West, and
- The A629 from Keighley, Bingley, Bradford, and Halifax.
The town has extensive on-street and off-street car parking, including large car parks at major edge of town centre retail stores.

Skipton is also well connected to both bus and rail networks, detailed in Table 1 and Table 2 respectively. The bus station is located on Keighley Road and the Rail Station of Broughton Road. The two are linked by ‘Black Walk’ a pedestrian route that is not currently suitable for wheelchair access.

2.5 Historical Development

Skipton is a settlement with a history dating back to the early part of the past millennium, a timber castle being constructed in about 1100. By the 18th century, courts were being held in the town, but it wasn’t until industrialisation and the arrival of factories in the 19th century that the town recognisable today began to develop. More recently change has continued with the decline of traditional industries and a shift towards the financial services sector.

2.6 Transport development

Throughout its history, Skipton has been a focal point for travellers attracted by the facilities and hospitality on offer. The outlying highway network developed from turnpikes whilst the infill of urban routes grew sporadically from the tracks of horse and foot traffic. As well as being served by the highway network, Skipton was also accessed by the Leeds and Liverpool Canal and later the railway.

The core highway network has developed little and within the town is now generally considered to be inappropriate for modern traffic volumes. A bypass was constructed to the North and West of the town in the early 1980s, although latterly traffic conditions have deteriorated in both the town centre and in the Middletown area.
3. Transport in Skipton

3.1 Main traffic generators

As a town, Skipton is multifaceted, catering for those living locally, those working or being educated locally and those passing through. In turn, each of these groups uses the town for different purposes, in different ways and at different times. This can lead to localised transport related problems. The main traffic generators are highlighted in Figure 2, these include, supermarkets, schools and colleges on Gargrave Road, the Snaygill Industrial Estate, Skipton Building Society headquarters, the hospital, town centre, bus and rail stations.

Figure 2: Main Traffic Generators
3.2 Major pedestrian activities

Particularly high pedestrian flows have been recognised on High Street, at Caroline Square, on Newmarket Street, from Swadford Street to Broughton Road, on Jerry Croft, on Coach Street, and at particular times on Gargrave Road. Significant numbers of pedestrians have also been noted crossing:

- Keighley Road between Sackville Street and the pedestrian entrance to the bus station; and,
- At the entrance to Tesco where the flow along Black Walk is directed towards Carleton Street (Plate 1).

Plate 1: The exit from Black Walk towards Carleton Street

Only limited pedestrian count information is available related to the provision of the pedestrian crossing facility on Broughton Road in the vicinity of the Railway Station and on The Bailey. The high number of pedestrian accidents related to substandard pedestrian infrastructure on Newmarket Street should also be noted and is covered in more detail in Section 3.13.
3.3 Major cyclist activities

There are numerous factors affecting levels of cycle use, including the provision of facilities, topography and weather. At a town wide level, 27% of households participating in the TMS Survey reported at least some cycling activity whilst 12% of households reported that they cycle often. 12% of those aged between 16 and 25, 15% of those aged between 26 and 60, and 5% of those aged over 60 stated that they cycle often.

18% of those “between jobs” cycle, compared to 15% of those in work and only 5% of those in education.

The levels of cycling at detailed locations in Skipton have recently been identified through traffic counts and turning counts at strategic locations in the study area. These counts, detailed below, exhibit considerable variation, which at least in part, can be attributed to prevailing weather conditions.

- Pedal cycle counts
  - Traffic counts detailed in Section 3.8 indicate that cycles account for 0.6% of vehicle movements in Skipton. Therefore it is of concern that cyclists account for 17.5% of accidents resulting in injury and 23.5% of serious accidents, discussed further in Section 3.13.

- Turning counts
  - Cycle turning counts were undertaken during August and September 2000, on two weekdays and two days at the weekend. There is not yet sufficient count data to establish trends or provide comparison with other comparable towns. General observations from the count data at each survey site are:
    - Snaygill Industrial Estate / Keighley Road
      - On weekdays the main flow is travelling through the junction on Keighley Road. Up to seven people accessed Snaygill Industrial Estate and two children were observed travelling North on Keighley Road.
      - During the weekend counts a flow of over 60 cyclists travelling in each direction were recorded on 30 September, although 29 of these appear to be travelling in a group, passing South between 10:00 and 11:00 and passing North between 11:00 and 12:00. 10 cyclists were recorded turning right from the unclassified route from Low Bradley, on to Keighley Road in the direction of the Town Centre. Levels of cycling recorded on 26 August were lower with the maximum 12-hour flow being 25 cyclists heading South on Keighley Road. No children were recorded cycling through the junction at weekends.
• Gargrave Road / Coach Street / Water Street
  • Weekday counts recorded an average of 21 cyclists travelling westbound on Gargrave Road, whilst 10 were recorded travelling eastbound. Roughly half of the cyclists recorded were children in the count undertaken during term-time. 12-hour flows recorded up to 24 cyclists on Water Street and 17 cyclists on Coach Street.
  • The influence of weather can be observed from the counts undertaken at weekends. Rain during the count in August appears to have reduced the level of cycling by over 60%.

• North and South of the High Street
  • The High Street acts as a focal point for cycling activity within Skipton.
  • The majority of cyclists appear to be in large groups with a background level of under 5 cyclists entering the High Street per hour. If groups of cyclists are to stop in the town, then parking facilities need to be provided for large numbers in a central visible location.
  • Newmarket Street is the least used entrance to the High Street by cyclists.
  • Cycle flows in and around the High Street are detailed in Figure 3.

Additional cycle use has been identified on the existing canal towpaths through the town, including that running parallel to Keighley Road. The quality of the surfacing and width of these paths is currently substandard for cycle use. There is also considerable potential for cycle tourism with many recreational tour operators providing guided routes through the town.

Two sections of existing cycle infrastructure have been identified. The first and more extensive is an advisory cycle lane on Gargrave Road between the bypass and Harewood Road (entrance to Airedale Park). The second a short section of joint use cycle path crossing over the top of the freight rail line to Grassington, between Carleton Road and the entrance to Brooklands School. The gradient on the latter and its intersection with Carleton Road are of concern.
Figure 3: Cycle Flows - 12 hour counts: High Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In (WD)</th>
<th>To B (WD)</th>
<th>Out (WD)</th>
<th>To M (WD)</th>
<th>In (WD)</th>
<th>Out (WD)</th>
<th>To N (WD)</th>
<th>In (WD)</th>
<th>Out (WD)</th>
<th>To N (WD)</th>
<th>Out (WD)</th>
<th>To S (WE)</th>
<th>Out (WD)</th>
<th>To N (WE)</th>
<th>Out (WD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (WD)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (WE)</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WD = Weekday; WE = Weekend)
3.4 Public transport facilities and services

Mouchel undertook a survey of bus stops in Skipton between the end of November 2001 and early January 2002. 48 stops were identified. It is also understood that services operate on an informal hail-and-ride basis in the residential areas to the East and North East of the town centre. Key facts generated by the survey are:

A flag attached to a lamppost identifies 40% of stops and one attached to a pole 38%. The stops located on High Street are particularly poor, only being identified by lines painted on the road surface. With the exception of the bus station (Plate 2) only one stop has a shelter.

Of the companies and organisations shown on flags, 12 indicate Keighley and District, 7 the former West Yorkshire National Bus Company subsidiary, 4 North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) and 1 National Express. Some flags include a telephone number but this is not necessarily current. Only flags provided by NYCC display the national traveline number 0870 608 2 608.

17% of stops include a timetable and/or routing information, whilst 10% include the date of such information and 6% indicate fares. Damage was reported at 19% of stops, the most common damage being to the flag, pole and timetable case.

Bus services to and from Skipton are detailed in Table 1.

Plate 2: Skipton Bus Station
Table 1: Weekday bus services for destinations with at least one direct service per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Return services per day</th>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>First outward service departs</th>
<th>Last return service departs</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addingham</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:45</td>
<td>22:47</td>
<td>00:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airedale Hospital</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>08:55</td>
<td>23:12</td>
<td>00:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 x AM, 2 x PM</td>
<td>06:35</td>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>00:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnoldswick</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Better than hourly</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>20:45</td>
<td>00:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramhope</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:45</td>
<td>22:02</td>
<td>01:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Two hourly</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>19:01</td>
<td>00:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burley</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:45</td>
<td>22:26</td>
<td>00:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>21:55</td>
<td>01:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>19:15</td>
<td>00:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clitheroe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Two hourly</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>18:20</td>
<td>00:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colne</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>22:23</td>
<td>00:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cononley</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>08:55</td>
<td>23:27</td>
<td>00:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowling</td>
<td>4 x PM (No return)</td>
<td>12:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracoe</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:20</td>
<td>20:10</td>
<td>00:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosshills</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Better than half hourly</td>
<td>06:43</td>
<td>23:06</td>
<td>00:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>22:35</td>
<td>00:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embrey</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>08:05</td>
<td>17:45</td>
<td>00:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foulridge</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>22:29</td>
<td>00:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargrave</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>06:35</td>
<td>17:56</td>
<td>00:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giggleswick</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:25</td>
<td>17:27</td>
<td>00:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisburn</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Two hourly</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>18:35</td>
<td>00:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glusburn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>08:55</td>
<td>16:48</td>
<td>00:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassington</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:20</td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>00:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebden</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:20</td>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>00:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellifield</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:25</td>
<td>17:46</td>
<td>00:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetton</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:20</td>
<td>20:13</td>
<td>00:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilkley</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:45</td>
<td>22:40</td>
<td>00:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Better than half hourly</td>
<td>06:20</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>00:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelbrook</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>22:40</td>
<td>00:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kildwick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outbound from Kildwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:45</td>
<td>21:36</td>
<td>01:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linton</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:20</td>
<td>20:05</td>
<td>00:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Preston</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:25</td>
<td>17:40</td>
<td>00:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lothersdale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 x PM</td>
<td>12:07</td>
<td>15:08</td>
<td>00:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Bradley</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Half hourly</td>
<td>08:55</td>
<td>17:28</td>
<td>00:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 x AM, 2 x PM</td>
<td>06:35</td>
<td>16:35</td>
<td>00:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>22:10</td>
<td>00:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 x AM, 2 x PM</td>
<td>06:35</td>
<td>16:50</td>
<td>00:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otley</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:45</td>
<td>22:16</td>
<td>00:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Two hourly</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>17:20</td>
<td>01:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryleston</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:20</td>
<td>20:15</td>
<td>00:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:25</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>00:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silsden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Three hourly</td>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>14:24</td>
<td>00:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steeton</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Better than half hourly</td>
<td>06:20</td>
<td>23:08</td>
<td>00:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton in Craven</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Better than half hourly</td>
<td>06:20</td>
<td>23:19</td>
<td>00:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton in Craven</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>22:50</td>
<td>00:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshfield</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:20</td>
<td>20:03</td>
<td>00:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Marton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Two hourly</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>18:55</td>
<td>00:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to traditional public transport services, Skipton and Craven Action for Disability (SCAD), operate a community transport service for both individuals and groups. SCAD currently has two vehicles in Skipton, both are fully wheelchair accessible. The cost of the service to the individual users is:

- An annual registration fee of £5
- £1 for a short hop of up to three miles
- £2.50 for a journey of between 3 and 30 miles.
- 50p per mile for longer journeys

For groups the annual fee is £10 and the rate of 50p per mile applies to all journeys.

3.5 Rail

Skipton is well served by local, regional and national rail services, being 12 minutes from Keighley, 45 minutes from Leeds, around 3 hours from London and 4 hours from Glasgow. Leeds and intermediate stations are served by in excess of 60 services per day, at rates of up to 5 services per hour. Full details of destinations with at least 1 direct service per week, are summarised in Table 2. Services with up to one change were included when this did not significantly increase the duration of the journey. Arriva services operated by bus due to driver shortages at the time of the survey were excluded when the duration of the journey was significantly increased compared to that usually experienced by rail.

In March 2001, Halcrow Fox undertook an accessibility audit of Skipton Station for the West Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive. The resulting report dated May 2001, highlighted the unsuitability of the direct route from the rail to bus station (Black Walk) for wheelchair users. It continued that the alternate wheelchair route using the road system needed the installation of dropped kerbs and a ‘proper signing system to distinguish between pedestrian and wheelchair access’. The full list of recommendations is included as Appendix 5. The priority issues are identified as:

- The provision of dropped kerbing and tactile paving on key access routes;
- Signing between rail and bus stations; and,
- Re-marking existing disabled parking bays.
Table 2: Weekday rail services for destinations with at least one direct service per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Return services per day</th>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>First outward service departs</th>
<th>Last return service departs</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appleby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>approx. every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>18:36</td>
<td>01:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnthwaite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>approx. every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>18:08</td>
<td>01:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>every 4 to 5 hours</td>
<td>05:33</td>
<td>20:49</td>
<td>00:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>up to 5 per hour</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>23:32</td>
<td>00:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Forster Sq.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>up to 4 per hour</td>
<td>06:03</td>
<td>23:06</td>
<td>00:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>every 2 hours</td>
<td>05:33</td>
<td>18:35</td>
<td>02:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnforth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>every 4 to 5 hours</td>
<td>05:33</td>
<td>17:09</td>
<td>01:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>every 4 to 5 hours</td>
<td>05:33</td>
<td>21:04</td>
<td>00:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cononley</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>up to 5 per hour</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>23:46</td>
<td>00:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossflatts</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>up to 4 per hour</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>23:34</td>
<td>00:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>approx. every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>19:08</td>
<td>00:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frizinghall</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>up to 4 per hour</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>23:09</td>
<td>00:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargrave</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30 mins to 3 hours</td>
<td>05:33</td>
<td>21:54</td>
<td>00:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garstade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>approx. every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>19:03</td>
<td>00:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giggleswick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>every 4 to 5 hours</td>
<td>05:33</td>
<td>21:19</td>
<td>00:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Central</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>04:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellfield</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30 mins to 3 hours</td>
<td>05:33</td>
<td>21:39</td>
<td>00:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horton-in-Ribblesdale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>approx. every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>21:06</td>
<td>00:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>up to 5 per hour</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>23:38</td>
<td>00:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkby Stephen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>approx. every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>18:49</td>
<td>01:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>every 2 to 5 hours</td>
<td>05:33</td>
<td>19:30</td>
<td>01:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langwithby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>approx. every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>18:22</td>
<td>01:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazonby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>approx. every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>18:16</td>
<td>01:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>up to 5 per hour</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>23:13</td>
<td>00:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Kings Cross</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>20:30</td>
<td>03:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Preston</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>every 2 to 5 hours</td>
<td>05:33</td>
<td>21:29</td>
<td>00:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowhall</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>21:29</td>
<td>02:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morecambe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>approx. every 2 hours</td>
<td>05:33</td>
<td>19:10</td>
<td>01:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherwell</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>15:51</td>
<td>04:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorthorpe</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>21:59</td>
<td>01:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribblehead</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>approx. every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>00:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltaire</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>up to 5 per hour</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>23:28</td>
<td>00:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>approx. every 2 hours</td>
<td>09:27</td>
<td>21:14</td>
<td>00:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>up to half hourly</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>22:18</td>
<td>02:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipley</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>up to 5 per hour</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>23:26</td>
<td>00:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steeton &amp; Silsden</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>up to 5 per hour</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>23:42</td>
<td>00:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinton (S. Yorks.)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>hourly</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>21:44</td>
<td>01:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield Westgate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>up to 3 per hour</td>
<td>05:48</td>
<td>22:45</td>
<td>01:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wennington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>every 4 to 5 hours</td>
<td>05:33</td>
<td>17:22</td>
<td>00:45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Taxis

Taxi ranks are located in the bus station and on Swadford Street, with space for 14 and 4 taxis respectively.
3.7 Motorbikes

Flows of motorcycles appear to centre on High Street, with Table 3 indicating that motorcycle use is at a similar level to that of pedal cycles. As with pedal cycles there is currently a lack of high visibility motorcycle parking within the town.

3.8 Major vehicle activities

There are several key routes intersecting at Skipton:

- To the North, the B6265 heading into the Yorkshire Dales National Park;
- To the East, the A59 to Harrogate and A65 to Ilkley, Otley and Leeds;
- To the South, the A629 providing links to Keighley, Bingley, Bradford, and Halifax;
- To the West, the A59 to Gisburn, Clitheroe and North East Lancashire; and,
- To the Northwest, the A65 to Gargrave and Settle.

The bypass constructed in the 1980s, has the potential if correctly signed in combination with measures in the town, to channel non-Skipton bound traffic around the urban area. Tables 3 and 4 detail 12-hour traffic counts within Skipton. Of particular interest are flows:

- On High Street, which reach 7552 vehicles per day heading South and 6052 heading North. Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic accounts for between 2.1% and 2.2% of this traffic.
- At Skipton Roundabout to the South of the Snaygill Industrial Estate, counts indicate that around 60% of vehicles heading North and 18% of vehicles heading South on the A629, turn towards Skipton on Keighley Road. This turning movement results in a flow of 6170 vehicles rising to 7024 vehicles on Keighley Road at its junction with Cross Street.
### Table 3: Observed Traffic Counts (12 Hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>In/out</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>LGV</th>
<th>HGV</th>
<th>All Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A6131 (Hawbank Tunnel)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6131 (Hawbank Tunnel)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4975</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>6052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6208</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>7552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6069 (SW of Tiffany Bridge)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2158</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6069 (SW of Tiffany Bridge)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton Road (East of Station)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>5109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton Road (East of Station)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3559</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>4187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton Road (West of Station)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2544</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton Road (West of Station)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3094</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish Street</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish Street</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Street</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Street</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LGV - Light Goods Vehicle

### Table 4: Derived Traffic Counts (12 Hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>In/out</th>
<th>Bicycles</th>
<th>Medium Goods Vehicle</th>
<th>HGV</th>
<th>All Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keighley Road @ Cross Street</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley Road @ Cross Street</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>6434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley Road @ Skipton Roundabout</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>6170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley Road @ Skipton Roundabout</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>5426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A629 (North) @ Skipton Roundabout</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Bypass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>4018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A629 (North) @ Skipton Roundabout</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Bypass</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>4717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A629 (South) @ Skipton Roundabout</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>8755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A629 (South) @ Skipton Roundabout</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>8710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9 Car parks, off-street and on-street parking, coach parking, waiting restrictions.

There are four main types of car parking in Skipton:

- Public off-street;
- Public on-street;
- Private residential; and,
- Private non-residential (PNR).

The strategy will primarily consider the two types of public parking, these being those over which NYCC and Craven District Council (CDC) exert control respectively. It is felt unlikely that workplace-parking levies will be introduced to influence PNR parking. CDCs adopted parking standards for new developments are in line with those adopted by NYCC.

Public off-street parking

CDC controls 1171 public off-street car parking spaces for which charges are made. These spaces are distributed off High Street (commonly referred to as the Town Hall Car Park), on Cavendish Street, on Coach Street and on Keighley Road/Waller Hill. The Town Hall Car Park also accommodates up to 13 coaches, whilst overflow coach parking is provided at the Swimming Pool, accessed off Gargrave Road. The charges for CDC public off-street parking are detailed in Table 5.

Table 5: Craven District Council: off-street parking charges: 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Charge (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 hour</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 hours*</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3 hours</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 4 hours</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4 hours (Cavendish Street)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4 hours (High Street)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Maximum stay at Keighley Road/Waller Hill

A number of parking permits are also made available for both residents and non-residents allowing either 3 hours or 23 hours parking in the Cavendish Street and Coach Street car parks. The 3-hour residents permit currently costs £16 per annum with the 23-hour permit priced at £75. The cost of the latter for non-residents is £250. Residents’ permits are also valid for up to 3 hours parking per day in the Town Hall Car Park during the period between 1 November and 28 February.
In addition to use by permit holders, CDC estimate from ticket sales that 619,846 vehicles including 5448 coaches will use its car parks in Skipton during the financial year 2001/02. The data provided by CDC also provides the following profile of the length of stay:

- 37% up to one hour;
- 35% up to two hours;
- 13% up to three hours; and,
- 15% four hours or over.

**Public on-street parking**

Parking is also permitted during non-market days on the setts in High Street. Parking restrictions covering the setts are summarised below.

- Monday, Wednesday, Friday & Saturday – No parking 06:00 to 18:45
- Tuesday and Thursday – 08:00 to 18:00 – Maximum stay 2 hours, no return within 1 hour
- No restrictions at other times
- No parking on the carriageway

Specific information relating to on street parking for disabled badge holders is still to be determined.

**Private non-residential (PNR) parking**

Considerable amounts of private non-residential car parking exist in Skipton, provided by both the retail and business sectors.

Parking at Tesco and Focus Do-it-all is currently free, whilst Morrisons supermarket on Broughton Road levees charges periodically of £1 for 2 hours, refundable at the till. After 2 hours, the charge is £1 per hour and this is not refundable.

Skipton Building Society provides off-street parking spaces for its employees, at the headquarters building located off The Bailey.

**Waiting restrictions**

On the main routes through Skipton, the use of double yellow lines (no parking at any time) predominates. The extent of restrictions is detailed in Table 6.
### Table 6: Waiting Restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Extent of restrictions from the Town Centre.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Bailey</td>
<td>Double yellow lines to Skipton Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otley Road</td>
<td>Double yellow lines - North side to garage (Peter Watson) East of Skipton Police Station – South side to opposite King’s Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargrave Road</td>
<td>Double yellow lines on both sides to Harewood Road (entrance to Airedale Park) except in designated bays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley Road</td>
<td>Double yellow lines both sides to Nos. 37/39 (South of Lower Union Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Bridge</td>
<td>Double yellow lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raikes Road</td>
<td>Single yellow lines (no parking Mon-Sat 08:00 – 18:00) to Raikes Avenue. No restrictions are present on Grassington Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residents Parking

It is acknowledged that commuter parking and parking by shoppers in residential streets, often by drivers avoiding car park charges, causes nuisance and disturbance to residents. Thus, a residents parking survey was undertaken in Skipton by NYCC during 1999. An additional survey of Bellevue Terrace on Broughton Road was undertaken as part of the TMS in late 2001.

Over 2050 public on-street parking spaces were surveyed, around half of which were in use at any given time (Figure 4). The survey also revealed that at 10am, individuals not resident to a particular street occupied over 74% of spaces (Figure 5). Although it is likely that a number of these individuals may be a resident in another part of Skipton, a considerable number must travel in to the area, representing an untapped revenue source.
Figure 4: Percentage occupancy of on street parking spaces

Reproduced from Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
North Yorkshire County Council
License No. LA003135 1006.
Figure 5: Percentage of on street parking attributed to non-residents
3.10 One-way streets, roundabouts, weight-height-width-access restrictions, speed limits

The section of Coach Street between Belmont Bridge and Bridge Street is one way Northbound, as is Rectory Lane between Rope Walk and The Bailey. Otley Street is one-way eastbound between High Street and Court Lane. Access to Sheep Street is restricted and Castle Street has no access from Keighley Road (except for pedestrians).

A three-arm roundabout, formed by the war memorial, is located at the North end of High Street.

Mini-roundabouts are located at:
- Caroline Square;
- The intersection of Newmarket Street, Otley Road, Shortbank Road and Brougham Street;
- The intersection of Gargrave Road and Rockwood Drive; and,
- The entrance to Morrisons on Broughton Road.

Heavy Commercial Vehicle (HCV) traffic accessing the town is constrained by low bridges on both Broughton Road and Keighley Road. The bridge carrying Carleton New Road over Broughton Road and the railway limits traffic on Broughton Road to a height of 15 feet, whilst a height limit of 14 feet is in force on Keighley Road.

Newmarket Street currently caters for two-way traffic with a total carriageway width of 4.36 metres.

‘New Bridge’ on Coach Street has a weight limit of 7 tonnes.

Grassington Road has a weight limit of 7.5 tonnes.

30mph speed limits apply within the urban area.

3.11 Traffic signals and pedestrian crossings

Prior to the development of the Traffic Management Strategy there were no signal-controlled junctions in Skipton. The junction of Keighley Road and Carleton Road was signalised in 2003.

There are a number of pedestrian crossing facilities in the town, however, the presence of measures for sensory impaired users are often lacking. The locations of these facilities are shown in Figure 6 and the current state of the facility is detailed in Table 7.
Figure 6: Location of pedestrian crossing facilities

Table 7: Details of Pedestrian Crossing Facilities: 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 6 ID</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Tactile Paving</th>
<th>Tactile Cones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gargrave Road in vicinity of Coach Street car park</td>
<td>Pelican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>Pelican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Broughton Road outside Skipton Railway Station</td>
<td>Puffin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Swadford Street</td>
<td>Pelican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Newmarket Street in Vicinity of Telephone Exchange</td>
<td>Zebra</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Keighley Road, North of Waller Hill</td>
<td>Pelican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Keighley Road, North of Craven Street</td>
<td>Zebra</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.12 Known traffic speed problems, law breaking and enforcement

There is a perception that speeding is a problem within Skipton although it is felt that travel at inappropriate speeds rather than law breaking may be the issue.

3.13 Road traffic accidents

155 accidents resulting in injury were reported in the study area between July 1998 and June 2001. The location, number and severity of accidents that occurred during this period are indicated in Figure 8.

Of these accidents 6 involved a HGV, 13 a motorcycle, 19 a LGV, 26 a cyclist and 53 a pedestrian. 23.5% of serious accidents involved a cyclist whilst a further 41% involved a pedestrian. The age profile of motorcyclists, cyclists and pedestrians involved in accidents is shown in Figure 7. 78% of accidents occurred in daylight and 22% in darkness. No accidents were reported during the hours of darkness on unlit roads. However, in daylight 70% of accidents occurred in dry conditions, whilst in darkness 73.5% of accidents occurred when the road surface is wet.

Figure 7: The age profile of motorcyclists, cyclists and pedestrians injured in accidents: 1998-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8: Key accident hotspots: 1998-2001

1: Caroline Square Area
2: Keighley Road / Craven Street / Upper Union Street
3: Keighley Road / Carleton Road
4: Keighley Road / Cawder Road
5: Broughton Road (in vicinity of Station)
6: Brougham Road and Sackville Street

© Mouchel Parkman
Issue 2 25
Accident Hotspots

This subsection provides details of accident hotspots within the study area, i.e. those locations were there have been 4 or more injury accidents in the last 3 years. Locations at which remedial works have already been undertaken or are programmed have not been included in the accident analysis, for example the junction of Belmont Street and Cavendish Street, which was altered as part of a traffic-calming scheme in 2000.

