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1 Introduction

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

The overall aim of the study is to produce an integrated traffic management strategy for Leyburn, 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 is included as Appendix 1. Whilst not totally prescriptive, it sets out the stages to be included in the strategy development process, which have been used to establish the structure of this report. The strategy has been developed within the framework provided by the North Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2001-2006 (dated July 2000) and the Richmondshire Local Plan 1999-2006 (dated 2001). These plans have been produced within the wider scope of the national guidance including Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 (PPG13): Transport, which sets objectives to integrate planning and transport decision making at all levels.

Consultation has been carried out to ensure the views of the local people, Leyburn Town Council and Richmondshire District Council, transport operators, police and emergency services, and other key stakeholders have been taken into account at each stage of the study process. A list of those involved in developing the strategy is included as Appendix 2.

The strategy proposed within this document identifies costs and prioritises a programme of schemes for implementation. A Pedestrian Action Plan was produced as an integral part of this strategy, and is included as a separate document within Appendix 3.
2 The Leyburn Study Area

2.1 Location
Leyburn is located on a terrace above the northern bank of the River Ure in Wensleydale, Richmondshire, on the edge of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. It is at the cross-roads of the A684 running east-west and by the A6108 running north-south. Richmond lies 8 miles to the north, Bedale 10 miles to the east, Ripon 20 miles to the south, and Hawes 16 miles to the west (Figure 1). It is also bisected by the Wensleydale Railway which also runs east-west. It has an extensive rural hinterland, particularly for education, and as a retail and commercial centre.

2.2 Character of the Town
Leyburn is a small market town which still acts as a traditional service, commercial and social centre for a large surrounding rural hinterland. It also acts as the gateway to the Yorkshire Dales National Park for those travelling from the east on the A684, and attracts tourists in its own right. The re-opening of the Wensleydale Railway is seen as a key element of town’s diversification.

The town is very busy each Friday for the traditional livestock and general markets, but is always busy in and around the Market Place which acts as the centre for commence, and as a hub for local bus services. The town has three schools, a health centre, supermarkets, shops, banks, public houses and restaurants.

Figure 1: Leyburn in its Regional Context
2.3 Demography
1036 households were recorded in Leyburn ward, of which 193 (19%) did not have access to a private car or van, and 555 (54%) only had access to one private car or van, suggesting that many rely on a combination of public transport and local service provision. 959 people considered to be economically active, of which 144 (15%) work at home and a further 234 (24%) walk to work. A further 539 travel to work by car (57%), whilst 15 cycle and 14 use public transport. For over half of those travelling to work, the home and workplace are less than 2km apart, although the average distance rises to 11.2km when all travel to work is taken into account.

2.4 Access
- Pedestrian access around the town is adequate, although the structure of the modern housing estates, particularly off Dale Grove, and a number of private roads, increases the length of pedestrian trips unnecessarily. The pedestrian network fails to comply with Disability Discrimination Act standards in a number of areas including a lack of dropped kerbs and tactile paving and narrow sections or missing sections of footway, for example, on Richmond Road between Grove Square and the Auction Mart.

- Despite being popular with cycle tourists and being a future gateway to the North York Moors Cycle Network, Leyburn lacks cycle facilities, particularly for utility cyclists who aren’t afforded any priority.

- Leyburn forms a hub on North Yorkshire County Council’s ‘Premier Specification Bus Network’ serving Wensleydale and adjacent towns, the main bus stops being in the Market Place. Many of the children educated at Wensleydale School also arrive by bus, some 17 services serving the school each day in each direction. Access by public transport to and between outlying villages and hamlets in Wensleydale is poor and difficult to serve with traditional public transport services, making family ties difficult to maintain for the elderly.

- The Wensleydale Railway Ltd. offers services along Wensleydale from Redmire to Leeming Bar, operates and serves Leyburn Railway Station, and has plans to connect to the National Rail Network at Northallerton Station.

- Access to Leyburn from the trunk road network is via the A684 to the A1(M) at Leeming Bar 12.5 miles to the east. The nearest airport is Durham Tees Valley 31 miles to the east.
2.5 Historical Development
Although the name Leyburn suggests that the town has Saxon origins, and the town was mentioned in the Domesday Book, Leyburn as it is seen today is largely a product of the 19th and 20th centuries.

- Thornborough Hall (formerly Grove House/The Groves/Leyburn Grove), although being a significant house in the 16th Century, was considerably altered and enlarged in 1863.

- The town hall has been traditionally located at the western end of the Market Place, and before 1821 two great elm trees could be found next to it. The town hall (now Wray Brothers) was rebuilt by Lord Bolton in 1856/7, the upper storey being the court-room with sessions traditionally being held on the last Friday of each month.

- The catholic church of St. Peter and St. Paul was opened in 1835, St Matthew’s Church was consecrated on 16th September 1868, and the Wesleyan Chapel erected in 1884.

- A gas works was erected in 1855 on what is now South View to the north of the Railway Station. The town was first lit by gas on 5th December of the same year.

2.6 Transport Development
The local road network has developed over a long period, but was already well established by 1856 when mapped by the Ordnance Survey.

The Great North of England Railway gained power to extend its line from Bedale to Leyburn on 4th August 1853. With amalgamations, the line was opened to goods traffic on 24th November 1855 and to passenger traffic on 18th May 1856, by the North Eastern Railway Company. The extension of the line from Leyburn to Askrigg opened on 1st February 1877, and line to Hawes and Garsdale on 1st October 1878. Because of joint funding of the line from Hawes to Garsdale, both the Midland Railway and North Eastern Railway had running powers to Leyburn, resulting in some notable special trains such as ‘horsebox specials’ from Leyburn via Garsdale to stations on the Midland network. Passenger services on the line began to suffer from competition by buses in the 1940s and passenger services were withdrawn in 1954. The Wensleydale Railway PLC formally took over the line from Railtrack in 2003, running its first passenger service between Leeming Bar and Leyburn on 4th July 2003, extending the service to Redmire on 1st August 2004.
3 Transport in Leyburn

3.1 Main Traffic Generators
The main traffic generators within Leyburn are highlighted on Figure 2, and include:

- Leyburn has three educational establishments: Leyburn Community Primary School (170 pupils) Wensleydale Avenue; St Peter and St Paul RC Primary School (40 pupils) on Bellerby Road; and, Wensleydale School (477 pupils) on Richmond Road.
- The town’s Dentist is located on Wensley Road off the western end of the Market Place and the Medical Centre is located on Brentwood.
- Leyburn Livestock Auction Mart is located on Richmond Road to the north of the Market Place. It holds twice weekly sales, including a large sale on Friday coinciding with the Traditional Market held every Friday in the Market Place.
- The Market Place also serves as the centre of retail and business, having a post office, banks, two large supermarkets, a chemist, and a number of pubs, restaurants and hotels. On non-market days, the Market Place is used as a car park.
- The Library and Town Council Offices, including a room for events, are located on Moor Road to the West of Grove Square.
- Leyburn Railway Station – operated by Wensleydale Railway PLC, is located on the A684 to the east of its junction with the A6108.
- Leyburn Business Park – On the A684 at the eastern edge of the town has also developed in recent years, with further land allocated for development. Immediately adjacent to the Business Park is auctioneers Tennants of Yorkshire which holds weekly sales throughout the year.
- To the west of the town, the large Leyburn Quarry which produces limestone and concrete, and also undertakes materials recycling, is operated by CEMEX the world’s largest building materials group.
- Leyburn is also a popular tourist destination with natural features such as Leyburn Shawl, and events such as Dales Festival of Food and Drink, attracting many visitors.
Figure 2: Leyburn Study Area and Main Traffic Generators
3.2 **Major Pedestrian Activities**

The majority of pedestrian movement within the town is along footways adjacent to the road network, although there are also a number of tracks and public footpaths that form an important part of the pedestrian network. Further details of the pedestrian routes are provided in Appendix 3, and summarised below.

The main pedestrian routes are:

- Along the A684 heading east from Commercial Square and the Market Place, serving the Cinema, Parish Church, Railway Station, Business Park, Tennants and further out, the Caravan Park and Harmby;
- Along the A6108 heading north from the Market Place, serving Grove Square, St Peter and St Paul RC Primary School, the Auction Mart, Wensleydale School and adjacent residential areas forming the north-west flank of the town;
- Along Woodside and Brentwood, providing access to the County Primary School and Medical Centre; and,
- Along Grove Square and Moor Road to the Town Council Office, Library and Events held at Thornborough Hall.

Important tracks and footpaths include:

- The footpath leading from Park View to the A684 in the vicinity of the cinema;
- The footpaths running to the east of, and through, the Auction Mart, linking Brentwood and Maythorne to Richmond Road;
- The footpath linking Mount Drive and Woodburn Drive to Richmond Road; and.
- The track linking Woodburn Drive to Thornborough Hall and Moor Road.

Dale Grove is poorly connected to the rest of the town for those on foot. Despite the relatively short 'straight-line distance', there is no direct route to the County Primary School and Maythorne. Those living in Dale Grove, can currently be seen cutting along the eastern boundary of Wensleydale School as an informal 'short-cut'.

The three schools generate a significant number of walking trips, 57 pupils regularly walking to Leyburn Community Primary School, 24 walking to St Peter and St Paul RC Primary School and, 80 walking to Wensleydale School.

There is no footway on Moor Road beyond Manor Court.

**Accidents involving Pedestrians**

A pedestrian sustained slight injury after stepping out from behind a parked vehicle and into the nearside of a moving vehicle on the South side of the A684.
3.3 Major Cyclist Activities
North Yorkshire County Council produced a Leyburn Town Centre Cycle Plan in March 2003, as part of their development of the Yorkshire Dales Cycling Plan. The Leyburn Cycle Plan acknowledged that cycling facilities in Leyburn were ‘very limited’ and suggested:

- The introduction of an inbound cycle lane between Middleham Road and St Matthew’s Church on the A684;
- A route on Wensley Road linking to Low Wood Lane and the proposed route W1, which included widening of the footway on the North side of the A684 to provide an off-road route to Wensley;
- The potential for a cycle scheme leading to Wensleydale School on Richmond Road; and,
- Cycle parking at three locations within the Market Place and at Thornborough Hall.

Two manual classified turning counts have recorded cycle use within Leyburn. Surveys on:

- 30th March 2000, at the A684/A6108 junction at the western end of Leyburn Market Place recorded nine cyclists on High Street during a 12-hour period. Similar numbers were also recorded at the same junction on 20th September 2002; and,
- 12th October 2001, at the A684/Brentwood junction at the western end of Leyburn Market Place recorded 35 cyclists on Harmby Road during a 12-hour period.

Accidents involving Cyclists

- A cyclist riding in a charity ride lost control on the steep downhill stretch of Wensley Road after leaving the Market Place towards Wensley. The cyclist was thrown over the handlebars of his cycle resulting in slight injury.
- A child cyclist sustained slight injury after losing control of his cycle on Rumford Way (off Dale Grove) and colliding with a parked car.

3.4 Bus Facilities and Services
Leyburn is served by a number of bus operators and is located on North Yorkshire County Council’s ‘Premier Specification Route Network’ that serves Wensleydale and adjacent centres. As part of this network, the County Council has expressed the desire to upgrade the Bus Stops within Leyburn Market Place to cater for fully accessible interchange between three buses. Weekday bus services to and from Leyburn are summarised in Table 1.
<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>Max. Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agglethorpe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5 hours</td>
<td>09:50</td>
<td>14:54</td>
<td>00:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainderby Steeple</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2xAM, 3xPM</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>20:52</td>
<td>00:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askrigg</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Approx. 2hr</td>
<td>06:52</td>
<td>23:10</td>
<td>00:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aysgarth Falls Corner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20, 50min AM</td>
<td>06:10</td>
<td>23:21</td>
<td>00:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aysgarth Memorial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4x20min AM, 1.5 hourly PM</td>
<td>06:10</td>
<td>23:20</td>
<td>00:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Between 1 and 2 hourly service</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>21:10</td>
<td>00:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedale, Market Place</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Between 1 and 2 hourly service</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>21:10</td>
<td>00:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerby</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:55</td>
<td>18:04</td>
<td>00:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton, Coverdale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5 hours</td>
<td>09:50</td>
<td>14:46</td>
<td>00:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carperby</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>18:26</td>
<td>00:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Bolton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>18:32</td>
<td>00:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable Burton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Between 1 and 2 hourly service</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>21:21</td>
<td>00:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crakehall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Between 1 and 2 hourly service</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>21:14</td>
<td>00:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>07:55</td>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>00:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington, West Row</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>07:55</td>
<td>17:10</td>
<td>00:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downholme</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:55</td>
<td>17:58</td>
<td>00:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firghall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 2 hours</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>18:20</td>
<td>00:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammersgill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5 hours</td>
<td>09:50</td>
<td>14:41</td>
<td>00:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4x30min AM, 1.5 hourly approx.</td>
<td>06:10</td>
<td>22:53</td>
<td>00:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmby</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Between 1 and 2 hourly service</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>21:28</td>
<td>00:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawes Market Place</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4x20min AM, Hourly, 4x40min PM</td>
<td>06:10</td>
<td>22:55</td>
<td>00:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsehouse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5 hours</td>
<td>09:50</td>
<td>14:36</td>
<td>00:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>00:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeming Bar White Rose</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2xAM, 3xPM</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>20:59</td>
<td>00:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>17:03</td>
<td>00:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melmerby, Coverdale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5 hours</td>
<td>09:50</td>
<td>14:50</td>
<td>00:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>09:15</td>
<td>17:23</td>
<td>00:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton on Swale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2xAM, 3xPM</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>20:54</td>
<td>00:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton-le-Willows</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 2 hours</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>18:15</td>
<td>00:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>15:40</td>
<td>00:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Stanley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>15:45</td>
<td>00:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northallerton, Buck Inn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5hr and 50m</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>20:40</td>
<td>01:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nosterfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>15:56</td>
<td>00:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Brompton</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Between 1 and 2 hourly service</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>21:17</td>
<td>00:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston-under-Scar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>18:39</td>
<td>00:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>18:35</td>
<td>00:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>07:55</td>
<td>17:44</td>
<td>00:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>15:35</td>
<td>00:53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bus Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romanby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5hr and 50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoth Corner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedbusk Lane End</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeeby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spennithorne</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Between 1 and 2 hourly service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoralby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>04:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thormborough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton Rust</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2x4hr AM, 1.5 hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wensley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4x20min AM, Hourly, 4x40min PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Burton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5hr PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Tanfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Witton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4x20min AM, 2 hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4x20min AM, 1.5 hourly PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.ukbus.co.uk

Table 1: Locations with Bus Services from Leyburn, 2003

Bus services are of critical importance for access to school, particularly Wensleydale School, the catchment area of which extends to beyond Hawes. This is reflected in the percentage of pupils travelling by bus to school, recorded at slightly over 27% for both Leyburn Community Primary School and St Peter and St Paul RC Primary School, and at 73% for Wensleydale School.

### Rail Facilities and Services

The Wensleydale Railway Station located on the A684 to the east of the junction with the A6108 was re-opened in 2003. The railway is operated by Wensleydale Railway PLC under the terms of its 99-years lease with Network Rail.

Passenger services operate between Leeming Bar and Redmire, seven days a week during the summer months with a more limited service operating during winter. Services operate to connect with Arriva service 73 from Leeming Bar to Northallerton, but the Wensleydale Railway has aspirations to establish to extend the line into the Northallerton East Coast Main Line Station.

The new platform at Leyburn Station is shown in Plate 1, and Wensleydale Railway PLC are actively promoting the development of the station forecourt to provide additional parking and a bus-rail interchange.
3.6 Taxis
A number of private hire operators serve Leyburn. These include BMW Taxis and MY Taxi Services based in Harmby, and Elk Private Hire, and GA Private Hire based in Leyburn. Richmondshire District Council operates a Taxi Voucher scheme as an alternative to a bus pass for disabled people.

3.7 Motorcycling
The traffic count data available for Leyburn does not classify motorcycles. Observation suggests that the peak activity for motorcyclists is at weekends when the ‘run’ through Wensleydale is particularly popular.

3.8 Major Vehicle Activities
Leyburn is at the cross-roads of the A684 and A6108 shown on Figure 1. The results of 12 hour Manual Classified Counts undertaken in 2000 and 2001 are shown in Table 2. Limited classified turning counts indicate that Heavy Commercial Vehicles (HCVs) account for between 0.4% and 0.5% of all traffic.
Table 2: Traffic Flows in Leyburn, 2000-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>12 Hour Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2000</td>
<td>A684 Market Place</td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>2467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>2686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2000</td>
<td>A684 Wensley Road</td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2000</td>
<td>A6108 High Street</td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>2451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>2619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 October 2001</td>
<td>A684 Railway Street</td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>3736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>2947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 October 2001</td>
<td>A684 Harmby Road</td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>3434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>3359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 October 2001</td>
<td>Brentwood at the A684</td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 October 2001</td>
<td>Unclassified one-way exit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from Market Place to A684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(North of Tourist Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre)</td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 Car Parking and Waiting Restrictions

3.9.1 The Market Place, Commercial Square and Grove Square
The Market Place, Commercial Square and Grove Square were obtained by Leyburn Parish Council on 5th May 1960, using powers available to it under the Open Spaces Act 1906. A covenant within the agreement allows Baron Bolton and his successors in title ‘the right to park at all times a motor vehicle or vehicles on that part of Commercial Square measuring fifteen feet by eighteen feet and … such site shall be kept free at all times for the purpose aforesaid’. The position of this restricted parking within Commercial Square (Figure 3) was altered following an agreement dated 6th April 1992.
Figure 3: Parking Spaces within Commercial Square for the use of Baron Bolton and his successors

Parking area for Bolton Estates (with appropriate wall mounted sign) delineated as below

delimitation

edge of cobbles and parking area delineated by blue brick or paver blocks
Section 57 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, gives Parish Councils the powers to provide and maintain car parking within their area. It also allows Parish Councils to appropriate for car parking, land that they control under the Open Spaces Act 1906. It subsequently limits the parking on land such appropriated to ‘one-eighth of its total area or 800 square feet, whichever is less’.