Caroline Square Area (including parts of Swadford Street, High Street, Newmarket Street and Keighley Road) - Map Location 1

4 Serious Pedestrian, 24 Slight (inc. 20 Slight Pedestrian and 2 Slight Cycle)

- Only two of the accidents did not involve a cyclist or pedestrian. One of these was a rear end collision on Keighley Road outside the bus station, and the other a collision between a vehicle heading North on Keighley Road and a second turning right from Keighley Road into Swadford Street. The same situation was experienced by one of the cyclists, whilst a taxi driver opened a door into the path of the other. Of the 24 pedestrian accidents:
  - 8 (including 3 serious) occurred when a pedestrian stepped on to the carriageway;
  - a further 7 involved a vehicle hitting a pedestrian walking on the pavement of Newmarket Street;
  - 4 (including 1 serious) involved vehicles reversing into pedestrians; and,
  - of the remaining 5, 3 can be attributed to driver error.

Because of the proximity of the accident sites and the likely impact of any action at one upon another, it is recommended that Caroline Square Area should be considered in its entirety rather than as a number of discrete locations. It is intended that priority measures in this location be reassessed for early inclusion in the NYCC programme of capital works.

Keighley Road/Craven Street/Upper Union Street - Map Location 2

8 Slight (inc. 3 Pedestrian Slight)

- 3 of the accidents at this location involved vehicles exiting Craven Street; 1 was a rear end collision in a queue of traffic and one was a head on collision between vehicles on Keighley Road.
In each of the three accidents involving pedestrians, the pedestrian or driver appears to have failed to see the other.

It is understood that this junction may be signalised as part of an adjacent redevelopment.

**Keighley Road/Carleton Road - Map Location 3**

5 Slight (inc. 2 Pedal Cycle Slight)

All but one of the accidents at this location involved vehicles exiting Carleton Road, the exception being a rear end collision into a vehicle waiting to turn in Carleton Road. One of the accidents involving a cyclist occurred when a vehicle exiting Carleton Road side swiped a cyclist travelling south on Keighley Road, whilst the other was hit by a vehicle entering Keighley Road whilst travelling North.

The visibility and sight lines for those exiting Carleton Road at this junction should be checked.

**Keighley Road and Cawder Road - Map Location 4**

1 Serious, 4 Slight (inc. 2 in vicinity)

At Cawder Road three accidents occurred when vehicles exiting onto Keighley Road were in collision with vehicles travelling South on Keighley Road. One resulted in a serious accident when a LGV travelling South was hit and collided with a third vehicle, on another occasion a vehicle came to rest on its roof. There have been two additional accidents in the vicinity of the junction, both unrelated, one occurred when a passenger grabbed the steering wheel causing the vehicle to leave the road.

**Broughton Road in the vicinity of the Rail Station - Map Location 5**

4 Slight (inc. 2 Pedestrian Slight)

At the junction of Broughton Road, Carleton New Road and the entrance to the Railway Station, four slight accidents have been reported, two involving pedestrians, and one a pedal cycle.

Also of concern is the number of accidents occurring on Brougham Street and Sackville Street (Map Location 6), a local rat-run used to avoid congestion at Caroline Square.
Accidents involving pedestrians

The main concentration of accidents involving pedestrians is in the area discussed previously as Caroline Square. Table 8 lists the reasons attributed to such accidents within the study area. The narrow footways on Newmarket Street (Plate 3) are highlighted as a particular concern that must be addressed.

Table 8: Reasons for accidents involving pedestrians: 1998-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian stepped into carriageway</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian hit by reversing vehicle</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian on footway hit on Newmarket Street</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver failed to see pedestrian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ran out into carriageway</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian was drunk</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plate 3: Narrow footways on Newmarket Street
Accidents involving pedal cycles

Traffic counts indicate that cyclists account for only 0.6% of road vehicles, yet it has been shown that they are involved in 17.5% of accidents resulting in injury and 23.5% of serious accidents. With the identified level of cycle use, it is not surprising that accidents are not confined to specific locations, however, the accidents do have a limited number of causal factors. These are outlined in Table 9, the most common being a vehicle pulling out into (or into the path of) a cyclist.

Table 9: Reasons for accidents involving cyclists: 1998-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle pulled out into (or into the path of) a cyclist</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child cyclist rode into car/road</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle forced cyclist off road</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist lost control</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle hit cyclist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.14 The views of the public

The current problems and issues detailed within this section have been identified through engaging both stakeholders and residents in an ongoing process dating back to November 1998, when the NYCC Area Highway Sub-Committee met with representatives of other local authorities and interest groups to identify issues of concern and consider possible solutions. In March 2001, the TMS Survey was distributed to all residents and businesses within the town. A workshop to identify and explore current problems and issues was held with stakeholders in December 2001.

Issues and priorities: the TMS Survey

At all stages, attempts have been made to prioritise issues, sometimes in a prompted manner (Table 10), but also as priorities identified as free text comments (Table 11) and through voting by stakeholders (Table 12).

Table 10 summarises residents’ priorities when provided with a predefined list. The instruction accompanying the question in the TMS Survey required one answer, however, a number of residents selected more than one option. Both the percentage of responses and the percentage of respondents selecting an option have therefore been included as have variation in response by gender. Too many cars in the centre, too few car-parking spaces and too many lorries in the town were the key concerns.

Table 10: TMS Survey: Transport issues in Skipton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>% responses</th>
<th>% respondents</th>
<th>% female</th>
<th>% male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too many cars in the centre</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too few car parking spaces</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many lorries in the town</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little space for pedestrians</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too few bus services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of bus services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little provision for cyclists</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches parked unhelpfully</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 ranks the free text responses from the TMS Survey, as identified and categorised by NYCC. The key issues, the ‘Need for a one-way system in Skipton’ and ‘Pedestrianisation for Skipton High Street’ need to be considered in tandem because the implementation of one element would most likely have a significant impact on the other. Of particular note is the concept of a park and ride scheme, which was receiving coverage in the local press at the time of the survey. Issues of concern highlighted in the workshop (Table 12) are similar to those previously identified but perhaps give more priority to the perception and functioning of Skipton as a viable urban centre.

Table 11: TMS Survey: Issues raised as free-text comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need one-way system in Skipton</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrianisation for Skipton High Street</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more dropped kerbs</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and ride scheme</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion around schools at start/end of day</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market vans park behind stalls taking up room on setts</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of enforcement of existing town centre parking</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doorways/pavements too narrow</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents permit parking</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who work on town will not pay for car parks</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking charges are too high</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street parking presents danger to pedestrians</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors parking in residential areas to avoid car park fees</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better bus service</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorries do not use the bypass</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build multi-storey car park</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini roundabout at Caroline Square is dangerous</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too few disabled car parking spaces</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More facilities for short term parking</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheaper public transport fares</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough parking spaces in the centre</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport costs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush hour congestion is a problem</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more facilities for cyclists</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more cycle stands</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More maintenance of pavements and roads</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have fewer market days</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled hazards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting down speeding traffic on approach roads to Skipton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: Issues identified in the stakeholder workshop: 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of signing and routes into town</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking – Location, use and signing</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Days – variability of traffic flow/problems associated with the market</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches, pick-up/drop off, parking, congestion, egress from car park</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict between traffic streams (Cavendish Street/Belmont Street, Sackville Street/Keighley Road)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – mix of pedestrians, shoppers and vehicles</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of concessionary fares on public transport in North Yorkshire</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of enforcement of existing parking restrictions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary short and cross-town journeys</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses exiting the bus station onto Keighley Road</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Station redevelopment issues, including taxis blocking the entrance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – Jerry Croft</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Runs – heavy parking on Gargrave Road</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities for the disabled – drop kerbs, footway widths etc. (including implications resulting from the Disability Discrimination Act)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargrave Road – conflict between school traffic and stage carriage bus services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargrave Road – poor design of traffic calming</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGV overnight parking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewery Lane – Access from Broughton Road is difficult due to the geometry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough short bus routes from town centre to residential areas?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket Street – narrow footways, pedestrian accidents and vehicle conflict in the vicinity of Caroline Square</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – Pedestrian access to the castle and parish church</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of delivery vehicles – inappropriate sizes and routes used</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding (Rakes Road, Broughton Road, Gargrave Road)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle and personal safety/security</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit from Town Hall car park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequacy of pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of cycling facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking on setts in High Street</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians walking into the road outside the nightclub (Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday Nights 02:00 – 02:30) - considered future accident fatality site.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic generation from the supermarkets in town</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate positioning of pedestrian crossing (Broughton Road/Rail Station)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of car parking at the Railway Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of signed safe pedestrian routes, including between the bus and rail stations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pedestrians

A considerable area of the town is subject to a high potential for pedestrian vehicle conflict, especially on Market Days (Plate 4). The extent of the area of conflict is shown in Figure 9.

Two areas were identified as particular concerns in the stakeholder workshop:

- The central area (3, 4, 6, 8) which has a large number of slight injury accidents involving pedestrians; and,
- Jerry Croft (5), although not being an accident hotspot, is a shared use pedestrian and vehicle access to the Town Hall Car Park.

Through the TMS survey, residents were made aware that footpaths within the town could only be made better if space was reallocated from the carriageway for this purpose. They were subsequently asked whether we should make the town centre nicer for walking around (Figure 10). The responses were completed using a five-point scale ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. Assigning values of 5 to the former and 1 to the latter, a mean value of 3.8 with a standard deviation of 1.2 was obtained indicating that measures to improve footpaths through the reallocation of road space are likely to generate public support.

Plate 4: Pedestrians on High Street (Market Day)
Figure 9: Pedestrian Vehicle Conflict

1: Grassington Road
2: Elliot Street/Castle View Terrace
3: Mill Bridge
4: The Bailey
5: Jerry Croft
6: High Street/Market Area
7: Newmarket Street
8: Caroline Square/Keighley Road
9: Keighley Road/Craven Street
10: Keighley Road/Carleton Road
11: Cross Street/Gas Street/Cavendish Street/Black Walk
12: Broughton Road/Swadford Street
13: Brewery Lane Bridge
14: Coach Street
15: Gargrave Road

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Other pedestrian issues requiring further investigation include:

- Safe routes
- between bus and rail stations
- between the Skipton Building Society HQ and the town centre
- The width of footways on Newmarket Street
- Control of pedestrians outside the nightclub during the early hours
- The overall quality of pedestrian facilities.
Cycling

Cycling, as a mode of transport, needs to be addressed. Although, subjectively, cycling does not seem to be popular as a primary mode of transport in the Skipton Area, it does need to be encouraged as a healthy and non-polluting activity.

The provision of safe cycling routes and links, including routes to school where appropriate, the possible use of part of the canal towpath network and the provision of secure parking facilities need to be addressed and will be further developed in the Skipton Cycling Plan.

Disabled access and mobility

Plate 5: Parked wheelchair on Sheep Street

There are many barriers for disabled people including wheelchair users and the visually impaired, making journeys into the central shopping and commercial areas and to other facilities.

Safe and easy access to facilities and unhindered mobility for disabled people should be addressed. Careful consideration of access routes and facilities for disabled users also tends to result in better facilities for all.
• An audit needs to be undertaken, and Skipton needs to be brought into line with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act;
• Signing to disabled parking bays needs to be improved;
• Tactile paving needs to be provided in a consistent and coherent manner; and,
• Pedestrian crossings need upgrading with tactile cones whenever possible.

Key routes need to be identified, developed to a suitable standard and signed. These will also be considered as an element of the Skipton Pedestrian Action Plan.

Public transport and tourist coaches

A number of issues specific to public transport have been identified although most fall outside the remit of the TMS.

Because of a lack of a common concessionary fare policy with the West Yorkshire ‘Metro’ area in which rail services are subsidised, there is a significant flow of commuters travelling by car into the subsidised area, particularly to Steeton and Silsden railway station. It is understood that NYCC is working with West Yorkshire PTE and the train operating company to address this situation, and that a bus link has been established between the aforementioned station and villages in the Kildwick area. Due to the relatively short journey times to Leeds by train, the penalties imposed by interchange between public transport modes will make success difficult.

There is considerable scope for the improvement of public transport infrastructure, and funds have already been identified for the redevelopment of Skipton Bus Station and the upgrading of the Keighley Road Corridor.

The current state of bus stop facilities was reviewed in Section 3.4, revealing both stops without flags or information and former stop locations where flags had not been removed. Even on High Street, no flags or information are present, road markings being the only indication of the stops location or indeed presence. It has to be recognised that bus stops form an individuals first point of contact and thus initial perception of the local, regional and indeed national public transport network.

It is also noted that some areas of the town benefit from circular ‘hail and ride’ type services, yet the lack of signing for such services means that awareness of their operation is likely to be poor.
Problems have been identified with the current entrance/exit of the bus station at Keighley Road/Waller Hill. These include the difficulty of turning right onto Keighley Road and the location of the taxi rank. These problems will be addressed as part of the bus station redevelopment. The TMS will need to be sensitive to the access requirements of the bus station and the needs of bus operators.

Skipton remains a focus for coach based tourism and in the summer months up to 45 coaches per day need to be accommodated. The current drop off/pick up points lack definition and parking arrangements are inadequate.

**Motorised cross-town journeys**

The stakeholder workshop identified a perceived problem of unnecessary cross-town journeys both by private cars and goods vehicles. It was thought that elements of this problem include:

- A lack of clarity in directional signing (including signing to car parks from radial routes), identified as a problem by NYCC in its list of priorities (Section 4.6);
- The distribution of parking locations available to CDC Parking Permit holders;
- Residents travelling through the town centre to access out-of-town activities;
- Journeys to supermarket car parks;
- The school run;
- HGV access, limited by the constraints detailed in Section 2.10, Broughton Road being the preferred route; and,
- Service vehicles travelling through the town centre when they could use a more appropriate radial or indeed orbital route.

Particular problems exist between conflicting traffic flows turning right off Keighley Road and turning right from Belmont Street into Cavendish Street. It is thought that additional traffic has been generated from new homes in and on the site of former mills and industrial premises.

The TMS survey asked residents whether they chose to use the bypass or travel through the town if the choice was available. The responses are provided in Table 13.
Table 13: On occasions when you have a choice which route do you prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Bypass</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through the Town</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking

Car parking was identified as a contributory factor to unnecessary cross-town journeys, but, is also of vital importance to the functioning of retail and commercial businesses in the town centre. The stakeholders present at the workshop identified a number of problems, these included:

- Illegal parking on the setts making cleaning after the market difficult
- The lack of visibility of disabled parking
- Signing not directing drivers to the nearest car park when entering the town nor directing drivers out of car parks on foot as pedestrians
- The allocation of long stay, short stay and spaces for permit holders within car parks
- Parking charges as a considerable source of revenue for CDC that must be maintained
- HGV and coach parking in the Town Hall Car Park.
- Maintain vehicle access to the Town Hall Car Park
- Parking on both sides of narrow streets in Middletown leaves insufficient width for emergency vehicles (also considered as an enforcement issue)
- The perception that it is safer to park on street than in a car park
- A perceived need for more commuter parking, including at the Railway Station where the car park is said to be "not large enough for current levels of demand"
- Parking in residential areas (Section 3.9).

Any measures adopted need to ensure that the current actual and perceived problems are not displaced to other areas of the town.
In the TMS survey, residents were asked whether we should make it easier to park in Skipton. The responses were completed on the five-point scale detailed in Section 4.2. A mean value of 3.5 with a standard deviation of 1.3 was obtained, revealing that the residents of Skipton are generally in favour of making it easier to park. There is little variation in response by either age or gender, the mean values ranging from 3.32 to 3.61. To ease comprehension, the results are presented in Figure 11.

**Figure 11:** We should make it easier to park in Skipton

![Map of Skipton showing parking preferences](image)

**Signing**

It has already been noted that a lack of clarity in directional signing is a problem. Signing has developed organically over a number of years (Plate 6) and is neither comprehensive nor consistent. Any review of signing needs to incorporate the outcomes of the TMS, for example, any changes to traffic flow, parking, pedestrian or cycling routes.

- Signing to car parks is currently insufficient to direct drivers, especially visitors, to the nearest car park when entering the town.
- General directional signing needs improving to direct visitors on to the main highway network.
• Signing to supermarkets needs to be provided
• Speed limit signing needs to be reviewed in the light of any safety initiatives
• Pedestrian, cyclist and disabled route signing needs to be implemented
• Signing of height and weight restrictions needs considering

Locations where signing is obstructed by vegetation also need to be identified.

Plate 6: Signing approaching the War Memorial from Mill Bridge

Road safety, speed limits and enforcement

Section 3.13 reviewed accident data available for the town, and revealed that 155 accidents resulting in injury had occurred in the study area between July 1998 and June 2001. It is estimated that there are approximately six times as many damage only accidents as those causing injury in Skipton. The fear of involvement in an accident can be a barrier to mobility for some individuals.

Residents were questioned about traffic calming in terms of whether they thought it would be beneficial for their street, within the tight geographical boundary of their street. Thus, the spatial representation of this data presented in Figure 12 is useful.
Figure 12: Do you think traffic calming would be beneficial for your street?

Considering Figure 12 in detail, it becomes apparent that there may be pockets of the town, in which, residents do think that traffic calming would be beneficial. The most prominent areas are Burnside, and the terraced streets both to the West of Skipton Railway Station and in Middletown. Attention also needs to be focused on the area surrounding the grammar schools off Gargrave Road.

The appropriateness of speed limits and their enforcement are seen as a cause for concern, especially within the Middletown area where parking on both sides of narrow streets leaves insufficient width for the passage of emergency vehicles. Are all of the speed limits within Skipton appropriate, should a move to 20mph or home zones be considered for residential areas and can speed restraint be reduced in the central area to reduce pedestrian/vehicle conflict?
The High Street and retail servicing

The High Street is the focal point for retailing within the town. When combined with the market held on the setts to the sides of the road on Monday, Wednesday, Friday, Saturday and a limited number of Sundays, an inevitable conflict between large numbers of pedestrians and road users occurs, impacting on both.

An additional problem specific to the market is that of servicing stalls. It is understood that at present stallholders are permitted to park their vehicles on High Street for the removal of stalls from 15:30, and that during periods of inclement weather, stallholders are permitted to park to the road side of the stall as a form of protection.

There may be a need to designate an area of parking within a town centre car park for stallholders if it is desired to displace the current parking of vehicles.

The ownership arrangements for the setts are also potentially problematic in that whilst the highway and pavements are owned by NYCC as the Highway Authority, the setts themselves are owned by the shops and rented out to market stallholders.

Other problems and issues that relate to servicing vehicles and HCVs include:

- Intrusion on unsuitable routes
- The timing of deliveries
- Overnight parking facilities

Routing of deliveries to the main supermarkets has been assessed. The majority of vehicles are currently routed via Broughton Road to avoid High Street.

Gargrave Road

£100,000 has been spent in recent years on traffic calming Gargrave Road. Despite considerable public consultation as part of the design process, there is a feeling amongst key stakeholders that problems still exist, particularly at the times of the beginning and end of the school day. It is contended that both the footpath and carriageway are too narrow for the competing demands of users at these times, particularly in the vicinity of Ermysted’s Grammar School and the Girls High School. Additional Travel management many need to be considered.

3.15 Other Problems and Issues

Other problems and issues identified through the Workshop process that lie beyond the scope of this study have been recorded and passed on to the appropriate NYCC officers for further consideration.
4. Policies and Transport Objectives

4.1 Local Transport Plan Objectives

The North Yorkshire Local Transport Plan is based on a structure of aims and objectives, developed into a strategy that seeks to achieve a core vision:

‘Of a sustainable transport system which will not only meet the social and economic needs of local communities but also safeguard the environment’.

The five common aims linking transport to its role in the wider social and urban environment are:

- Promoting Economic Prosperity – by facilitating opportunities for economic regeneration and growth and improving the operational efficiency of the transport system and provision for tourism.
- Improving Community Life – through traffic management and measures to reduce pollution and opening up/maintaining access to social facilities for all age groups.
- Improving Safety – through controlling speed/routing/traffic orders, giving priority to cyclists, pedestrians and people with disabilities.
- Protecting and Enhancing Environmental Quality – by integrating land use and planning and all forms of transport as a means of minimising environmental impact and reducing the need to travel.
- Promoting Social Equality and Opportunity – by providing genuine choices of travel mode and meeting the travel needs of the socially and physically disadvantaged.

4.2 Local Transport Plan Local Objectives

Skipton is located in NYCC’s ‘A65 Corridor’ policy sub-area. NYCC identify the town as suffering from traffic congestion, particularly on busy market days, creating an unpleasant environment for residents, shoppers and visitors alike. The following priorities have been identified from the NYCC LTP.

- Facilities for cycling, walking, people with disabilities and other less advantaged groups
  - Provision of footways
  - Improve footpath links between bus and rail stations
  - Investigate the potential for new cycle infrastructure/facilities including the joint-use of canal towpaths.
  - Provision of enhanced facilities for wheelchair users and other less advantaged groups.
• Audit all future schemes for ease of use by people with disabilities and other less advantaged groups.

• Promote public transport
  • Improve of public transport infrastructure, services and information
  • Improve facilities on the Skipton – Keighley corridor
  • Redevelop Skipton bus station
  • Improve rail service levels between West Yorkshire and the West Coast
  • Harmonise public transport fare differentials with West Yorkshire PTE
  • Re-open the station at Crosshills

• Accident prevention, safety and access
  • Traffic calming to address road traffic accidents and improve conditions for residents
  • Local safety schemes on main roads
  • Minor schemes to improve junctions

4.3 Local Plan Developments and Constraints

Craven District Council controls land-use planning in Skipton. In relation to this study, reference has been made to the Craven District (outside the Yorkshire Dales National Park) Local Plan adopted on 2nd July 1999. The local plan contains two aims specific to transport and a number of transport related objectives:

• Aims
  • To achieve a balance between the provision of an improved transport network and the retention of the intrinsic environmental qualities of the District.
  • To provide for the safe and easy movement of people, goods and services through the transport system.

• Objectives
  • To direct development in a way that minimises the use of private car transport.
  • To ensure satisfactory transport access to serve new development.
  • To minimise the adverse effects of traffic and parking, particularly upon residential properties and in town centre locations where pedestrians predominate.
• To protect routes as required for new roads and road improvements where construction would lead to significant environmental benefits and would assist the free flow of traffic.

• To encourage the economic, safe and environmentally sensitive provision of public transport by locating new development where rail and/or road network hierarchy are suitable.

Skipton is identified as the District Centre within the Local Plan, and as such, is a focus for both residential and employment related development. Development sites of relevance to the TMS are detailed in Table 10 (H = Housing, E/I = Employment / Industrial).

4.4 National Planning Policy Guidance

Both the strategy and the aforementioned documents are produced within the context of wider government policy relating to land-use planning. This is generally issued in the form of Planning Policy Guidance notes (PPGs). PPG 13 relates specifically to Transport and was revised in March 2001. It sets out far reaching aims that include:

• To reduce the growth in length and number of motorised journeys;

• To encourage alternative means of travel which have less environmental impact; and,

• To reduce reliance on the private car, including through the designation of maximum rather than minimum parking standards on the basis that a balance has to be struck between encouraging new investment in town centres by providing adequate levels of parking, and potentially increasing traffic congestion caused by too many cars.

• PPG 13 states that:

• Well-designed traffic management measures can contribute to planning objectives in a number of ways, including:

  • Reducing community severance, noise, local air pollution and traffic accidents;

  • Promoting safe walking, cycling and public transport across the whole journey;

  • Improving the attractiveness of urban areas and allowing efficient use of land;

  • Helping to avoid or manage congestion pressures that might arise in central areas from locational policies;
Table 14: Recent and future land-use developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Leeds and Liverpool Canal, west of, and with access from Marton Street</td>
<td>25 dwellings</td>
<td>Planning consent granted on appeal – site not yet developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Land, south of, and with access from Broughton Road, former garage, nurseries and timber yard</td>
<td>25 dwellings</td>
<td>Site developed and complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Allotment gardens to the west of Burnside Crescent. Access from either/or Carleton Road and between nos. 64 and 66 Burnside Crescent.</td>
<td>25 dwellings</td>
<td>Site not developed – planning consent not granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land between Keighley Road and A629(T), 100m south of Acorn Business Park</td>
<td>0.35ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land adjacent to western by-pass, Airedale Business Centre</td>
<td>0.2ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Keighley Road and Snaygill Industrial Estate, Airedale Business Centre</td>
<td>0.58ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land at Sandylands Business Centre</td>
<td>0.16ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land east of Sandylands Leisure Centre, Carleton New Road</td>
<td>0.52ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land north of Engine Shed Lane, adjacent to railway</td>
<td>0.01ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land east of Ings Lane</td>
<td>0.5ha</td>
<td>Site not developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land west of Ings Lane</td>
<td>0.38ha</td>
<td>Site not developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land East of the Bailey, north of Overdale Grange</td>
<td>1.37ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Craven Nursery Park, Snaygill Industrial Estate</td>
<td>0.12ha</td>
<td>Site not developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land east of Dales Pharmaceuticals, adjacent to Keighley Road, Snaygill Industrial Estate</td>
<td>0.66ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Charvo Ltd., to the south of Snaygill Industrial Estate</td>
<td>1.54ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land south of the sewage works adjacent to the western by-pass, west of Snaygill Industrial Estate</td>
<td>2.72ha</td>
<td>Consent granted for industrial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Acorn Business Park, Airedale Business Centre</td>
<td>0.54ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land immediately north-west of the go-cart track, Engine Shed Lane</td>
<td>0.09ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land 200m east of Craven District Council Depot, Engine Shed Lane</td>
<td>0.08ha</td>
<td>Site developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>O.S. Field No. 5600, adjacent to A629 Skipton Bypass, Ings Lane</td>
<td>1.65ha</td>
<td>Site not developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Leeds and Liverpool Canal, Firth Street</td>
<td>0.03ha</td>
<td>Site not developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/I</td>
<td>Land adjacent to former Skipton-Bolton Abbey railway, Firth Street</td>
<td>0.12ha</td>
<td>Site not developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Resident parking schemes and other controls to avoid on-street parking in areas adjacent to developments with limited on-site parking; and

• Producing better and safer local road conditions in rural areas and reducing the impacts of traffic in sensitive locations, while facilitating the access that is important to maintaining a vibrant rural economy.

• When desirable, the strategy will also take account of PPG 7, which provides guidance on development in rural areas and PPG 15, which covers development in historic environments.

4.5 Traffic Management Strategy Objectives for Skipton

The overall aim for the Town Centre Traffic Management Study for Skipton is to produce an integrated strategy for the Town Centre aimed at securing long lasting improvements, especially for vulnerable road users, whilst maximising the economic and environmental well being of the town and minimising existing or potential sources of detrimental impact. At the stakeholder workshop the following vision formed for the future of Skipton.

’Skipton needs to differentiate itself both as a financial service centre during the week and as a high-class shopping centre especially at weekends’.

In order to realise this vision, it was felt that the traffic management strategy should seek to upgrade the physical environment within the town centre.

To enable delivery of the aim and vision, a number of objectives were determined.

• Identify and make necessary improvements to establish a network of signed safe routes for pedestrians and the mobility or sensory impaired, between key attractors, such as:
  • The Bus Station
  • The Railway Station
  • The High Street and market area
  • Schools and colleges
  • Skipton Building Society Headquarters
  • The Castle
  • Main superstores
  • Skipton General Hospital

• Develop a network of cycle routes and facilities to make using a cycle for a journey, a safe, comfortable and realistic alternative to using a car.
• Improve the coherence, quality and attractiveness of facilities for the use of public transport. This should include working with operators and Craven District Council, to develop a minimum standard for stops and formalise current hail-and-ride operations within residential areas of the town.

• Reduce the potential for pedestrian/vehicle interaction around the central area, and on High Street in particular. This should include a package of measures including signing, traffic restraint and travel management to reduce traffic in the central area resulting from unnecessary cross-town journeys.

• Develop a coherent parking strategy in collaboration with Craven District Council, to encompass both on and off street parking, the management of car parks and signing to car parks. There is a need to ensure that such a strategy is consistent with the objective of reducing unnecessary cross-town journeys. In parallel to the development of a parking strategy environmental enhancement of inner residential areas is desirable.

• Improve and consolidate signing within the town. This should include directional signing for pedestrians and cyclists, towards car parks and for tourist coaches, linking together many of the other objectives.

• Enhance safety for all road users, especially within the central area and with particular emphasis on reducing injury accidents involving pedestrians and cyclists. This should include a review of speed limits and the development of alternative strategies for traffic routing.

4.6 Finance and Implementation

NYCC Traffic Management Priority System

Identified problems and potential solutions to traffic issues in and around Skipton are collated and processed by the NYCC Area Traffic Manager who reports on progress to the NYCC Craven Area Committee. Table 15 summarises the current situation in relation to Skipton and identifies those issues to be considered as part of the TMS process.
Table 15: Traffic Management Issues Under Investigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Nature of Request</th>
<th>To be considered in TMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3.421</td>
<td>Gargrave Road/Gainsborough Court</td>
<td>Waiting Restrictions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.444</td>
<td>Swadford Street/Coach Street</td>
<td>Waiting Restrictions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.459</td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>Disk Parking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.462</td>
<td>Park Street/Primrose Hill</td>
<td>Residents Parking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.463</td>
<td>Sheep Street/Sheep Hill</td>
<td>Pedestrianisation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.470</td>
<td>Skipton Area</td>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Cycle Routes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.470</td>
<td>Skipton Area</td>
<td>Signing Review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.504</td>
<td>Consort Street</td>
<td>Waiting Restrictions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.516</td>
<td>Skipton Area</td>
<td>Residents Parking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.526</td>
<td>Lower Union Street</td>
<td>Waiting Restrictions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.578</td>
<td>Mill Lane</td>
<td>Waiting Restrictions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.609</td>
<td>Belmont Wharf</td>
<td>Waiting Restrictions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.637</td>
<td>Upper Union Street</td>
<td>Review of Waiting Restrictions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programmed Schemes

The NYCC budget for capital expenditure on transport schemes is set annually by central Government with indicative allocations for future years. NYCC programme schemes based on priority and the levels of this settlement. The Schemes currently programmed for the funding period 2001 to 2004 are detailed in Table 16. £204,000 is the current indicative allocation to schemes resulting from the TMS during the period 2002 to 2004. £67,000 of this being directed towards cycling schemes.

Table 16: NYCC Programmed Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scheme</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Keighley Road</td>
<td>169,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Broughton Road (Footway)</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Facilities</td>
<td>Skipton Railway Station (Cycle Storage)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Routes to Schools</td>
<td>Parish School</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>Skipton/Grassington/Embsay</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>Skipton/Keighley Corridor</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMS Schemes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>204,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Swadford Street / Coach Street / Keighley Road</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Developing the Traffic Management Strategy

5.1 Identification of Options

Based on the information provided in Sections 3 and 4 of this report, a number of practical measures for improving traffic management in Skipton were identified with reference to the NYCC hierarchy of road users. These comprised:

- **Short Term Complementary Measures, including:**
  - Dropped kerbs and tactile paving on key routes and at key pedestrian crossing points
  - Upgrading bus stops to a minimum standard, including provision of boarding (Kassel) kerbs whenever physically possible.

- **Option A - Improving Road Safety and Choice, including:**
  - Pedestrian and Cycling Measures
    - Upgrading of Black Walk as the preferred route between the rail station, bus station and town centre, including the provision of ramps at Gallows Bridge.
    - Pedestrianisation of Sheep Street.
    - Upgrading of the Leeds and Liverpool Canal towpaths to a standard suitable for unsegregated joint pedestrian and cycle use.
    - Providing a signed cycle route between Skipton General Hospital and Skipton Railway Station.
    - Consideration of pedestrian access from Sackville Street to the Bus Station.
  - Public Transport Measures
    - Upgrading facilities on Keighley Road as part of a Quality Bus Corridor.
    - Formalising and signing the ‘Hail and Ride’ sections of the town bus services to raise awareness of their existence.
  - Junction Improvements
    - Improving of facilities for pedestrians at Water Street / Mill Bridge
    - Signalising the junction of Newmarket Street and Otley Road to reduce pedestrian / vehicle conflict.
    - Improving Caroline Square as part of a Local Safety Scheme targeted at accident reduction.
• A developer funded improvement of Keighley Road / Craven Street, likely to be traffic signals with pedestrian facilities.

• Parking
  • Disc controlled parking on High Street, typically limited to a 2-hour duration.
  • Residents Parking Zones in the areas surrounding the town centre, residents being able to purchase an annual permit with parking for non-residents limited to short periods, typically between 30-minutes and 2-hours depending on the location within the zone.
  • Restructuring of payments in existing off-street car parks to promote long-stay at the more distant locations.
  • Refining of signing to car parks.

• Option B - Further Enhancing the Town Centre and Residential Areas, including:
  • Creating a 20-mph zone for an extended area centred on High Street.
  • Pedestrianising part of Otley Street.
  • Redeveloping Skipton Bus Station with short-stay coach parking displaced from the Town Hall Car Park to bus station site.
  • A 'Home Zone' for Middletown.
  • Localised traffic calming in the residential areas of Skipton.

• Option C - Reorganisation of High Street, three alternative options:
  • Providing a coloured strip at the edge of the existing carriageway to aid pedestrian movement, particularly on market days.
  • Narrowing the carriageway and displacing the setts to enable the creation of wider pavements adjacent to the shop fronts.
  • Displacing the sets to the central area of High Street to create a multifunctional environmentally enhanced central space.

5.2 Stakeholder Workshop

These measures were presented to a stakeholder workshop held in Skipton on 25th April 2002, attended by 14 stakeholders and 5 NYCC officers. A full list of attendees is included at Appendix 2. Following the presentation the stakeholders were given the opportunity to discuss the measures in detail. Key elements of the discussion were:
• Short Term Complementary Measures
  • The disability representative stated that tactile paving does not cater for the partially sighted as much as a white line painted on the kerb. Negotiating Gallows Bridge was identified as particularly difficult for the partially sighted.
  • Two bus stops on Grassington Road needed to be added to the consultation plans.

• Option A - Improving Road Safety and Choice
  • Pedestrian and Cycling Measures
    • It was acknowledged that Black Walk was owned by a number of parties including Railtrack and that these would need to be consulted about any improvements.
    • Pedestrianisation of Sheep Street was welcomed as long as access could be maintained for service and delivery vehicles.
    • Two additional pedestrian routes were discussed, firstly the 'Cinder Path' linking to The Bailey to the South of the Skipton Building Society Headquarters, and secondly, the path running parallel to Gargrave Road through Aireville Park. It was agreed to take both of these forward within the strategy.
    • It was agreed that the towpath would make an effective route for pedestrians and cyclists if resurfaced. Negotiation would be needed with the NHS Trust regarding a link through the Hospital grounds and a facility for cyclists to cross Keighley Road would be desirable.
  • Public Transport Measures
    • It was acknowledged that the Keighley Road Quality Bus Corridor would only consist of the upgrading of stops and that it would not be possible to include bus lanes.
  • Junction Improvements
    • Signing improvements were suggested at a number of junctions including on Broughton Road and Keighley Road.
    • The introduction of a mini-roundabout was suggested for Water Street / Mill Bridge, but it was felt that this would not improve conditions for pedestrians and providing the necessary deflection would be difficult.
    • The police requested a hurry call facility for any signals at Newmarket Street / Otley Road, so that emergency vehicles can exit the Police Station.
• A ban to stop HCVs accessing High Street was requested and it was agreed to include this within the proposals for consultation.

• Parking
  
  Disc controlled parking proposals received support with requests for Petit Grove, Coach Street and Otley Street to be added to any scheme. Considerable support was expressed for Residents Parking although it was questioned whether the areas identified were extensive enough. It was agreed that additional areas could be added for assessment within the proposed schemes.

  Enforcement of the Residents Parking schemes by Craven District Council may be acceptable if agreement could be reached on who keeps any fines collected. This could also apply to Disc Parking.

  Residents Parking Zones in the areas surrounding the town centre, residents being able to purchase an annual permit with parking for non-residents limited to short periods, typically between 30-minutes and 2-hours depending on the location within the zone.

  There is a need to retain disabled parking within the centre.

  Refining of signing to car parks.

  The need for additional car parking including a multi-storey was discussed.

• Option B - Further Enhancing the Town Centre and Residential Areas

  It was suggested that it was not possible to go faster than 20-mph in the High Street, although is was acknowledged that speeds were higher outside peak times and on non-market days.

  The idea of integrating bus, coach and taxi services on the bus station site received support, although it was acknowledged that those longer staying coaches would need to park elsewhere. Developing “Shop Mobility” within any proposals was also considered to be an option.

  The proposals for a ‘Home Zone’ were supported although the concept was considered require additional clarification.

• Option C - Reorganisation of High Street

  Providing a coloured strip at the edge of the existing carriageway to aid pedestrian movement, particularly on market days.

  It may be more difficult to access parking spaces on the setts.

  A buff coloured strip received greater support than a more brightly coloured surface.
• Could walkways be provided rather than a coloured surface?
  • Narrowing the carriageway and displacing the setts to enable the creation of wider pavements adjacent to the shop fronts.
  • Concern was expressed regarding the ability of market traders to load and unload, and about the future of the existing trees on High Street.
  • It was agreed to not progress the option further and not take the option forward to consultation.
  • Displacing the sets to the central area of High Street to create a multifunctional environmentally enhanced central space.
  • Concern was expressed about moving traffic closer to the footways, but the police favoured the option.
  • The option would not affect access to Jerry Croft.

5.3 The Strategy Options in Detail

The comments provided in the stakeholder workshop were used to refine the measures and options into a package suitable for public consultation. The resulting measures were:

• Option A - Focused on improving road safety, enhancing cycling, pedestrian and public transport facilities, the introduction of residents parking zones and the removal of Goods Vehicles using the High Street as a through route. Proposed schemes included:
  • Pedestrian measures
  • The upgrading of Black Walk as the preferred route between the Rail Station, Bus Station and town centre, including resurfacing, lighting and signing improvements.
  • Ramps at Gallows Bridge to facilitate disabled access between the bus and rail stations using Black Walk.
  • Pedestrianisation of Sheep Street to reduce pedestrian vehicle conflict in this largely pedestrian area, whilst maintaining access for service and delivery vehicles as necessary.
  • Improvement of the ‘Cinder Path’ to the South of the Skipton Building Society Headquarters, between the Regents Estate and The Bailey, with the potential provision of an improved pedestrian crossing point on The Bailey.
Cycling measures
- Upgrading the existing canal towpath to facilitate joint use by pedestrians and cyclists, including widening and hardening the surface as necessary and improving access.
- A signed link from Skipton General Hospital to the Rail Station using Carleton Road and Carleton New Road.

Public Transport
- Formalising the ‘Hail and Ride’ sections of the town bus services, including provision of signing to define the extent of the ‘Hail and Ride’ zone and to raise awareness of such services.

Car parking
- Introduction of ‘Parking Discs’ for the High Street sets with two-hour duration of stay. Agreement to be reached between NYCC, CDC and North Yorkshire Police regarding long-term enforcement.
- Restructuring charging in off-street car parks to encourage long-stay use of spaces furthest from the town centre. To be investigated in partnership with CDC as part of their Best Value Review Process.
- Improving signing to and from car parks for both vehicles and pedestrians.
- Creating residents parking zones where residents pay a small annual charge for permits and non-residents are only allowed to park for short periods, typically 30 minutes or 2 hours in specific locations.

Junction Improvements at
- Caroline Square - Additional feasibility study to include a section of High Street, Newmarket Street, Swadford Street and Keighley Road as far as the entrance to the Bus Station.
- Water Street at Mill Bridge - Potential for re-aligning the junction or providing signals to reduce pedestrian vehicle conflict on this key route to school.
- Newmarket Street at Otley Road - Replacing the existing mini-roundabout with traffic signals to reduce the barrier effect of this junction to pedestrians.
- Keighley Road/Craven Street - Developer funded improvement.
- Keighley Road/Carleton Road. - Traffic signals as part of the Keighley Road Quality Bus Corridor improvements.
• Option B - Built on the measures proposed in Option A with enhancement of residential areas. Proposed schemes included:
  
  • An extended area around the High Street would be incorporated into a 20 mph zone. This would include Swadford Street, Keighley Road to the entrance of the Bus Station, Mill Bridge, the lower end of The Bailey, Otley Street, Court Lane, Bunkers Hill and the western end of Newmarket Street where the combination of narrow footways and a narrow carriageway have resulted in a number of accidents.

  • The section of Otley Street between High Street and Court Lane would be pedestrianised reducing pedestrian vehicle conflict and improving the local environment. The servicing of retail premises would be unaffected.

  • A ‘Home Zone’ would be created in the Middletown Area, giving residents the chance to choose how the road space within the area is managed in terms of: environmental enhancement, restriction of traffic; parking; and alternate uses of some space.

  • Other residential areas of the town would benefit from localised traffic calming to address specific problems and issues, with long-term potential for the extension of the ‘Home Zone’ concept.

• Option C - Focused on the potential to rationalise the space within the High Street whilst retaining space for the operation of the Market and car parking. Two alternatives were developed.

  • The first saw the creation of a pedestrian strip on both edges of the carriageway on High Street, defined in a distinct but complementary material to aid pedestrian movement and afford those crossing High Street a degree of protection, particularly on market days.

  • The second involved the creation of a ‘Market Place’ within the centre of High Street, the relocation of the existing setts from the kerbside to the central area, with the support of businesses located on the High Street. Traffic movement would be restricted to a carriageway area between the existing kerbline and new central area, which would also provide adequate space for delivery vehicles. Traffic on this carriageway would be restricted to 20 mph and traffic calming measures, such as raised crossing points, would keep speeds low.
• The Bus Station - The County Council is committed to developing infrastructure at key waiting and interchange points and two initial concepts were developed to make improvements to the Bus Station

  • Concept 1
    • Improved the current facilities within Waller Hill with a revised layout, improved bus stands and passenger waiting area. This also included: six bus stands with low floor bus boarder kerbs; taxi rank with space for twenty vehicles; three layover stands for local bus services; secure and practical waiting facilities; passenger and general town information; CCTV cameras; and specialist disabled provision.

  • Concept 2
    • Sought to provide a public transport focus on Waller Hill, with a view to serving current and future needs. This could include: six bus stands with low floor bus boarder kerbs; taxi rank with space for twenty six vehicles; coach “drop off” facilities; three layover stands for local bus services; short stay parking for seven coaches (relocated from the Town Hall Car Park); secure and practical waiting facilities; passenger and general town information; CCTV cameras; and specialist disabled provision.

5.4 Public Consultation

The measures and options described above were presented on a leaflet distributed to 70 stakeholders and Statutory Consultees and over 10,000 households and businesses within the Skipton Area, during the week beginning 2 September 2002. This leaflet was accompanied by a questionnaire, and both are included in this report as Appendix 8.

An exhibition was held between Thursday 19th September and Saturday 21st September, in a Marquee in the car park behind Skipton Town Hall. Staff from both Mouchel and NYCC manned this exhibition.

In addition the consultation materials were posted on the internet at a site set up for the consultation exercise [http://www.nycc-consultation.info] and a press release was issued by NYCC on 4th September.

2097 questionnaires were returned within the response period, representing a response rate of approximately 20%, including 40 questionnaires completed on the internet and 24 questionnaires received from those distributed at the exhibition.
5.5 Summary of Consultation Responses

Option A - Improving road safety and travel opportunities, introducing residents parking zones and removal of Heavy Goods Vehicles using the High Street as a through route.

- 76% of respondents supported Option A, 13% did not support this option and 11% did not register an opinion.

Option B - Building on the measures in Option A, by introducing a 20 mph zone centred on High Street and enhancing residential areas, including a 'Home Zone' in Middletown.

- 51% of respondents supported Option B, 29% did not support this option and 20% did not register an opinion.

Option C - Changing the use of space within the High Street

- 54% of respondents supported Option C, 36% did not support this option and 10% did not register an opinion. Of those respondents supporting Option C, 54% favoured Scheme 1, and 42% favoured Scheme 2, 4% not registering an opinion.

Bus Station re-development

- 88% of respondents supported the improvement of facilities at the Bus Station. Of these, 48% favoured Concept 1, 46% favoured Concept 2 and 6% did not register an opinion.

- 50% of respondents supported the relocation of short-stay coach parking from the Town Hall Car Park to the Bus Station site, 40% not supporting relocation and 11% not registering an opinion.

Additional Detailed Comments

A number of additional detailed comments were received. These are summarised in Appendix 9.

6. The Skipton Traffic Management Strategy

The consultation results were reported to the North Yorkshire County Council Craven Area Committee on 7th November 2002. The report asked members of the committee for support of the following proposals:
• Option A - Including a number of pedestrian and cycling measures, public transport improvements, junction improvements, parking issues including ‘Residents Only’ parking, and restriction of the use of High Street by heavy goods vehicles except those requiring access for delivery purposes.

• Option B - Which builds on Option A by adding a 20 mph zone in the central area of Skipton, the pedestrianisation of Otley Street, the creation of a Home Zone in Middletown and localised traffic calming in residential areas.

• Option C, Scheme 1 - Changing the use of space within the High Street, improving conditions for pedestrians, including improvements at the northern end of High Street and at Caroline Square. (No further action to be taken regarding Option C, Scheme 2).

• Bus Station, Concept 1 - retaining mixed use of the site including some car parking. (No further action to be taken regarding Bus Station, Concept 2).

The members resolved to support the proposals. The main text of the committee report and minutes of the meeting are included as Appendix 10.

The North Yorkshire County Council Director of Environmental Services, Mike Moore, made an executive decision on 24 December 2002 as follows.

1. That a Traffic Management Strategy for Skipton be adopted which includes the proposals contained in Option A, Option B and Option C Scheme 1 as described in the consultation leaflet and as indicated on Drawing No’s B9239/015/015B, B9329/015/016B and B9329/015/017B which were displayed at the County Council’s Craven Area Committee on 7 November 2002, and

2. That the re-development of Skipton Bus Station Concept 1 as described in the consultation leaflet and as indicated on Drawing No. B9329/015/021 which was displayed at the County Council’s Craven Area Committee on 7 November 2002 be progressed in conjunction with Craven District Council and bus operators.

Option C Scheme 2 as described in the consultation leaflet and as indicated on Drawing No B9329/015/017B displayed at the Craven Area Committee on the 7 November was rejected in favour of Option C Scheme 1.

Concept 2 for the re-development of Skipton Bus Station as described in the consultation leaflet and as indicated on Drawing No B9329/015/021 displayed at the Craven Area Committee on 7 November was rejected in favour of Concept 1.

Drawing nos. B9239/015/015B, B9329/015/016B, B9329/015/017B and B9329/015/021 are attached to this report.
6.1 Implementation of the Strategy

A phasing programme has been devised to implement the Skipton Traffic Management Strategy. This is summarised in Table 17 and sets out the main measures and options, the timescale for implementation and current estimated cost of the project. North Yorkshire County Council’s Craven Area Committee has agreed the programme and an officer group has been established to oversee the implementation of the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dropped kerbs and tactile paving</td>
<td>2002 -</td>
<td>£149,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - Aireville Park to Craven College</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - Guisburn Street and Broughton Road</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>£8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - Short Bank Road</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>£6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Lining - Gallows Bridge</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>£300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - Black Walk</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - The Cinder Path (Bailey to Regents Road)</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£48,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - Ramps at Gallows Bridge</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
<td>£220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - Broughton Mews to Railway Station</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
<td>£69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - Gargrave Road</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
<td>£40,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - Grassington Road</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
<td>£17,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing Upgrade - High Street</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing Improvements - Mill Bridge</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing and 20 mph zone - Brougham Street</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£55,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian / Cycle Improvement - Canal Towpath</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£41,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian / Cycle Improvement - Carleton Road / Carleton New Road</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrianisation of Sheep Street</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV Restrictions on High Street</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements - Otley Street</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements - High Street (Option C Scheme 1)</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>£130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Area 20 mph zone</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>£41,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Traffic Calming</td>
<td>2003 -</td>
<td>£829,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown ‘Home Zone’</td>
<td>2006 -</td>
<td>£218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Improvement - Water Street</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Improvement - Caroline Square</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>£123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Improvement - Keighley Road / Craven Street</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>£64,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Improvement - Newmarket Street / Otley Road</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>£69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Improvement - Keighley Road / Snaygill Industrial Estate</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
<td>£260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Improvements</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to Hail and Ride service</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipton Bus Station Redevelopment</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>£800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Parking Zones</td>
<td>2003/06</td>
<td>£90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing Audit</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£30,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTION A - IMPROVING ROAD SAFETY AND CHOICE
OPTION B - FURTHER ENHANCING THE TOWN CENTRE AND RESIDENTIAL AREAS

Key:
- 20 mph Zone
- Home Zone
- Localised Traffic Calming
  Within these areas, some streets and key locations would benefit from traffic calming measures and/or additional parking restrictions.
- Pedestrianisation
OPTION C - REORGANISATION OF HIGH STREET

Scheme 1
- Existing Footway
- Existing Setts
- New Footway
- Existing Pedestrian Crossing
- Existing Trees to be Retained

Scheme 2
- New Trees to Replace Existing
- 'Market Place'
- Raised Pedestrian Crossing Points
- Existing Pedestrian Crossing

Caroline Square

Pavement
Setts
BUS STATION REDEVELOPMENT - CONCEPTS

Concept 1 - Improvement of current facilities

- Tool rank for twenty vehicles
- Stands for six buses with boarding kerbs
- Covered waiting area and information kiosk
- Bus layover area for up to three buses

Bus Station Key
- Footway/Pedestrian Space
- Pedestrian Crossing Point
- Dropped Kerbs and Tactile Paving
- Covered Waiting Area
- Information Kiosk
- Public Transport Stop/Waiting Area
- Tool Rank
- Car Parking
- Information Board
- Existing or Proposed Trees

Concept 2 - Public transport focus to serve current and future needs

- Tool rank for twenty vehicles
- Stands for six buses with boarding kerbs
- Coach drop-off Area
- Ramp (as Concept A)
- Covered waiting area and information kiosk
- Coach pick-up area
- Bus layover and short stay coach parking
- Area with potential for the development of specialist disabled facilities

CDC Keighley Road
Car Park unaffected
Keighley Road
Appendix 1: Consultants Brief
CONSULTANTS BRIEF FOR THE PRODUCTION OF A TOWN CENTRE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR SKIPTON

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This brief sets out the requirements for continuing the traffic management study for Skipton including undertaking a further analysis of the issues involving all modes of transport and for producing an integrated strategy aimed at securing long lasting improvements, especially for more vulnerable road users.

1.2 The proposed strategy must be a practical and pragmatic document; i.e. it must be capable of realisation both in practical and financial terms, given likely levels of LTP funding over the next 5-6 years, and taking account of the fact that 6 or 7 town strategies are likely to be completed in each of the next 5 financial years. The strategy must identify proposed schemes, budget costs and a suggested priority and programme. A good deal of work has already been carried out in the Skipton study, including the completion and analysis of a questionnaire survey following the production of a draft working strategy document. The development of the final strategy will need to be based on this previous work.

1.3 In developing the strategy, Consultant will need to ensure that all of the already identified partner organisations together with the local elected member and members of the public are consulted and fully involved before forming any conclusion at relevant stages of the study. This will involve careful planning and effective organisation since it is expected that from commencement of the commission to completion of final report will take no longer than 4 months. The principal contact officer during the preparation of the study will be the County Council's relevant Area Traffic Manager, and guidance will also be available from the Senior Assistant Engineer (Traffic Management) SAE(TM), the Passenger Transport Manager (PTM), and the Senior Assistant Engineer (Forward Planning) SAE(FP) as appropriate, all of whom are based at County Hall.

1.4 Any issues and/or additional requirements which are specific to the town covered by this study are listed at Appendices A and B to this Brief. The Consultant will be expected to include in his work on this study, consideration of all of the particular
issues listed at Appendix A, and to undertake all of the additional requirements listed at Appendix B.