Leyburn Town Council controls Leyburn Market Place, Commercial Square and Grove Square as a single landholding, and therefore the maximum area that can be lawfully provided for parking within this landholding is 74.3 square metres. As stated above, 270 square feet, some 25 square metres of parking is reserved for the use of the Bolton family. A standard parking space of width 2.4 metres and length 4.8 metres has an area of 11.52 square metres. Therefore, with the exception of the parking of the Bolton family, parking can only lawfully be provided for 4 cars on the combined area of Leyburn Market Place (Plate 2), Commercial Square and Grove Square.
Legal opinion obtained as part of this study, suggested that the Parish Council could, if the Market Place is no-longer required for open space, appropriate the land for parking under Sections 124 and 126 of the Local Government Act 1972. Such an appropriation would need to be advertised and objections could be made. If objections were received, the Parish Council would need to consider the objections before passing a resolution to change the use of the land.

A survey of parking duration in the Market Place and Commercial Square was conducted between 08:30 and 17:00 on 16th October 2003. The area of the Market Place was defined as that within the ownership of Leyburn Town Council and adjacent highways controlled by North Yorkshire County Council. The survey manually recorded the registration plate of each vehicle parking within the Market Place and Commercial Square and the length of time each vehicle was parked for.

The number of parking spaces within the Market Place is approximately 149, of which 86 are marked parking bays within the central area of the market place and 10 are marked parking bays along the southern boundary of the Market Place. Parking bays are not market within Commercial Square, but there are approximately 44 parking spaces. The survey revealed that:

- **Within the central area of the Market Place**
  - 60% of drivers were parking for a period of less than 1.0 hour
  - 14% of drivers were parking for a period of between 1.0 & 1.5 hours
  - 10% of drivers were parking for a period of between 1.5 & 3.0 hours
  - 9% of drivers were parking for a period greater than 6.0 hours
- **Along the northern perimeter of the Market Place, that of those parking:**
  - 47% of drivers were parking for a period of less than 1.0 hour
  - 20% of drivers were parking for a period of between 1.0 & 1.5 hours
  - 17% of drivers were parking for a period greater than 6.0 hours
- **Along the southern perimeter of the Market Place, that of those parking:**
  - 58% of drivers were parking for a period of less than 1.0 hour
  - 26% of drivers were parking for a period of between 1.0 & 1.5 hours
- **Within Commercial Square that of those parking:**
  - 40% of drivers were parking for a period of less than 1.0 hour
  - 15% of drivers were parking for a period of between 1.0 & 1.5 hours
  - 24% of drivers were parking for a period of between 1.5 & 3.0 hours
  - 17% of drivers were parking for a period greater than 6.0 hours

\[1\] The implications of such a change were subsequently considered within the strategy consultation and are detailed in Section 5 of this report.
The survey also revealed the impact of long-stay parking. Commercial Square exhibited a high degree of long stay parking, reflected to a lesser degree along both the northern and eastern perimeters of the Market Place. Observations during the survey period also highlighted a tendency for the western flank of the central Market Place area to be occupied by vehicles parked for more than six hours. The parking bays located in the central area of the Market Place occupied by vehicles parking more than six hours equated to 23 of the available 86 marked parking bays.

Within the entire area, 68 parking spaces are occupied by vehicles parking for more than six hours. The survey did not include parking in Grove Square, although regular observations were made throughout 16th October 2003, which revealed a significant proportion of vehicles parking for long periods. Those employed within the town, those employed elsewhere but using the town as an informal park and ride, hotel guests and permanent residents are largely responsible for the long stay parking.

In addition to the issues considered above, the central area of the town is signed as a controlled parking zone for good vehicles of over 3 tons, with no parking on verges or Market Areas between Midnight and 6 am, and 6pm and Midnight. The signing is not compliant with current Traffic Signs Regulations (Diagram Ref. 665) which only permits restrictions for vehicles of 5t or 7.5t. Thus, the current restriction can not be enforced and the Traffic Regulation Order should be amended or revoked.

Much of the town centre is also subject to the following restrictions:

- No waiting at anytime;
- No waiting all days 08:00 – 18:00; and,
- No waiting Monday to Saturday 08:00 – 17:30.

3.9.2 Off-street Parking

Richmond District Council operates a 120 space off-street car park in Leyburn (Plate 3) situated between the Market Place and Auction Mart. It is accessed from the Market Place with an exit past the fire station on to Richmond Road/Harmby Road. Charges for parking in the car park at the time the study was undertaken applied from 08:00 to 18:00 all days and were:
- Free for motorcyclists and the disabled;
- 60p for unto 2 hours;
- 40p for each hour thereafter;
- £2 maximum per day (10 hours);
- £7 for a long-stay 1 week permit; and,
- £30 for an annual permit allowing unlimited parking in all of the District Council’s off-street car parks.

Plate 3: Richmond District Council Car Park, Leyburn

3.10 One-way Streets, Roundabouts and Access Restrictions
Railway Street in the vicinity of the Sandpiper Inn is one way in an easterly direction.

The junction of the A684 and A6108 at the western end of the Market Place is laid out and operates as a mini-roundabout, although access by large vehicles serving the commercial premises in Grove Square is at best unconventional; HCVs reversing from High Street into Grove Square, travelling backwards towards traffic exiting the mini-roundabout onto the A6108. Parking on High Street also results in vehicles queueing back over the mini-roundabout, particularly on market day.
The developers of the Maythorne Farm residential area located off Dale Grove were advancing the construction of a mini-roundabout with signing and rumble strips on the northern approach, at the junction of Dale Grove and Bellerby Road through a Section 278 planning agreement.

Smithy Lane between Commercial Square and Grove Square is subject to a 8'6” width restriction.

Shawl Terrace beyond Commercial Square is subject to an access only restriction.

The A6108 between Leyburn and Middleham is subject to a 13' height restriction at Middleham Bridge over the River Ure, but the advance signing of the restriction is no longer clear (Plate 4).

Plate 4: Advance signing of the height restriction on Middleham Bridge, Leyburn

3.11 Traffic Signals and Pedestrian Crossings
There are no traffic signals in Leyburn. There is one ‘Puffin’ pedestrian crossing across the A684 in the Market Place.
3.12 **Vehicle Speeds**

The built up area of Leyburn is subject to a 30mph speed limit with the exception of Woodside, Wensleydale Avenue and Brentwood which are subject to a 20mph speed limit and the Harmby Road which has a 40mph speed limit in the vicinity of Leyburn Business Park.

Automatic speed surveys were undertaken on Woodside, Wensleydale Avenue and Brentwood, in August 2001 and June 2003, before and after the introduction of a 20 mph speed limit and traffic calming, and are summarised in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>2001 85% Speed (mph)</th>
<th>2003 85% Speed (mph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wensleydale Avenue</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Automatic Speed Survey Data, Brentwood Area, Leyburn 2001 and 2003*

Manual speed surveys were undertaken by Mouchel Parkman on 22nd August 2003, and are summarised in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>85% Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Mean Speed (mph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmby Road at Middleham Road Junction (30mph limit)</td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmby Road east of Caravan Park (60mph limit)</td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wensley Road at Leyburn Cemetery (60mph limit)</td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moor Road opposite Thornborough Hall (30mph limit)</td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Road at the entrance to Wensleydale School (30mph limit)</td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Manual Speed Survey Data, Leyburn 2003*
3.13  **Road Traffic Accidents**

Twelve Road Traffic Accidents resulting in injury were reported within the study area in the three year period between January 2000 and December 2003. One accident resulted in a fatality; the other eleven accidents resulted in slight injury.

In the fatal accident, a driver collapsed at the wheel of his vehicle whilst travelling westbound on Railway Street entering the Market Place; the vehicle crossing onto the opposite side of the carriageway colliding with an oncoming vehicle. The driver was pronounced dead at the scene.

None of the remaining accidents were clustered, although three of the accidents resulted from vehicles failing to give-way at priority junctions, a further three being rear-end collisions into right turning vehicles leaving the major road at priority junctions.

3.14  **The Views of the Stakeholders and the Public**

An initial stakeholder workshop was held in Thornborough Hall, Leyburn, on 10th July 2003. This consisted of a presentation of relevant data by Mouchel Parkman, a brainstorming session to generate ideas and to identify key issues and a number of smaller focus groups to evaluate and to add detail to the issues and attempt to identify potential solutions. 43 issues were identified prior through the brainstorming session, and these are detailed in Appendix 4.

Ten overarching issues were discussed within the focus groups. These are included in detail in Appendix 4, and are summarised below.

**Pedestrian Issues** – Lack of pedestrian accessibility within the town and to neighbouring villages – Footways within the town are generally narrow and there are also gaps, for example, on the south side of the A684 opposite St Matthew's Church, and between the Auction Mart and Grove Square on Richmond Road (Plate 5). A need was identified to better link the residential areas to the north and east of Leyburn to the town centre, also facilitating better pedestrian access to the railway station. A number of important pedestrian routes within the town are neither adopted, nor shown on the definitive plan.

**Cycle routes and parking** – Lack of safe cycling routes and secure cycle parking facilities – There is a lack of routes linking the residential areas to the town centre and Leyburn to other Wensleydale towns and villages. Cyclists were seen as having to compete for limited road-space with 'quarry vehicles, cars, caravans and speeding motorcyclists', children now opting to cycle on the footway endangering pedestrians. Improvement was requested to the number and location of cycle parking facilities, including at the station and bus stops.

**Equestrian Issues** – Lack of equestrian routes avoiding the town centre – Equestrian provision to the north and south of the town is lacking, meaning that horse riders have to utilise busy roads such as the A684. It was agreed to ascertain the current routeing patterns of local stables and organised hack routes within the area.
Public Transport and the potential for transport interchange – improvement of bus services, integration between bus and rail and the creation of a transport interchange – Whilst the recent upgrading of bus services was welcomed, bus services to surrounding villages were not thought to be sufficient for those without access to a car. The quality of bus stops was also brought into question, including within the Market Place where three buses share a space suitable for two (Plate 6) and at the station. The lack of boarding kerbs, particularly within the Market Place was also raised as a concern, particularly since the introduction of low-floor buses. The need to improve coach parking facilities was also seen as key to encouraging additional tourism.

School Travel – Parking and congestion outside schools, and lack of safe pedestrian access to schools – It was noted that at least 16 buses currently serve Wensleydale School although only one bus can either enter or exit the school grounds at a time. The lack of pedestrian access and safe crossing facilities on Richmond Road was a concern, as was the lack of advance signing of the schools. Vehicle speeds on Richmond Road were also thought to be excessive in the vicinity of both schools, vehicles accelerating both upon exiting the town centre and on the down-hill approach into the town. A request was made for the introduction of 20mph zones.
Car Parking – Lack of parking enforcement and disabled facilities, access and egress from the District Council Car Park and provision of additional parking facilities – Double parking, parking on footways and vehicles reversing out into traffic were all deemed to be creating hazardous conditions and congestion within the town. The desire to bulk shop and the distances involved in travelling in from surrounding areas were thought to be the main reasons for parking. A lack of disabled parking and disabled parking which conflicts with commercial servicing was identified. Parking problems are exacerbated on Market Day when more people are attracted into the town and parking provision is reduced.

Signing – Misleading and poor highway signing – Direction signing was seen to give a cluttered feeling with ‘drivers having to stop on the carriageway to read the appropriate sign’. Signing to the District Council Car Park was also termed ‘confusing’ and shown to be inconsistent. Signing was also requested for non-motorists.
Speeding and Traffic Calming – Excessive vehicle speed, particularly on the approach routes into the town – It was reported that current speed limits are not enforced and that traffic speeds were excessive on all approaches, but not in the town centre, speeds in the latter being kept down by on-street parking. Speed restrictions were requested on the approaches to the town.

Junction Improvements and Traffic Flows – Junction hazards and vehicle access/egress problems – Three junctions were identified as being of particular concern: Harmby Road/Middleham Road; Brentwood/Railway Street; and, Dale Grove/Richmond Road.
The Market Place – Vehicular access, parking, and lack of pedestrian space – The Market Place effectively functions as a long-stay car park. This prevents short-term parking and ‘if people are unable to park in the Market Place, then they are not interested in stopping in Leyburn’. People also park vehicles illegally on the carriageway to make quick stops at the convenience stores. The Business Association, District Council and Town Council all supported the introduction of Parking Discs to maximise parking provision for locals and visitors, also maximising trade and encouraging tourism. Modifications to the access to and egress from the Market Place were requested, as was the creation of a part-pedestrianisation, including the removal, reallocation or rearrangement of some parking.

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 to the appropriate NYCC officers for consideration.
4 Policies and Transport Plan Objectives

4.1 Local Transport Plan Objectives
The North Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (2001-2006) 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 an 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 Policy Sub-Area Objectives
Leyburn is located in the Yorkshire Dales policy sub-area of the LTP. To take account of the particular needs of the area NYCC has set a number of local objectives with the LTP. These are:

- To minimise the adverse impact of traffic on the environment.
- To limit traffic growth by minimising the need to travel and developing alternative non-car modes.
- To provide a quality public transport system for as many residents as possible which recognises the importance and impact of tourism on the County.
- To promote social equality by providing genuine choice of travel mode which meet the travel needs of the socially and physically disadvantaged.
4.3 Local Plan Developments and Constraints
Richmondshire adopted its Local Plan dated 1999-2006, in 2001. Leyburn is identified as a 'Main Growth Area' within the Local Plan, having residential development allocation for 90 units of Dale Grove on the northern periphery of the town and a 2.7 hectare industrial development allocation adjacent to the existing Leyburn Business Park. Two policies within the local plan have direct relevance to the Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy.

Policy 77 – The Wensleydale Railway
Safeguarded the alignment and infrastructure of the Northallerton to Redmire Railway Line. Whilst the Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy was being developed, The Wensleydale Railway Company reopened the line to passenger services, including the refurbishment of the platform at Leyburn Railway Station.

Policy 92 – Public Parking in Richmond, Leyburn and Middleham
Based on surveys undertaken in 1994, the Local Plan states that ‘increases in the need for public parking in Richmond and Leyburn up to 2006 will be met through the efficient management of parking space which is currently available and free of legal constraints’. No provision was therefore made for additional parking in Leyburn.

The centre of Leyburn, including the Market Place, Commercial Square and Grove Square are within the Leyburn Conservation Area. Richmondshire District Council’s Guidance Note 12 “Design Principles for Conservation Areas” is consistent with PPG 15 noted below.

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 (PPG’s). PPG 13 relates specifically to transport and was revised in March 2001. It sets far reaching aims that include:

• To promote more sustainable transport choices for both people and for moving freight.
• To promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling.

PPG13 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.
• Resident parking schemes and other controls to avoid on-street parking in areas adjacent to developments with limited on-site parking.

• 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.

Where 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 Leyburn

The overall aim for the Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy is to produce an integrated strategy for the Town 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. To enable delivery of this aim, a number of objectives were developed following the first stakeholder workshop and their suitability was assessed using a survey of 10 percent of households and businesses within the area. The objectives and the level of support received through this 10% sample survey are:

• Improve walking routes between residential areas and Leyburn town centre (60% support)

• Improve walking routes into Leyburn from surrounding towns and villages (57% support)

• Develop a network of cycle routes and provide secure cycle parking facilities (51% support)

• Improve safety within the vicinity of schools (89% support)

• Create safer walking and cycling routes to schools (83% support)

• Develop equestrian routes around the perimeter of Leyburn (26% support)

• Improve public transport facilities in the Market Place (66% support)

• Re-organise the Market Place to improve safety for all (70% support)

• Improve coach drop-off, pick-up and parking (66% support)

• Improve safety for all road users at junctions (86% support)

• Introduce disc parking to control the duration of parking in the town centre (75% support)

• Improve signing to key locations and car parks (64% support)

• Reduce vehicle speeds on approaches into the town (72% support)
4.6 Finance and Implementation

Identified problems and potential solutions to traffic issues in and around Leyburn are collated and processed by the NYCC Area Improvement Manager who reports on progress to the North Yorkshire County Council Richmondshire Area Committee. In February 2003, the only such scheme in the Leyburn was the revision of waiting restrictions on the northern section of the A684 that passes through the Market Place (Ref RD/A1.453).

The NYCC budget for capital expenditure on transport schemes is currently set by Central Government with indicative allocations for future years. NYCC programmes schemes based on priority and levels of available funding. In February 2003, no schemes were programmed for the funding period with the exception of a block allocation of £100,000 for schemes resulting from this Strategy. A road safety improvement to the junction the A684 and A6108 had been identified as costing £110,500, but had not been programmed.
5 Developing the Traffic Management Strategy

5.1 Identification of Potential Options

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

Pedestrian Improvements

- Identification of the key pedestrian network, consisting of footways, footpaths, bridleways and other tracks.
- Improvements across the network to ensure compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, including removal of obstructions, surface and lighting improvements, and the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at crossing points.
- Specific footway improvements in the vicinity of the A684/A6108 Middleham Road junction, where the public right of way from Park View meets the A684 opposite the Parish Church, and Richmond Road between Grove Square and the Auction Mart, the latter combined with a short section of priority working.

Cycling Improvements

Creation of a cycle network for Leyburn, linking to the Yorkshire Dales Cycle Network and consisting of the following routes:

- Advisory cycle lanes on Richmond Road, linking to Wensleydale School;
- Advisory cycle lanes on the A684 between the Parish Church and A6108 Middleham Road, extended as a signed cycle route to Harmby; and,
- A signed cycle route via Maythorne, Wensleydale Avenue and Brentwood, serving the County Primary School and Medical Centre.