NOTE: The inclusion of Appendix A with a study brief is to provide the opportunity to ensure that the Consultant includes particular issues already identified as critical in the preparation of the traffic strategy, but which might otherwise not be included.

The inclusion of Appendix B will inform the Consultant that a Pedestrian Action Plan and/or a Cycling Plan is needed as a separately identifiable element of the study.

2.0 CONTINUING STUDY FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Production of background, LTP context, current problems and issues chapters | The work already undertaken will provide an important input to this stage of the study, but additional work will be needed to enable a review to be undertaken of the existing situation in Skipton, including details of main traffic generators, main features including car parks, bus and rail stations, on-street parking areas and extent of waiting restrictions, any one-way streets or other restricted junction movements, including any significant constraint on vehicle movements such as HCV bans, pedestrian crossings, roundabouts and signalised junctions. The text to include a summary of major vehicle and pedestrian activities, including a review of movement patterns, parking numbers, bus stop locations and locations where there are known speed problems and/or a high incidence of personal injury accidents. This work should be based on information obtained from the existing survey, other survey sources and from Area Traffic Managers knowledge of the town supplemented only by snapshot surveys where no other information is available.

This stage is also required to identify the LTP policy implications insofar as they affect the study area, identifying in particular, LTP priorities, indicated levels of available funding and schemes already programmed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using the results of the questionnaire survey, it will be necessary to identify the main issues which need to be addressed in Skipton and their relative priority. It is expected that the following areas will be covered as a minimum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Pedestrian problems and needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Cycling and cycle facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Public transport including rail (if appropriate), buses and taxis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td>Servicing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>Vehicular traffic – congestion/parking/demand management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi)</td>
<td>Mobility/Disabled access considerations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii)</td>
<td>Safety problems, and vehicle speed issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii)</td>
<td>Environmental concerns including identification of locations/sites likely to benefit from either school or Green Travel Plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix)</td>
<td>Land use allocations in District Local Plan so as to identify any future major traffic generators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Strategy Objectives

Completion of this stage is a vital milestone in the study and should draw together the main factors identified in Stage 1, and formulate a set of critical objectives for the strategy. Initially these, together with the current problems and issues chapter, must be agreed with the Officer Sub-Group, Area Chairman and Local Members and then with the key partners at a study partnership meeting to be organised by the Consultant. It is anticipated that the consultant will be guided by the County Council's principle objectives which, in priority order, seek to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and vehicle drivers, having particular regard to meeting the County Council's road safety objectives and targets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Strategy</td>
<td>The formulation of an integrated management strategy for Skipton. This stage should include the production of appropriate plans to demonstrate the way various proposals will integrate as part of an overall strategy. The text will be expected to describe in detail the approach to meeting the critical objectives, indicate areas for priority treatment, identify individual schemes for implementation and indicative budget costs, and produce a prioritised programme of work having regard to likely funding levels in the LTP which will need to be ascertained by discussions with the appropriate Client Officers. Any potential sources of 3rd party funding for particular elements of the strategy should be identified. As separate walking and cycling strategies are called for, separate priority lists for pedestrian and cycling facilities must be identified, together with outline implementation programmes based on the likely available funding levels in the LTP. A draft of the Strategy must be produced for agreement by the Officer Sub-Group, and then circulated to key partners for comment. A further workshop meeting should then be arranged to discuss any suggested amendments. <strong>Aim of Workshop</strong> - To secure agreement to the detailed draft strategy, and agree the method of public consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other consultations</td>
<td>The draft of the document incorporating stages 1-7 will then be circulated for wider consultation with the public. The consultant will be responsible for production of a questionnaire/explanatory leaflet and any exhibition material and will be expected to allow for the attendance of one member of staff at the public exhibition for an 8-hour period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The response to this round of public consultation must be collated and appropriate responses formulated prior to the production of any amendments to the draft document. The draft should be circulated to key partners if it is agreed with the Officer Sub Group there are any significant changes arising from the public consultation stage. A further partnership meeting would, in this eventuality, need to be organised to discuss and agree any changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The draft document must then be reported to the County Council’s Craven Area Committee for approval. The Consultant should allow for the production of an amended document, suitable display drawings for the Committee meeting and for attendance at the meeting. At this stage, the final draft should also include an implementation programme, identification of additional sources of funding, LTP funding profile, and proposals for monitoring the outcomes of the various scheme elements and the criteria by which they should be monitored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Final draft</td>
<td>Following the Area Committee meeting, the Consultant will be responsible for producing any amendments to the document, for circulating a copy of the final draft to key partners and for producing 6 copies with bound-in plans to the Client.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

3.1 The Consultant will be expected to undertake this continuation study (from commencement to completion and circulation of final draft) in an 4-month period. The Consultant will be responsible, within 1 week following the issue of the commission, for producing, for approval, a detailed programme of study activities, including all partnership meetings and consultation stages. This programme will be used by the Client to monitor progress on the study.
3.2 It is emphasised that this study is to include the whole of the urban area defined in the draft working strategy document, but should concentrate on major corridors of movement. It is not expected that issues in particular residential or industrial areas of the town should be examined in detail. However that is not to preclude, for example, consideration of residential parking schemes if particular problems with commuter and/or shopper parking in residential areas close to the town centre have been identified.

3.3 There will be a presumption that the strategy will be developed in such a way as to reflect the LTP priority accorded to different categories of users, as follows.

1. Pedestrians; in particular taking account of the needs of the disabled.
2. Cyclists.
4. Vehicle drivers.

This order of priorities should also be viewed in the context of maximising the economic well being of the town and minimising/removing existing or potential sources of detrimental environmental and commercial impact. It is also vital that the strategy takes due account of the County Council's accident reduction targets and that all proposed schemes form an integral part of an urban safety management programme.

3.4 It is not expected that any significant further survey work should be necessary, but the Consultant will be expected to have allowed in the programming and in the pricing for the study, for undertaking sufficient additional "snapshot" surveys to ensure that any conclusions/recommendations reached which are dependent on survey figures are sufficiently robust.

3.5 The Consultant will be deemed to have fully satisfied himself as to the requirements of this brief once he has provided programming and pricing details to the Client. Any clarification must be obtained prior to commencement of Stage 1 of the study as outlined in Section 2 of this brief.
Town Centre Traffic Management Studies

Appendix B1 – Pedestrian Action Plan

A stand alone Pedestrian Action Plan for Skipton should be produced. This should normally be produced in accordance with the NYCC Guidelines for the Production of Pedestrian Action Plans. However departures from this format may be justified in some areas where local circumstances dictate.

The report should include the following sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Provides the policy background to pedestrian provision in North Yorkshire and brief detail of the local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>Give details of the aims and objectives of the local Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Key Pedestrian Routes</td>
<td>Gives details of and philosophy behind the identification of the key pedestrian routes in the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>Should be split into 3 sections;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Problems for Pedestrians – identification of problems / constraints for all pedestrians on the key pedestrian routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Problems for the Mobility Impaired – an important element of the pedestrian action plan is the identification of problems for pedestrians with mobility impairments on the key pedestrian routes in each town. These need to be identified in this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Ad hoc Problems – identification of significant problems for pedestrians (including those with mobility impairments) not on the key pedestrian routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Remedial Measures</td>
<td>Identification of remedial measures for the problems identified in Section 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Local Targets</td>
<td>Develop local targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Implementation and Priorities</td>
<td>Give details of the ranking for implementation of the measures identified in the plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pedestrian Action Plan should be produced giving due consideration to the IHT publication Guidelines For Providing For Journeys On Foot.
Town Centre Traffic Management Studies

Appendix B2 – Local Cycling Plan

A stand alone Local Cycling Plan for Skipton should be produced. This should include the following sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Provides the policy background to cycling provision in North Yorkshire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>Give details of the aims and objectives of the Local Cycling Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>Gives details of the problems encountered by cyclists in the study area. Should include both generic problems and those specific to the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Gives details of opportunities for cycling in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cycle Routes</td>
<td>Gives details and justification of cycle routes and shorter cycle links to be implemented in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cycle Parking</td>
<td>Gives details of the locations of proposed cycle parking facilities in the study area. This should include those being provided by NYCC and those at other locations (e.g. leisure centres) which NYCC will encourage other bodies to provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cycling Promotion and Education</td>
<td>Gives details of proposals both locally and county wide for the promotion of cycling and education of all road users on cycling matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Local Targets</td>
<td>Gives details of local targets to increase cycling and reduce the cycle accident history in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Implementation and Priorities</td>
<td>Gives details of the ranking for implementation of cycle routes and facilities identified in the plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A copy of the draft Filey Cycling Plan is enclosed as an example of the expected format. The above format should, in general, be followed. However departures from this format may be justified in some areas where local circumstances dictate.

Much of the above detail can be directly drawn from information included in the main study.

Where a Local Cycling Plan is to be produced the consultant should include one or more local cyclists in the partnership meetings or set up a separate cycling sub group.

All routes and facilities included in the Local Cycling Plan should be in accordance with the NYCC Guidelines on Provision of Cycling Facilities.
Appendix 2: Skipton Workshop Attendees
Workshop Attendees 6th December 2001

Stakeholders
County Councillor Alex Bentley
County Councillor Mike Doyle
County Councillor Irene Greaves
Marcia Turner - Craven District Council
Rachel Mann - Craven District Council (Chief Executive)
Duncan Hartley - Craven District Council (Planning)
Greg Robinson - Craven District Council (Operational Services)
Steven Norman - North Yorkshire Police
Inspector Nowakowski - North Yorkshire Police
Sgt. Kevin Wilson - North Yorkshire Police
Chris Shields - Selby and York Primary Care Trust
Phil Jolly - Keighley and District
Norman Simpson - Pennine Motors
George Peach - Confederation of Passenger Transport
Bob Wright - Skipton Chamber of Trade
Skipton Civic Society

NYCC
Graham Cressey
Bill Isherwood
Richard Marr
Andrew Bainbridge
Richard Owens

Mouchel
Alan Bunting
Rob Tumbull
Colin Brown
Matt Steele
Debbie Swatman
Workshop Attendees 25th April 2002
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County Councillor Alex Bentley
County Councillor Mike Doyle
County Councillor Shelagh Marshall
Marcia Turner - Craven District Council
Helen Firth - Craven District Council (Deputy Leader)
Duncan Hartley - Craven District Council (Planning)
Greg Robinson - Craven District Council (Operational Services)
Sgt Kevin Wilson - North Yorkshire Police
Norman Simpson - Pennine Motors
George Peach - Confederation of Passenger Transport
Bob Wright - Skipton Chamber of Trade
Bill Barron - Skipton Building Society
Gwynne Walters - Skipton Building Society
Peter Robinson - Better Government for Older People in Craven

NYCC

Graham Cressey
Bill Isherwood
Andrew Bainbridge
Mary Welch
Steve Greaves

Mouchel

Alan Bunting
Rob Turnbull
Colin Brown
Matt Steele
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022A Pedestrian Action Plan
1. Introduction

1.1 This Pedestrian Action Plan has been produced in parallel to the Skipton Traffic Management Strategy, adopted by North Yorkshire County Council on 25th November 2002, and developed in partnership with Mouchel Consulting Limited.

1.2 The Pedestrian Action Plan is entirely consistent with the aforementioned strategy, but can be read separately without referring to the strategy document.

1.3 This report sets out:

- The objectives of North Yorkshire County Council for Pedestrians and specific aims for this plan.
- The principal features and pedestrian attractors within the town.
- Key pedestrian routes within and around the town.
- Proposals for improvement
- Consultation responses

1.4 The outcome of the Pedestrian Action Plan is summarised in Appendices A, B and C, and on Drawing B9329/015/022A.

2. Objectives

2.1 North Yorkshire has adopted an over-arching Pedestrian Strategy, which commits it to produce a Pedestrian Action Plan for all towns within the County. This contains a number of objectives:

- To maximise the role of walking, in order to reduce the use of and the reliance on the private car.
- To identify and improve, based on an assessment of demand and potential demand, high quality networks providing safe, convenient and attractive routes for pedestrians in urban areas.
To ensure that in assessing transport and development proposals, the needs of pedestrians are the first priority.

To maintain and improve the network of rural, urban and interurban pedestrian routes, hence achieving greater public satisfaction.

To ensure that suitable facilities for the mobility impaired are provided, wherever possible, on the key pedestrian route network. To improve the facilities on all pedestrian routes and to ensure appropriate facilities are always provided when new and refurbished pedestrian crossings are installed.

The preparation and implementation of the Pedestrian Action Plan is intended to provide a means to assist in achieving these objectives within the study area.

2.2 Specific Objectives

The specific aims of the Pedestrian Action Plan are outlined below:

- To identify key pedestrian routes based on an assessment of demand and potential demand;

- To determine any shortfall in facilities along these key routes and any significant shortfalls on any other important pedestrian routes;

- Identify actions and/or facilities to address any shortfall; and

- Prioritise proposals for improvements required to these routes.

The ultimate aim of the Pedestrian Action Plan is to ensure that the key pedestrian routes are coherent and of a consistent design standard thereby contributing to the provision of a high quality pedestrian route network.
3. Principal Facilities

3.1 Town Centre - Skipton serves a hinterland that encompasses the surrounding towns and villages in the counties of Lancashire, West Yorkshire and North Yorkshire. The town contains an array of shopping facilities including:

- the open-air market located along the High Street;
- the Victorian style shopping arcade of Craven Court;
- Rackhams and Sunwin (Co-op) department stores;
- numerous national chain stores; and,
- small local specialist shops on Coach Street, Newmarket Street and Otley Street.

Pedestrian activity is concentrated around High Street, Sheep Street, Mill Bridge, Otley Street, Newmarket Street, Caroline Square, Swadford Street and Coach Street, corresponding to the shopping facilities available. Pedestrian activity increases on days when the market is in operation, currently, every Monday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday, and some Sundays. There are also Tesco and Morrison supermarkets and a Focus DIY store, all located within a short distance to the south-west of the High Street on Craven Street and Broughton Road. Other facilities available include numerous public houses and restaurants, a cinema, a nightclub, Town and District Council offices, a post office, numerous banks and other business/personal services.

3.2 Tourist Attractions - In addition to the open-air market and characteristic nature of the town centre containing the aforementioned shopping facilities, Skipton Castle, Craven Museum and the Leeds and Liverpool Canal serve to attract many visitors. Guided tours of the town and the castle, and cruises along the canal are available. Skipton is also considered a gateway settlement to the North Yorkshire Dales and together with the town’s proximity to Bolton Abbey, many visitors travelling to these attractions visit Skipton.
3.3 Residential Areas - Extensive residential areas have been developed to three sides of Skipton, the northern quadrant between Skipton Castle and the bypass remaining undeveloped. These areas vary greatly in character between the traditional terraced housing of Middletown, off Broughton Road and off Granville Street, to the large detached properties off Grassington Road. To the east of the town and within Burnside, semi-detached houses and linked-terraces dominate. Within the residential areas, facilities with the exception of small shops and primary schools are minimal, residents having to visit the town centre to meet most needs. Segregated pedestrian footpaths between the residential areas and town centre are limited, and thus, the core of the highway network fulfils this role.

3.4 Education - There are 10 schools located within Skipton and one Further Education College. Craven College, the three secondary schools - Aireville School, Skipton Girls' High School and Ermysted's Grammar School are all located on Gargrave Road, as is St. Stephen’s Catholic Primary School. Whilst a large number of pupils travel by bus to the High School and Grammar School, Gargrave Road remains a key pedestrian route for school children. Additional pedestrian traffic is generated on Water Street from the Water Street Community Primary School, (located on Elliot Street) adding to numbers accessing the north end of the High Street from Gargrave Road. To the east of Middletown, Skipton Parish Church CE Primary School, is located on Brougham Street, used locally as a rat-run between Otley Road and Keighley Road. Other primary schools include Brooklands School (located at the end of a cul-de-sac), Greatwood Community Primary School (within a traffic calmed area), Christ Church CE Primary School (on Craven Street) and Skipton Ings Community Primary and Nursery School (on Broughton Road).

3.5 Employment Centres – In addition to the numerous employees working in the town centre, the Skipton Building Society with headquarters on The Bailey, Kingsley Cards at Belle Vue Mills and the Snaygill Industrial Estate off Keighley Road are the main employment centres. To a lesser extent, a number of industrial units are located on Engine Shed Lane and on the Sandylands Business Park.
3.6 Transport facilities - Skipton Railway Station, located on Broughton Road provides access to a wide range of rail services including those on the Settle to Carlisle and Leeds railway lines. Pedestrian activity mainly corresponds to morning and evening commuter flows. Skipton Bus Station, located on Keighley Road exists as an interchange point for town services, services to / from towns and villages in the surrounding area and as an access point to National Express coach services.

3.7 Other facilities - Include: Skipton General Hospital, two medical surgeries located close to the town centre, a swimming pool facility, two leisure centres, a fitness studio, a dance studio and a bowling club and various football / rugby facilities.

4. Pedestrian Routes

4.1 Primary pedestrian routes, not in priority order, have been identified as:

A. High Street Area including Jerry Croft, Otley Street and Sheep Street - This area provides the focus for pedestrian activity within the town. Whist the footways on the High Street are generally wide, overhanging market stalls cause problems and the sheer number of pedestrians, especially on market days in the summer, creates congestion. At such times some pedestrians tend to walk behind the market stalls alongside the edge of the carriageway. Footway widths around Holy Trinity Church at the northern end of the market place reduce to 0.72m towards the entrance to Skipton Castle. Jerry Croft is a major area of pedestrian vehicle conflict, forming both the pedestrian and vehicular access to the Town Hall Car Park. Again, there is little scope to remedy the situation without some redevelopment of frontages on the High Street. Car parking to the rear of the premises on High Street also reduces the potential for redirecting pedestrian traffic. Both Otley Street and Sheep Street (Plate 1) are narrow shopping streets largely dominated by pedestrians. To improve conditions for pedestrians on the former a number of access issues need to be addressed, whilst the latter already has an ‘Access Only’ restriction
which needs to be either better enforced or changed to limit access to specific times. At the southern end of the High Street, Caroline Square (Plate 2) is currently subject to investigation by NYCC as part of a Local Safety Scheme.

Plate 1: Looking north on Sheep Street

Plate 2: Pedestrian vehicle conflict at Caroline Square
B. *Black Walk and Gas Street* - Provide a largely segregated route for pedestrians linking the Railway Station, Bus Station and town centre. The ownership of the route is currently thought to reside with Tesco and Network Rail. The route is not a public right of way on the definitive map, but is in continuous use by the public. The route is lit, but the standard of the surface is beginning to degrade (Plate 3), creating problems for the mobility impaired. Another potential barrier on the route is Gallows Bridge (Plate 4), which links Gas Street to the Bus Station. The bridge currently has steps on both sides, but the provision of ramped access was raised as part of ongoing discussions regarding the redevelopment of the Bus Station. Typical footway widths on Black Walk are between 2.5m and 1.6m.

**Plate 3: Footpath surface degradation on Black Walk**
C. **Broughton Road, between the Rail Station and Caroline Square, including Belmont Bridge, Coach Street and Swadford Street** - This route provides the alternate route between the Railway Station and the town centre, and has pedestrian crossings located outside the station (Plate 5) and on Swadford Street. The route serves a number of functions including providing pedestrian access to the Focus and Morrison stores, Belle Vue Mills, Coach Street Car Park and a network of secondary pedestrian routes, including:

- Along Broughton Road to Skipton Ings School
- Carleton New Road to Sandylands Business Park
- Through Aireville Park to the swimming pool, Aireville School and Craven College
- Up Brewery Lane and over the swing bridge to Gargrave Road
- Along Cavendish Street towards Black Walk and the Tesco store
- The towpath of the Leeds and Liverpool Canal.
Typical footway widths on Broughton Road are in the region of 1.85m but two problem areas exist. On Coach Street over the canal, widths on the west side are between 0.89m and 0.96m and on the east side range between 0.34m and 0.38m. The second problematic area is Belmont Bridge (Plate 6) where the gradient of the slope makes wheelchair use problematic and reduces the visibility significantly for pedestrians crossing the road, particularly to fish and chip restaurant and take-away located on the north side.

D. The Bailey and Cinder Path (Plate 7) - Provide access between the Regents Estate, Skipton Building Society HQ and the northern end of the High Street. The footway alongside The Bailey is raised above carriageway level, part way up the castle wall. The typical width of the part is 2.8m although this is reduced to 1.35m at pinch points corresponding to turret type features. The surfacing on ‘The Cinder Path’ is in poor condition and needs repair. The Bailey is the main vehicular access into Skipton from the East on the A59 and the Skipton Bypass. As such, crossing from ‘The Cinder Path’ and Building Society on the east side of The Bailey to the footway on the west side of the Bailey can be difficult.
Plate 6: Poor visibility over Belmont Bridge

Plate 7: ‘The Cinder Path’
E. **Gargrave Road and Water Street** - This route provides a key access to half of the educational establishments in Skipton, and as such, is subject to intense pedestrian use at the beginning and end of the school day. This is exacerbated outside Skipton Girls’ High School and Ermysted’s Grammar School (Plate 8), at which local bus operators have reported a number of minor collisions with children. The footways on Gargrave Road are typically 2.0m wide and the route has recently been traffic calmed using a mixture of build-outs and formalised parking areas, in such areas footways widen to up to 4.1m.

**Plate 8 - Gargrave Road outside Ermysted’s Grammar School**

F. **Keighley Road** - Is the main north-south artery within the town, with some bordering residential areas and the Snaygill Industrial Estate at the south end, towards the bypass. This route is currently subject to a major remodelling as part of the Skipton - Keighley Bus Corridor and complementary traffic calming measures, including the provision of a signal controlled junction at Carleton Road. The route will therefore need to be re-assessed following completion of these works. The Leeds and Liverpool Canal runs parallel to the route.
G. **Grassington Road, Raikes Road and Mill Bridge** - Grassington Road and Raikes Road provide pedestrian access from the north-west of the town to the town centre, via Mill Bridge. The footways on this section are not ideal and the route is steep. On Grassington Road, north of the junction with Raikes Road, footway widths are typically between 0.8m and 0.9m. There may be some scope to widen the footway in this vicinity in combination with traffic calming measures. Further towards the bypass widths increase, typically to 1.5m. The junction at Mill Bridge with Water Street (Plate 9) is particularly problematic for pedestrians, partly due to the carriageway geometry. It may be possible to provide pedestrian facilities through signal control at the junction.

Plate 9 - Crossing Water Street at Mill Bridge

H. **Shortbank Road** - Is a steep but steady incline from the Railway Bridge to the point at which the road becomes a Public Right of Way continuing to the East. The route channels pedestrians from residential areas to the north and south of Shortbank Road to the junction of Newmarket Street and Otley Street. Whilst the footway is generally good, a short length of construction is required to make it continuous.
I. Newmarket Street and Otley Road - Run east from the southern end of the Market Place. Commercial premises largely front Newmarket Street whilst Otley Road becomes increasingly residential after passing the Police Station and adjacent garage. The footway widths on Newmarket Street (Plate 11) reduce to between 0.7m and 0.9m at pinch points and as noted in section 5.2 a number of pedestrians have been injured through collisions with vehicles whilst walking on the pavement. Although it is not possible to either redirect traffic or widen the footways, traffic speeds could be reduced through the introduction of a 20mph zone.

Plate 10 - Newmarket Street looking from Caroline Square

The mini-roundabout at the junction of Newmarket Street, Otley Road, Shortbank Road and Brougham Street (Plate 11) is problematic for pedestrians and particularly for the elderly, mobility impaired and those with children. The use of thermoplastic run-over areas and lack of median refuges on Otley Road makes the time required to cross in one movement far greater than visibility and vehicle speeds permit. Signal control is the only option in order to improve facilities for pedestrians.
Plate 11 - Newmarket Street, Otley Road Mini Roundabout

J. Brougham Street - Is currently used as an unofficial eastern town centre bypass and this is incompatible with the pedestrian traffic generated by the Skipton Parish Church CE Primary School. It is suggested that localised speed reduction and traffic claming be implemented.

4.2 Canal Towpaths - The Leeds and Liverpool Canal runs in parallel to both Keighley Road and Broughton Road. The route provided by the towpath is almost level and fully segregated from traffic. There are a number of access points and additional locations exist where the creation of a new access would be possible. If treated sympathetically with an all-weather surface, the potential exists for the route to become a sustainable pedestrian and cycle spine for travel within the town.
4.3 48 accidents were reported involving pedestrians in the three-year period between July 1998 and June 2001. This represented nearly one third of all accidents in Skipton. The main concentration of accidents involving pedestrians is at the south end of the High Street in and around the area known as Caroline Square and on Newmarket Street. These alone accounted for half of this total including four accidents resulting in serious injury to pedestrians. On seven occasions pedestrians were injured having being hit by vehicles whilst walking on the footway on Newmarket Street. Detailed analysis of pedestrian accidents is presented in the main Skipton Traffic Management Strategy Report.
4.4 There are currently seven controlled pedestrian crossing facilities in Skipton. Two of these are ‘zebras’, one is located on Newmarket Street in the vicinity of the telephone exchange and the other on Keighley Road to the north of Craven Street. Signal controlled pedestrian crossings are located at:

- Gargrave road near Coach Street Car Park;
- High Street at the north end of Sheet Street;
- Broughton Road at Skipton Railway Station;
- Swadford Street; and,
- Keighley Road to the north of the Bus Station.

5. Proposals and Consultation

5.1 The problems and issues regarding all modes of transport were identified at two stakeholder workshops in Skipton and through observations from a number of other meetings with stakeholders. A large number of the issues raised related to pedestrian and non-motorised accessibility. Studies were also undertaken of personal injury accidents involving pedestrians and of footway widths, footway condition, obstructions and crossing facilities.

5.2 Within the Traffic Management Strategy, three main options ‘Strategy Options A, B and C’ were proposed, as were a number of general improvements.

5.3 Pedestrian related general improvements included:

- Provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving on the key pedestrian routes
- New uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points

5.4 ‘Strategy Option A’ focused on a wide range of measure aimed at improving road safety and transport choices for people in Skipton. Pedestrian related improvements included:
Upgrading Black Walk as the preferred route between the Rail Station, Bus Station and Town Centre, including the potential for provision of ramps at Gallows Bridge

Pedestrianisation of Sheep Street;

Improvements to the junctions of

- Caroline Square
- Water Street at Mill Bridge
- Newmarket Street at Otley Street
- Keighley Road at both Craven Street and Carleton Road
- Provision of a 20mph zone in the vicinity of the school on Brougham Street.

Upgrading of the towpaths on the Leeds and Liverpool Canal to create an all weather surface for joint use by both pedestrians and cyclists.

5.5 ‘Strategy Option B’ built on ‘Strategy Option A’, further proposing:

- An extended 20mph zone centred on the High Street, but also including the problem areas of:
  - Jerry Croft
  - Newmarket Street
  - Mill Bridge
  - The lower section of the Bailey

- Pedestrianisation of Otley Street between High Street and Court Lane

- The creation of a ‘Home Zone’ for the Middletown area.

- Localised safety improvements and traffic calming in other residential areas.
5.6 The High Street was the main focus of ‘Strategy Option C’, with two alternatives being presented to improve the environment, particularly for pedestrians. The first alternative was for the creation of pedestrian strips on both edges of the existing carriageway, whilst the second saw the relocation of the setts within High Street to create a central ‘Market’ area.

5.7 Public consultation was undertaken during September 2002 and included the distribution of a leaflet and questionnaire to 70 stakeholders and statutory Consultees, and around 10000 addresses within Skipton and the surrounding area. A public exhibition was held in a marquee behind Skipton Town Hall between Thursday 19th September and Saturday 21st September and. The information and a response form were also placed on the Internet.

5.8 2097 postal surveys were returned representing a response rate of about 20% and a number of additional responses and comments were received from visitors to the exhibition. The following support for options and measures were obtained.

- ‘Strategy Option A’ - 76%
- ‘Strategy Option B’ - 51%
- ‘Strategy Option C - Alternative 1’ - 54%

5.9 Given the levels of support detailed above, North Yorkshire County Council adopted ‘Strategy Options A, B and C1’, and the general improvements on 25th November 2002.

5.10 Many additional comments concerned with pedestrian issues were provided through the consultation process. These are included as Appendix C of this plan.
6. **Summary**

6.1 Key pedestrian routes in Skipton have been identified and the problems faced by pedestrians and the mobility impaired, in using these routes, determined.

6.2 A strategy to address these problems has been prepared and integrated with the wider traffic management strategy for the town.

6.3 Local support for the proposed pedestrian route improvements has been tested through public consultation with the whole community.

6.4 Pedestrian signing is currently being reviewed as part of a Signing Audit.
## APPENDIX A - Summary of the Pedestrian Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A High Street Area including Jerry Croft, Otley Street and Sheep Street | • New footways to be constructed on along both edges of the existing carriageway adjacent to setts  
• Extended 20mph zone to be introduced  
• Sheep Street to be pedestrianised  
• Part of Otley Street to be pedestrianised  
• Local Safety Scheme - Caroline Square  
• Investigate pedestrian crossing at northern end of High Street  
• Widen footway around Holy Trinity Church  
• Dropped kerbs and tactile paving to be provided as required |
| B Black Walk | • Surface to be repaired  
• Route to be added to definitive plan as a Public Right of Way  
• Ramps to be provided at Gallows Bridge  
• Route signing to be improved |
| C Broughton Road, between the Rail Station and Caroline Square, including Belmont Bridge, Coach Street and Sackville Street | • Footway improvement at Guisburn Street  
• Dropped kerbs and tactile paving to be provided as required  
• No other improvements possible at this time |
| D The Bailey and Cinder Path | • Cinder Path to be resurfaced  
• Puffin crossing to be installed on Bailey to aid crossing at the end of the Cinder Path  
• Dropped kerbs and tactile paving to be provided as required |
| E Gargrave Road and Water Street | • Effectiveness of traffic calming to be monitored  
• Dropped kerbs and tactile paving to be provided as required |
| F Keighley Road | • No action pending corridor improvements |
| G Grassington Road, Raikes Road and Mill Bridge | • Footway widening and complementary traffic calming on Grassington Road  
• Improvement of Mill Bridge / Water Street junction  
• Dropped kerbs and tactile paving to be provided as required |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| H | Shortbank Road                    | • Footway improvement  
                                    • Dropped kerbs and tactile paving to be provided as required |
| I | Newmarket Street and Otley Road   | • Newmarket Street included within extended 20mph zone  
                                    • Improvement of Newmarket Street / Otley Road junction  
                                    • Dropped kerbs and tactile paving to be provided as required |
| J | Brougham Street                   | • Introduction of a school safety zone, including the provision of a 20mph zone and complementary traffic calming  
                                    • Consider provision of a Puffin crossing in vicinity of the school.  
                                    • Will be included in ‘Home Zone’  
                                    • Dropped kerbs and tactile paving to be provided as required |
### APPENDIX B - Summary of Pedestrian Action Plan Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropped Kerbs and Tactile Paving</td>
<td>Introduction of dropped kerbs and tactile paving throughout the plan area (indicated as green dots).</td>
<td>£149,200</td>
<td>2002 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>High Street Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Creation of additional footways on High Street, reducing the width of the existing carriageway.</td>
<td>£130,000</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>High Street Pedestrian Crossing Upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrade Pelican Crossing to Puffin Standard.</td>
<td>£21,600</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Otley Street Pedestrianisation</td>
<td>Otley Street to be pedestrianised with access for loading restricted by physical measures.</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Sheep Street Pedestrianisation</td>
<td>Sheep Street to be pedestrianised with access for loading restricted by physical measures.</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Caroline Square Improvements</td>
<td>Localised safety and junction improvements.</td>
<td>£123,000</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Gallows Bridge Visibility</td>
<td>White lining to be painted on the steps of Gallows Bridge to aid partially sighted.</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Black Walk Improvements</td>
<td>The surfacing of Black Walk to be improved with adoption of the route if desirable.</td>
<td>£14,600</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Gallows Bridge Ramps</td>
<td>Provision of wheelchair ramps at Gallows Bridge to make Black Walk accessible to all.</td>
<td>£220,000</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Gisburn Street Footway Improvement</td>
<td>Localised footway construction on Broughton Road at Gisburn Street.</td>
<td>£8,800</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Broughton Road Footway Improvement</td>
<td>Footway improvement from Broughton Mews to Skipton Railway Station.</td>
<td>£69,000</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Cinder Path Pedestrian Improvement</td>
<td>Resurfacing of the Cinder Path, introduction of a controlled pedestrian crossing point on the Bailey with suitable ramping to footway level.</td>
<td>£48,600</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Gargrave Road Footway Improvements</td>
<td>Footway improvements on Gargrave Road.</td>
<td>£40,300</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Aireville Park - Pedestrian Improvement</td>
<td>Improvement of the route through Aireville Park from Gargrave Road to Craven College.</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Mill Bridge Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian crossing facilities to aid crossing of both Mill Bridge and Water Street, particularly for school children.</td>
<td>£18,000</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Grassington Road Footway Improvements</td>
<td>Widening of the Footway on Grassington Road in combination with speed reducing measures</td>
<td>£17,300</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Localised footway improvement on Shortbank Road in vicinity Ermysted Street.</td>
<td>£6,400 2002/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Improvement to junction to aid pedestrian crossing movements</td>
<td>£69,000 2005/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>Introduction of a 20mph zone with pedestrian crossing facility and traffic calming outside the primary school on Brougham Street.</td>
<td>£55,400 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>Creation of a Home Zone covering Middletown</td>
<td>£218,000 2006 onwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C - Summary of Consultation Comments

Dropped Crossings and Tactile Paving

- 5 comments requested improvement to kerbs for wheelchair/pushchair access. Specific locations suggested include:
  - Rectory Lane/Princes Drive - in vicinity of old people’s home
  - Otley street/Otley road - cars park at end of road blocking access for wheelchairs

Footpath Width and Maintenance

Several respondents commented requested general pedestrian environmental improvements regarding the need for regular pavement maintenance, improved street lighting, pedestrian path demarcation and increased pavement width. These comments are detailed below.

- Pedestrian facilities around the High Street.
  - 20 comments were received regarding the setts. All of these highlighted mobility problems for groups including the elderly, disabled and those with pushchairs or young children. 11 comments specifically requested the removal of the setts for mobility reasons.
  - 6 requested upgrading the footways
  - 3 requested a new/improved footway around the Church at the northern end of the High Street and around the Castle. Access to this footway is also an issue.
  - 1 individual requested the removal of market traders from the footway, commenting that ‘the obstruction causes danger to blind, elderly and children’.

- 14 comments were received regarding the widths of pavements of Newmarket Street. 5 comments specifically noted the ‘dangerous’ width of pavements on the northern footway, whilst the remainder requested the construction of proper footways on both the north and south sides.

- 9 comments stated that Skipton was regarded as a poor environment for wheelchair access, an additional comment stated that pavements were intolerable for disabled access.

- 8 responses supported improvements to Black Walk. Of these, 1 suggested improvement to the road crossing point near to the entrance of Tesco and another noted the provision of ramps at Gallows Bridge. An additional response forwarded the perception that Black Walk is dangerous for female pedestrians.

- 3 responses commented on pedestrian use of Jerry Croft. 1 noted pedestrian vehicle conflict, 1 the need for a pedestrian footway, and 1 creating a pedestrian access via Albion Square.

- 2 comments asked for the widening of footways on Coach Street to improve pedestrian and wheelchair access.

- 1 comment requested that Grassington road pavement should be widened for pedestrian access.

- 1 comment suggested improvement to the footway on Broughton Road past the Railway Station.
Several comments requested the provision of new pedestrian routes, specifically:
- Footbridge access over canal to the marina
- Rural footway from Embsay to Skipton via Skipton woods and the south side of the bypass
- Pedestrian access via the canal towpath to Cononley and Bradley

Pedestrian Crossing Facilities
Numerous requests were received for the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities. These included:
- High Street
  - Across the High Street at the north end - (Town Hall/Jerry Croft to Library) - (53)
  - Caroline Square/Newmarket Street - (29)
  - Location unspecified - (6)
  - Across the entrance to Jerry Croft - (3)
- Keighley Road
  - Carleton Road - (5)
  - Craven Street - (2)
  - At the entrance of the Bus Station - (2)
- Mill Bridge/Water Street - (10)
- Newmarket Street - (Bunkers Hill to Mini Roundabout) - (5)
- Otley Road (at Mini Roundabout) - (3)
- The Bailey
  - To Skipton Castle and Church - (15)
  - Near Rectory Lane - (5)
  - At Skipton Building Society HQ - (3)
  - At the western end of the Cinder Path - (2)
- Unspecified locations - (8)
- In addition, potential problems were commented upon with regard to the sight-lines of existing crossings. 3 comments related to the zebra crossing on Keighley Road, and 4 to the zebra crossing on Newmarket Street. This problem was also highlighted in relation to the Pelican crossing on Swadford Street.
- One comment was received for pedestrian crossings at each of Aireville School and St Stephens School.
Vehicles Obstructing Footways
- 14 comments were received regarding the obstruction of footways by parked vehicles. Specific locations mentioned included:
  - Rectory Lane (3)
  - Corner of High Street and Mill Bridge (1)
  - Alexandra Court (1)
  - Keighley Road in the vicinity of Dillons (1)

Pedestrianisation
Views were expressed regarding the proposed pedestrianisation of Sheep Street and part of Otley Street, requests were also received regarding Coach street and Jerry Croft. These are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>For Pedestrianisation</th>
<th>Against Pedestrianisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otley Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Croft</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1 comment from a business on Otley Street stressed the need to maintain access to commercial premises on and around Otley Street.
- 1 comment noted that the present abuse of access only restrictions on Otley Street needed to be addressed.
- 1 comment asked for disabled parking to be retained on Sheep Street.
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1. **Introduction**

1.1 In March 1999 North Yorkshire County Council adopted a North Yorkshire Cycling Strategy.

1.2 The overall objectives of the strategy are:

   - To maximise the role of cycling as a transport mode, in order to reduce the use of private cars for utility and recreational purposes.
   - To develop a safe, convenient, efficient and attractive transport infrastructure that encourages and facilitates the use for walking, cycling and public transport and which minimises reliance on, and discourages unnecessary use of, private cars.
   - To ensure that policies to increase cycling and meet the needs of cyclists are fully integrated into the Structure Plan, Local Transport Plan, the Road Safety Plan and all other relevant strategies to encourage the appropriate authorities to do likewise for the District Local Plans.

1.3 Policy 2 of the strategy states:

   ‘Cycle studies for each of the major market towns, the two National Parks and other rural areas of the county will be carried out and where appropriate cycle plans developed and implemented. The Sustrans National Cycle Network will form an integral part of these plans’.

1.4 The Skipton Cycling Plan has been developed as part of the Skipton Traffic Management Strategy. It is entirely consistent with the latter strategy, but can be read separately without referring to the strategy document. The Plan has been produced with input from:

   - North Yorkshire County Council
   - Craven District Council
   - North Yorkshire Police
   - NHS Primary Care Trust
   - The Cyclists’ Touring Club
   - Pennine Motors
   - Keighley and District
• Confederation of Passenger Transport
• Skipton Chamber of Trade
• Skipton Civic Society
• The Skipton Building Society
• Better Government for Older People in Skipton.

2. Cycle Routes, Problems and Opportunities

2.1 Skipton is located in the Aire Valley to the South of the Yorkshire Dales National Park, approximately 20 miles north-west of Bradford. Once out of the valley the land rises rapidly to the extent that even within the town a rise of over 50m in height over less than a kilometre in distance is experienced on the radial routes to the North and East, average gradients being in the range of 5% to 7%. The Cyclist’ Touring Club recommend that gradients on cycle routes should not exceed 3%, but a gradient of 5% is acceptable over a distance of 100m and a gradient of 7% over a length of 30m. Using these criteria developing facilities for much of Skipton would be problematic and this is represented in the cycle flow data that suggests cycle use is greater within the flatter areas of the town.

2.2 The TMS Survey undertaken by North Yorkshire County Council began to define some parameters for cycle use within Skipton.

• 27% of households reported some cycle use
• 12% of households stated that they cycle often
• 18% of people ‘between jobs’ cycle often
• 15% of those aged between 26 and 60 cycle often
• In addition traffic counts indicate that cycles account for only 0.6% of vehicle movements in Skipton.

2.3 A number of cycle turning counts were undertaken during August and September 2000. Information from this count data is detailed below.

• Snaygill Industrial Estate / Keighley Road
  • On weekdays the main flow is travelling through the junction on Keighley Road. Up to seven people accessed Snaygill Industrial Estate and two children were observed travelling North on Keighley Road.
During the weekend counts a flow of over 60 cyclists travelling in each direction were recorded on 30 September, although 29 of these appear to be travelling in a group, passing South between 10:00 and 11:00 and passing North between 11:00 and 12:00. 10 cyclists were recorded turning right from the unclassified route from Low Bradley, on to Keighley Road in the direction of the Town Centre. Levels of cycling recorded on 26 August were lower with the maximum 12-hour flow being 25 cyclists heading South on Keighley Road. No children were recorded cycling through the junction at weekends.

Gargrave Road / Coach Street / Water Street

- Weekday counts recorded an average of 21 cyclists travelling westbound on Gargrave Road, whilst 10 were recorded travelling eastbound. Roughly half of the cyclist recorded were children in the count undertaken during term-time. 12-hour flows recorded up to 24 cyclists on Water Street and 17 cyclists on Coach Street.

- The influence of weather can be observed from the counts undertaken at weekends. Rain during the count in August appears to have reduced the level of cycling by over 60%.

North and South of the High Street

- The High Street acts as a focal point for cycling activity within Skipton.

2.4 Recreational cyclists also use the town's car parking, shopping and refreshment facilities. Both on-road and off-road cycling is possible from the town and Skipton is a key entry point onto the Yorkshire Dales Cycle Way (National Cycle Network Route 10), a 130-mile (208km) circular route. Access to the route from Skipton is via the Bailey and Skipton Road/Cross Bank to Embsay.

2.5 There are currently two sections of cycle infrastructure within the town, advisory cycle lanes on Gargrave Road between the Bypass and Aireville Park and a short section of joint use path over the freight rail line to Grassington, between Carleton Road and Brooklands School.
2.6 Secure cycle parking is provided by Craven District Council in the Town Hall Car Park, is available at Skipton Railway Station, and at the major edge of centre superstores. Cycle parking is currently lacking at the bus station and additional short term parking in the form of hoops on buildings could potentially be provided throughout the town centre but would need to be in keeping with the conservation area and listed status of many buildings, particularly on High Street. There are currently no cycle lockers suitable for the storage of cycles and luggage.
2.7 26 road traffic accidents were recorded involving pedal cyclists in Skipton between July 1988 and June 2001. This represents 17.5% of all road traffic accidents whilst cyclists account for only 0.6% of the vehicles within the town. 17 of the accidents occurred on the main radial routes, the remainder being within residential areas. In three locations: The Bailey; Swadford Street; and, Broughton Road, two accidents were recorded in close proximity, although with the exception of The Bailey where in both accidents the car driver was not aware of the cyclist, the causal factors were not linked. Table 1 indicates the reasons for accidents involving cyclists between July 1998 and June 2001.

### Table 1: Reasons for accidents involving cyclists: 1998 - 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle pulled out in to (or into the path of) a cyclist</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child cyclist rode into car/road</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle forced cyclist off road</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist lost control</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle hit cyclist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 The majority of roads within the urban area are subject to considerable levels of on-street car parking. This makes the provision of additional on-street cycle lanes problematic. Footway widths are such that neither segregated nor unsegregated shared use routes are appropriate. The towpath of the Leeds and Liverpool Canal is used by cyclists despite being signed by British Waterways as unsuitable for cycle use. The Canal runs parallel to Keighley Road to the south of the town centre and between Broughton Road and Gargrave Road to the West of the town centre. It represents the best opportunity for a safe off-street route within the town.

3. **Proposals for Skipton**

3.1 The main issue identified through discussions with stakeholders in Skipton was the creation of additional cycle infrastructure and in particular the potential for joint pedestrian and cycle use of the towpath on the Leeds and Liverpool Canal. Initial surveys would suggest that this is feasible with a number of accesses from Keighley road, including at the Hanover Hotel and General Hospital, the latter requiring agreement of the NHS Trust. From this point an additional signed route is feasible.
utilising Carleton Road and Carleton New Road, providing an alternative route for cyclists between the South and West of the town. The junction of Keighley Road and Carleton Road was signalised in 2003 and a reduction in conflict between cyclists and cars at this location should result. Additional cycle parking is to be provided through redevelopment of the Bus Station providing a useful cycle/bus interchange facility. The residential areas of Skipton will also be traffic calmed in a rolling programme throughout the implementation of the Skipton Traffic Management Strategy, reducing the likelihood of cycling accidents across the town.

3.2 The measures outlined above were included within Option A, Option B and the Bus Station Redevelopment Options of the Skipton Traffic Management Strategy consultation exercise which included delivery of a leaflet and questionnaire to over 10,000 households and businesses in and around Skipton and the production of a consultation website. The response rate to the consultation was approximately 20%. Option A was supported by 76% of respondents. Option B by 51% of respondents and the Bus Station Redevelopment by 88% of respondents. The North Yorkshire County Council Craven Area Committee was asked on 7th November 2002 to support the results of the consultation exercise. They resolved to do so. North Yorkshire County Council adopted the Skipton Traffic Management Strategy incorporating this plan on 24th December 2002.

3.3 The consultation exercise also generated a number of additional comments including requests for the canal towpath route be extended to Keighley to the South and Gargrave to the West. In addition, cycling already takes place in Aireville Park between Broughton Road and Gargrave Road. These and other routes were investigated in terms of cycle provision, and a number of signed cycle routes added to the Cycle Plan. These include:

- An East West route utilising Otley Road, Newmarket Street, Swadford Street and Broughton Road;
- A route linking the existing facility on Gargrave Road with Water Street, Mill Bridge, High Street and National Cycle Network Regional Route 10;
- A route linking Otley Road to Keighley Road via Shortbank Road, Greatwood Avenue, Western Road, North Parade, Cawder Road and Cawder Lane, also providing links on Keighley Road and into Snaygill.
4. **Cycle Promotion and Education**

4.1 To ensure that the cycling facilities provided are fully used, the County Council will promote cycle use in Skipton, focusing on utility cycling. When the facilities are substantially complete, this will include the production of a route map, which will be distributed to all households and businesses in the Skipton area.

4.2 The County Council will also seek to encourage cycle use through the promotion of Green Travel Plans to major employers and School Travel Plans. Locally based Road Safety Officers will undertake much of this work.

4.3 During the course of a year, there are a number of national and local events, which can be used to promote cycling. The county Council will seek to make use of these including National Cycle Week.

4.4 As an integral part of all cycling promotion the County Council reminds all road users of their responsibilities towards each other. The contribution that considerate behaviour by all road users can make in providing a safer and more pleasant environment should not be underestimated.

5. **Local Cycling Targets**

5.1 Within the North Yorkshire Cycling Strategy a total of seven key targets were established. These are:

- **Target 1** - To identify current levels of cycle usage in North Yorkshire and to subsequently determine and adopt locally appropriate targets which will contribute to a national doubling of cycle usage by 2002 and a further doubling by 2012.

- **Target 2** - To identify current and potential levels of cycle use for trips to school and to determine and adopt targets to increase the modal share of cycling by pupils of 10 years or older.

- **Target 3** - To identify and adopt targets to reduce the casualty rate for pedal cyclists per km cycled.

- **Target 4** - To provide, and seek provision by other parties, a minimum of 50 cycle parking facilities per year throughout North Yorkshire.

- **Target 5** - To provide on-road cycle training for 20% of 10-12 years olds.
• Target 6 - To identify and ensure that funding bids include significant plans and schemes to benefit cycling, in line with the local cycling strategy.

• Target 7 - To spend, in addition to funding from external sources, at least £70000p.a. of the County Council Local Transport Plan budget on measures to improve facilities for cyclists.

5.2 Following further consideration by the County Council, it was felt more appropriate to set Target 1 and Target 3 at the Local Cycle Plan level rather than on a county wide basis. Thus, Target 1 has been established using the existing count data and the targets set out within the Government's Ten Year Transport Plan, combined with the measures to encourage cycling in Skipton.

• Target 1: To increase cycle use in Skipton so that by 2010, 75 cycle trips are made in each direction, each day, averaged across Keighley Road and Gargrave Road and that 150 cycle trips are made in each direction, each day, on High Street.

The National Cycling Strategy suggests that targets for accident reduction for cyclists should be based on a reduction in the casualty rate per km cycled, because past experience has shown that absolute reductions in cyclist casualty rates have resulted from reduced cycle use. Target 3 in the North Yorkshire Cycling Strategy was originally to identify and adopt targets based on this philosophy. At present there is no accurate method of establishing cycle accident rates per km cycled. Whilst maintaining the present level of casualties whilst increasing cycle use would provide a decreasing cycle casualty rate, it is felt that the number of cycle casualties in Skipton at an average of 8.7 per year is unacceptable, particularly when considered against other towns in North Yorkshire, for example, Whitby where there is an average of 2.7 cycle casualties per year. This plan therefore seeks to reduce the total number of cyclist casualties in Skipton. In order to minimise random variations from year to year targets will be set based on accidents in the three years before the target date.