Secure cycle parking being provided at:

- Additional locations within the Market Place;
- Thornborough Hall;
- The Railway Station;
- The Medical Centre; and,
- Within Leyburn Business Park.
Public Transport Improvements

- The upgrading of bus stops throughout the town to the NYCC standard, including a new pole and flag, where appropriate a timetable case, and where physically possible boarding kerbs.
- Support for the proposed improvements to integrated passenger facilities at Leyburn Railway Station, to facilitate bus/rail and coach/rail interchange.
- Additional and improved bus passenger facilities within the Market Place to accommodate existing service requirements.

Road Safety Improvements

Reduction of vehicle speeds on the approaches to the town centre, through:

- Localised signing and lining improvements to the bridge over the railway on Wensley Road, with the 30mph speed limit being extended to beyond the Cemetery;
- Signing and lining features within the existing 30mph limit on Moor Road to increase drivers’ awareness of pedestrians walking in the road;
- A school safety zone outside Wensleydale School, incorporating a 20mph speed limit, traffic calming, pedestrian crossing facility, formalisation of parking and improved street lighting;
- Extension of the 40mph speed limit on the A684 to the eastern extent of Harmby; and,
- A 20mph speed limit within the Town Centre.

Parking

Development of an outline parking strategy, including:

- Short-stay controlled parking within the Market Place, Commercial Square and Grove Square;
- Long-stay pay and display parking in Richmondshire District Council’s Car Park;
- Use of the Auction Mart as overflow parking (except on Friday);
- On-street parking restrictions with residents exemptions on Brentwood; and,
- Additional on-street parking restrictions on Wensley Road and Harmby Road.
**The Market Place**

Five options for traffic circulation, four alternate parking layouts and three options for environmental enhancement were developed. These options are shown on plans in Appendix 5, and were used as a basis for discussion at a second stakeholder workshop.

### 5.2 Stakeholder Workshop

A second stakeholder workshop was held at Thornborough Hall, Leyburn, on 20th May 2004, attended by the local NYCC Member, 6 NYCC Officers, and 21 stakeholders. A list of the workshop attendees is included in Appendix 2. Following the presentation, the stakeholders were given the opportunity to discuss the measures in detail. Key elements of the discussions were:

#### Pedestrian Improvements

- A request was made to show proposals for a footway between Leyburn and Bellerby, previously promised by NYCC upon the closure of Bellerby School, to provide access for school pupils from Bellerby attending school in Leyburn. It was also requested that any link comply with current disabled access standards.

- Disability Action in Richmondshire requested that the use of tactile paving be kept to a minimum, as those with mobility impairments experience problems walking on the tactile surface.

- Concern was expressed at the lack of footway on Moor Road, and it was explained that the width of the highway prohibited the construction of a continuous footway.

- Improvement to the footways on Richmond Road through the creation of a short section of priority working was considered to be essential to improve the link between the town centre and the residential areas to the north of the town. The direction of the priority working was also discussed.

- It was thought that footway improvements in the vicinity of the A684/A6108 Middleham Road junction may allow the give-way line to be brought forward to improve visibility.

#### Cycling Improvements

- It was suggested that cycle routes be provided between Leyburn and all surrounding villages.

#### Road Safety Improvements

- Support was expressed for the extension of the 30mph speed limit on Wensley Road.
• Concern was expressed that the signing on Moor Road may not in itself, reduce vehicle speeds.
• A request was made to extend the 30mph speed limit to beyond Harmby.
• It was stated that the introduction of a central area 20mph zone would improve safety for all road users whilst only adding 20 seconds to drivers’ journey times.
• A request was made to test the feasibility of introducing a mini-roundabout at the junction of the A684 and A6108 Middleham Road. It was explained that such analysis had been carried out, but was likely to result in an increased risk of accidents at the junction.

Parking

• Discussion focused on the likely method of parking control and enforcement within the Market Place, the likely costs of such a scheme and how these might be met. It was explained that any decision on parking control and enforcement would ultimately rest with Leyburn Town Council as the owners of the area in question.

Market Place

A considerable amount of discussion focused on the need for and location of the proposed bus bays. It was explained that the need for three buses to connect and the need for a bus to be able to circuit the Market Place were constraints on any design.

The need to facilitate loading at commercial premises was seen as paramount. It was explained that a survey had been undertaken of all of the commercial premises loading requirements and that these had been incorporated within the designs.

Concern was expressed that any environmental enhancement may remove up to 15 car parking spaces. It was explained that the removal of this number of spaces could be accommodated through better use of the parking stock within the town.

It was agreed that ‘Option 5’ which created a circulatory movement around the Market Place, also making the two sections of Railway Street to the east of the Market Place one-way, would be discarded and not taken forward to consultation.

All of the parking options, with the exception of the ‘sheep pen’ layout (Option B) found favour, whilst considerable opposition was expressed at the proposals for creating an environmentally enhanced area within the Market Place. Following

2 As part of this study Mouchel Parkman and NYCC undertook detailed financial modelling and had continuous dialogue with both Richmond District Council and Leyburn Town Council in relation to the revenue costs and potential income streams from various methods of parking control and enforcement.
debate, it was decided by those present that it may be possible to incorporate some form of environmental enhancement as part of a wider scheme for the Market Place.

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

**Leyburn Pedestrian Action Plan** (Drawing 340513/002/010A)

- The Leyburn Pedestrian Action Plan identifies key pedestrian routes to be targeted as part of NYCC’s response to the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA). In order to allow use of these routes by everyone, including the disabled; surfaces need to be repaired; dropped kerbs and tactile paving needs to be provided; and, some more specific works need to be undertaken.

- Continuous footways need to be provided on both sides of Richmond Road between the Primary School and the Kings Head Pub. To allow this, southbound traffic will be required to give-way to northbound traffic (Drawing 340513/002/011A – Detail A).

- The defined pedestrian strip lining the western footway on Richmond Road to Grove Square needs better definition, often being parked over at the present time.

- The dropped crossing on St Matthews Terrace, at Middleham Road, needs to be moved further west to allow pedestrians to cross more safely. This will be particularly useful for a blind resident of Park View who will then be able to differentiate between vehicles approaching on the A684 and A6108, and then access the town centre independently (Drawing 340513/002/011A – Detail B).

- A wider footway needs to be provided on Railway Street to allow safe movement between the Elite Cinema and public footpath to Park View. The current footway is less than 0.5 metre wide which is too narrow for either the use of a guide dog or wheel chair.

- The state of the tracks between the Market Place and the Richmondshire District Council Car Park is currently limiting use of the car park. The tracks are unlit and personal safety concerns have been expressed. The tracks need surface and lighting improvements before the successful implementation of a comprehensive parking strategy for the town.

- Parking on the redefined footway outside the Sandpiper Inn continues to be a problem that needs to be monitored.

- Joint use pedestrian and cycle routes are being investigated between Dale Grove and Brentwood, and from Leyburn to Bellerby.
General Improvements (Drawing 340513/002/011A)

A large number of general improvements are also proposed, mainly focusing on road safety and travel choice, consisting of:

Cycling – The development of a network of cycle routes, building upon the East-West route to be provided through the NYCC Dales Cycle Plan. Advisory cycle lanes are proposed on: Richmond Road between Dale Grove and the Auction Mart, improving access to Wensleydale School and the northern residential fringe including Dale Grove; on the A684 between the Elite Cinema and Middleham Road, providing continuity for cyclists and changing the character of the section of road; and, along the southern side of Wensley Road proving access to the Cemetery and Wensley. A signed route is proposed via Woodside and Brentwood to encourage cycle use to encourage cycle use both by the residents of the area, and those travelling to the County Primary School or Medical Centre. Secure cycle parking facilities will be provided at locations throughout the town.

Public Transport – The upgrading of bus stops with new poles, signs, timetables and raised boarding kerbs. NYCC will also continue to work in partnership with the District Council and Wensleydale Railway to secure improved integrated passenger facilities at Leyburn Station.

Speed Limits – Proposals to make changes to a number of speed limits, all of which will include physical measures such as signing, lining and gateways in order to make them self enforcing. Because of the type of traffic using Leyburn, road humps are not being proposed.

- Extension of the 40mph limit on Harmby Road to beyond Harmby, consistent with the current speed of vehicles using the road. Over this section, the adjacent footway and considerable pedestrian use, give the road a semi-urban feel even though it is not continuously built up. Reducing the speed limit will make the road more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists, and further improve road safety.

- Extension of the 30mph limit on Wensley Road to beyond the cemetery, to what is in effect the new edge of the town, combined with measures to slow traffic over the railway bridge, the changes is direction and limited visibility having previously contributed to accidents at this location.

- Creation of a central area 20mph limit including the Market Place, Commercial Square and Grove Square, reducing the risk of collision and injury in an area with considerable potential for pedestrian/vehicle and vehicle/vehicle conflict.

- Improvements to signing and lining on Moor Road to raise awareness both of the existing 30mph limit and the likelihood that pedestrians will be walking in the road, Moor Road having no footways over lengthy sections.

- Proposals to introduce a ‘School Safety Zone’ on Richmond Road outside Wensleydale School, including: a controlled pedestrian crossing; some on-street parking; localised carriageway narrowing and improved lighting.
Signing - An audit was undertaken of signing in Leyburn, resulting in proposals to remove unnecessary signs and consolidate others to reduce signing clutter. Damaged signs will also be replaced and improvements made to directional signing for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

**Leyburn Market Place** (Drawing 340513/002/020)

Three options were proposed for improving safety and pedestrian access in the Market Place, all including the provision of:

- a pedestrian crossing between the Market Place and Commercial Square;
- one-way anti-clockwise traffic flow around Commercial Square;
- provision of three loading bays;
- a speed table to the east of the entrance to District Council car park; and,
- the provision of two bus stops.

Changes were required to the existing bus stops regardless of the preferred option to facilitate interchange between three connecting bus services and to comply with the DDA. Car parking needed to be rearranged to complement the preferred option and two alternative locations were suggested for environmental improvement, creating a car-free area, prioritising pedestrians and creating a space for community and visitor enjoyment.

- **Option A** - Retains the existing two-way flow on High Street and Railway Street, with access to parking on the Market Place and within the District Council Car Park via a link to the west of the Tourist Information Centre (TIC). The additional bus bay was provided to the east of the existing bus bay.

- **Option B** – Created a one-way clockwise traffic flow around the Market Place with two bus bays being provided on the northern side of the main parking area, footways being constructed around the entire perimeter of the central area. A variation (Option B2) permitted two-way traffic flow along High Street.

- **Option C** - Retains the existing two-way traffic on High Street and Railway Street, with access to parking on the Market Place and the District Council Car Park via an eastbound one-way section along the northern side of the Market Place, accessed to the north of Wray Bros. The additional bus bay was provided opposite the existing bus bay. Two variations were also generated. Option C2 allowing two-way flow on the link to the West of the TIC providing direct access to both parking areas, and Option C3, providing an additional bus stop in the carriageway.
Parking Strategy (Drawing 340513/002/12A)

Many of the problems in the town centre result from current parking policies and practices, and when asked, 75% of residents and businesses thought that introducing parking control in the town centre was either important or very important. A subsequent parking survey revealed that around half of the spaces available in Commercial Square, Grove Square and the Market Place, are occupied by vehicles staying for over 6 hours each day. NYCC, the District Council and Leyburn Town Council worked in partnership to evaluate viable options for introducing parking controls.

The overall parking strategy consisted of:

- Short-stay controlled parking both on and off-street in the Central Area, including Commercial Square, Grove Square and the Market Place.
- Long-stay controlled parking in the District Council Car Park.
- No parking on-street, in an area surrounding the town centre with residents exemptions on parts of Brentwood and Middleham Road.

Parking within the central area could be controlled by either a Parking Disc or a Pay and Display system.

- Discs permit limited duration parking control without charging those who are parking. However, there are considerable costs associated with such a system including providing parking discs, enforcement and, business rates could be in the region of £20,000 per year. Such costs would be borne by Leyburn Town Council and thus Leyburn Council Tax payers.
- A Pay and Display system would offer considerable flexibility in managing parking, enabling demand to be balanced between the Central Area and District Council Car Park. It also has the benefit of passing the costs associated with the system onto those parking, including visitors. A system could be developed with exemptions for the disabled, free limited duration parking for residents and short-stay charges below current levels in the District Council Car Park. After taking into account the costs of providing the ticket machines, such a system could also generate additional revenue for other Leyburn Town Council projects, benefiting the community.

Other Issues

- An assessment of safety on Middleham Road will be conducted as a separate route study.
- NYCC is currently developing an Equestrian Strategy, which will be implemented across the county.
5.4 Public Consultation
The measures and options described above were presented on a leaflet distributed to stakeholders and statutory consultees, and nearly 4,000 households and businesses in Leyburn and surrounding parishes. This leaflet was accompanied by a questionnaire and both are included as Appendix 7 of this report.

An exhibition was held from Friday 22nd October to Thursday 28th October, in Thornborough Hall. The exhibition was manned by staff from both North Yorkshire County Council and Mouchel Parkman on 22nd and 23rd October. A public meeting chaired by County Councillor Roger Harrison-Topham was also held at Thornborough Hall on the evening of 28th October.

In addition, the consultation materials were posted on the internet at a site set up for the consultation exercise [http://www.nycc-consultation.info].

1,241 responses were received within the response period, representing a response rate of 31%. A total of 20 questionnaires were completed via the internet site.

5.5 Summary of Consultation Responses

- 75% of the respondents supported the proposed Pedestrian Action Plan, including the introduction of dropped kerbs and tactile paving, and footway and route improvements. 20% did not support the proposed Pedestrian Action Plan and, 5% did not offer an opinion.
- 60% of the respondents supported the development of a network of cycle routes and the provision of cycle parking, 35% did not support the development of a network of cycle routes and, 5% did not offer an opinion.
- 68% of the respondents supported the proposed upgrading of bus stops, 25% did not support the upgrading of bus stops and, 7% did not offer an opinion.
- 69% of the respondents supported the improved interchange facilities, 20% did not support the improved interchange facilities and, 11% did not offer an opinion.
- 66% of the respondents supported the proposals extension of the 40mph speed limit on Harmby Road, 30% did not support the proposed changes to speed limits on Harmby Road and, 4% did not offer an opinion.
- 69% of the respondents supported the proposed extension of the 30mph speed limit of Wensley Road, 27% did not support the proposed changes to speed limits on Wensley Road and, 4% did not offer an opinion.
- 66% of the respondents supported the proposal to create a central area 20mph speed limit, 30% did not support the proposal for a 20mph speed limit, and 4% did not offer an opinion.
- 75% of the respondents supported the proposal to increase awareness of the 30mph speed limit of Moor Road, 20% did not support the proposal for Moor Road and, 5% did not offer an opinion.
83% of the respondents supported the proposed introduction of a School Safety Zone outside Wensleydale School on Richmond Road, 12% did not support the proposed School Safety Zone and, 5% did not offer an opinion.

63% of the respondents supported the proposed changes to the Market Place, including alterations to traffic flow, improvement of pedestrian, public transport and loading facilities, 26% did not support the proposed changes to the Market Place and, 13% did not offer an opinion.

Of those who supported the proposed changes to the Market Place:

- 34% supported Option A – Access to all car parking via the link to the west of the Tourist Information Centre;
- 26% supported Option B – One-way traffic flow;
- 23% supported Option B2 – As Option B but retaining two-way traffic flow on High Street;
- 19% supported Option C – Access to all car parking via the northern side of the Market Place;
- 27% supported Option C2 – As Option C but with two-way access to car parking; and,
- 13% supported Option C3 – Additional bus stop provision on the carriageway.

35% of the respondents supported the proposals to create a car-free environmental improvement area within the Market Place, 56% did not support the proposed environmental improvement area and, 10% did not offer an opinion.

57% of the respondents supported the proposed parking strategy, 30% did not support the parking strategy and, 12% did not offer an opinion.

Of those respondents supporting the Parking Strategy:

- 57% of respondents supported the introduction of Disc Parking control.
- 43% of respondents supported the introduction of Pay and Display control.
- Less that 1% did not specify an opinion.

---

3 The percentages shown adding up to more than 100% because people were given the opportunity to vote for more than one option.
**Spatial Analysis**

Following a request from Leyburn Town Council, the responses to the questions related to the Parking Strategy were also analysed spatially using the postcode information provided by respondents. 404 responses were received from those within the Leyburn Town Council area. Of these:

- 62% of Leyburn residents supported the parking strategy; and,
- 48% of Leyburn residents did not support the parking strategy.

Of those Leyburn residents supporting the parking strategy:

- 46% supported Disc Parking;
- 53% supported the introduction of Pay and Display parking; and,
- 1% did not specify a preference.

**Additional Detailed Comments and Stakeholder Responses**

A number of additional detailed comments were received. These are summarised in the committee report (Appendix 8).
6 The Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy

6.1 Adoption of the Strategy
The consultation results were reported to the North Yorkshire County Council Richmondshire Area Committee on 25th February 2005. The members of the committee were asked to support the following proposals.

- Pedestrian Plan improvements, including the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving;
- The integrated network of cycle routes and secure cycle parking;
- The proposed bus stop improvements;
- Improved passenger interchange facilities at Leyburn Railway Station;
- The school safety zone with 20mph speed limit on Richmond Road outside Wensleydale School;
- The central area 20mph speed limit and traffic calming in the central area of Leyburn;
- Changes to speed limits, including the extension of the 40mph limit on Harmby Road and the extension of the 30mph limit on Wensley Road;
- Measures to improve awareness of the 30mph speed limit on Moor Road;
- The rationalisation of traffic signs; and,
- Proposals to improve the access from the Market Place to Yoredale Avenue.

The members of the committee were also asked to support further discussion between:

- North Yorkshire County Council, Leyburn Town Council and North Yorkshire Police to explore ways to improve traffic arrangements in the Market Place;
- North Yorkshire County Council, Leyburn Town Council and Richmond District Council to see how raised boarding kerbs can be accommodated at the bus stops in Leyburn Market Place; and,
- North Yorkshire County Council, Leyburn Town Council and Richmond District Council in relation to controlled parking in the Market Place, Commercial Square and Grove Square.
The members resolved to support the proposals. The main text of the committee report and minutes of the meeting are included as Appendix 8.

The North Yorkshire County Council Director of Environmental Services, Mike Moore, made an executive decision on 21st March 2005 as follows:

1. To proceed to the detailed design and implementation of a number of the short term measures referred to in paragraph 3.2 of the report to the County Council's Richmondshire Area Committee on 25 February 2005 in the 2005/06 financial year.

2. That a Traffic Management Strategy for Leyburn which includes proposals in paragraphs 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 of the report be approved in principle subject to the requirements for further consultation set in paragraph 4.1.

3. To prepare proposals for improving the access from Market place to Yoredale Avenue for further local consultation.

4. That further discussions be held with Leyburn Town Council and North Yorkshire Police to explore whether less significant changes might be developed to improve traffic arrangements in Leyburn Market Place.

5. To continue discussions with both Leyburn Town Council and Richmondshire District Council to consider ways in which the bus stop in Leyburn Market Place can be altered to allow for the provision of raised kerbs.

6. That the proposals for controlled parking in Leyburn not be taken further at this time, but that discussions with the Town and District Councils should be continued.

7. That in relation to the proposed car free environmental improvement area within the Market Place no further action be taken.

8. To present a further report to a future meeting of the Richmondshire Area Committee, setting out a proposed phasing plan for implementation of the approved strategy for Leyburn.

---

4 Attached as Appendix 8 of this report.
6.2 Implementation of the Strategy

Implementation of the Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy will take place over a number of years. An initial phasing programme has been devised to provide an indication of the cost and likely construction date of each element of the strategy (Table 5). North Yorkshire County Council’s Richmondshire Area Committee has agreed the programme and an officer group has been established to oversee implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Programme Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Kerbs and Tactile Paving</td>
<td>£33,600</td>
<td>2005/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Public Rights of Way Improvements</td>
<td>£14,000</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway across No Parking strip on Grove Square</td>
<td>£1,400</td>
<td>2008/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footway and priority working on Richmond Road</td>
<td>£25,200</td>
<td>2008/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDA related footway improvement at Harmby Road / Middleham Road junction</td>
<td>£11,200</td>
<td>2005/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of parking outside Sandpiper and at Yoredale Avenue / Market Place junction</td>
<td>£3,800</td>
<td>2006/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footway / cycleway from Dale Grove to Woodside / Brentwood (1)</td>
<td>£119,000</td>
<td>after 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to footway lighting in the Ginnels from the market place to RDC car park</td>
<td>£56,000</td>
<td>2008/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to lighting in the RDC car park</td>
<td>£14,000</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footway on the south side of Harmby Road from the Cinema to PROW</td>
<td>£11,200</td>
<td>2007/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement of permissive path south of the railway line</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing between Wray Brothers and Commercial Square</td>
<td>£72,800</td>
<td>2006/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed cycle route - Woodside / Brentwood</td>
<td>£2,800</td>
<td>2005/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed cycle route - Harmby Road, Middleham Road to eastern end of the Industrial Estate.</td>
<td>£1,400</td>
<td>2005/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Lanes on Richmond Road</td>
<td>£4,200</td>
<td>2006/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle lanes on Harmby Road (Parish Church to Middleham Road)</td>
<td>£2,800</td>
<td>2006/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle lanes outbound on Wensley Road</td>
<td>£11,200</td>
<td>2006/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCC Yorkshire Dales Cycle Plan routes - inbound from Wensley (2)</td>
<td>£224,000</td>
<td>after 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCC Yorkshire Dales Cycle Plan routes - Low Wood Lane (2)</td>
<td>£224,000</td>
<td>after 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle parking at attractors throughout the town</td>
<td>£4,800</td>
<td>2006/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop improvements - Market Place (3)</td>
<td>£46,200</td>
<td>2008/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop improvements south of Wensleydale School</td>
<td>£9,800</td>
<td>2005/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop improvements north of Wensleydale School</td>
<td>£9,100</td>
<td>2005/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus / rail interchange facilities at Leyburn Station (4)</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>2005/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised signing and lining at railway bridge on Wensley Road</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
<td>2006/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing and lining within 30mph speed limit on Moor Road</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
<td>2005/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended 30mph speed limit with street lighting on Wensley Road to the cemetery extension</td>
<td>£21,000</td>
<td>2006/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety Zone at Wensleydale School</td>
<td>£77,000</td>
<td>2006/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended 40mph speed limit with gateways etc. on Harmby Road to beyond Harmby</td>
<td>£11,900</td>
<td>2005/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central area 20 mph zone</td>
<td>£56,000</td>
<td>2007/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking restrictions / residents parking on Brentwood</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Place alterations including footway widening outside Barclays Bank (3)</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
<td>2008/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleham Road Route safety study</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyburn to Bellerby footway scheme</td>
<td>£420,000</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and pedestrian signs rationalisation</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>2005/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) To be funded from external sources
(2) To be funded from cycling budget and external sources
(3) Subject to ongoing discussion with Leyburn Town Council
(4) Contribution to Wensleydale Railway Scheme

Table 5: Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy Implementation Programme
Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy
Final Report

Key:
- Primary pedestrian routes
- Secondary pedestrian routes
- Public rights of way (PROW)
- Pedestrian desire lines
- Further investigation
- Dropped kerb and tactile paving

Public Rights of Way will be signed as part of the Pedestrian Network, although due to physical constraints it is not always possible to make them accessible to all.

NYCC is further investigating provision of improved pedestrian and cycle routes to Bellerby and Middlesham.

NYCC to investigate addition of this link to the definitive map as PROW footpath.

New footway to be created on south side of road. Parking restrictions to be extended.

Lighting to be improved.

Pedestrian Plan Improvements
Notes:
- Short-stay parking could be controlled with either a Parking Disc or Pay and Display System.
- On-street parking restrictions will typically be 'No parking at any time'.
- Residents exemptions could be through a permit available to adjacent properties.

Key:
- Short Stay Controlled Parking
- Long Stay Controlled Parking (RDC)
- On-street Parking Restrictions
- On-street Restrictions with Residents Exemptions
**Option A**
Main benefits: Provides a single access to all car parking areas, a 'Zebra' crossing facility between the Market Place and Commercial Square, and improves public transport and loading facilities.

**Option B**
Improves vehicle flows within the area of the 20mph speed limit, provides a 'Puffin' crossing, and additional footways, improves public transport and loading facilities. Option B2 retains the existing north-south movement on High Street.

**Option C**
Main benefits: Provides a 'Puffin' crossing, reduces pedestrian-vehicle conflict in the Market Place, improves public transport and loading facilities. Option C2 retains existing access to the District Council Car Park. Option C3 provides an alternate bus stop arrangement.

---

**Market Place Options**
Appendix 1 - Consultants Brief
TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIES FOR MARKET TOWNS
CONSULTANTS BRIEF

Introduction
North Yorkshire County Council (The Client) has made provision in 2002/2003 for a study of transportation in market towns within the county.

The study will:
- critically examine the existing transportation arrangements
- identify traffic related problems
- develop a number of solutions
  - with an emphasis on the introduction of higher levels of sustainable transportation
  - designed to bring the conditions in the town centre area up to a level which is, as far as practicable, in line with the best of current practice
  - which should remain suitable for a period of 10 years
- expose the solutions, packaged as options, to public consultation
- formulate a preferred strategy.

The study process will include reporting to the Clients fixed cycle of committees and for this reason a closely defined timetable will be produced and monitored on a regular basis.

Overview and Monitoring
The study will be funded on a reimbursable cost basis. The consultant is required agree a target cost with client, in order to facilitate monitoring of expenditure. The consultant is further required to develop a cost plan divided into the eight main stages of the study. These are set out in the table below with an indication of the percentage of the total fee that the Client feels appropriate for each stage. Although it is not possible to define an exact timetable for each study because of differing area committee dates, indicative times from the ‘Start Point’ are also shown.

The Consultant will be required to provide the following information, not later than the first Wednesday of each month, for monitoring purposes.
- An appraisal of the progress of the work measured against the plan together with a statement of how the agreed timetable will be recovered if slippage is reported.
- A statement of expenditure to date (the date at which the measurement took place) and a statement as to the expected out turn expenditure at the completion of the task.
- Any predicted over expenditure will be treated as a claim for extra payment for work that could not reasonably have been foreseen at the time of tender. The reasons for this extra must accompany the progress report.

Table 1 Percentage of total fee expected to be expended on each stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage of fee</th>
<th>Indicative time from ‘Start point’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>‘Start Point’ - Appoint Consultant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timetable and Reporting</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Existing Situation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Overall Objectives, Guidelines and Constraints</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A Critical Appraisal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Specific Aims and Objectives</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Identification of Measures and Strategy Options</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The preferred scheme</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Brief in Detail

Preamble
The following Stages 1 to 8 are to be read in conjunction with 'Transportation Strategies for Town Centres: Key Events and Reporting', provided at Appendix A

- The Client will nominate a representative called The Lead Officer who will be responsible for the development of the Transportation strategy for each town.
- The Consultant will nominate a Partner or Associate and a Project Manager. The former having overall responsibility, the latter dealing with the day to day management of the project.

Stage 1: Timetable and reporting

The Client will arrange two meetings.

The first meeting will include the Chairman of the Clients Area Committee, appropriate local councillors and an officer sub group. The purpose of the meeting will be as follows:

- Define the boundary of the study area
- Identify key partners and consultees who will be involved in a variety of capacities during the study
- Explain the reporting system, which will be influenced by the dates of the Council’s area committee meetings.
- Outline the key activities and events including the fixed committee reporting dates, which are to form the framework for the study timetable together with an indication of the level detail required.
- Examine the assistance and services, which are to be provided by the Client together with those aspects of the study, which the Client will fund directly.
- Provide an opportunity for the Consultant to identify any methods of working or work content not included in the brief and which are likely to lead to increased efficiency.
- An initial identification of problems and issues and discussion of the current status of any outstanding matters being dealt with through the Clients ‘Traffic Management Priority System’ and any schemes currently on the Clients ‘Reserve List’.

The second meeting will include the Clients Officers and the Officers of the District Council. The purpose of the meeting will be to:

- Discuss methods of consultation and communication
- Consider local planning matters and car parking.

Stage 2: The Existing Situation

Ordnance Survey base mapping and associated datasets will be provided by the Client for use within each specific study. The Consultant will be expected to produce any additional layers for use within the subsequent process of consultation and design. Additional layers will highlight: main transport generators; pedestrian facilities; bus stops and/or rail stations; off-street car parks; on-street parking; major junctions and other similar features. It will also be necessary for the Consultant to identify any significant constraints including but not limited to: traffic orders; physical restraints and significant land use developments likely to materialise within the period of 10 years.

The Client will provide all available data relating to vehicular counts, pedestrian counts and speed surveys undertaken within the previous five-year period, and accident records for a three-year period. This will be supplemented by local knowledge from both the Client and Consultant. The Consultant will appraise this information and inform the Client of any additional data requirements that may be needed to test the feasibility of measures or support strategy options developed within the study. The client will consider if it is necessary to obtain this additional data and either make arrangements for its collection or award an extra payment within the contract.
The existing situation will be detailed within ‘The Report’ under headings such as:

- Main vehicular flows
- Main pedestrian flows
- Occupancy and turnover of short stay and long stay car parks
- Excessive traffic speed
- Abnormal incidence of personal injury accidents

**Stage 3: Overall Objectives, Guidelines and Constraints**

The Consultant will be required to identify and summarise the main policies, guidelines and constraints that will influence the development of the alternative strategies for future transportation arrangements. In addition to including town centre developments which are funded from external sources, the client and consultant will work in partnership to identify opportunities to attract other forms of inward investment into the Town. Particular reference is made to the following:

- North Yorkshire County Council Local Transport Plan 2001/2006
- The relevant Local Plans of:
  - a) The District Council
  - b) The National Park where appropriate
- Regional Planning Guidance
- Government Planning Policy Guidance, in particular PPG 13 Transport
- The likely budgets available for capital and revenue expenditure in the short term and for the subsequent five years.

The Consultant will be guided by the Client’s implicit objectives which, in priority order seek to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and vehicle drivers, all with particular regard to meeting the Client’s road safety objectives and targets.

**Stage 4: A Critical Appraisal**

This will be undertaken through a two-stage process.

- Firstly, a workshop involving the key partners (as identified in Stage 1). The outcome of the workshop will be released in a press release agreed by the Client and Consultant, and a summary of the workshop proceedings will be sent to stakeholders.
- Secondly, a survey involving the local community, the format of which will be agreed with the client.

The main aim of the appraisal will be to identify the current problems and issues within the study area (defined in Stage 1), augmented by the technical appraisal and analysis (carried out in Stage 2).

The appraisal will be detailed within ‘The Report’ under headings such as:

- Pedestrian problems and needs.
- Cycling and cycle facilities.
- Public transport including rail (if appropriate), buses and taxis.
- Servicing
- Vehicular traffic -congestion/parking/demand management.
- The current management arrangements for car parking. (Including the balance between long stay and short stay parking provision, turnover of spaces and charging policy)
- Residents parking
- Mobility/Disabled access considerations.
- Safety problems and vehicle speed issues.
- Environmental concerns including identification of locations/sites likely to benefit from either school or Green Travel Plans.
- Land use allocations in District Local Plan so as to identify any future major traffic generators.
Stage 5: Specific Aims and Objectives
The Consultant will produce a statement specific to each study focused on what is achievable within the scope of the resources available to best meet the needs of the local community. Reference will be made to proposals which have been identified by the workshop but which would be impracticable owing to budget limitations.

This statement will consist of:
- The aims and policy goals of the future transportation strategy
- Outline objectives specific to meeting the ongoing needs of the town
- The process required to identify transportation measures and options for the town

Stage 6: Identification of Measures and Strategy Options
The Consultant will be required to produce a number of transportation options together with outline costs, which meet as closely as possible the aims and objectives identified (stated in Stage 5). It is expected that these will span the range between a minimum of change to the existing situation through to the maximum practicable within the expected lifespan of the project and with the resources available. A normal range would be three options, although, more or less, may be acceptable. The exact range will be agreed between the Client and Consultant for each individual study.

- The strategy options are to be produced as sketch drawings at an appropriate scale. Additional detailed representation may be required for specific measures if this is necessary to either ‘prove the concept’ or allow the Client or local community to make a decision regarding the measure.
- Improvements which are common to all strategy options and which do not require a long lead-time must be identified on a separate plan. This will enable the Client to make an early start on the implementation of the work.
- The amount of text required would be at a minimal level, although the various elements will be listed on each drawing to enable the components to be easily re-assembled so as to produce different sub options if required.

The Consultant will make arrangements for the strategy options will be considered by a second workshop involving the key partners (identified in Stage 1, with additions as necessary).
- The Council's officers will introduce and chair the workshop and will interpret the result of the meeting to the extent that the options for public consultation will be identified.
- The Consultant will provide a presentation of the strategy option to a high standard in line with current techniques

In addition, the Consultant will examine the viability and practicality of providing stand-alone Pedestrian Action and Local Cycling Plans in accordance with the Clients guidelines, and identify potential sources of third party funding.

Stage 7: Public Consultation
The views of the public will be obtained by means of an exhibition, a colour leaflet and a pre-paid postal questionnaire. A press release will introduce a period of public consultation appropriate to the study but not exceeding four weeks.

The Client will approve a timetable of dates for the development of the public consultation process, which should be submitted by the Consultant at the earliest practicable date. The Consultant will also design the leaflet and questionnaire, and arrange for the holding of the exhibition. The Client will oversee the design and arrangement.

The leaflet and questionnaire will be distributed to a large proportion of the population within the study area and in some cases it may be delivered to all households. The public exhibition will also represent an important outlet for leaflet distribution and further copies will be placed in prominent locations, for example public buildings and main service facilities.

The Consultant will coded the responses electronically any provide appropriate statistical and spatial analysis as determined by support indicated within the responses. The analysis will be reported to the Client.
Stage 8: The Preferred scheme
The Consultant, in consultation with the Client, will draw up a preferred strategy based upon the results of the public consultation process.

The Consultant will produce a final draft report, suitable for consideration by the Clients Area Committee. This will be provided in both electronic format and as hard copy for internal use. The Consultant will, if required, attend the Client Area Committee.

Following a decision by the Client's Area Committee, the Consultant will make any necessary amendments and produce the Transportation Strategy for the particular town, consistent with the framework attached as Appendix C. This will also include an outline programme for implementation, including costs, for the preferred strategy.

The Client provide appropriate separate Pedestrian Action and Local Cycling Plans.
# TOWN CENTRE TRANSPORTATION IN FOUR MEDIUM SIZED TOWNS

**Key Events and Reporting**

**Note on reporting:**

- **Informal** means oral approval by the appropriate clients representative as nominated by lead officer.
- **Formal** means written approval in the form of minutes of a meeting or by letter. 