• Target 3: To reduce the number of cycle casualties per year in the plan area to an average of 5 per year by 2010.
6. **Implementation**

6.1 £42,800 has currently been allocated to implement this plan in the financial year 2003/04. Additional funding has been made available for redevelopment of the Bus Station, which will incorporate cycle parking, and a signing strategy to include directional signing for cyclists.
Appendix 5: Skipton Station Accessibility Audit: Recommendations
## Skipton Traffic Management Study

### Date of Inspection: 13th March 2001
Weather Conditions: Sunshine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>ORR Ref.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting to the station</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B3.1</td>
<td>Provide new dropped kerbs and tactile paving across Cavendish Street near the junction with Broughton Road. Provide new guardrail if necessary to ensure pedestrians cross away from the junction. Photograph 5</td>
<td>To allow easier, safer crossing for wheelchair users and the visually impaired. Cost allows for dropped kerbs and tactile paving only</td>
<td>£400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B3.1</td>
<td>Provide new dropped kerbs and tactile paving across the access opposite Coach Street. Photograph 6</td>
<td>To allow easier, safer crossing for wheelchair users and the visually impaired</td>
<td>£400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B3.1</td>
<td>Provide new zebra crossing markings across Cross Street to the bus station. Photographs 8 and 9</td>
<td>Due to the junction being very wide a zebra crossing would be a suitable method of providing access to the bus station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B3.2</td>
<td>Provide new ‘Way In’ signing on the wall adjacent to the entrance to the station. Photograph 10</td>
<td>To clarify which side of the entrance is the way in as one of them is disused. Mandatory</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B3.2</td>
<td>Re-mark existing 4 parking bays in yellow with shared hatched area. Photographs 11 and 12</td>
<td>To enhance the ‘safety zone’ for transfer to the vehicle. Mandatory</td>
<td>£650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B3.2</td>
<td>Provide Help Point near disabled parking bays to summon staff. Photograph 11</td>
<td>To summon staff for help. This is not a requirement but would be helpful</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside the station</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B4.1.1</td>
<td>Provide a vertical handle on the door into the shelter on platforms 3/4. Photograph 13</td>
<td>Remove the existing lever type handle on the door. Mandatory</td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM NO.</td>
<td>ORR Ref.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B4.1.1</td>
<td>Provide door holds to both doors in the ticket office. Photographs 15 and 16</td>
<td>To allow easier access for wheelchair users. This is not high priority as the door closure mechanism is quite weak. Easy access is mandatory</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass and transparent materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B4.1.5</td>
<td>Provide a contrasting band of colour to all of the glass windows in the station. Photographs 15 to 20</td>
<td>This is to help make the doors stand out as an obstruction. Mandatory</td>
<td>£400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information - Signing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B4.2.1</td>
<td>Provide one sign showing 'Toilets', 'Disabled' and 'Changing facility' instead of the existing two signs. Provide separate door signs on each of the doors to the toilets. Photograph 21</td>
<td>The existing signing to the toilets is cluttered and confusing. This is a low priority item. Mandatory</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information - maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>B4.2.3</td>
<td>Provide a map of Skipton showing the location of the bus station and useful telephone numbers</td>
<td>To help passengers unfamiliar with the local area. Recommended</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information - announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>B4.2.5</td>
<td>Link the station PA system to induction loops around the whole station</td>
<td>To help visually impaired passengers. Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information - announcements: Low cost scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>B4.2.5</td>
<td>Provide an information point telephone linked to an induction loop</td>
<td>To help visually impaired passengers. Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timetables, posters, leaflets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B4.2.7</td>
<td>Replace the existing wall mounted leaflet rack with a floor standing leaflet rack in the ticket office. Photographs 15 and 22</td>
<td>To enable wheelchair users to reach the timetables and other leaflets easily. Mandatory</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM NO.</td>
<td>ORR Ref.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ticket machines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>B4.3.2</td>
<td>Replace the ticket machine in the waiting room with a machine that has a coin slot and instructions at a height of no more than 1200mm above floor level. Photograph 23</td>
<td>To allow wheelchair users to read the instructions and insert coins easily. This is a low priority issue. Mandatory</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Seating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>B4.4.2</td>
<td>Add intermittent armrests to all bench type seating in the station. Photographs 24 to 27</td>
<td>This is not a priority item as the seating is in good condition and functional. Cost allows to replace one bench on each of the platforms. Mandatory</td>
<td>£1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ramps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>B5.2.3</td>
<td>Alter gradient of the ramps to the minimum gradient of 1:12. Photographs 29 and 31</td>
<td>This is a major engineering project. Given site restrictions and heavy costs, lifts likely to be a better option. Mandatory</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>B5.2.3</td>
<td>Installation of lifts</td>
<td>To provide access to platforms from the station house. Recommended</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B5.2.3</td>
<td>Provide new triangle markings indicating the direction of the slope on both ramps. Photographs 29 and 31</td>
<td>To enhance awareness of the hazard of the ramp to the visually impaired. Cost allows for 3 markings on both ramps. Recommended</td>
<td>£240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Handrails</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>B5.2.5</td>
<td>Provide single handrails down both sides and double handrails down the middle of both ramps to the subway system. Photographs 29 and 31</td>
<td>These are to aid all passengers down the ramps. They are especially useful considering the steeper than desired gradient. Mandatory</td>
<td>£33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Platforms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>B5.3</td>
<td>Provide tactile paving along the edge of all platforms. Photographs 32, 33 and 34</td>
<td>To enhance awareness of the hazard of the edge of the platform. Mandatory</td>
<td>£32,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Complete List of Issues identified and votes cast (key issues shown in bold type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Unnecessary short and cross-town journeys</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Lack of signed safe pedestrian routes, including between the bus and rail stations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Provision of bus facilities and priority, including enforcement issues</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Car Parking – Location, use and signing</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Buses exiting the bus station onto Keighley Road</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Inadequacy of pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Rat-running around the central area (Brook Street, Canal Tow Path, Cross Street Gas Street and, to and from supermarkets)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Coaches, pick-up/drop off, parking, congestion, egress from car park</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Lack of enforcement of existing parking restrictions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Enough short bus routes from town centre to residential areas?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Lack of cycling facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Parking on setts in High Street</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Lack of facilities for the disabled – drop kerbs, footway widths etc. (including implications resulting from the Disability Discrimination Act).</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Size of delivery vehicles – inappropriate sizes and routes used</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Gargrave Road – major traffic attractors and commuters don’t mix</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Gargrave Road – conflict between school traffic and stage carriage bus services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Gargrave Road – congestion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Gargrave Road – poor design of traffic calming</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Speeding (Rakes Road, Broughton Road, Gargrave Road)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Market Days – variability of traffic flow/problems associated with the market</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 School Runs – heavy parking on Gargrave Road</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Vehicle and personal safety/security</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Lack of road safety awareness of children</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Perception of signing and routes into town</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – mix of pedestrians, shoppers and vehicles</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – no improvement in pedestrian facilities since the construction of the bypass</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – Pedestrian access to the castle and parish church</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – Mill Bridge</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – Jerry Croft</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Conflict between traffic streams (Cavendish Street/Belmont Street, Sackville Street/Keighley Road, Craven Terrace/Keighley Road)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Newmarket Street – narrow footways, pedestrian accidents and vehicle conflict in the vicinity of Caroline Square</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Lack of car parking at the Railway Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Pedestrians walking into the road outside the nightclub (Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday Nights 02:00 – 02:30) - considered future accident fatality site.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Change in traffic patterns</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 HGV overnight parking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Traffic generation from the supermarkets in town</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Inappropriate positioning of pedestrian crossing (Broughton Road/Rail Station)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Brewery Lane – Access from Broughton Road is difficult due to the geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Exit from Town Hall car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lack of concessionary fares on public transport in North Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Bus Station redevelopment issues, including taxis blocking the entrance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Skipton Workshop 1 - Thursday 6 December 2001

Group Discussion Notes
Index to Issues Discussed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unnecessary short and cross-town journeys</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Car Parking – Location, use and signing</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Buses exiting the bus station onto Keighley Road</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Coaches, pick-up/drop off, parking, congestion, egress from car park</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of enforcement of existing parking restrictions</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Market Days – variability of traffic flow/problems associated with the market</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. School Runs – heavy parking on Gargrave Road</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Perception of signing and routes into town</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – mix of pedestrians, shoppers and vehicles</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – Jerry Croft</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Conflict between traffic streams (Cavendish Street/Belmont Street, Sackville Street/Keighley Road, Craven Terrace/Keighley Road)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Lack of concessionary fares on public transport in North Yorkshire</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Bus Station redevelopment issues, including taxis blocking the entrance</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vision

The objectives
1. **Unnecessary short and cross-town journeys**

   **The Problem**
   - Unnecessary short and cross-town journeys, especially by private motor vehicles and HGV traffic.

   **Observations**
   - The pace of life has speeded up
   - The school run is part of the problem
   - Cross-town rat-running?
   - Need to consider emergency vehicle access
   - Any solution needs to be self policing
   - HGV access is problematic because of height restrictions. Broughton road is the preferred route.
   - Overnight parking for HGVs is currently allowed on the Town Hall car park.
   - Pedestrianising the High Street alone could create more problems than it solves, with the resulting one-way flow of traffic effectively cutting off the High Street from the Bus Station and the Castle.

   **Suggested Options**
   - Make the commercial area traffic free between 10:00 and 16:00 on market days (With exceptions for Public Transport?).
   - A time pedestrian zone
   - Physically restrict cross town journeys
   - Weight limits could be introduced on selected streets
   - Access to HGVs could be restricted to those loading and unloading only.
   - Could overnight parking for HGVs be provided at the Auction Mart?
   - There needs to be a big rethink of the central area with either priority to pedestrians, or priority to cars with pedestrian safety.

4. **Car Parking – Location, use and signing**

   **The Problem**
   - Car Parking – Location, use and signing (also perception of personal safety/security)

   **Observations**
   - Parking revenue is a major source of revenue for Craven DC (roughly £1m per year) which has to be maintained.
   - Harrogate has a resident’s parking scheme using its own parking inspectors.
   - Illegal parking on the setts in High Street makes cleaning up after the market difficult, thus, creating a litter problem within the town.
   - If access is restricted to High Street can access to the Town Hall car park be maintained?
• Do we need to demolish selected properties to allow the construction of new access in to the Town Hall car park.
• Could an exit be created to send vehicles West on the Bailey?
• At present drivers have to look for marked disabled bays.
• There is a need for more commuter parking
• At present there is a perception that it is safer to park on street than in a car park.
• The Railway Station car park is not large enough. There are 70 train drivers working out of Skipton, where do they park.
• Are Morrisons planning to charge for using their car park?
• There is a part-time traffic warden working 4 hours some days.

**Suggested Options**

• The zoning of car parks depending on the direction entering Skipton, for example, Coach Street car park from Gargrave Road and the Town Hall car park from Keighley Road (especially for commuters). Variable signing i.e. spaces/full is a possibility.
• Redistribution of parking spaces for permit holders – to a percentage in each car park.
• Redistribute spaces for long-stay commuters to those that are least attractive/further from the central area.
• Controls on street – movement towards CPZs, Meter Zones and/or decriminalised parking (see issue 9).
• Could parking by make available in the vicinity of Airedale Nurseries – would access be a problem.
• Could a bridge be constructed over the canal in to a second storey on the council car park?
• Signage is the key issue.

• Greg Robinson @ CDC to provide car parking data

5. **Buses exiting the bus station onto Keighley Road**

**The Problem**

• Buses exiting the bus station onto Keighley Road.

**Observations**

• Buses have difficulties turning right across the flow of traffic.
• Buses usually have to wait for the pedestrian crossing to stop traffic or turn left and circle around Caroline Square.
• There is a need to investigate who uses the buses.
Suggested Options

- Need to improve the drop off facilities on High Street.
- Should be covered as a bus station redevelopment issue.

8. Coaches, pick-up/drop off, parking, congestion, egress from car park

The Problem

- There is a lack of a defined drop-off location for those arriving by coach.
- Layover times need to be reduced in the town hall car park.
- Up to 45 coaches have to be accommodated per day during the summer season.

Observations

- Coaches currently park in the Town Hall Car Park (13 bays?) with an overflow located at the swimming baths.
- Coach parking elsewhere might not work.
- Coaches need to be routed on the bypass and as such long stay parking needs to be in the vicinity of the bypass.
- The ideal point for a coach drop-off is at the South end of the town.
- The coach drop off must be well serviced with toilets and cafes etc.
- Coach parking is currently too expensive.
- Not all coaches are all day stops – many are short lunch only stop and so different drop-off and parking locations might not work - short and long stay coach parking is required.

Suggested Options

- Coach parking could be moved to:
  - The quarry on the bypass
  - The Auction Mart
  - Gargrave Road (Snaygill).
  - NYCC land next to the Hanover Hotel with a waterbus in to the town centre?

9. Lack of enforcement of existing parking restrictions

The Problem

- There is an actual or perceived problem with parking, especially in the Middletown area.

Observations

- Any measures might lead to a transfer of the problem to other areas.
- There is a need to consider NYCC policy on the issue.
- Parking on both sides of narrow streets in Middletown leaves insufficient width for emergency vehicles.
- Parking should be stopped altogether at critical locations by narrowing the road e.g. Coach Street
Suggested Surveys

• A residents parking survey has already been completed.

Suggested Options

• Home zones could be adopted for some residential areas within Skipton.
• Parking in residential areas could be decriminalised with small Controlled Parking Zones.
• A residents parking scheme could be introduced for at least part of Middletown.
• Allow limited permit parking within CPZs.
• Existing double yellow lines need to be changed to (3 lines on kerb) Loading and unloading restricted to certain times.
• NYCC could buy-in to bus lane enforcement type technology.

20. Market Days – variability of traffic flow/problems associated with the market

The Problem

• The alignment of market stalls

Observations

• The market is held on Monday, Wednesday, Friday, Saturday and on a limited number of Sundays
• Whilst the highway and pavement is owned by NYCC as the Highway Authority, the setts are owned by the shops and are rented out to market stallholders.
• In inclement weather, stallholders are allowed to park their vehicles to the roadside of the stalls to protect the stalls. It is thought that this applies at the top and bottom of High Street.
• Stallholders are allowed to park their vans for the removal of stalls from 15:30.
• It is thought that some stall holders park in the traffic lane around the war memorial.
• There is a need to designate a parking area for stall holders vans.

Suggested Options

• Put back the time for the removal of stalls to 16:30.
• If the High Street was pedestrianised or close when the market is being held, the stalls could be turned around. (CDC are in favour of this).
• Vehicle parking could then be allowed on the setts behind the stalls.
21. School Runs – heavy parking on Gargrave Road

The Problem
- The footpath is too narrow for the volume of children accessing buses
- The carriageway is too narrow with parking to allow buses to pass
- A number of stage carriage services pass down the road at the times when passage is difficult because of loading on to special services outside the schools.

Observations
- Much of the parking on Gargrave Road might be attributed to sixth form students.
- There are currently about 1200 students studying at the two grammar schools
- 60% of the students are resident outside Skipton and Upper Wharfedale.
- The speed of traffic outside the girls grammar school is about 34mph after the implementation of traffic calming.

Suggested Surveys
- Survey of views of those attending the school
- Identify locations for speed surveys to assess perceived speeding against the reality

Suggested Options
- Include the town centre end of Gargrave Road in any residents parking scheme.
- Develop school travel plans.
- Move sixth form parking to a specific area of the Swimming Pool Car Park.
- Could part-time traffic signals improve the situation
- Can the waiting area for buses or stops be moved back on to school grounds
- Consider loading on Raikes Road. This would need a roundabout at the junction of Raikes Road and Grassington Road.

24. Perception of signing and routes into town

The Problem
- Signing within Skipton has developed organically over a number of years and is neither comprehensive nor completely coherent.

Observations
- Signing needs to be linked to the outcomes of the TMS, for example, any changes to parking or pedestrianisation.
Suggested Surveys

• A comprehensive review of signing for both pedestrians and vehicles
• Identify key routes for signing.

Suggested Options

• Variable car park signing for both cars and coaches to reduce unnecessary trips made through the town centre looking for a parking space
• Produce a printed map highlighting appropriate routes into the town.

25. **Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – mix of pedestrians, shoppers and vehicles**

**The Problem**

• There is currently significant conflict between pedestrians and vehicles resulting in a large number of slight injury accidents.

**Observations**

• There is a need for good links from A to B
• Pedestrians will take the most direct route unless channelled by barriers.

**Suggested Options**

• There is a need for a safe signed pedestrian route between the Skipton Building Society Site and town centre, and the Bellevue Mill site and the town centre.
• Limited use of aesthetically designed pedestrian barriers may be appropriate in certain circumstances.

29. **Pedestrian and vehicle conflict in the Central Area – Jerry Croft**

**The Problem**

• Drivers using Jerry Croft as pedestrian access to the Town Hall car park, whilst it is narrow and also provides the main vehicular access

**Observations**

• There is a need to keep pedestrians off Jerry Croft. It is the access to the Town Hall car park.

**Suggested Options**

• Re-route pedestrians from the Town Hall car park around the rear of Rackhams.
30. Conflict between traffic streams (Cavendish Street/Belmont Street, Sackville Street/Keighley Road, Craven Terrace/Keighley Road)

The Problem
- Conflicting traffic flows on and turning right off Keighley Road, and traffic turning right from Belmont Street on to Cavendish Street

Observations
- Keighley Road is the main artery in to Skipton and services the industrial estate.
- Traffic has been generated from new homes in and on the sites of former mills.
- Junctions are primarily congested at peak hours

Suggested Options
- There are a number of options for Cavendish Street/Belmont Street. NYCC expressed their preference for signalling this junction. Stop lines could be set back to aid bus turning manoeuvres.
- Sackville Street/Keighley Road will be considered as a Bus Station Redevelopment issue.
- Craven Terrace/Keighley Road is due to be signalised as part of the TESCO expansion.
- A traffic calming scheme is programmed for Keighley Road.
- Bus lanes may not be appropriate because of the lack of a Sunday service.

40. Lack of concessionary fares on public transport in North Yorkshire

The Problem
- The need to generate modal shift.
- The need to attract people making short journeys on to public transport.

Observations
- There is a significant flow of commuting into the ‘Metro Area’ by car to catch subsidised rail services onwards to Leeds etc.

Suggested Options
- An experimental bus pass could be linked to a trail either through the Rural Transport Partnership or as a Rural Bus Challenge.
- This could be linked to a high frequency service linking the town centre and residential areas with small buses (with potential for flexible routing).
- Could a scheme be introduced which allows the residents parking permit to be used as a bus pass within the town?
41. **Bus Station redevelopment issues, including taxis blocking the entrance**

**The Problem**
- Is the current location the most suitable for the bus station
- There is conflict between buses and taxis
- Priority within the existing bus station was changed to allow priority to exiting cars and taxis.
- There is a need to minimise dead space.

**Observations**
- The location of the current bus station is good, but manoeuvring can be a problem.
- Buses, taxis and cars currently share the same access from Keighley Road
- NYCC / Craven DC do not want buses parked for prolonged periods in the bus station.
- Shopmobility needs to be included. (Adds about £100,000 to the cost of redevelopment but would allow for a staffed office with benefits such as management of the Bus Station).
- There should be provision for community transport services.
- This is a particular problem at night

**Suggested Surveys**
- A taxi rank survey to assess throughput and numbers parked up.

**Suggested Options**
- Consider the potential of moving the bus station to the car park on Cavendish Street – CDC own the Cavendish Street Site, but the sub-surface would be very expensive to upgrade.
- Move the bus station to the front of the existing site.
- Cars need a separate access to the car park
- Taxis blocking the bus station will be dealt with as part of the bus station redevelopment

**The vision**

Skipton needs to differentiate itself both as a financial service centre during the week and as a high-class shopping centre especially at weekends. The traffic management strategy should ... upgrade the quality of the physical environment within the town centre.

**The objectives**

The key thing is to introduce a subtle scheme involving restricting vehicular access to the central area at times when pedestrians/visitors are around. This might involve pedestrianising the High Street or a wider area. Restrictions might be different on different streets moving away from the core.
Appendix 7: NYCC: Local Transport Plan: Performance indicators and targets
TARGETS AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The County Council’s transport objectives have been used to develop a series of headline targets for measuring progress and achievement of the policies in action. A series of causal chains is included in the Plan which identify specific aspects to be monitored in each of the policy areas set out in the “Transport Strategy” section. To enable progress to be measured in the short term a number of performance indicators and targets are also identified in Appendix 1.

These targets are based upon full implementation of the programme set out in the Plan. If funding allocations are below this level, the targets will need to be reviewed.

Objective =
To promote social equity by providing choices of travel mode which meet the needs of the socially and physically disadvantaged.

- Target = To increase the total annual distance in km covered by local buses within the area of the Authority by 10% by 2005/06.
- Target = To introduce facilities for people with disabilities at all new signalised pedestrian crossing facilities and to retrofit all existing facilities by 2004.

Objective =
To limit traffic growth by minimising the need to travel and developing alternative non car modes.

- Target = To achieve zero traffic growth in the town centres of the two main urban areas of Harrogate and Scarborough from 2000.
Target = To limit traffic growth in the North York Moors National Park to at least 1% below average national traffic growth over the period of the Plan.

Target = To limit traffic growth in the Yorkshire Dales National Park to at least 2% below average national traffic growth over the period of the Plan.

Target = To reduce traffic flow on the A19 through Selby by 30% on the opening of the Selby Bypass and restrain growth not to exceed national low growth forecasts from that time to the end of the Plan period.

Target = To reduce the cost per passenger journey of subsidised bus services from £1.35 (1999/2000) to £1.30 (2000/2001) and by a further 10% by 2005/2006.

Target = To increase the total number of passenger journeys made annually on local buses within the area of the Authority by 10% by 2005/06.

Objective =

To provide a safe, efficient and well maintained highway network as part of an integrated transport strategy.

Target = To reduce to 6% the length of principal road network with negative residual life during the Plan period.

Target = To reduce to 14% the length of principal road network with skidding resistance below investigatory level during the Plan period.
Objective =

To minimise the adverse impact of traffic on the environment, particularly with regard to noise and pollution.

- **Target =** To achieve zero traffic growth in the town centres of the two main urban areas of Harrogate and Scarborough from 2000.
- **Target =** To limit traffic growth in the North York Moors National Park to at least 1% below average national traffic growth over the period of the Plan.
- **Target =** To limit traffic growth in the Yorkshire Dales National Park to at least 2% below average national traffic growth over the period of the Plan.
- **Target =** To reduce traffic flow on the A19 through Selby by 30% on the opening of the Selby Bypass and restrain growth not to exceed national low growth forecasts from that time to the end of the Plan period.
- **Target =** To establish three quality freight partnerships during the life of the Plan.
- **Target =** To introduce 10 calming/gateway schemes per annum.
- **Target =** To increase the total number of public transport journeys made annually in the two National Parks and AONB by 15% by 2005/06.

Objective =

To provide a quality public transport system for as many residents as possible which recognises the importance and impact of tourism in the County.

- **Target =** To ensure that 75% of users are satisfied with local bus services by the end of the Plan period.
• Target = To ensure that 75% of users are satisfied with local provision of public transport information by the end of the Plan period.

• Target = To increase the total number of public transport journeys made annually in the two National Parks and AONB by 15% by 2005/06.

Objective =
To reduce the number and severity of casualties arising from road accidents in the County.

• Target = To achieve a 40% reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured by 2010 compared with the average for 1994 – 1998.

• Target = To achieve a 50% reduction in children under 16 years of age killed and seriously injured by 2010 compared with the average for 1994 – 1998.

• Target = To achieve a 10% reduction in slight casualty rate (expressed as the number of people slightly injured per 100 million vehicle km) compared with the average for 1994 – 1998.

Objective =
To facilitate opportunities for economic regeneration, growth and the sustainable movement of goods.

• Target = To establish a lorry routing database for the County in the first two years of the Plan.

• Target = To establish three quality freight partnerships during the life of the Plan.
Appendix 8: Consultation Leaflet and Postal Survey
Introduction
North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) has identified the need for a strategy to improve safety and efficiency for all road users, particularly pedestrians and cyclists, in the town of Skipton. The aim of this strategy is to address the existing problems and improve the overall safety and efficiency of the town's road network.

What are the problems?
- Pedestrian and cyclist issues: The layout of the town centre and surrounding areas presents challenges for both pedestrians and cyclists. The narrow streets and lack of adequate facilities for cyclists can make it difficult and unsafe for these road users.
- Traffic congestion: The town centre is subject to significant traffic congestion, particularly during peak hours, which can lead to delays and increased emissions.
- Accessibility: There is a lack of accessible and safe routes for pedestrians, cyclists, and wheelchair users, which can limit their ability to travel around the town.

What are we trying to achieve?
- Safety improvements: The strategy aims to improve the safety of all road users, particularly pedestrians and cyclists, by implementing measures to reduce the risk of accidents.
- Traffic management: Measures are being introduced to manage traffic flow and reduce congestion.
- Accessibility: Improvements are being made to enhance accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists, and wheelchair users.

Road Safety
- Too many traffic accidents which cause injury to pedestrians and other road users. Safety problems outside schools particularly at the beginning and end of the school day.
- Speed limits - Speeding problems on main roads particularly in the Middlesbrough area. Lower speed limits are needed.

What are we trying to achieve?
The following objectives were used to develop the Transport Management Strategy options and complementary measures. They are not listed in a priority order.

Establishe a network of signed safe routes for pedestrians and the mobility impaired, between key areas.
- Develop a network of cycle routes and facilities to make cycling safe, comfortable and a realistic alternative to using a car.
- Improve the coherence, quality and attractiveness of public transport facilities.
- Produce in conjunction with the Green District Council, a coherent parking strategy to encourage both on and off-street parking.

Option A
This builds on the measures proposed in Option B and enhances certain key areas. Proposed schemes include:
- Junction improvements: The following junctions: Darwen Square, Weat Street at Mill Bridge, Burslem Street at the Town Centre, Burslem Street at the Old Bailey, Bridge Street, Low Street, Burslem Bridge, and the minor road junctions on the town centre.
- Parking: The "H3 islands" sections of the town centre will be encouraged to use signage to reduce the number of vehicles using the High Street. Changes to off-street parking will be considered to encourage longer-term use of spaces rather than the short-term use by the town centre.
- Traffic management: Traffic calming measures will be introduced to reduce the speed of vehicles in the town centre. Speed limits will be reduced to 30 mph in the town centre. Proposed schemes include:
- Junction improvements: The following junctions: Darwen Square, Weat Street at Mill Bridge, Burslem Street at the Town Centre, Burslem Street at the Old Bailey, Bridge Street, Low Street, Burslem Bridge, and the minor road junctions on the town centre.
- Parking: The "H3 islands" sections of the town centre will be encouraged to use signage to reduce the number of vehicles using the High Street. Changes to off-street parking will be considered to encourage longer-term use of spaces rather than the short-term use by the town centre.
Skipton Traffic Management Strategy
Consultation Questionnaire

1. Do you support Option A? - ‘Improving road safety and travel opportunities, introducing residents parking zones and removal of Heavy Goods Vehicles using the High Street as a through route’
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. Do you support Option B? - ‘Building on the measures in Option A, by introducing a 20 mph zone centred on High Street and enhancing residential areas, including a ‘Home Zone’ in Middletown’
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

3a. Do you support Option C? - ‘Changing the use of space within the High Street’
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

3b. If yes to question 3a, which scheme do you prefer?
   Scheme 1 [ ] Scheme 2 [ ]

Bus Station Re-development

4a. Do you support the improvement of facilities at the Bus Station?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

4b. If yes to question 4a, which concept do you prefer?
   Concept 1 [ ] Concept 2 [ ]

5. Do you support the relocation of short-stay coach parking from the Town Hall Car Park to the Bus Station site?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

So that we can analyse the information that you have provided in the most effective way, we would appreciate if you could enter the name and/or number of your building and your full postcode in the boxes provided.

What is the name and/or number of your building __________________________

What is your full postcode (for example BD23 1XX) [______ ______]  [______ ______]

Other Comments

Thank you for your time and assistance.
This questionnaire can also be completed on-line at http://www.nycc-consultation.info
Appendix 9: Public Consultation - Additional Detailed Comments
Skipton TMS survey comments

Option A
Option A includes a number of measures grouped under the headings of: Junction Improvements; Pedestrian Measures; Cycling Measures; Public Transport; Car Parking and Residents Parking Zones. Also considered is a HCV ban on High Street. Comments on these have been grouped into sub-sections.