(In the case of the final report identified in Stage 8, only written approval by the lead officer will suffice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Key Event</th>
<th>Actions by Consultant</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information, services and facilities provided by client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Timetable)</td>
<td>Initial meeting to identify key partners</td>
<td>Prepare list of partners/key stakeholders for future consultation</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete action plan</td>
<td>Total work programme based on key events</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public consultation format and timetable</td>
<td>Report to determine scope content and cost of consultation</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commence survey</td>
<td>Provide access to departmental records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Existing Situation)</td>
<td>Progress meeting 1</td>
<td>Meetings programmed to facilitate a review of content and progress</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress meeting 2</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Lead officer comments on final draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete report</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 (Objectives, Guidelines, Constraints) | Completion | Informal discussion regarding the scope and content of report | Formal | Provide copies of 
|       | Survey involving the community | Consultant to undertake survey of local community in order to identify local problems and issues | Informal | Client observes progress and provides guidance if required |
|       | Presentation for Workshop 1 | Presentation to Client's representative of visual display material and agenda for Workshop 1 | Informal | Lead Officer approves |
|       | Workshop 1 | Arrange, attend and present report | Introduce and interpret the result of Workshop 1 |
| 4 (Critical Appraisal) | Report on the findings of workshop 1 | Copy to nominated officers | Formal | Give guidance in the development of the report |
|       | Complete Report | Produce clear aims and objectives for the Study Town | Formal |
|       | Develop practicable options | Arrange meeting with nominated officers | Formal | Guidance in refinement of options |
|       | Ratification report for workshop 2 | Arrange meeting with nominated officers | Formal | Lead officer approves report to workshop 2 |
|       | Workshop 2 | Arrange and present report | Introduce and interpret the meeting and identify options for public consultation |
| 6 (Identify Options) | Ratification of proposals for public consultation | Arrange meeting to finalise costs, feasibility, media publicity, leaflet, questionnaire, exhibition and analysis previously approved | Formal | Provide statement of NYCC responsibilities and costs which it will bear for the exercise |
|       | Complete report for public consultation | Produce and deliver to client's office an appropriate number of reports to a specified format on a specific date | Formal |
| 7 (Public Consultation) | Area Committee meeting | Obtain approval to proposals for public consultation by NYCC Area Committee |
|       | Public consultation commencements | Client observes progress and provides guidance if required |
|       | Public exhibition | Carry out consultation process to agreed format |
|       | Public consultation ends | |
|       | Returns analysed | |
| 8 (The Preferred Scheme) | Preferred option identified | Consultant develops preferred scheme based upon results of public consultation in close consultation with client | Formal | Guidance provided |
|       | First draft final report | Copy to nominated officers | Formal | Lead officer provides comments |
|       | Final report | Copy to nominated officers | Formal | Lead officer gives approval (written) |
|       | Committee report | Produce and deliver to the client's office an appropriate number of reports to a specified format on a specific date | Formal | Distribute report to committee members |
|       | Area Committee meeting | Consultant produces Transportation Strategy | Formal | Distribution to Officers and appropriate Libraries |
|       | | | | |
Appendix B

How can you help? Visit our exhibition to view the plans on display.

Please read his pamphlet and then, for a clearer understanding of the plans come to the exhibition, to be held between Friday 19 July and Thursday 1 August, in The Ark, Kilgreet, Tadcaster. At the exhibition you will be able to discuss the proposals with representatives of both NYCC and Mouchel. On Friday 19 July between 14:00 and 20:00, and on Saturday 20 July between 10:00 and 14:00.

Whilst any comments would be helpful, it would be appreciated if you would also complete the questionnaire accompanying this pamphlet. This can be handed in at the exhibition, returned free of charge in the envelope provided or completed on the internet. All comments and questionnaires should be returned by 9 August 2002.

Your views will be considered on an equal basis with those of other people and organisations. The final strategy for implementation will be guided by the majority view indicated by the responses received. At that stage formal proposals will be published for those elements of the strategy options that require detailed local consultation prior to their construction.

This pamphlet and accompanying questionnaire are also available on the internet at [http://www.nyc-consultation.info].

M O Mayor, Director of Environmental Services

North Yorkshire County Council
Environments Services
Introduction
North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) wishes to afford transport and access related issues a high priority within the Tadcaster area over the next few years. Recently effort has been focused on the development of a Traffic Management Strategy for Tadcaster. This aims to secure long lasting transport improvements, especially for vulnerable road users, whilst maximising economic and environmental well being and minimising existing or potential sources of detrimental impact.

Many local organisations and individuals have participated in the development of the strategy options and measures contained within this pamphlet through attendance at two workshops. The County Council would like your views in order to help construct a final strategy. Implementation of the strategy is then likely to begin before the end of the year.

What are the problems?
The problems and issues summarised in the list below were identified by stakeholders at a workshop in Tadcaster during 2001. They represent the first input into the Traffic Management Strategy.

- **Pedestrian Issues** - Pedestrian/vehicle conflict, particularly on market days. A 30 mph zone has been requested.
- **Cycling** - The lack of cycle facilities especially in relation to routes to schools and a shortage of secure cycle parking facilities.
- **Facilities for the Mobility Impaired and Wheelchair Users** - Many barriers exist for those making journeys into the central commercial areas, and between other facilities.
- **Public Transport** - The bus station redevelopment is urgently needed. Entry and egress from the site is a problem. Bus stops generally need upgrading by provision of shelter and information.
- **Motorised Cross-Town Journeys** - A problem is perceived with unnecessary cross-town journeys by private cars and particularly goods vehicles. Problems are exacerbated by the lack of bidirectional access at junctions on the A64.
- **Parking Issues** - The provision and condition of off-street parking. Holding the market on part of the Central Car Park is perceived to reduce the supply of spaces whilst increasing demand.
- **Signage Issues** - Directional signage within the town needs to be reviewed, particularly at the A64 and destinations beyond. Signage to car parks needs to be improved, as does signage to pedestrians and buses.
- **Traffic Calming** - A need for more traffic calming which must take account of the needs of all road users.
- **Retail Servicing** - The essential servicing requirements of businesses and public facilities must be addressed.

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.

- Secure improved access to Tadcaster at the three junctions on the A64, in order to reduce unnecessary journeys through both the town and historic core.

- Identify and make necessary improvements to establish a network of signed preferred routes for pedestrians, especially for safer routes to schools, and the mobility impaired, between key attractors including the historic core and commercial area, schools, bus station and supermarket, residential areas, and key employment locations.

- Develop a network of cycle routes and facilities to make using a cycle a safe, comfortable and realistic alternative to using a car.

- Limit the speed of traffic in the historic core and adjacent commercial areas, in order to reduce the severity of collisions between motor vehicles, pedestrians and cycles.

- Facilitate the improvement of public transport services for those commuting into and out of Tadcaster through both the upgrading of infrastructure and by working in partnership with neighbouring local authorities and local employers.

- Improve entry and egress from the Tadcaster Bus Station site on completion of the redevelopment scheme.

- Implement remedial measures at known high risk accident locations.

- Rationalise on-street parking in the commercial area.

- Eliminate as far as practicable, through traffic within residential areas.

- Improve and consolidate signing within the town, especially in respect of changes resulting from measures developed as part of this strategy.

How can it be achieved?

NYCC has worked closely with its partner consultant Mouchel North Yorkshire to develop schemes that can deliver the objectives and provide an overall benefit for Tadcaster. Three options, a number of complementary measures and the off-line of a long-term parking strategy have been developed for the town. NYCC has allocated funds in its capital budget to allow schemes up to the value of £100,000 to commence this financial year (2002/03). In addition, a sum of almost £200,000 has been earmarked for the redevelopment of the bus station. This scheme has recently been out to consultation and work is programmed to commence this autumn.

For one or more of the options to be developed the necessary level of support would be required from the local community through this consultation process. Progression on the complementary measures is not dependent on the selection of any of the other options, so a number of improvements can proceed even if none of the options is favoured by the community.

Option A

- Option A has the joint aims of improving road safety and encouraging cycling and walking for those travelling around Tadcaster.

- At the core of this strategy option, an extended 30 mph zone would be created from the existing zone on Wetherby Road, encompassing the eastern end of Station Road, Westgate, St. Joseph’s Street, Chapel Street, Kirkgate, High Street, Bridge Street, Mill Lane and the western end of Commercial Street.

- On Leeds Road and Wighill Lane 40 mph buffer zones would be created between the national 60 mph speed limit and existing 30 mph zone. "Gateways" features would be created at these points also additionally at the 30 mph speed limit on York Road. Traffic calming measures would be introduced on Wighill Lane and part of York Road.

- The footpath on Leeds Road to Tadcaster Grammar School would be upgraded to facilitate joint pedestrian/cycle use and lighting the path would be considered. Additional footway improvements would be made on Leeds Road Station Road, Wetherby Road, and to the Viaduct Walk, the later again being upgraded for joint pedestrian/cycle use. The existing zebra crossings on York Road and Leeds Road would be upgraded to "Puffin" crossings.

- In addition to the cycle facilities noted above, advisory cycle lanes would be provided on Station Road, Leeds Road and York Road. An additional route would be provided through the residential area to the North of York Road linking to the viaduct path. The junction of Station Road and Leeds Road would be modified and cycle parking would be provided at a number of locations throughout the town.

- A box junction would be provided to aid access from the bus station.

Option B

- Option B would create a modified one-way system with traffic travelling northbound on St. Joseph’s Street and southbound on Chapel Street. The system would be designed to operate within a 20 mph zone and complementary traffic calming measures would be introduced to keep traffic speeds low.

- Part of Kirkgate would be pedestrianised, from which all traffic would be prohibited during specified hours of the day.

- The junctions of High Street with Chapel Street and St. Joseph’s Street will be signalled to improve safety and allow for unimpeded turning movements by essential heavy commercial vehicles.

- A parking bay for at least 14 vehicles will be created on the South side of Westgate in the vicinity of the Post Office, with a further 9 spaces or St. Joseph’s Street near residential properties.

Option C

- Option C removes the existing one-way system with two way traffic being retained on St. Joseph’s Street. As with Option B, Kirkgate would be part pedestrianised.

- Chapel Street would have a closure part way along its length.

- The option would also operate within a 20 mph zone. Complementary traffic calming measures would be introduced. The junctions of St. Joseph’s Street and Chapel Street with High Street will be signalled.

Complementary Measures

The complementary measures include: the introduction of dropped kerbs and tactile paving on key pedestrian routes and the improvement of existing informal pedestrian crossing points and the upgrading of bus stops to a minimum standard including the provision of raised kerbs to aid boarding, the repair of existing and provision of new shelters and improved information provision. An example of the application of these measures is shown on the reverse of this sheet and they are listed on the questionnaire.

Parking Strategy

Selby District Council has funds available for the improvement of both the Britannia and Central Car Parks. Proposals forwarded by Samuel Smiths Brewery include the creation of additional spaces on Robin Hood’s Yard. As additional spaces are created, a number of short-stay spaces could be created within the Central Car Park and the number of spaces on High Street and Bridge Street could be reduced, providing space for pedestrian and environmental improvements.
Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy
Consultation Questionnaire

1. Do you support Option A - ‘Safety Improvements’? Yes □ No □

2. Do you support Option B - ‘Pedestrianisation of Kirkgate and a modified One-Way System on Chapel Street and St. Joseph’s Street’, in tandem with the proposals contained in Option A? Yes □ No □

3. Do you support Option C - ‘Pedestrianisation of Kirkgate and Two-Way traffic on St. Joseph’s Street’, in tandem with the proposals contained in Option A? Yes □ No □

4. Do you support the Parking Strategy? Yes □ No □

Complementary Measures

5. Do you support the introduction of dropped kerbs and tactile paving? Yes □ No □

6. Do you support the improvement of existing informal pedestrian crossing points? Yes □ No □

7. Do you support the upgrading of bus stops and associated information? 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 LS24 3XX)

Other Comments

Thank you for your time and assistance.
This questionnaire is also available for completion on-line at http://www.nycc-consultation.info
Appendix C

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR TOWN CENTRES
STANDARD REPORT FRAMEWORK

Introduction
• State what it expected to be achieved.
• Refer to overall policies and the influence of PPG 13.
• Explain the concept that the main themes will be to create a better environment and to increase prosperity.
• Describe the public participation process in some detail including how the final scheme will be strongly influenced by the people of the Town.

• The Study Area
• Location
  • Describe the geographic location. The character of the town and what major facilities it provides for the people of the area.
• Access
  • The access by road rail and public transport and the provision of car parking A general description
• Historical development
  • A brief explanation indicating an appreciation of the areas historical heritage.

Transport In 'The Study Town'
• Field Survey
  • The results of the survey in brief.
• The Views of the Public
  • Include the findings from Workshop 1. Explain in some detail how the process was structured and the attendance level. Including the range of attendees. and how many people attended. A full list of attendees should be included in an appendix.
  • Identify issues raised at the meeting which are outside the scope of this study explain how these have been dealt with

Policies and Transport Objectives
• The Objectives
  • The main objectives contained within the Local Transport Plan
  • Any relevant local objectives stated in the Local Transport Plan
  • Relevant District Council and National park (where appropriate) Local Plan developments and constraints.
  • The transportation aims of the study and the influence of PPG 13.
• Transportation Strategy Aims and Objectives for' (the particular town)'
  • This section should be the one that local people should find the most interesting, it will consist of aims, some of which may almost be seen as projects. This sets the scene for the development of the options.
• Finance and Implementation
  • The budget provision from all relevant sources and the period over which the works will be implemented

Developing the Transportation Strategy
• Identification of Options
  • An explanation of the format and attendance of workshop 2 as described above. Reference will be made to those options identified but excluded and the reasons for rejection will be stated.
  • The practicable options chosen for public consultation together with an indication of those aspects, which are common to all options. The latter being those traffic management measures, which do not require along lead time for implementation.
• The Options in Detail
  • The practicable options will be covered by a brief but concise description. A detailed drawing of each at size A4 will be contained in an Appendix.

The Identification of a Preferred Scheme
• An explanation of how the different options and sub-options were put to public consultation, attendance and results:
  • A description of the preferred scheme together with detailed drawings at A4 scale as an appendix.
  • Drawings of the strategy at A1 scale as an appendix.
Appendix 2 - Workshop Attendees
### Leyburn Workshop 1 – 10th July 2003 - Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roger Harrison-Topham</td>
<td>NYCC Cllr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Heseltine</td>
<td>NYCC Cllr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Knight</td>
<td>Leyburn Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene McIntosh</td>
<td>Leyburn Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavis Parry</td>
<td>Leyburn Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Westwood</td>
<td>Leyburn Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Bell</td>
<td>Richmondshire District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Dew</td>
<td>Richmondshire District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Georgina Ramsbottom</td>
<td>Richmondshire District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Deans</td>
<td>Castle Bolton Parish Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Connolly</td>
<td>British Horse Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Peach</td>
<td>Confederation of Passenger Transport UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Robertson</td>
<td>Disabled Action in Richmondshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hendry</td>
<td>Leyburn CP School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Shaw</td>
<td>North Yorkshire Ambulance Service HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Barker</td>
<td>NYCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Beighton</td>
<td>NYCC Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Brown</td>
<td>NYCC - Traffic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Hurst</td>
<td>NYCC - Traffic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Hutchinson</td>
<td>NYCC - Passenger Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Smith</td>
<td>Mouchel Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Steele</td>
<td>Mouchel Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Townley</td>
<td>Mouchel Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Turnbull</td>
<td>Mouchel Consulting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Leyburn Workshop 2 – 20th May 2004 - Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Harrison-Topham</td>
<td>North Yorkshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Mason</td>
<td>North Yorkshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Brown</td>
<td>North Yorkshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms C Foster</td>
<td>North Yorkshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms M Welch</td>
<td>North Yorkshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P Roberts</td>
<td>North Yorkshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr I Beighton</td>
<td>North Yorkshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Taylor</td>
<td>North Yorkshire Police Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr D J Morton</td>
<td>Richmond District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr F G Ramsbottom</td>
<td>Richmond District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ian Barker</td>
<td>Leyburn Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P Westwood</td>
<td>Leyburn Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms M Parry</td>
<td>Leyburn Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms J Forrest</td>
<td>Leyburn Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms T Tolhurst</td>
<td>Middleham Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms J Arrow</td>
<td>Middleham Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Clarke</td>
<td>West Witton Parish Council / Wensleydale Railway Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr F Ryecroft</td>
<td>Bellerby Parish Council / Leyburn Dental Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Peach</td>
<td>Confederation for Passenger Transport UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms L Curran</td>
<td>Disability Action in Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A Timms</td>
<td>Yorkshire MAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Brown</td>
<td>Society of Friends (Quakers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Gladden</td>
<td>Faith Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms T Gladden</td>
<td>Faith Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Warden</td>
<td>St Matthew’s Parish Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms S Wright</td>
<td>Elite Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D Milner</td>
<td>Milner Furniture Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P Holmes</td>
<td>Leyburn Leisure Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R Turnbull</td>
<td>Mouchel Parkman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Steele</td>
<td>Mouchel Parkman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A T Moseley</td>
<td>Mouchel Parkman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss P Townley</td>
<td>Mouchel Parkman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apologies received in person from Ms Hendry (Leyburn Community Primary School)
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1 Introduction

This Pedestrian Action Plan has been produced by Mouchel Parkman on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council in parallel to the development of the Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy. The Strategy and Pedestrian Plan were adopted as policy by North Yorkshire County Council on 21st March 2005.

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

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 study area
- Key pedestrian routes within and around the study area
- Proposals for improvement
- Consultation responses

The outcome of the Pedestrian Action Plan is summarised on drawing 340512/002/010A, and with the costs associated with implementation in Appendix A.
2 Objectives

2.1 Overall Objectives
North Yorkshire has adopted an over-arching Pedestrian Strategy, which commits it to produce a Pedestrian Action Plan for all services areas 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 of pedestrian route network. The Plan should also identify all improvements necessary to comply with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA).
3 Principal Facilities

3.1 Town Centre
The Market Place serves as the centre of retail and business, having a post office, banks, two large supermarkets, a chemist, and a number of pubs, restaurants and hotels. Market day is Friday, and on non-market days, the whole of the Market Place is used as a car park. The Library and Town Council Offices, including a room for events, are located on Moor Road to the West of Grove Square.

3.2 Auction Mart
The Auction Mart is located on Richmond Road to the north of the Market Place. It holds twice weekly sales, including a large sale on Friday coinciding with the Traditional Market held every Friday in the Market Place.

3.3 Business Park
A small business park is located on the A684 Harmby Road at the eastern edge of the town. Further land allocated is allocated for development adjacent to the business park. To the Harmby side of the business park are auctioneers Tennants of Yorkshire which holds weekly sales throughout the year.

3.4 Education
Leyburn has three educational establishments: Leyburn Community Primary School (170 pupils) located on Wensleydale Avenue; St Peter and St Paul RC Primary School (40 pupils) located on Bellerby Road; and, Wensleydale School (477 pupils) located on Richmond Road. The three schools generate a significant number of walking trips, 57 pupils regularly walking to Leyburn Community Primary School, 24 walking to St Peter and St Paul RC Primary School and, 80 walking to Wensleydale School.

3.5 Health
The town’s Dentist is located on the A684 Wensley Road off the western end of the Market Place and the Medical Centre is located on Brentwood.

3.6 Tourism
Leyburn is also a popular tourist destination with natural features such as Leyburn Shawl, and events such as Dales Festival of Food and Drink, attracting many visitors. Leyburn Railway Station, located on the A684 to the east of the A6108 Middleham Road, was reopened by the Wensleydale Railway PLC in 2003.

3.7 Residential Areas
The areas to the north, east and west of the town centre are predominantly residential.

3.8 Pedestrian Accidents
A single pedestrian sustained slight injury after stepping out from behind a parked vehicle and into the nearside of a moving vehicle on the South side of the A684.
4 Key Pedestrian Routes

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

4.1 The A684 from the town centre to the Business Park and Harmby
Also serving the Cinema, Parish Church, Railway Station and Caravan Park.

- Within the Market Place, footways are generally of an adequate width, e.g. 140cm outside the Golden Lion Hotel.
- Crossing from Commercial Square to Wray Bros can be problematic; particularly when in appropriate parking on High Street restricts visibility.
- Tactile paving is provided across the A684 at the mini-roundabout junction with the A6108 and at the signalised crossing near Barclays Bank. The former is misleading to those with visual impairments, with the tactile blisters guiding the unaware onto the carriageway of the A684 heading towards Wensley. There are also other examples of misleading tactile paving in the Market Place, such as near to Norman Brown (Estate Agents) where the tactile paving covers one side of a crossing point and guides the unaware into a stone wall.
- Indiscriminate parking outside the Sandpiper Inn (Plate 1) is also hazardous to the visually impaired.

Plate 1: Indiscriminate parking outside the Sandpiper, Leyburn
Leyburn Pedestrian Action Plan

- On the south side of the A684 Railway Street, the footway does not continue at an adequate width as far as the footpath access to Park View (Plate 2).

- The footpath continues at an adequate width on the north side of the A684 as far as Harmby.

- A footpath is also provided on the west side of the A6108 Middleham Road to Park View, although this is occasionally obstructed by vehicles, outside the garage at the junction with the A684.

- The existing dropped crossing at the aforementioned junction (Plate 3) needs to be moved further west to allow pedestrians to cross more safely. This will be particularly useful for a blind resident of Park View who will then be able to differentiate between vehicles approaching on the A684 and A6108.
4.2 The A6108 from the Market Place to Wensleydale School  
Also serving St Peter and St Paul RC Primary School, the Auction Mart and Wensleydale School

Pedestrian access along the A6108 Richmond Road is limited by the pinch point between Grove Square and St Peter and St Paul RC Primary School. The footway on the east side of the road is discontinuous and the footway on the west side is reduced to approximately 72cm (Plate 4). Many pedestrians choose to walk in the road with their back to oncoming traffic, particularly when heading onto town.

The remainder of the route is of widths over 1m as far as the Mount Drive/Dale Grove junction.

The footway outside Wensleydale School measures between 230cm and 370cm. This encourages parking on the footway limiting pedestrian access at the beginning and end of the school day.
4.3 **Maythorne, Wensleydale Avenue and Brentwood**  
*Also serving the County Primary School and Medical Centre*

Footway widths are adequate and dropped kerbs with tactile paving have been provided across most side-roads. A number of additional dropped kerbs with tactile paving are needed to make the route continuous (Plate 5).

4.4 **Grove Square and Moor Road**  
Along Grove Square and Moor Road to the Town Council Office, Library and Events held at Thornborough Hall.
Plate 5: Adequate footway width but some missing dropped kerbs, Wensleydale Avenue, Leyburn

4.5 Other important tracks and footpaths

- The footpath leading from Park View to the A684 in the vicinity of the cinema;
- The footpaths running to the east of, and through, the Auction Mart, linking Brentwood and Maythorne to Richmond Road;
- The footpath linking Mount Drive and Woodburn Drive to Richmond Road, which with a steep gradient and width of 26cm is useful for those without mobility impairment, but could never be upgraded to DDA compliance (Plate 6); and.
- The track linking Woodburn Drive to Thornborough Hall and Moor Road, part of which is stepped.
4.6 Other Missing Links

- Dale Grove is poorly connected to the rest of the town for those on foot. Despite the relatively short 'straight-line distance', there is no direct route to the County Primary School and Maythorne. Those living in Dale Grove, can currently be seen cutting along the eastern boundary of Wensleydale School as an informal 'short-cut'.

- There is no footway on Moor Road beyond Manor Court (Plate 7).
Plate 7: No footway - Moor Road, Leyburn
5 Proposals and Conclusion

The problems and issues regarding all modes of transport were identified at two stakeholder workshops held at Thornborough Hall in Leyburn, through observations, and from a number of other meetings with stakeholders. A visual study was also undertaken of footway widths, condition and obstructions.

Pedestrian Plan encompasses all of the proposed pedestrian improvements, including the introduction of dropped kerbs and tactile paving on key pedestrian routes, and improvements to existing informal pedestrian crossing points (Drawing 340513/002/010A).

- The Leyburn Pedestrian Action Plan identifies key pedestrian routes to be targeted as part of NYCC’s response to the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA). In order to allow use of these routes by everyone, including the disabled; surfaces need to be repaired; dropped kerbs and tactile paving needs to be provided; and, some more specific works need to be undertaken.

- Continuous footways need to be provided on both sides of Richmond Road between the Primary School and the Kings Head Pub. To allow this, southbound traffic will be required to give-way to northbound traffic (Drawing 340513/002/011A – Detail A).

- The defined pedestrian strip lining the western footway on Richmond Road to Grove Square needs better definition, often being parked over at the present time.

- The dropped crossing on St Matthews Terrace, at Middleham Road, needs to be moved further west to allow pedestrians to cross more safely. This will be particularly useful for a blind resident of Park View who will then be able to differentiate between vehicles approaching on the A684 and A6108, and then access the town centre independently (Drawing 340513/002/011A – Detail B).

- A wider footway needs to be provided on Railway Street to allow safe movement between the Elite Cinema and public footpath to Park View. The current footway is less than 0.5 metre wide which is too narrow for either the use of a guide dog or wheelchair.

- The state of the tracks between the Market Place and the Richmondshire District Council Car Park is currently limiting use of the car park. The tracks are unlit and personal safety concerns have been expressed. The tracks need surface and lighting improvements before the successful implementation of a comprehensive parking strategy for the town.

- Parking on the redefined footway outside the Sandpiper Inn continues to be a problem that needs to be monitored.

- Joint use pedestrian and cycle routes are being investigated between Dale Grove and Brentwood, and from Leyburn to Bellerby.

In addition to this, improvements to pedestrian access and safety were proposed as part of the strategy options, including:
• Improvements to signing and lining on Moor Road to raise awareness both of the existing 30mph limit and the likelihood that pedestrians will be walking in the road, Moor Road having no footways over lengthy sections;

• Proposals to introduce a ‘School Safety Zone’ on Richmond Road outside Wensleydale School, including: a controlled pedestrian crossing; some on-street parking; localised carriageway narrowing and improved lighting; and,

• A pedestrian crossing between the Market Place and Commercial Square (Plate 8).

Plate 8: Pedestrians crossing High Street, Leyburn

Public consultation was undertaken during October 2004 and included the distribution of a leaflet and questionnaire to nearly 4,000 households and businesses within the Leyburn area. A public exhibition was held between Friday 22nd October and Thursday 28th October in Thornborough Hall. A public meeting chaired by County Councillor Roger Harrison-Topham was also held at Thornborough Hall on the evening of 28th October.

The Pedestrian Action Plan received support from 75% of respondents to the public consultation exercise and was adopted by North Yorkshire County Council on 21st March 2005.
6 Summary

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

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

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

Pedestrian signing is to be reviewed as part of a Signing Audit.

It is recommended that a review of street lighting should be conducted to assess whether the existing levels of footway lighting is adequate, as this is a factor which not only influences pedestrian road safety but also influences the transport mode used and ability to make journeys during hours of darkness.
Localised signing & lining improvements in vicinity of railway bridge

Signs and lining features within 30mph limit to increase driver awareness of pedestrians

Advisory cycle lanes to schools and residential areas

School safety zone outside Wensleydale School including:
- Sign control of puffin crossing
- Traffic calming
- Formalisation of parking
- Improved street lighting

Shared use pedestrian and cycle track to link residential areas

Construction of footway

Give way prior to incoming vehicles

New dropped kerb and tactile paving

Bus stop to be relocated

40mph speed limit extended beyond Hamby with speed reducing features and

parking as necessary. Advisory cycle lanes to be provided as part of route W1

General Improvements

NYCC will continue to work in partnership with Richmondshire District Council and Wensleydale
Railway to secure improved integrated passenger facilities at Leyburn Railway Station.

Localised footway arrangement to facilitate pedestrian crossing St Matthew's Terrace, bus stop to be relocated.

Extend 30mph zone beyond cemetery with appropriate street lighting

20mph speed limit with features as necessary to reduce speed

NYCC Yorkshire Dales cycle plan proposed route W1

Unsegregated off-road pedestrian and cycle route on North side of A894

Advisory cycle lane on South side of A894
Appendix A – Summary of Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Programme Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Kerbs and Tactile Paving</td>
<td>£33,600</td>
<td>2005/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Public Rights of Way Improvements</td>
<td>£14,000</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway across No Parking strip on Grove Square</td>
<td>£1,400</td>
<td>2008/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footway and priority working on Richmond Road</td>
<td>£25,200</td>
<td>2008/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDA related footway improvement at Harmby Road / Middleham Road junction</td>
<td>£11,200</td>
<td>2005/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of parking outside Sandpiper and at Yoredale Avenue / Market Place junction</td>
<td>£3,800</td>
<td>2006/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footway / cycleway from Dale Grove to Woodside / Brentwood (1)</td>
<td>£119,000</td>
<td>after 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to footway lighting in the Ginnels from the market place to RDC car park</td>
<td>£56,000</td>
<td>2008/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footway on the south side of Harmby Road from the Cinema to PROW</td>
<td>£11,200</td>
<td>2007/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement of permissive path south of the railway line</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing between Wray Brothers and Commercial Square</td>
<td>£72,800</td>
<td>2006/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety Zone at Wensleydale School</td>
<td>£77,000</td>
<td>2006/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and pedestrian signs rationalisation</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>2005/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To be funded from external sources*
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Enhance the attractive nature of the town centre through environmental improvements including the creation of a pedestrian area and provision of public additional seating facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The safety of pedestrians is reduced as they compete with Quarry vehicles, cars, caravans and speeding motorcyclists for access and road space e.g. along Moor Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Vehicular egress from the Market Place parking area is considered hazardous and the potential for creating a one-way system around the Market Place should be examined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Any modifications to the nature of Leyburn through engineering must be made sympathetically as the bustling character of the town is both its charm and attraction and the haphazard parking practice provides a natural form of traffic calming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Improvements to the footways located opposite St Peter and St Paul Roman Catholic Church and opposite the St Matthews Parish Church is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The provision of a pedestrian crossing facility, enabling access to St Peter and St Paul Roman Catholic School, is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Maintain existing pedestrian routes, including unadopted routes used for access to schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The Market Place is considered the most appropriate location for providing cycle parking facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Vehicular speeds are considered excessive on the outbound approach to the Harmby Road / Middleham Road junction, and on the Middleham Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Vehicular speeds are considered excessive in the vicinity of the Cemetery, a hazard exacerbated by vehicle parking along the carriageway of this locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The Harmby Road / Middleham Road junction is considered hazardous due to numerous vehicle ‘near-misses’ at the junction, congestion created by vehicles queuing for petrol station services, and the poor definition of the entrance to the petrol station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The Brentwood / Railway Street junction is considered a blind and hazardous junction upon egress, exacerbated by cars parked for the cinema.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The relocation of current disabled parking facilities and provision of additional disabled parking facilities is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Town Council supports disc parking, but highlighted the lack of financial resources necessary to enforce a disc parking scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The Market Place car parking area requires modification as occupied parking bays obscure egress visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Enforcement of parking restrictions would eliminate illegal parking practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>The enforcement of disabled parking spaces, particularly within the Market Place, is required as non-badge holders currently abuse these spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>The signing of an alternative route from Middleham to upper Wensleydale, avoiding the centre of Leyburn, should be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Provision of an equestrian bridleway via the north and south of Leyburn to avoid the town centre is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The potential of removing cars from the Market Place thus converting the area to a pedestrian zone should be examined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The shopping-journey destination of residents in the Leyburn catchment area was queried as the lack of convenient parking facilities may actively deter residents / visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Richmondshire District Council kindly offered the use of its Richmondshire Resident’s Panel for the public consultation elements of the traffic management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Richmondshire District Council highlighted the fact that an annual District Council parking permit costs £30. However, doubt was raised as to whether local residents would be prepared to pay for local parking.

The role of the Auction Mart and its siting within the town is critical.
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1. **Pedestrian issues**

   **The Problem**
   - Lack of pedestrian accessibility within the town and to neighbouring towns and villages.

   **Observations**
   - Lack of safe pedestrian access and/or routes between:
     - Leyburn and Bellerby
     - Leyburn and Middleham
     - Residential areas and the Town Centre
     - The Railway Station and the Town Centre
   - Lack of safe pedestrian crossing points:
     - In the vicinity of St Peter and St Paul Roman Catholic School
     - Between the Cinema and Brentwood
   - Footways are considered to be of inadequate width:
     - Opposite St Peter and St Paul Roman Catholic Church on Richmond Road
     - In the vicinity of St Matthews Parish Church Hall on Harmby Road
     - Outside Crown Cottages.
   - Unadopted pedestrian routes, which are used by pedestrians between the Richmondshire District Council (RDC) Car Park and Kelberdale Terrace and the Auction Mart and Maythorne are not maintained.
   - Pedestrians compete with Quarry vehicles, cars, caravans and speeding motorcyclists for access and road space, particularly along Moor Road.

   **Suggested Options**
   - Examination of potential route alternatives and improvements for those routes identified above.
   - Development of a network of pedestrian routes between residential areas and the town centre, with particularly emphasis on the residential sectors located in the north and eastern quadrants of the town, including the investigation of a pedestrian route from Dale Grove to Wensleydale Avenue, along the eastern flank of Wensleydale playing field.
   - Identify locations where substandard footways can be widened or new links between isolated sections of footway constructed
   - Examine the potential for constructing pedestrian crossings at St Peter and St Paul Roman Catholic Primary School, and between the Cinema and Brentwood.
   - Investigate the potential to widen the pavement outside Crown Cottages and create a shuttle / priority traffic flow, providing the added benefit of reducing the speed of traffic in this area.
2. Cycle routes and parking

The Problem

- A lack of safe cycling routes and secure cycle parking facilities.

Observations

- There are a lack of safe cycle routes within the town, most notably linking residential areas and the town centre.
- There are also a lack of cycle routes connecting Leyburn to other Wensleydale towns and villages.
- Cyclists feel particularly vulnerable on Moor Road.
- Children tend to cycle on the pavements, endangering pedestrians. East Lane was identified as particular area of pedestrian cycle conflict.
- The provision of safe cycle parking including cycle lockers needs to be addressed, both within the town centre and at key bus stops.

Suggested Options

- Identify a network of cycle routes and lanes within the town to link residential areas with the town centre and schools.
- Investigate cycle routes forming an integrated network between Leyburn and surrounding towns / villages including routes to link Leyburn with the National Park bus/cycle routes.
- Examine the level of safety and access provision of current carriageway cycling to identify potential safety and access improvements.
- Improve the number and location of cycle parking facilities and examine the potential for integrating cycle parking at bus stops. The Market Place is considered to be an appropriate location for providing cycle lockers.
• Examine the potential of cycle hire provision at the railway station and associated cycle parking facilities / access. Also look at the potential to develop cycle routes from Leyburn and between railway stations.

Suggested Surveys
• Assessment of potential intra-urban (residential /school / town centre) and inter-urban cycle routes.
• Assessment of current cycle parking facilities.
• Identification of hazards to cycling.

3. Equestrian issues

The Problem
• Lack of equestrian routes avoiding the town centre.

Observations
• Provision of an equestrian route / bridleway around the perimeter of the town both to the north and south (thus avoiding the town centre) is required.
• Maximise the safety of horse riding along carriageways by reducing existing speed limits.

Suggested Options
• Create equestrian routes or bridleways in the area which avoid the town centre, including the potential to develop quiet routes for pedestrian, cyclists and equestrian usage.
• A potential route via the Pheasant Inn to the north, along the railway track to the east and via Hollow Way / Cricket Field Lane / Cemetery to the south, was suggested.