Junction Improvements
A number of junction improvements were include in Strategy Option A, these included: Caroline Square; Water Street/Mill Bridge; Newmarket Street/Otley Road; Keighley Road/Craven Street and Keighley Road Carleton Road. A considerable number of comments were received concerning these and other junctions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junction</th>
<th>(Mini) Roundabout</th>
<th>Signals</th>
<th>Unspecified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Against</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton Rd/Bypass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton Rd/Carleton New Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Square</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish St/Broughton Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargrave Rd/Craven College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargrave Rd/Rockwood Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate Road/Bypass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Bridge/The Bailey/High St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley Rd/Carleton Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley Rd/Craven St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley Rd/Sackville St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley Rd/Snaygill Indy Estate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket St/Brougham St/Otley Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swadford St/Coach St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water St/Raikes Rd/Mill Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In addition, 6 comments were received opposing the introduction of traffic signals, 2 comments suggested that traffic lights should be synchronised, 1 comment considered junction improvements to be too expensive and another, that mini-roundabouts need better markings.
- 1 comment queried that number of near collisions at mini-roundabouts on Gargrave Road.
Pedestrian Measures

• **Dropped Crossings and Tactile Paving**
  • 5 comments requested improvement to kerbs for wheelchair/pushchair access. Specific locations suggested include:
    • Rectory Lane/Princes Drive - in vicinity of old people’s home
    • Otley street/Otley road - cars park at end of road blocking access for wheelchairs

• **Footpath Width and Maintenance**
  Several respondents commented requested general pedestrian environmental improvements regarding the need for regular pavement maintenance, improved street lighting, pedestrian path demarcation and increased pavement width. These comments are detailed below.
  • Pedestrian facilities around the High Street.
    • 20 comments were received regarding the setts. All of these highlighted mobility problems for groups including the elderly, disabled and those with pushchairs or young children. 11 comments specifically requested the removal of the setts for mobility reasons.
    • 6 requested upgrading the footways
    • 3 requested a new/improved footway around the Church at the northern end of the High Street and around the Castle. Access to this footway is also an issue.
    • 1 individual requested the removal of market traders from the footway, commenting that ‘the obstruction causes danger to blind, elderly and children’.
    • 14 comments were received regarding the widths of pavements of Newmarket Street. 5 comments specifically noted the ‘dangerous’ width of pavements on the northern footway, whilst the remainder requested the construction of proper footways on both the north and south sides.
    • 9 comments stated that Skipton was regarded as a poor environment for wheelchair access, an additional comment stated that pavements were intolerable for disabled access.
    • 8 responses supported improvements to Black Walk. Of these, 1 suggested improvement to the road crossing point near to the entrance of Tesco and another noted the provision of ramps at Gallows Bridge. An additional response forwarded the perception that Black Walk is dangerous for female pedestrians
    • 3 responses commented on pedestrian use of Jerry Croft. 1 noted pedestrian vehicle conflict, 1 the need for a pedestrian footway, and 1 creating a pedestrian access via Albion Square.
    • 2 comments asked for the widening of footways on Coach Street to improve pedestrian and wheelchair access.
    • 1 comment requested that Grassington road pavement should be widened for pedestrian access
    • 1 comment suggested improvement to the footway on Broughton Road past the Railway Station.
  • Several comments requested the provision of new pedestrian routes, specifically:
    • Footbridge access over canal to the marina
    • Rural footway from Embsay to Skipton via Skipton woods and the south side of the bypass
    • Pedestrian access via the canal towpath to Cononley and Bradley
• **Pedestrian Crossing Facilities.**

  Numerous requests were received for the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities. These included:

  - **High Street**
    - Across the High Street at the north end - (Town Hall/Jerry Croft to Library) - (53)
    - Caroline Square/Newmarket Street - (29)
    - Location unspecified - (6)
    - Across the entrance to Jerry Croft - (3)

  - **Keighley Road**
    - Carleton Road - (5)
    - Craven Street - (2)
    - At the entrance of the Bus Station - (2)

  - **Mill Bridge/Water Street** - (10)

  - **Newmarket Street** - (Bunkers Hill to Mini Roundabout) - (5)

  - **Otley Road** (at Mini Roundabout - (3)

  - **The Bailey**
    - To Skipton Castle and Church - (15)
    - Near Rectory Lane - (5)
    - At Skipton Building Society HQ - (3)
    - At the western end of the Cinder Path - (2)

  - **Unspecified locations** - (8)

  In addition, potential problems were commented upon with regard to the sight-lines of existing crossings. 3 comments related to the zebra crossing on Keighley Road, and 4 to the zebra crossing on Newmarket Street. This problem was also highlighted in relation to the Pelican crossing on Swadford Street.

  - One comment was received for pedestrian crossings at each of Aireville School and St Stephens School.

• **Vehicles Obstructing Footways**

  14 comments were received regarding the obstruction of footways by parked vehicles. Specific locations mentioned included:

  - Rectory Lane (3)
  - Corner of High Street and Mill Bridge (1)
  - Alexandra Court (1)
  - Keighley Road in the vicinity of Dillons (1)
Pedestrianisation

Views were expressed regarding the proposed pedestrianisation of Sheep Street and part of Otley Street, requests were also received regarding Coach street and Jerry Croft. These are summarised in the table below.

Table: Summary of additional comments on pedestrianisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>For Pedestrianisation</th>
<th>Against Pedestrianisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otley Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Croft</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 comment from a business on Otley Street stressed the need to maintain access to commercial premises on and around Otley Street.
1 comment noted that the present abuse of access only restrictions on Otley Street needed to be addressed.
1 comment asked for disabled parking to be retained on Sheep Street.

Cycling Routes and Facilities

Within Strategy Option A, a joint unsegregated pedestrian and cycle route was put forward, upgrading the existing towpath on the Leeds to Liverpool Canal. This generated 35 comments.

18 comments expressed opposition towards the use of canal towpath, of which:
- 9 stated that the narrow physical dimensions would increase the risk of pedestrians being knocked into the canal
- 3 comments stated that it would spoil the pleasure of this peaceful walking route.

17 comments supported the proposal. Of these:
- 8 expressed concern that it would be too narrow for both cyclists and pedestrians to use safely.
- 5 asked for bicycle bells to be made compulsory on this route
- 2 suggested the provision of a defined cycle lane along the canal towpath to reduce pedestrian/cycle conflict
- 1 suggested that a permit system be introduced to access the route
- 1 comment proposed extending the route at the southern end to beyond the second roundabout on the A629.
- 1 comment asked for access from Broughton Road onto the route
- 1 comment requested the provision of lighting along the canal towpath

The Strategy Option also proposed a signed cycle route from Skipton General Hospital to the Railway Station. This generated 11 comments.
- 7 comments were concerned about the heavy traffic on this route. 2 of these suggested that speed on the route be limited to 20 mph.
- 2 comments noted the poor visibility at the junction with Engine Shed Lane
- 2 comments suggested using Black Walk as an alternative cycle route.
• 9 comments expressed concern regarding cyclists violating the following highway code regulations:
  • Cycling on pavements should be prohibited as it is a hazard to elderly and disabled pedestrians (7)
  • Cycling along Westmoreland Street and Sackville Street should be prohibited (1)
  • Cyclists ignoring traffic lights, pedestrian crossing and one-way street directions (1)

• 5 comments expressed concern about cycling on particular roads in Skipton.
  • High Street and Newmarket Street (2)
  • The A65 (1)
  • Gargrave Road (1)
  • Bailey/Bunters Hill junction (1),

**Alternative routes**
• 25 respondents requested safe cycle routes to be extended from Skipton to the surrounding villages, of which:
  • 8 requested Skipton to Gargrave cycle route (4 of which suggested via the canal towpath as the main roads proved dangerous),
  • 4 suggested Skipton to Embsay, of which 1 suggestion of a route via the railway line or Skipton Woods was provided
  • 4 requested Skipton to Keighley
  • 3 requested Skipton to Bradley via the canal towpath,
  • 3 requested Skipton to Carleton
  • 1 requested Skipton to Kildwick via the canal towpath
  • 12 comments requested additional provision of cycle routes in Skipton, of which 1 suggested cycle routes for tourists, and another requested commuter cycle routes
  • 9 comments requested provision for safe cycle routes to school
  • 7 comments requested additional provision of separate off-road routes as roads were deemed dangerous for cycling, of which 2 comments admitted to cycling on pavements for this reason.
  • 4 comments requested additional provision of joint use cycle paths.
  • 4 comments requested extending the cycle route to form a complete network encapsulating the town in a circular manner as cross town routes would be beneficial, of which 1 commented that this would enhance cycle access to schools.
  • 3 comments request extending the cycle route from the swimming pool to Craven College, of which 2 suggesting via Aireville Park, and the other suggesting connecting this route to the canal towpath.
  • 1 comment requests extending cycle route network to penetrate residential estates (via Short Bank Road, Otley Road, and Horse Close Road)
  • 1 comment requested priority boxes at junctions for cyclists
  • 1 comment requested the provision of a cycle lane along The Bailey.
  • 1 comment requested the construction of a cycle lane along Keighley Road and requested that it should be enforced in order to prevent lane obstruction.
**Cycle Parking**

- 20 comments stated that cycle parking provision was Inadequate. Of these:
  - 12 requested additional secure cycle parking to be provided, 3 of which specified the need to provide secure 'Sheffield' type cycle stands
  - 10 requested stands at specific locations
    - The Bus Station (3)
    - The Railway Station (3 including 1 request for cycle lockers)
    - Either end of High Street (2)
    - Town Hall Car Park (1)
    - In all car parks (1)
- Only 2 comments stated opposition towards cycle routes of which 1 suggested the hilly nature of Skipton as unfavourable for cycling, and the other comment stated that there were insufficient numbers of cyclists to justify the construction of cycle routes.

**Public Transport**

**Bus services**

- A number of comments were received regarding bus service provision within and beyond Skipton
- Skipton to Leeds bus services would be of benefit for access to medical centre if routed via Otley Road (5 comments, 1 specifically commented that lack of bus service provision forced them to use taxi’s - the fare price of which impeded regular access to various places);
- Increase the frequency of bus services to outlying villages (11 comments, of which 6 additionally mentioned that the infrequency of services actively forced them to use car transportation).
- Provide a circular shuttle bus service serving town centre, bus station and railway station (11).
- Reduction in the cost of bus fares was requested by 8 respondents, 5 of which specifically requested this in relation to outlying village destination.
- Provide additional Skipton bus services during the evening (7)
- Introduction of low floor buses for elderly passengers would prove beneficial (4)
- Provide bus services to/from Harrogate (1)
- Provide bus services to residential areas:
  - via Short Bank Road (5)
  - via Regents Estate (2)
  - via Grassington Road (1)
  - via Moorview Way (1)
  - via Rockwood Drive (1)
- Extend bus service routing via railway station and supermarkets (8)
- Extend hail and ride services to other residential areas (3);
- Extend hail and ride services to Greenacres (Regents Estate), Bunters Hill, Rectory Lane and Princes Drive (1);
- Extend hail and ride services to Carleton New Road and Carleton Road (1);
- Increase the frequency of bus services to outlying villages during the evening (after 1700) - 8 comments, of which 4 comments referred to services to/from Carleton/Skipton, illustrated by
the 30 or 60 minute service frequency during the day, but drastically reduced during the evening.

- Operate bus services using smaller hoppa buses as these are convenient for accessing residential areas (2)

**Bus stops/shelters**

- Relocate the bus stop on Otley Road as they are not positioned in appropriate locations for disabled or elderly passengers (1)
- Relocate bus stop from Consort Street to the bottom end of Springfields (2)
- Provide new bus flag at the stop on Overdale Court as the X64 service does not consider the current flag as a bus stop (1).
- Provide a bus shelter at Airebank Terrace by the railway bridge (1)
- Provide a bus shelter opposite the entrance to Carleton Park (1)

**Rail**

- 2 comments highlighted railway station parking issues, of which 1 comment requested increased parking facilities to be provided, and the other suggested that station parking should be free to travellers upon ticket purchase
- 2 comments requested additional rail services, of which 1 specifically requested increased services for Cononley and Cross Hills.

**Car Parking**

*Additional Parking Provision*

- 55 comments suggested a need for an increase in parking provision, a further 187 comments suggested either the construction of a multi-storey car park or the development of park-and-ride.
- 98 comments requested multi-storey car parking. Specific locations suggested for such parking included:
  - Town Hall Car Park (37)
  - Coach Street Car Park (23)
  - Bus Station/Keighley Road (4)
  - Cavendish Street Car Park (4)
- 89 comments were received in relation to the creation of park-and-ride within Skipton. The majority of these comments did not provide a specific location for such a service, for those that did, the locations were:
  - Snaygill Industrial Estate (9)
  - The Auction Mart (7), additionally weekend only (2)
  - Aireville Park (3)
  - Grassington Road (3)
- Park-and-ride was generally requested in the context of preventing the town centre being used by visitors and reducing the need of coaches to travel into the town centre.
- 4 comments suggested the construction of a new car park on the Bailey.

**Balancing the Needs of Employees, Residents and Visitors**

- Many comments were received promoting favourable conditions for one or more of these user groups.
6 comments requested more or designated car parking for employees, with a further 5 comments requesting business and/or employees permits for businesses located within the proposed residents parking zone.

76 comments requested a reduction in car parking charges, many of which suggested free parking or parking for a nominal fee for local residents. Suggestions made to improve facilities for residents and ‘Skipton Tax Payers’ whilst worsening conditions for the other groups included:

- Skipton residents/tax payers having priority in car parks (5)
- Town Hall Car Park for residents only (3)
- Extend local residents parking provision at Town Hall Car Park to the whole year (2)
- Keighley Road Car Park for residents only (2)
- Increase parking charges for non-residents (1)
- Commuter Parking Permits only for far end of Coach Street Car Park (1)
- Make Town Hall employees pay for parking (1)

4 comments were received requesting more car parking for visitors and 3 comments stressed the need to access Skipton by car from its outlying hinterland. The latter was combined with a request to include those from such areas in parking schemes and reduce parking charges for locals not living in Skipton itself. An additional comment suggested that visitors ‘took over’ both Cavendish Street and Coach Street Car Parks during summer months.

### Disabled Parking

- 34 comments were received in relation to issue of disabled parking.
  - 25 of these requested an increase in provision within the town centre.
  - 4 requested the retention of disabled places at Sunwin House
  - 7 commented on the abuse of disabled spaces by non-disabled drivers
  - 1 complained about the abuse of restrictions on Coach Street by disabled badge holders.

### Duration of Stay

- 40 comments were received regarding the duration of stay when parking.
  - 32 of these comments called for an increase in the number of very short stay spaces with a 20 to 30 minute limit. It was suggested that the charge should also be small.
  - 4 comments called for an increase in long stay provision, although, 2 additional comments questioned the safety of Coach Street Car Park for women, children and the elderly during the hours of darkness.

### Enforcement

- 90 comments were received criticising the current combined parking and speed enforcement regime. There included:
  - 28 comments suggesting that the current warden needs to do their job properly and not ignore the allegedly illegal and hazardous stallholder parking.
  - 24 comments requesting the enforcement of existing parking restrictions
  - 13 comments urging the employment of more traffic wardens
  - 24 comments related to speeding, of which, 5 requested enforcement through speed cameras.
Other Parking Issues

- 6 comments requested parking restrictions at junctions on Brougham Street and Sackville Street where parking close to corners means exiting side streets effectively blind.
- 6 comments suggested banning all on-street parking
- 4 comments promoted a parking ban on Rectory Lane, stating that inconsiderate parking easily blocks it.
- 3 comments noted the problems with Jerry Croft providing both pedestrian and vehicle access to the Town Hall Car Park.
- 3 comments requested parking restrictions on Otley Road, which they claim, is used as a free long-stay commuter car park.
- 2 comments requested a parking ban on Coach Street
- 2 comments requested the retention of parking at Sunwin House (The Co-Op)
- 2 comments suggested that the elderly parking concession be extended until 10 am, whilst a further comment asked for it to be extended for all months of the year.
- Other requests for parking restrictions included the junctions of: Brook Street and Gargrave Road; Consort Street and Windsor Avenue; Keighley Road and Craven Street, Water Street, Mill Bridge and Raikes Road; and, King Street and Queen Street. Also mentioned were Brookland Terrace, Carleton New Road (in vicinity of Kwikfit), Keighley Road (north of Craven Street) Princes Drive, Regent Drive and Sackville Street.

Parking on High Street

- Strategy Option A proposed the introduction of disc parking as a method of parking control within Skipton High Street. 14 comments were received specifically about the proposal.
  - 3 of these did not support its introduction, stating that it is too restrictive, would be confusing and would make no difference to the current lack of enforcement. Of the other comments, support was received for such parking on the setts within the High Street, but whilst some spaces should have a 2 hour maximum stay, others should be limited to 30 minutes.
  - 1 comment highlighted that the area of disc parking shown on Otley Street should only cover the section from High Street to Bunkers Hill.
  - 28 additional comments were received about parking on High Street. These were concerned with: Duration (8); Traffic problems (5); Vehicles overstaying (4); Removal of the market (3) and promoting public rather than business parking (2). The introduction of Pay and Display parking on the setts also featured.

Residents Parking

- The introduction of residents parking zones was included as an element of Strategy Option A. It generated 388 comments, largely associated with the area over which such a zone would operate and the working of a residents parking scheme. The table below details the numbers of requests for inclusion predominantly by an individual street and in a limited number of cases by area. 1 comment asked for the residents parking zone not to include each of Water Street and West Bank Road respectively, whilst another, asked for the whole of Skipton to designated as such a zone.
Table: Requests for Residents Parking by street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Number of Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belle Vue (3) comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Street (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brougham Street (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle View Terrace (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Street (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consort Street (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Street (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Street (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire Street (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embsay (Area) (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargrave Road (Area) (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Street (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville Street (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley Road (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown (Area) (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown (Area) (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otley Road (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otley Street (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke Street (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke Street (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princes Drive (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents Estate (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville Street (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury Street (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Moor Drive (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Mill (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson Houses (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bank Road (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland Street (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primrose Hill (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of requests shown in brackets

- 64 comments raised concerns over enforcement.
- 49 comments were received from residents who would object paying for a residents permit, whilst a further 25 comments objected to the concept in principal.
- 27 comments stated that parking in residential streets by non-residents, mainly consisted of commuters trying to avoid parking charges.
- 21 respondents wanted the provision of a dedicated bay outside their house, 9 of these indicated that they would be prepared to pay for such a bay.
- 20 comments asked for provision to be made for those visiting households within the zone.
- 15 comments suggested that such a zone discriminates against residents because residents have to pay to park whilst non-residents don’t.
- 10 comments requested that residents permits allow limited free parking in off-street car parks within Skipton
- 8 comments were concerned about parking displaced from such a zone
- 7 comments questioned the definition of a resident (street, Skipton, Craven etc).
- 7 comments objected to being restricted as a non-resident, suggesting that they might decide to shop elsewhere. An additional 4 comments asked for residential streets to be used for employee parking during the day.
- 4 comments asked for permits to be issued ‘per vehicle’ whilst 3 asked for permits to be issued for any vehicle within a household or a property. An additional comment questioned the situation regarding horseboxes and trailers.
- 4 comments asked for additional information
- 3 comments requested a limited number of permits to be issued.
- 2 comments requested exemptions for disabled drivers parking within the zone.
- 2 comments asked for parking meters for non-residents parking within the zone
- 2 comment asked for the parking zone to be made a 20 mph zone
HCV Access Issues

- 56 comments supported the proposal contained within Strategy Option A to restrict HCV use of High Street. 4 comments noted that restrictions should have been imposed when the bypass opened.
- 56 comments requested a wider restriction encompassing the ‘town centre’, of which 9 suggested the imposition of time limited access. 14 of these comments also focused on the need to enforce any such restriction. In addition, comments mentioned Otley Road (4), Newmarket Street (3), Sackville Street (3) and Broughton Road (2).
- 30 comments suggested that HCVs should either be encouraged or compelled to use the bypass.
- 8 comments requested the prohibition of HCV driver training within the High Street.
- 5 comments suggested banning HCV parking within car parks.
- 2 comments noted the problems in restricting access because of the low bridges on Broughton Road and Keighley Road.

Other Elements of Option A

- Strategy Option A contained two further elements, a 20mph zone on Brougham Street and Westmoreland Street, and monitoring of the effectiveness of the existing traffic calming in Gargrave Road.
- The proposed 20 mph zone generated 46 comments. Of these:
  - 20 comments highlighted excessive vehicle speeds along Westmoreland Street particularly as it is used as a rat run avoiding the town centre. 3 additional comments noted excessive speeds on Sackville Street and asked for it to be included within the 20 mph zone. 1 comment asked for an extension to include Russell Street.
  - 9 comments requested a pelican crossing outside the school on Brougham Street.
  - 4 comments requested traffic calming along Brougham Street, whilst 1 comment opposed this stance.
  - 3 comments requested enforcement of the lower speed limits
  - 3 comments were concerned with the school run, including pick up/drop off, on Brougham Street, Devonshire Street and Neville Street, posing a hazard to other drivers.
  - 1 comment requested pavement improvements

- Traffic Calming on Gargrave road generated 105 comments. Of these:
  - 61 comments reported upon the traffic calming measures currently used along the Gargrave Road in Skipton:
  - 24 comments reported that the road is still dangerous, with 21 of these stating that excessive speed of vehicles is still a problem
  - 9 comments suggest that the traffic calming measures are ineffective and have failed to calm traffic
  - 9 comments state that the traffic calming measures were a waste of money
  - 6 comments report that the traffic calming measures have increased the number of near-collisions and actual accidents
  - 4 comments state that traffic calming has decreased road safety for all road users, of which 1 comment highlights the increased danger to cyclists as they are forced into the traffic at the chicane points.
  - 3 comments request the enforcement of a 20mph speed limit along Gargrave Road
  - 2 comments request the introduction of road humps to reduce traffic speed
  - 2 comments request the need to install speed cameras to reduce traffic speed traffic
• 1 comment requests the painting of white line road marking at the chicane points to increase driver awareness of these features

• 24 comments were received in relation to the problems of school bus boarding and the school run on Gargrave Road
  12 of these highlighted severe traffic congestion, of which 3 also questioned pedestrian safety.
  7 suggested that school buses should terminate at the bus station, whilst 1 was opposed to this idea and indeed routing of such buses through the town.
  5 suggested that boarding should take place within the school grounds
  3 comments suggested restricting vehicular access along Gargrave Road at the start and end of each school day, of which 1 comment offered the suggestion of closing Gargrave Road completely between the periods of 0800-0830 and 1500-1630.
  3 comments stated that all roads outside and near schools should enforce reduced traffic speeds
  1 comments requested reducing the 40mph speed limit (which is not observed by motorists), to a 10-15mph enforced speed limit
  1 comment requested reducing the speed limit to an enforced 20mph speed restriction between the Little Chef roundabout and the Water Street/Mill Bridge Junction.

Option B
Option B includes: the pedestrianisation of part of Otley Street (the comments for which have been included within the pedestrianisation section of Option A); the introduction of a 20 mph zone covering the town centre; the development of a home zone for Middletown; and, the proposed phased introduction of localised traffic calming within the other residential areas of Skipton.

20 mph zone
• 52 comments were received supporting the introduction of the 20 mph zone. Of these:
  • 18 comments stressed the need for enforcement, with a further 3 comments supporting the option if camera enforcement was implemented
  • 17 comments suggested that congestion on High Street naturally reduces traffic speeds
  • 14 comments asked for the zone to be extended to cover:
    • All schools within the central area (9)
    • All residential areas (3)
    • Short Bank Road (1)
    • Water Street (1)
  • 5 comments thought that 20 mph restrictions are not enforceable
  • 2 comments would not support a 20 mph zone enforced through speed humps
  • 2 comments suggested that insufficient information had been provided with regard to the complementary traffic calming measures.
Home Zone

- 10 comments were received about the proposed Home Zone. Of these:
  - 7 requested additional information
  - 2 suggested that a Home Zone is not enforceable?
  - 1 asked for Sun Moor Drive to be included within the Home Zone

Traffic calming

- The proposals to introduce traffic calming for several residential streets/areas has evoked support but also opposition
  - 28 comments stated opposition towards the use of road humps as a traffic calming mechanism,
    - 14 comments stated opposition towards the traffic calming proposals,
    - 15 respondents requested the enforcement of current speed and parking restrictions, with 4 of these requesting a greater police presence.
    - 5 comments requested the use of speed cameras as preferred traffic calming mechanism,
    - 3 respondents questioned how the proposed 20mph speed restrictions would be enforced
    - 2 comments requested the introduction of road humps for traffic calming, stating that this was the only effective method for slowing down motorists.
    - 2 comments requested the use of chicanes rather than road humps as the preferred traffic calming mechanism
    - 2 comments requested minimal or no painting along roads in traffic calmed areas
    - 2 comments requested speed limit reduction to 10 or 20mph to be introduced in all residential areas.
    - 1 comment requested the introduction of rumble strips with 30mph speed restrictions at all schools - favouring this traffic calming mechanism as other mechanisms distract the driver from awareness of pedestrians.
    - 1 comment requested traffic calming and the introduction of a 20mph speed restriction for the Craven Street Primary School area.

- Many comments identified roads requiring traffic calming. Those with the most comments have been grouped under sub-heading below.
  - Otley Road
    - 12 comments highlighted excessive vehicle speeding along this road, particularly as it was used as a short cut from the bypass mainly by HCVs
    - 4 comments requested 20mph speed restrictions along this road to enhance pedestrian safety, of which 1 suggested the introduction of speed limit signs placed on the approach before the bridge.
    - 1 comment requested the proposed traffic calming area be extended from Regents Estate to include Otley Road
    - 1 comment requested traffic calming be introduced encompassing Greenacres and Otley Road, to prevent this route being used as a rat-run and race track by vehicles
  - Carleton Road/Carleton New Road/Keighley Road
• 2 comments requested the introduction of traffic calming for the Carleton New Road/Keighley Road junction on Carleton Road, reporting that the current 30mph speed limit is not observed and is therefore dangerous especially as it contains a 90 degree blind bend
• 2 comments requested the introduction of a 20mph speed limit along Carleton Road as current excessive traffic speed is dangerous.
• 1 comment requested the introduction of traffic calming for the Carleton Road/Carleton New Road/Brooklands Terrace junction as it is currently hazardous
• 1 comment requested the introduction of traffic calming along Carleton New Road to extend past the cemetery
• 1 comment requested the introduction of speed cameras along Keighley Road
• Raikes Road
  • 8 comments requested traffic calming to be extended to cover the entire length of Raikes Road
  • 7 comments reported excessive vehicle speeds along Raikes Road
  • 3 comments requested the introduction of a 20mph speed limit along Raikes Road
  • 2 comments requested the introduction of speed humps along Raikes Road
  • 1 comment reported the dangerous use of Raikes Road as a turning point for all types of vehicles
• Short Bank Road
  • 12 comments requested the introduction of traffic calming for this road, particularly the need to impose a 20mph speed limit in order to reduce the excessive speed of vehicles travelling along this road.
• The Bailey
  • 5 comments requested the introduction of traffic calming along The Bailey as speeding vehicles endangered the safety of pedestrians crossing this road in front of the castle, of which 2 comments specifically requested the enforcement of a 30mph or less speed restriction along this road.

• Comments also requested the introduction of traffic calming for the following areas:
  • Grassington Road (5)
  • Castle Street (3)
  • Middletown (2)
  • Raikeswood Drive (2)
  • All approach roads into Skipton, especially Harrogate Road (1)
  • Ermystead Street (1)
  • Horse Close Road (1)
  • Rectory lane (1)
  • St Stephens Close (1)
  • Sod Hill Lane (1)
  • Water Street (1)
Vehicle speeding was reported on the following:

- Moor View Way (2)
- Bright street (1)
- Brook Street to Gargrave Road (1t)
- Broughton Road (1)
- Consort Street (1)
- Embsay Road (1)
- Ings Lane (1)
- Keighley Road (1)
- Mill Bridge (1)
- Rockwood Drive (1)
- Windsor Avenue (1)

Embsay and Eastby traffic calming schemes

- 2 comments stated that the Eastby Road traffic calming measures in Embsay are ineffective and a waste of money
- 1 comment stated that traffic calming in Embsay and Eastby are totally ineffective as speeding still occurs and road humps are therefore required.
- 1 comment stated that the Bow Bridge traffic calming measures in Embsay are ineffective and a health hazard

Option C

- 53 comments were received opposing Strategy Option C in its entirety, stating that the historical character of the High Street should be preserved. A further 25 comments opposed the option because of the moving of setts. (This would only have occurred under Scheme 2).
- 19 comments stated that all that was needed was control and management of the market.
- 17 comments stated that all that is required is additional pedestrian crossing points.
- 11 comments opposed the removal of any trees within the High Street, (again only considered as part of Scheme 2)
- 6 comments considered Option C to be unnecessary and a further 2 comments stated that the Option would not reduce traffic levels.

Scheme 1

- 68 comments related specifically to Strategy Option C, Scheme 1. Of these:
  - 17 comments supported Scheme 1, but requested additional pedestrian crossing points. Notably in the vicinity of Jerry Croft, but also at the South end of the High Street at Caroline Square.
  - 14 comments considered the danger for pedestrians whilst on the proposed new footway, particularly that created by vehicles crossing the footway to access the
setts. An additional 3 comments opposed the scheme because it place pedestrians closer to the traffic.

- 16 comments suggested that the scheme would not change the behaviour of market stall holders in relation to their parking on the carriageway and the obstruction caused by stalls overhanging the footway.
- 4 comments considered the new footway to be unnecessary.
- 4 comments thought that Scheme 1 would spoil the character of the High Street.
- 2 comments asked for disabled parking to be retained.
- 2 comments thought that the proposed new footway was too narrow.

**Scheme 2**

- 132 comments were received regarding Strategy Option C, Scheme 2. All but 12 comments opposed the scheme, of these
  - 35 comments opposed the scheme because of the need for pedestrian to cross both to and from the central area.
  - 26 comments thought that the scheme would destroy the historic nature of the Market Place, whilst an additional 17 considered it to be ‘disastrous’.
  - 16 comments opposed the relocation of the setts.
  - 12 comments thought that the number of pedestrians crossing to the central area would increase traffic congestion.
  - 9 comments considered the scheme to be unnecessary, 3 or these commenting on the likely cost.
- Those supporting the scheme requested additional crossing points, the blocking of the right turning movement into Jerry Croft, retention of parking on the setts and enforcement of Market regulations.

**The Market**

- Within the context of Option C, a considerable number of comments were received about the Market. A number of these suggested that the aesthetic values of the high street are ruined by the presence of stalls, several comments regarded the market as a car boot sale and described its appearance and content as tatty. The structure of the market needs to be dealt with and there is a need to ensure highway and pedestrian safety.
  - 177 comments were received regarding the blatant abuse and lack of enforcement of Market Regulations, these predominantly related to the obstruction of the carriageway by stallholders’ vehicles and obstruction of the footway by protruding stalls.
  - 82 comments requested the relocation of the market from High Street. Of those who suggested an alternative, the favoured locations were the Town Hall Car Park (31) and Coach Street Car Park (11). Other suggestions included relocation to the Auction Mart or Waller Hill Car Park.
  - 13 comments asked for a reduction in the number of days that the market is held.
  - 12 comments suggested the construction of a permanent undercover market.
  - 11 comments requested the abolition of the market.
2 comments asked for the physical size of the Market to be reduced.

**Bus Station Redevelopment**

- 40 comments endorsed the proposal to redevelop the bus station, with 9 specifically commenting that the run-down physical appearance did nothing to encourage bus transport usage.
- 14 comments requested the bus station to be redeveloped in a similar or identical manner to Keighley bus station.
- 48 highlighted the inadequacy of current facilities, of these:
  - 16 commented expressed concern regarding personal safety, with 4 commenting upon the inadequate lighting, 5 requested improved station security, and 7 specifically requested the introduction of CCTV to enhance passenger safety.
  - 9 commented upon the lack of suitable shelter for passengers
  - 7 commented upon the lack of seating available
  - 8 commented upon the lack of public toilet facilities
  - 6 commented upon the lack of café facilities
- 26 comments also deemed passenger information to be inadequate
- A manned information kiosk (10)
- Provision of an electronic information board displaying services, destinations, connections (4)
- Maintenance of timetable information (9 - of which 1 illustrated the situation by stating that the present timetables are dated June 2001).
- Provision of detailed route information (2)
- Wall and bus stop/shelter timetables to be positioned at a lower eye level for elderly and disabled passengers (1)
- Bus station pedestrian and disabled access concerns regarding the following issues were raised:
  - Wheelchair ramp access en route to the bus station and for bus boarding (1)
  - Safe pedestrian access from bus station to Sunwin House was essential (1)
  - White lines along step edges and ramp access required on bridge from bus station to Tesco (1)
  - Disabled pedestrian access to Gallows bridge required (2)
  - Disabled route access to bus station when dropped-off by car (1)
- Although supporting the redevelopment of the bus station, several did not state a preference for either concept, as the following suggestions would require consideration:
  - Relocating the bus station to an integrated transport interchange at Skipton railway station (7)
  - Bus platforms structured in a staggered right-angled drive-in/reverse-out format (5)
  - Insufficient number of bus platforms proposed for number of bus services and connecting services (4)
  - Improved design of bus station entrance - one way in, one way out vehicular flow required (2)
  - Relocating the bus station to the Grassington Road/Bypass end of Tarn Moor estate enabling it to be used as a park and ride site (1)
  - Relocating the bus station to the Town Hall car park (1)
- Comments explaining their opposition regarding the redevelopment and proposed concepts elaborated upon the following issues:
  - 12 comments opposed the reduction in car parking provision, of which 4 specifically opposed any reduction in disabled car parking provision;
  - 2 comments opposed the use of the bus station by tourist coaches
7 comments requesting an alternative concept;
2 comments suggesting that the parking element of concept 1 and physical station structure of concept 2 to be combined;
8 comments stated that the concepts were a waste of resources as the bus station is prone to vandalism and retreat for those wishing to display anti-social behaviour
2 comments suggested that the proposed concepts were to elaborate and expensive;
1 comment stated that any improvements made to the bus station would not be maintained simply because Craven District Council does not possess the resources to provide or maintain public toilet facilities at the bus station.

Although supporting concept 2:
12 comments specifically requested the retention of car parking provision at the bus station
3 comments perceived concept 2 as more dangerous for pedestrians;
1 comment noted that concept 2 could not be introduced in combination of High Street Scheme 2 as road restrictions would prevent coaches access the town hall car park via Jerry Croft.

Of those who supported bus station redevelopment concept 1, 28 respondents commented upon the following:
21 comments stated that they supported Concept 1 on the basis that car parking spaces would be retained;
4 comments stated that although they preferred Concept 2, they support Concept 1 as they did not want to loose car parking spaces that elderly and disabled considered essential for access to the co-op and the post office;
2 comments stated their support was based on the perception that the station entrance proposed in Concept 1 would be safer than that proposed in Concept 2;
1 comment requested an additional pedestrian crossing for access to Keighley Road car park

Coaches
24 comments suggested that coaches should not park in the town hall car park but on the periphery. A number of specific locations were suggested, including:
Aireville Park (7)
Auction Mart (4, inc. 2 requests for park and ride)
As part of a multi-storey on Water Street (1).
Allow coach drop-off at bus station but non-town coach parking
1 comment expressed concern regarding the relocation of coach parking to periphery displacing parking at that re-location site.
50 comments stated opposition towards the relocation of coach parking to the bus station, of which:
16 comments highlighted the increased pedestrian/vehicle danger resulting from the increased walking distance and crossing points faced by coach passengers to access the high street area, particularly when there are substantial coach passenger numbers and elderly coach passengers;
13 comments perceived that the physical size of the bus station would not accommodate the sheer number of coaches which could amount to over 20 per day during summer;
3 comments expressed concern regarding increased danger to pedestrians and vehicles through the mixing of transport modes at the bus station
6 comments stated that coaches would add to the town centre congestion en route to the bus station
2 commented favoured coach relocation as it would then allow additional car parking at the town hall car park.
7 comments requested the introduction of coach access and parking restrictions:
6 comments did not support coaches dropping off and picking up within the High Street.

Taxis
The majority of the comments on Taxis within Skipton related to the location of taxi ranks, although 14 suggested that too many taxis are operating in the town and 5 complained about the standard of driving, notably u-turns in Cross Street.
13 comments suggested fewer taxis on the bus station site, and 6 comments that the proposals for taxis within the redevelopment were excessive. Another comment stated that the ‘rank in the bus station is too remote’.
2 comments requested the retention of current rank facilities.
2 comments requested lower fares.
1 comment requested a rank at the top end of High Street.
Concern was expressed by 1 comment upon the need to ensure taxi ranks do not encroach other areas of the bus station.

Other Issues

Maintenance
4 comments requested better street lighting
1 comment requested the remarking of the lanes on High Street
1 comment requested the remarking of the lanes on Otley Road from Otley Street to Market Street
1 comment asked for more money to be spent on maintenance

Obstruction
Due to vehicles obstructing the highway, several comments requested double yellow line parking restrictions at the following locations:
Between Brougham Street and Ermystead Street,
Along the entire length of Rectory Lane,
Along the entire length of Coach Street

One-way traffic flow
67 comments were received in relation to proposed one-way streets or indeed a one-way system that would, in effect, create an inner ring road.
24 comments requested a one-way system, a typical example being, Coach Street - Water Street - Mill Bridge - The Bailey - Rectory Lane - Newmarket street - Caroline Square - Swadford Street
14 comments requested one-way traffic on Newmarket Street (in isolation)
• 11 comments requested one-way traffic on Brewery Lane
• 7 comments requested the widening or Rectory Lane to accommodate 2 lanes of traffic.
• 4 comments requested one-way traffic on Cross Street
• 2 comments requested one-way traffic on Court Lane
• 1 comment was received for making each of Rectory Lane, Otley Street and The Bailey one-way and also reversing the current flow on Coach Street.

**Right Turn Bans**

• 18 comments requested that right turn access to jerry croft from high street, be banned.
  4 comments suggested the creation of a new access to the Town Hall Car Park from the Bailey.
• 3 comments requested that the right turn to Otley Street from High Street be banned
• 1 comment asked for the right turn from Caroline Square into Swadford Street to be banned.
• 1 comment suggested that the right turn from Cavendish Street into Swadford Street be banned.

**Signing**

• 43 comments were received concerning signing. These largely covered both the clarity and sometimes incoherence of existing signs. Of these:
  • 24 comments related to car park signing, including 5 requests for variable messaging signs. One comment requested the removal of the P from the sign mounted on Belmont Bridge, suggesting that it currently led to confusion and vehicles including coaches and HCVs turning into Belmont Wharf rather than Coach Street.
  • 13 comments related to better signing both of and on to the bypass with particular reference to the detail provided on the bypass signing (e.g. Skipton but not Snaygill Industrial Estate) and the routing out of town back to the bypass currently routed through High Street.
  • 2 requests were made for better signing to the railway station.
  • 1 request was made for better safety signing passing the Schools on Gargrave Road.
  • 1 request asked for better signing from the A59 to avoid use of Broughton Road.
Appendix 10: Area Committee Report, Area Committee Minutes and NYCC Decision Record
1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the outcome of the public consultation exercise which has recently been completed in connection with the Traffic Management Strategy options for Skipton.

1.2 In addition, the report makes recommendations on the Traffic Management Strategy for Skipton.

1.3 The report also discusses those short term measures which are now being developed and will be implemented using funds included in the 2002/2003 Integrated Transport Capital Budget.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Committee on 23 May this year, a report was presented which provided an update on progress on the preparation of the Skipton Traffic Management Strategy.

2.2 At the meeting, Members resolved that three options, listed as Options A, B and C for addressing traffic issues in Skipton, together with two concepts for the redevelopment of Skipton Bus Station be approved as a basis for the public consultation exercise. All of these proposals are indicated on the exhibition display drawings which will be available at your meeting.

2.3 Approximately 11,000 leaflets were delivered to addresses within the Skipton area and to 70 stakeholders and statutory consultees. An exhibition of the options and other proposals was also held in Skipton Town Centre on the 19, 20 and 21 September. This exhibition was manned by County Council and Mouchel North Yorkshire Officers. A copy of the consultation leaflet is included with these papers to remind Members of the details of the proposals presented for public comment.

2.4 The summary of the overall response to this exercise is attached to this report as Appendix 1.

2.5 Over 20% of the households and businesses have responded to the consultation. This is a satisfactory level of response and compares well with the response rate which can normally be expected in consultation exercises of this kind.
2.6 Many of the questionnaires were accompanied by detailed written comments, and in the case of many of the stakeholders and statutory consultees, more formal written submissions were made. A summary of the questionnaire comments is provided at Appendix 2. Comments have not been reproduced verbatim; rather, particular issues and categories of comment have been assembled together, and an indication of the numbers of respondents supporting or mentioning the issue is given.

2.7 In relation to the formal submissions from Statutory consultees and/or Stakeholders, these are attached as Appendix 3.

2.8 In addition, Craven District Council's Performance and Resources Committee discussed the strategy at its meeting on 16 October 2002. A copy of their report which was accepted is attached as Appendix 4.

3.0 INTERPRETATION OF RESPONSES

3.1 Members will note from Appendices 2 and 3 that a very wide range of views have been expressed in the responses to this public consultation exercise, from residents, businesses, stakeholders and statutory consultees.

3.2 The response summary in Appendix 1 indicates preferences for the various Options as follows:-

3.3 Option A, which includes a number of pedestrian and cycling measures, public transport improvements, junction improvements, parking issues including 'Residents Only' parking, and restriction of the use of High Street by heavy goods vehicles except those requiring access for delivery purposes, received a considerable level of support, with 76% of responses being in favour.

In addition, there was some support in the comments received for an extension of the HGV restriction in the town beyond the High Street (Appendix 2).

The comments in Appendix 2 raise several concerns related to residents parking zones, charges and displacement issues and enforcement which will need to be addressed in the development of any residents parking scheme.

3.4 Option B, which builds on Option A by adding a 20 mph zone in the central area of Skipton, the pedestrianisation of Otley Street, the creation of a Home Zone in Middletown and localised traffic calming in residential areas, also received a significant level of support, with 51% of respondents voting for the option with 29% voting against (20% not responding).

3.5 Given the level of support for Options A and B your officers consider that these options should be adopted and those proposals which can be progressed should now be developed for implementation subject to appropriate consultation. The timing of these works will need to be subject to further review as part of the roll forward of the capital programme.
3.6 Option C, changing the use of space within the High Street; was supported by 54% of respondents, with 36% voting against and 10% not responding. Of the two scheme options put forward, 54% of respondents supported Scheme 1 which maintains and enhances the existing layout of the market stalls. Scheme 2, however, which created a new 'Market Place' in the centre of the High Street to the north of Otley Street, was only supported by 42% of respondents, with 4% not responding. Craven District Council also considers that Scheme 2 does not merit any further attention by the County Council.

3.7 It is the view of your officers that Option C, Scheme 1 should be taken forward as a basis for developing, in discussion and consultation with Craven District Council and other partners, a plan for improving conditions within the High Street, including improved facilities for pedestrians at the northern end of High Street and Caroline Square as highlighted in Appendix 2. In addition your officers feel no further action should be taken on Scheme 2.

3.8 The consultation exercise also included proposals for the redevelopment of the Bus Station.

88% of respondents supported the improvement of facilities of the Bus Station with only 6% voting against and 6% not responding.

Concept 1, which improves the current facilities whilst retaining car parking and not affecting the Craven District Council's Keighley Road car park received the greatest support of 48% of the two concepts whilst Concept 2, which included a higher level of development including coach pick-up, drop-off and layover facilities but removed the Keighley Road car park, received marginally less support with 46% of the vote. Both options included an improved taxi rank.

Craven District Council, who own the Bus Station, is of the view that a mixed use concept (Concept 1) is more acceptable due to the need to maintain a car parking facility at this location near to the post office and shops.

There was support for the relocation of short-stay coach parking from the Town Hall Car Park to the Bus Station site 50% for 40% against, (10% not responding). This could only be achieved by redevelopment of the bus station (Concept 2) the least favoured concept.

One of the advantages of this would be to remove coaches from Jerry Croft. This aim could also be achieved by providing coach parking at other locations on the periphery of the town.

It will be noted from Appendix 2 that the issue of coach picking up and dropping off facilities was mentioned by a significant number of people. This is a matter which will need to be addressed in the detailed development of the High Street scheme.
3.9 Members will recall that a sum of £100,000 is included in the Integrated Transport Capital Programme in the current financial year to enable a start to be made on implementing the Skipton Traffic Management Strategy. At your meeting in May of this year you identified a number of short term initiatives which could be implemented using the funding in this year’s budget. Further development of these initiatives has been undertaken, and it is anticipated implementation of the following scheme will commence shortly:-

- Dropped kerbs and tactile paving in the whole of the study area.

- Bus stop improvements. Poles, flags, timetable cases, low floor boarding at key locations and on key bus corridors.

- Footway improvements at:
  a) Aireville Park
  b) Guisburn Street/Broughton Road
  c) Shortbank Road
  d) Black Walk and access route to Bus Station via Gallows Bridge
  e) The Bailey to Regent Road and Cinder Path

- Traffic sign audit, rationalisation and improvements. This issue is clearly one of major concern as indicated in Appendix 2.

3.10 It will also be noted at Appendix 2 that a variety of other issues and requests have been raised by respondents. These will be assessed and, where appropriate, additional investigations will be undertaken to determine whether they should be taken forward. Members will note that a number of responses related to off-street parking issues including park and ride. The comments will be discussed with Craven District Council who are responsible for off-street parking.

4.0 FURTHER INFORMATION

4.1 Members are asked to note that the decision on the traffic management strategy to be adopted for Skipton is a matter which is delegated to the Director of Environmental Services.

4.1 It is however vital that the views of the Area Committee are sought on the strategy to be adopted, since this is clearly a matter of great local concern, as underlined by the particularly high level of response to the public consultation exercise.
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:-

5.1 The current position on the short term measures identified in paragraph 3.9 be noted.

5.2 The Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee's view that Option A, described in Paragraph 3.3 and shown on display Drawing No B9329/015/015B should be adopted.

5.3 The Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee's view that Option B, which adds to Option A as described in Paragraph 3.4 and as shown on Drawing No B9329/015/016B should be adopted.

5.4 The Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee's view that Option C Scheme 1, which improves conditions in High Street whilst still retaining the existing market be adopted.

5.5 The Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee's view that no further action be taken on Option C Scheme 2.

5.6 The Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee's view that the re-development of the bus station Concept 1 is progressed in conjunction with Craven District Council and bus operators.

5.7 Officers be requested to present a further report to a future meeting of this Committee, setting out a proposed phasing plan for implementation of the adopted strategy for Skipton.

M O MOORE
Director of Environmental Services

Background Papers:

None.

Author of Report: W Isherwood
Presenter of Report: G Cressey

02 November 2002
CRAVEN AREA COMMITTEE

Extract of minutes of the meeting held 7 November 2002

SKIPTON TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

CONSIDERED –

Report by the Director of Environmental Services informing of the outcome of a public consultation exercise recently completed in connection with the Traffic Management Strategy Options for Skipton and considering short term measures which are being developed and will be implemented using funds included in the 2002/2003 Integrated Transport Capital Budget.

The Director of Environmental Services reported that the 20% response rate on the consultation exercise could be considered as having been satisfactory. 76% of the respondents having supported option A, whilst 51% had supported option B, with 9% being against that option. It was encouraging to see the wide range of comments which had been received.

A Member remarked that there needed to be some form of public announcement as an assurance that the setts in the High Street in Skipton were not to be removed as part of the Strategy. The situation relating to the construction of a new footpath in the High Street was debated with Members being reminded that traffic management did not only encompass motor traffic, but also involved proposals for the management of pedestrians and cyclists. The Director of Environmental Services reported that monies in respect of improvements to the bus station would be included in the 2003/04 budget and that no monies would be spent in this respect during the current financial year.

The Director of Environmental Services reported that any question of whether the District Council would be requested to provide a Traffic Warden to enforce Residents’ Parking had not been raised with that Authority, adding that the Strategy in respect of the implementation of enforcement of Residents’ Parking was still a matter for discussion. Whilst a view was expressed that residents should not be asked to contribute towards parking in front of their own properties, it was also the view that should such residents require assistance in keeping parking fronting their properties free for their own use, then they should be asked to contribute towards this.

The meeting was informed that a meeting was to be held with Mouchel in the first week in December and that it was intended to provide the Area Committee with progress reports relating to the Traffic Management Strategy.
Members discussed if/or whether taxis and buses should operate from the same site in order to prevent lengthy walks between sites by their users. Members considered that dual siting of the services would be in accordance with the intentions of the need for integrated transport.

A Member also asked that consideration be given to extending the closing of the High Street which occurred at Christmas to the closing of the High Street on each Saturday.

The Director of Environmental Services confirmed that many comments received in response to the consultation needed to be carefully considered and assessed and assured the Committee that a report would be brought back to a future meeting as a result, with recommendations as to how to move the matters forward.

A member of the public was invited to speak and mentioned a number of simple measures, which could be undertaken in order to improve the flow of the traffic through the town, particularly, the restriction of loading/unloading times of HGV’s outside of Woolworths.

RESOLVED –

(i) the current position on the short term measures identified in paragraph 3.9 of the report be noted;

(ii) the Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee’s view that option A, described in paragraph 3.3 of the report and shown on display drawing number B9329/015/015B should be adopted;

(iii) the Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee’s view that option B, which adds to option A as described in paragraph 3.4 of the report and as shown in drawing number B9329/015/016B should be adopted;

(iv) the Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee’s view that option C, scheme 1, which forms the basis to improve conditions in the High Street whilst still retaining the existing market be adopted; and that in this respect the Director of Environmental Services be instructed to investigate the possibility of imposing a weight restriction on the High Street;

(v) the Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee’s view that no further action should be taken on option C, scheme 2;

(vi) the Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee’s view that the re-development of the bus station concept C1 is progressed in conjunction with Craven District Council and bus operators;
(vii) officers be requested to present a further report to the meeting scheduled to be held in February 2003, setting out a proposed phasing plan for implementation of the adopted strategy for Skipton; and

(viii) the officers and consultants be thanked for the work they have undertaken in developing the Skipton Town Management Strategy to date.
NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

DECISION RECORD

[Produced under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000]

This form should be used to record key decisions taken by an officer (either alone or in consultation with an Executive Member) and executive decisions taken by an individual member. (One form per decision)

The following key decision has been taken: -

That a traffic management strategy for Skipton be adopted which includes the proposals contained in Option A, Option B and Option C Scheme 1 as described in the consultation leaflet and as indicated on Drawing No's B9329/015/015B, B9329/015/016B and B9329/015/017B which were displayed at the County Council's Craven Area Committee on 7 November 2002.

That the re-development of Skipton Bus Station Concept 1 as described in the consultation leaflet and as indicated on Drawing No B9329/015/021 which was displayed at the County Council's Craven Area Committee on 7 November 2002 be progressed in conjunction with Craven District Council and bus operators.

By whom:  M O Moore
(insert name of Meeting, Member or Officer)

On:  24 December 2002
(insert date decision taken)

Reasons for decision: -

To enable the traffic management strategy for Skipton to proceed.

Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: -

Option C Scheme 2 as described in the consultation leaflet and as indicated on Drawing No B9329/015/017B displayed at the Craven Area Committee on the 7 November was rejected in favour of Option C Scheme 1.

Concept 2 for the re-development of Skipton Bus Station as described in the consultation leaflet and as indicated on Drawing No 9324/015/021 displayed at the Craven Area Committee on 7 November was rejected in favour of Concept 1.
Conflicts of Interest

Please record below details of any conflict of interest declared by a Member or Officer regarding the decision and any dispensation granted by the Standards Committee in respect of that conflict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Dispensation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed .............................................. Date 24 December 2002

(Name) M O Moore

Directorate Environmental Services

Note: This decision will come into force, and may then be implemented, on the expiry of 5 working days after publication, unless any 6 members of the Council object to it and call it in by notice in writing to the Head of Committee Services.

Should you require any further information, please contact Mike Moore on telephone number 01609 532367

To: The Head of Committee Services (Stephen Knight)
Committee Services (Margaret Gray)
The Staff Officer to the Chief Executive (Amanda Fry)
All Members of the Council
The Monitoring Officer (Catherine Whitehead)
The Chief Finance Officer (John Moore)
The Head of Corporate Policy & Performance (Bill Cross)