Suggested Surveys
• Ascertain current routing patterns of local stables or organised hack routes.
• Identify additional issues regarding equestrian access.
4. **Public transport and the potential for transport interchange**

**The Problem**
- Improvement of bus services, the integration of bus and rail services and creation of a transport interchange / coach parking facilities.

**Observations**
- Bus stops need to be upgraded to encourage people to use buses - provision of shelter, seating and timetable facilities is essential.
- The provision of a bus drop-off / pick-up point at the railway station is required.
- The bus stop in the Market Place needs to cater for three buses at any one time to maximise connection between services. The lack of adequate bus stop facilities reduces potential patronage / utilisation of bus services. The creation of a bus interchange is thus required, with bus services co-ordinated with railway services. The integration of bus and railway services would encourage tourism to the town and surrounding area.
- The Disability Discrimination Act legally requires boarding access modifications at bus stops. The construction of these high kerbs (Kassel kerbs) cannot be mounted by cars or small vans and therefore will encompass the removal of three parking bays to prevent vehicles attempting this manoeuvre.
- Bus services across town and to surrounding villages are not of sufficient frequency to serve those without access to a car.
- The provision of a cross-dales bus service is required to enable those without access to cars to visit relatives and friends resident within the dales. This type of service may be operated through community transport schemes such as dial-a-ride, flexible routing or volunteer driver schemes if providing this service through conventional bus transportation does not prove economically viable.
- The upgrade of bus services from once per week to four times per day is greatly appreciated. However the provision of direct services from Leyburn to Darlington are required as the current indirect services are expensive and current journey times including transfer / connection times are considered excessive, in addition to the lack of shelter facilities in Bedale.
- Bus services from Leyburn to Northallerton should be extended to Friarage Hospital in Northallerton rather than terminating on Northallerton High Street.
- Day-trip coaches conflict with service buses in the Market Place because of having to remain stationary for longer time periods to whilst large numbers of passengers alight or board. Coach parties are currently discouraged from stopping in Leyburn due to the lack of parking facilities. Coach derived tourism should be encouraged especially with increasing number of attractions and facilities (e.g. railway services) and thus the creation of designated coach parking facilities should be considered.
Suggested Options

- Improve boarding access, shelter, seating, lighting and information provision at bus stops.
- Create a transport interchange facility in the town centre enabling three bus vehicles to park simultaneously thus maximising service connections, and integration between bus and rail services.
- Examine the potential to: integrate bus services and maximise service connections; improve direct bus services to larger urban centres; to extend the routing of services to e.g. health or education facilities; provide a trans-dales flexible routing or demand response transport service.
- Provide designated coach parking facilities. Grove Square was suggested as a possible location for a coach parking facility, it was highlighted that this area is used for residents parking.

Suggested Surveys

- Conduct an audit of seating, lighting, information and shelter provision at bus stops within the town and surrounding area.
- Assess the routing / catchment area and frequency of bus services operating in the area, and assess the integration between services.
- Assess the potential for creating a transport interchange facility within the town centre.
- Assess current coach parking practice and the potential for providing designated coach parking facilities.
- Ascertain whether proposals are included to provide a bus stop, car parking, or coach parking facilities at the railway station.

5. School travel

The Problem

- Parking and congestion outside schools, and lack of safe pedestrian access to schools.

Observations

- The conflict between parental school-run vehicles, school buses, taxis and minibuses serving Wensleydale School create congested and hazardous conditions on Richmond Road outside the school. Although a total of 16 buses serve the school, the dimensions of the school entrance permit only one bus access or egress at any given time.
- Vehicular speed is considered excessive in the vicinity of both schools on Richmond Road, with vehicles accelerating both upon exiting the town centre, and upon the downhill approach into the town (particularly in the vicinity of Dale...
Grove), unaware of potential hazards located at the road bend at Wensleydale School.

- Traffic calming measures and improved signing warning of the presence of the two schools, is required.
- The introduction of a 20 mph zone outside both schools on Richmond Road with possible physical traffic calming measures such as speed humps or chicanes, and the installation of flashing school warning signs was specifically requested.
- A lack of school pedestrian crossing facilities in the vicinity of both schools on Richmond Road was highlighted.
- The lack of advance signing and school crossing patrol / designated school crossing facility at Leyburn Community Primary School is required. The absence of these facilities reduces pedestrian safety and inhibits the establishment of a school walking bus scheme.
- The lack of safe pedestrian access to schools in Leyburn ensures that parents transport children to school by car. The creation of a safe environment for school pedestrians is essential to enable a transfer from car to foot as the mode of transport to school / encourage walking to school.

Suggested Options

- Investigation of the potential to create an indented pull-in / drop off bay on the grass verge located opposite the Wensleydale School entrance.
- Consider the construction of pedestrian crossing facilities in the vicinity of all three Leyburn schools.
- Improve signing to indicate the presence of schools.
- Create a network of safe pedestrian / cycle routes to all schools.
- Improve street lighting in the vicinity of schools and along pedestrian / cycle routes to school.
- Introduce measures to reduce the speed of traffic on Richmond Road in the vicinity of Wensleydale School and St Peter and St Paul RC Primary School.
- Examine the potential of improving traffic flow and school-run parking conditions in the vicinity of Wensleydale School including the potential for constructing an indented pull-in/ drop-off parking bay opposite the school entrance.

Suggested Surveys

- Assess street lighting provision and pedestrian / cycle access at all three schools.
- Assess parking, traffic speed and traffic flow conditions at all three schools.
- Identify and assess current routes used for pedestrian / cycle access to school.
- Mouchel need to review school travel issues (including school walking bus schemes) with relevant officer at NYCC.
- Check whether school signing improvements have been included as part of NYCC School Travel Plans.
6. Car parking issues

The Problem

- Lack of parking restriction enforcement and disabled parking facilities, District Car Park access / egress hazards, and provision of additional parking facilities.

Observations

- The enforcement of parking restrictions is required as: non-commercial vehicle parking in loading bays; the common practice of double parking at the post office and at the pedestrian crossing facility / outside the supermarket; and parking on kerbs / reversing into mainstream traffic, all create hazardous conditions.
- Current disabled parking facilities that conflict with commercial access to business premises need to be relocated.
- Additional provision of disabled parking facilities is required. These facilities should be dispersed at various locations around the town centre, enabling convenient access to different facilities, e.g. at the Post Office, banks and supermarkets.
- The enforcement of disabled parking facilities is required as non-badge holders currently abuse these facilities.
- The RDC Car Park is fully occupied only on Fridays when the market stalls use the parking area of the Market Place.
- Both access and egress from the RDC Car Park is considered hazardous, due to the nature of the access road and exit junction, respectively.
- Alterations to existing parking facilities will not solve long-term problems. The construction of an additional storey on the RDC car park was discussed, but it was noted that this type of facility would cost approximately £10,000 per parking space.
- As the newly opened Leyburn railway would attract people both wishing to use the service and visiting the facility, adequate car parking facilities would need to be provided.
- The reason why people drive and park in the town centre was discussed, with the suggestion that improving bus services, pedestrian and cycle routes may encourage people not to use the car. The ability to conduct bulk shopping, sheer convenience and the rural topography / travel distance involved in accessing the town from surrounding areas were highlighted as reasons why the car usage / dependence is high.
- The provision of a market day park and ride facility should be considered.
Suggested Options

- Improved demarcation and signage indicating parking facilities / restrictions to eradicate loading bay parking by non-commercial vehicles, and illegal or dangerous parking practices.
- Consider the provision of additional disabled parking facilities at appropriate / convenient locations.
- Investigate the potential for re-arrangement of parking facilities to both maximise parking provision and minimise parking hazards.
- Improve RDC Car Park access / egress.
- Residents parking permits in car parks.

Suggested Surveys

- Assess current town centre parking restrictions.
- Identify private on-street parking facilities and assess the usage of on-street parking for residential parking.
- Assess current town centre parking facilities, and the location and standard of current disabled parking facilities.

7. Signing

The Problem

- Misleading and poor highway signing

Observations

- Signing to the RDC car park is confusing - when travelling inbound from Wensley, the signing indicates an immediate right-turn at the roundabout, and when travelling inbound from Bellerby the signing indicates a left-turn into the Auction Mart.
- Directional signing and signing for tourist facilities / attractions currently consist of clutters of small signage, with drivers stopping on the carriageway to read the appropriate sign. The practice of attaching multiple signs to one lamp-post must be replaced with the practice of separating tourist and directional signs, producing larger signs which incorporate all the necessary information and locating them on the approach roads and at junctions.
- Pedestrian signs indicating routes, public convenience facilities, and car parking facilities are required.

Suggested Options

- Improve signing to the RDC car park, directional, tourist and pedestrian signing.
- Provide signing for cycle parking facilities / routes.
- Improve and ensure regular maintenance of existing signs.
Suggested Surveys
• Undertake a full signing audit (including pedestrian and cycle signing) to establish a baseline of existing levels and conditions.
• Check the provision of information boards in public areas.

8. Speeding and traffic calming

The Problem
• Excessive vehicle speeds, particularly on the approach routes into the town.

Observations
• Current speed limits are not observed or enforced.
• Vehicle speeds are considered excessive:
  • Eastbound toward the Harmby Road / Middleham Road junction
  • On Harmby Road
  • On Middleham Road.
  • On Richmond Road / Bellerby Road
  • In vicinity of the Cemetery on Wensley Road

Speed reduction measures including both vertical and horizontal forms of traffic calming were requested.
• Vehicle speeds are not considered excessive in the town centre as the presence of on-street parking (including haphazard parking practice) acts as a natural form of traffic calming. Concern was expressed that traffic speed within this area could potentially increase if on-street parking was removed or central area parking arrangements were modified.
• Existing speed limits between Wensley, Leyburn and Harmby may not be appropriate.

Suggested Options
• Investigate speed restriction measures on Bellerby Road / Richmond Road, Harmby Road, Moor Road, Middleham Road and Wensley Road.
• Consider the necessity for traffic calming measures on Richmond Road (encompassing the school areas).
• Consider changing the speed limits between Wensley, Leyburn and Harmby.

Suggested Surveys
• Assess vehicle speeds on all approach roads, Middleham Road, Brentwood, outside schools, and at road junctions.
• Investigate the potential for traffic calming in the vicinity of schools, and at business, industrial and caravan parks.
9. Junction improvements and traffic flows

The Problem

- Junction hazards and vehicle access / egress problems.

Observations

- The Harmby Road / Middleham Road junction is considered hazardous due to numerous vehicle ‘near-misses’ at the junction; the congestion created by vehicles waiting petrol station services queuing along the carriageway; and the poor definition of the entrance to the petrol station. Concern was expressed that this hazard may be replicated at the St Matthew’s Terrace / Railway Station junction.
- The Brentwood / Railway Street junction is considered a blind and hazardous junction upon egress onto Railway Street, aggravated by vehicle parking outside the cinema located opposite this junction. Concern was expressed that additional vehicular access generated by the relocation of the Brentwood Doctors Surgery may increase the vehicle turning volume and associated hazards at this junction.
- The creation of a roundabout at the Dale Grove / Richmond Road junction, in order to slow inbound traffic, was requested.
- Potential hazards at junctions created for new developments should be minimised.
- The potential to divert through traffic from Middleham via an alternate route thus avoiding Leyburn town centre.

Suggested Options

- Improve the Harmby Road / Middleham Road junction, including improved petrol station entrance clarification.
- Examine the potential to construct a roundabout at the Dale Grove / Richmond Road junction, in order to slow inbound traffic.
- Investigate the potential to improve Brentwood / Railway Street junction.

Suggested Surveys

- Assess junction turning conditions at the Brentwood / Railway Street junction and Harmby / Middleham Road junction.
- Assess vehicular access and egress from all parking areas in the town centre.
- Assess potential access / egress hazards at the Railway Station, along High Street, and for proposed development sites.
- Assess the volume of through-traffic entering Leyburn from Middleham and examine the potential to divert this traffic via an alternate route.
- Conduct an audit of street lighting and signing at junctions.
10. The Market Place

The Problem

- Vehicular access and parking, and lack of pedestrian space.

Observations

- If people are unable to park in the Market Place, then they are not interested in stopping in Leyburn. Long-stay parking in the Market Place by preventing people from parking short-term, creates hazardous parking with vehicles parking illegally / on the carriageway to make quick convenience stops. The need to relocate long-stay parking whilst retaining convenient / free short-stay parking was considered a fundamental point.

- The Business Association, Richmondshire District Council, and Leyburn Town Council support the introduction of disc parking, as it would maximise parking provision for local residents and visitors, thus maintaining trade and the importance of Leyburn as a market town, and encouraging tourism to the town. Leyburn Town Council however, highlighted the lack of financial resources required to enforce a disc-parking scheme.

- The creation of a pedestrian area / zone in the Market Place, involving environmental enhancement and the provision of additional public seating facilities, was requested.

- The creation of a segregated area for pedestrians / cycle parking and motorcycle parking in the vicinity of the war memorial, without encroaching upon market stall area, was suggested.

- As the Market Place is classified as an Open Space, the removal of cars from this area (thus pedestrianising the area) should be considered.

- The central parking area in the Market Place requires modification as vehicular egress from the parking area is considered hazardous, for example the parking bays marked to the edge of Railway Street carriageway (in the vicinity of the shoe shop), when occupied by vehicles, obscures egress visibility. The creation of a one-way system around the Market Place was suggested.

Suggested Options

- Consider restricting Market Place parking to a maximum of two hours but retaining Commercial Square as unlimited parking.

- Long-stay parking could be relocated away from the Market Place by either limiting waiting or parking (e.g. disc parking) to two - three hours, or by encouraging town employers / employees to purchase a District Council parking permit. The effectiveness of the latter suggestion was questioned as town employees and business owners would strongly object to changing their current parking practice of parking all-day in the Market Place / parking directly outside their business premises.
• Investigate the potential to create a pedestrian / cycle parking area in the Market Place, involving the part pedestrianisation or removal / reallocation / or re-arranging parking in the central area.
• Consider re-aligning or re-arranging parking bays in the central area of the Market Place to improve egress visibility from the parking area.
• Examine the potential for converting traffic flow in the town centre to a one-way traffic system around the Market Place.

Suggested Surveys
• Obtain a plan of the Market Place central parking area to map position of parking bays and to identify market stall boundary area.
• Conduct residential consultation to assess the potential implementation of a disc parking system.
• Assess vehicular access and egress from the central parking area of Market Place.
• Assess traffic flow within the town centre.
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Appendix 5 – Workshop 2 Presentation
Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy
Workshop 2

20th May 2004
Thornborough Hall, Leyburn
Programme

• 17:30  Assemble, tea and coffee
• 18:00  Welcome and introduction
• 18:15  Review of the process, issues and objectives
• 18:25  Overview of the strategy options
• 18:50  Points of clarification
• 19:10  Tea and coffee, opportunity for viewing the plans and information discussion
• 19:30  Review and debate the strategy options
• 20:45  Summary of the debate
• 20:55  Options for public consultation and closing remarks
Welcome and introduction

• Barrie Mason - NYCC
Review of the process, issues and objectives

• Matthew Steele - Mouchel Parkman
Current issues

• Need for improved pedestrian access, facilities and safety
• Lack of safe cycling routes and secure cycle parking facilities
• Lack of equestrian routes avoiding Leyburn town centre
• Poor bus infrastructure, inadequate coach parking, and inadequate rail/bus interchange
• Excessive vehicle speed, parking and congestion problems in the vicinity of schools, and lack of safe pedestrian access to schools
• Lack of parking restriction and enforcement, lack of parking facilities, and District Council car park access/egress hazard
• Misleading and poor highway signing
Current issues

- Excessive speeds on approach roads into Leyburn
- Middleham Road/ Harmby Road, Brentwood/ Harmby Road, and Bellerby Road/ Dale Grove junction hazards
- Inadequate pedestrian space, vehicle access and parking within Leyburn Market Place
Objectives for Leyburn

- Improve walking routes between residential areas and Leyburn town centre (60%)
- Improve walking routes into Leyburn from surrounding towns and villages (57%)
- Develop a network of cycle routes and provide secure cycle parking facilities (51%)
- Improve safety within the vicinity of schools (89%)
- Create safer walking and cycling routes to schools (83%)
- Develop equestrian routes around the perimeter of Leyburn (26%)
- Improve public transport facilities in the Market Place (66%)
Objectives for Leyburn

- Re-organise the Market Place to improve safety for all (70%)
- Improve coach drop-off, pick-up and parking (66%)
- Improve safety for all road users at junctions (86%)
- Improve coach drop-off, pick-up and parking (66%)
- Reduce vehicle speeds on approaches into the town (72%)
- Improve signing to key locations and car parks (64%)
- Introduce disc parking to control the duration of parking in the town centre (75%)
- Re-organise the Market Place to improve safety for all (70%)

10% sample survey based on 138 out of 393 returned forms
Signing and lining features within 30mph limit on Moor Road to increase drivers awareness of pedestrians

NYCC Yorkshire Dales Cycle Route W1 (unsegregated off road pedestrian & cycle route on north side of A684, and advisory lane on south side of A684)

Localised signing and lining improvements in vicinity of railway bridge

30 mph speed limit with gateway feature

20 mph zone with traffic calming

Signal controlled pedestrian crossing

Secure cycle parking

Secure cycle parking

General Improvements - Moor Road and Wensley Road
Bus stops relocated from north of Dale Grove junction

20mph zone with traffic calming

On-road cycle lanes

Priority Working Section - Detail A

Wensleydale School

School Safety Zone with:
- signal controlled crossing
- 20mph speed limit
- traffic calming
- formalisation of parking
- upgraded street lighting

Signed cycle route

Shared use pedestrian & cycle track

General Improvements - Richmond Road
Footway improvement

Middleham Road
Additional route safety study

40mph speed limit extending beyond Harmby with speed reducing features and gateways as necessary

NYCC supports proposed improvements to integrated passenger facilities at Leyburn Railway Station

Advisory cycle lanes as part of NYCC Dales Route W1

Secure cycle parking

General Improvements - A684 towards Harmby
Footway construction and widening

Give way - priority to oncoming vehicles

St Peter and St Paul Roman Catholic Primary School
Kings Head Public House
Richmond Road
Auction Mart

General Improvements - Richmond Road (Detail A)
General Improvements - St Matthews Terrace (Detail B)

- New dropped kerb & tactile paving
- Bus stop to be relocated
- Construction of footway to help pedestrian crossing movement
Outline Parking Strategy

Short stay controlled parking area

On-street parking restrictions
with residents exemptions

Auction Mart used for parking except on Fridays

Richmond District Council long stay pay & display car park

Richmond Road

Market Place

Brentwood

Harmby Road
Environmental Enhancement Options
Point of clarification

- Rob Turnbull – Mouchel Parkman
Tea and coffee

• Opportunity for viewing the plans and informal discussion
Review and debate the strategy options

• Each option will be discussed in turn
• All discussion points will be noted
Summary of the debate

• Barrie Mason - NYCC
Options for public consultation and closing remarks

• Explanatory Leaflet and Questionnaire
  - delivered to every postal address in Leyburn
  - Also on our Website (www.nycc-consultation.info)
• Exhibition
  - Staffed by NYCC and Mouchel Parkman on some days
• Assessment and analysis of public response
• Reporting to NYCC Area Committee
• Publication of Final Report
• Implementation of ‘Quick Win’ measures
• Implementation of Strategy during the following years
Appendix 6 - NYCC LTP1 Targets
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 7 - Consultation Materials
Please read this leaflet and then, for a clearer understanding of the plans at a larger scale or to discuss the proposals, visit the exhibition which will be held at Thornborough Hall in Leyburn, between Friday 22 October and Thursday 28 October. Representatives of both NYCC and Mouchel Parkman will be at Thornborough Hall on Friday 22 October between 12:00 and 18:00 and Saturday 23 October between 10:00 and 16:00. There will also be a public meeting at Thornborough Hall on Friday 28 October at 19:00. Outside these hours the exhibitions will be unmanned. In order for you views to be taken into account, you need to complete the questionnaire accompanying this leaflet. Questionnaires and any additional comments can be handed in at the exhibition, completed on the internet at [http://www.nycc-consultation.info], or returned by FREEPOST, to be received by NYCC no later than Friday 5 November 2004. The final strategy for implementation will be guided by the majority view obtained from responses received and will be adopted as policy by NYCC. The implementation of individual major elements of the strategy will still be subject to later detailed local consultation prior to their construction. For further information contact Colin Brown on 01609 532563.
Introduction
North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) has recently developed a more comprehensive approach to managing traffic in market towns, with the aim of providing long lasting improvements, especially for vulnerable road users, whilst helping the local economy and improving the local environment. This leaflet summarises current traffic and transport related problems and issues in Leyburn, identified by local organisations and individuals, including 10% of residents and businesses. It then sets out the objectives that we are trying to achieve, and some options for delivering improvements that have been developed with the local organisations. In particular, we have worked closely with Richmondshire District Council and Leyburn Town Council in order to develop a Parking Strategy that will achieve real benefits without creating additional traffic problems. We would now like the views of the whole community in order to help decide the best way forward.

What problems were identified?
- The need for improved pedestrian access, facilities and safety.
- A lack of safe cycling routes and secure cycle parking.
- Inadequate bus infrastructure, coach parking, and rail/bus interchange.
- Excessive speeds, parking and congestion in the vicinity of schools.
- Parking management, and poor access to the District Council car park.
- Misleading and poor highway and pedestrian signing.
- Excessive speeds on approach roads into Leyburn.
- The junctions of the A684 with Brentwood and Middleham Road.
- Competing needs of pedestrians and vehicles in Leyburn Market Place.

What are our aims?
- To improve walking routes between residential areas and the town centre.
- To improve walking routes into Leyburn from surrounding villages.
- To develop a network of cycle routes and provide secure cycle parking facilities both within and beyond Leyburn.
- To improve safety and reduce accidents throughout Leyburn, and particularly within the vicinity of schools.
- To create safer walking and cycling routes to schools.
- To improve public transport facilities in the Market Place, and to improve facilities within the town for tourist coaches.
- To re-organise the Market Place to reduce pedestrian-vehicle conflict.
- To develop and introduce a parking strategy for the town in partnership with the District Council and Town Council, including consideration of parking control in the Market Place.
- To rationalise and improve signing within the town.
- To reduce vehicle speeds on approaches into the town.

How can we achieve these?
NYCC has worked closely with its partner consultant Mouchel Parkman and local organisations to develop strategy options for Leyburn. The County Council has allocated funds to allow schemes up to the value of £100,000 to be implemented by the end of March 2005, and has identified funds for continuing implementation of the strategy. For the strategy to be developed further, we are looking for the support of the local community through this consultation process.

Leyburn Pedestrian Action Plan
The Pedestrian Action Plan identifies key pedestrian routes to be targeted as part of NYCC’s response to the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA). In order to allow use of these routes by everyone, including the disabled, surfaces need to be repaired, dropped kerbs and tactile paving needs to be provided, and some more specific works need to be undertaken.

- Continuous footways need to be provided on both sides of Richmond Road between the Primary School and the Kings Head Pub. To allow this, southbound traffic will be required to give-way to northbound traffic.
- The dropped crossing on St Matthews Terrace, at Middleham Road, needs to be moved further west to allow pedestrians to cross more safely.
- A new footway needs to be provided on railway Station Road to allow safe movement between the Elite Cinema and public footpath to Park View.
- Joint use pedestrian and cycle routes are being investigated between Dale Grove and Brentwood, and from Leyburn to Kellberry.

General Improvements
A large number of general improvements are also proposed, mainly focusing on road safety and travel choice. These consist of:

- Cycling - A network of cycle routes will be developed, building upon the East-West route to be provided through the NYCC Dales Cycle Plan. Advisory cycle lanes are proposed on: Richmond Road between Dale Grove and the Auction Mart, and on the A684 between the Elite Cinema and Middleham Road, and along the southern side of Wensley Road. A signed route is proposed via Woodside and Brentwood. Secure cycle parking facilities will be provided at locations throughout the town.
- Public Transport - Bus stops will be upgraded with new poles, signs, timetables and raised boarding kerbs. NYCC will also continue to work in partnership with the District Council and Wensleydale Railway to secure improved integrated passenger facilities at Leyburn Station.
- Speed Limits - A number of changes are proposed to speed limits, all of which will include physical measures such as signing, lining and gateways, in order to make them self enforcing. Because of the type of traffic using Leyburn, road humps are not being proposed.
- Extention of the 40mph limit on Harby Road to beyond Harby.
- Extention of the 30mph limit on Wensley Road to beyond the cemetery, combined with measures to slow traffic over the railway bridge.
- Creation of a central area 20mph limit including the Market Place, Commercial Square and Groove Square. Similar measures will also be used to raise awareness of the existing 30mph limit on Moor Road.
- School Safety Zone - A scheme is proposed for Richmond Road outside Wensleydale School, including: a controlled pedestrian crossing; some on-street parking; localised narrowings and improved lighting.
- Signing - An audit has been undertaken of signing in Leyburn. This will be used to reduce signing clutter, replace damaged signs, and improve directional signs for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

Parking Strategy
Many of the problems in the town centre result from current parking policies and practices, and when asked, 75% of residents and businesses thought that introducing parking control in the town centre was either important or very important. A subsequent parking survey revealed that around half of the spaces available in Commercial Square, Groove Square and the Market Place, are occupied by vehicles staying for over 6 hours each day. NYCC, the District Council and Leyburn Town Council have therefore worked in partnership to evaluate viable options for introducing parking control. The overall parking strategy, if adopted, will consist of:

- Short-stay controlled parking both on and off-street in the Central Area, including Commercial Square, Groove Square and the Market Place.
- Long-stay controlled parking in the District Council Car Park.
- No parking on-street, in an area surrounding the town centre with residents exemptions on parts of Brentwood and Middleham Road.
- Parking within the central area could be controlled by either a Parking Disc or a Pay and Display system.
- Discs permit limited duration parking control without charging those who are parking. However, there are considerable costs as associated with such a system including providing parking discs, enforcement and, business rates could be in the region of £20,000 per year. Such costs would be borne by Leyburn Town Council and thus Leyburn Council Tax payers.

Other Issues
- An assessment of safety on Middleham Road will be conducted as a separate route study.
- NYCC is currently developing an Equestrian Strategy, which will be implemented across the county.
Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy - Consultation Questionnaire

1. Do you support the proposed ‘Pedestrian Action Plan Improvements’ including dropped kerbs, tactile paving, footway and route improvements? 
   Yes □  No □

2. Do you support the development of a network of cycle routes and the provision of secure cycle parking? 
   Yes □  No □

3. Do you support the proposed public transport measures: 
   a. Upgrading of bus stops  
   b. Provision of improved passenger interchange facilities at Leyburn railway station 
   Yes □  No □

4. Do you support the proposed changes to speed limits: 
   a. Extension of the 40mph limit on Harmby Road  
   b. Extension of the 30mph limit on Wensley Road  
   c. Creation of a Central Area 20mph speed limit  
   d. Measures to improve awareness of the 30mph limit on Moor Road 
   Yes □  No □

5. Do you support the creation of a School Safety Zone on Richmond Road outside Wensleydale School? 
   Yes □  No □

6. Do you support the proposed changes to the Market Place, including alterations to traffic flow, and improvement of pedestrian, public transport and loading facilities. 
   If Yes to Q6. Please tick the OPTIONS that you prefer. 
   a. Option A - Access to all car parking via the link to the west of the Information Centre  
   b. Option B - One-way traffic flow  
   c. Option B2 - As Option B but retaining two-way traffic flow on High Street  
   d. Option C - Access to all car parking via the northerm side of the Market Place  
   e. Option C2 - As Option C but with two-way access to car parking  
   f. Option C3 - Additional bus stop provision on the carriageway  
   Tick □

7. Do you support the creation of a car-free environmental improvement area for community and visitor enjoyment? 
   If Yes to Q7. Please tick your preferred area. 
   a. Area A  
   b. Area B  
   Tick □

8. Do you support the proposed Parking Strategy? 
   If Yes to Q8 then please indicate your preferred system of Parking Control: 
   a. Disc Parking - with costs borne by Leyburn Town Council tax payers  
   b. Pay and Display - with costs borne by those parking in the Market Place  
   Tick □

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

What is the number and/or name of your building

What is your full postcode (for example DL8 5XX)

Thank you for your time and assistance. Space is provided on the reverse of this form for any additional comments. This questionnaire is also available for completion on-line at http://www.nycc-consultation.info
FREEPOST
Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy
DL358
Northallerton
DL7 8BR

Other Comments

Questionnaires should be returned by Friday 5 November 2004
Appendix 8 - Area Committee Report and Consultation Responses
1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise Members of the outcome of the public consultation exercise on the Traffic Management Strategy options for Leyburn.

1.2 In addition, the report makes recommendations on the Traffic Management Strategy for Leyburn including those matters which should be the subject of further consultation or which should not be proceeded with.

1.3 The report also indicates those short term measures which have received high levels of support during the consultation process, and which will now be progressed as quickly as possible to the detailed design stage. It is intended that these measures will be commenced during the 2005/06 financial year using funds already identified in the Local Transport Plan (LTP) budget/allocation.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Members will recall that, at the meeting of this Committee on 16 June 2003, a report was presented which provided an update on progress on preparation of the Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy.

2.2 The public consultation exercise has been completed, and manned public exhibitions were held in Leyburn on 22nd and 23rd October 2004. The display plans were available for inspection at the venue throughout the period 22nd to 28th October 2004.

2.3 3,863 leaflets and questionnaires were delivered to addresses in Leyburn and surrounding parishes, and to 75 stakeholders and statutory consultees. A copy of the consultation leaflet, the contents of which were agreed with your chairman and the local Member, is included with these papers to remind Members of the details of the proposals presented for public comments. The leaflet and questionnaire were also made available via the internet.

2.4 A summary of the numbers of responses to the questionnaires and to individual questions is attached to this report, as Appendix 1.
2.5 Members will note that 1,241 responses have been received (31%) and will also note the positive nature of the response in terms of the levels of support for the majority of the various suggested proposals. 20 questionnaire were completed via the internet.

2.6 Many of the questionnaires were accompanied by detailed written comments and suggestions, and in the case of many of the statutory consultees and stakeholders, more formal written submissions were made. A summary of these 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, a schedule which summarises their views, together with your officers’ comments (where these are appropriate), is attached as Appendix 3.

2.8 Members should note that a petition has been received with 1,094 signatures (including some repeated signatures), stating ‘We the undersigned are totally against any proposal that imposes compulsory parking charges in the three Leyburn Squares.’ An analysis of the addresses of those signing the petition shows that 314 (29%) of the signatories are from Leyburn itself (from 289 separate addresses) and 126 (12%) are from outside Leyburn but within the area that was the subject of the consultation exercise for the strategy. A further 633 (58%) originate from other areas. 21 signatories represented Leyburn businesses.

2.9 Members should also note that a petition of 13 signatories has been received from residents of Yoredale Avenue. The petition requests that:

A clearly defined kerbed Market Place entrance/exit to Yoredale Avenue with the existing Keep Clear sign should be considered, allowing for

- Unrestricted safe vehicle left and right entry/exit
- to discourage illegal parking
- to warn pedestrians of the vehicle entrance/exit to Yoredale Avenue

2.10 Yoredale Avenue is a private street accessed from Market Place. It is not uncommon for access to this road to be blocked by parked cars. Additional road markings have been provided on Market Place to discourage parking across the access. These have had only limited success in resolving the problem. More substantial alterations to this part of the Market Place could be considered subject to further consultation on the details.

3.0 INTERPRETATION OF RESPONSES

3.1 Members will note from the appendices that a very wide range of views have been expressed in the responses to this public consultation exercise, from residents and business operators, and from stakeholders and statutory consultees alike.
3.2 It is quite clear from the responses received that a range of short term measures including: the pedestrian action plan improvements (75% support), the integrated network of cycle routes (60% support), the proposed bus stop improvements (68% support), and the proposed changes to speed limits (over 66% support), have been well received in principle. It is therefore proposed to proceed to the detailed design and implementation of a selected number of these measures being those which require minimal further consultation, from the budget allocation. The suggested selected schemes are as follows:

i. Dropped kerb crossings
ii. Extension of the 40mph limit on Harmby Road
iii. Extension of the 30mph limit on Wensley Road
iv. Measures to improve awareness of the 30mph limit on Moor Road
v. Bus stop upgrades
vi. Secure cycle parking and signed and advisory cycle routes
vii. Phase 1 of sign rationalisation

3.3 In addition, the School Safety Zone on Richmond Road outside Wensleydale School was well supported (83% support), and 66% of respondents supported a 20 mph speed limit with traffic calming in the central area of Leyburn.

3.4 The provision of improved passenger interchange facilities at Leyburn Station was supported by 69% of respondents.

3.5 Members will also note that 57% of respondents supported the parking strategy proposals; with 57% of those supporting the introduction of Disc Parking and 43% supporting the introduction of Pay and Display in the Market Place.

3.6 A spatial analysis has been made of the responses to the parking strategy. This showed that:

Of the responses received, 404 were from residents of Leyburn.

• Of these, 62% supported the parking strategy and 38% did not support the parking strategy.

• Of those supporting the parking strategy, 46% supported Disc Parking, and 53% supported the introduction of Pay and Display parking. 1% did not specify a preference.

3.7 In relation to the options for Leyburn Market Place, some 63% (782) of respondents favoured some changes whereas 26% (383) did not, with 14% (174) not stating any preference. Support for the individual options was as follows:

I. Option A – Access to all car parking via the link to the west of the information centre 266 in favour;
II. Option B – One-way traffic flow clockwise around the Market Place 203 in favour;

III. Option B2 - One-way traffic flow clockwise around the Market Place, but with two-way traffic on High Street (the west side of the Market Place) 180 in favour;

IV. Option C– Access to all car parking via the northern side of the Market Place 149 in favour;

V. Option C2 – One-way eastbound on the northern side of the Market Place 211 in favour; and

VI. Option C3 – Option C or C2 but with bus stop provision on the carriageway instead of in a layby 102 in favour.

3.8 However, the suggested provision of a car free environmental improvement area within the Market Place was not supported; with only 35% in favour and 56% against.

3.9 A public meeting was held on Thursday 28 October 2004 at Thornborough Hall Leyburn. County Councillor Roger Harrison-Topham chaired the meeting which was attended by approximately 128 members of the public. Matthew Steele from the County Council’s partner consultant Mouchel Parkman gave a short presentation to explain the proposals. This was followed by an open session for members of the public to express their views.

3.10 All attendees were given an opportunity to air their opinions and a second such meeting was offered to those present should they have felt that they had not been able to make their point. At the end of the meeting it was unanimously agreed that a second public meeting was not required.

3.11 A wide range of views were expressed at the public meeting repeating a significant amount of those contained in Appendices 2 and 3. There was significant opposition to parking charges and the costs associated with the introduction of a disc parking scheme.

3.12 The emerging results of the questionnaire responses were made public on 15 December 2004 and further comments were invited in light of the results. At the time of writing no additional comments have been received.

**Richmondshire District Council**

3.13 In broad terms, Richmondshire District Council accepts the issues that have been identified in the strategy. A range of comments have been made by the District Council in relation to the proposed solutions in the strategy and these are considered in detail in Appendix 3. In particular, the District Council has commented on the conservation area status of the centre of Leyburn which is recognised and any design materials used would be of an appropriate quality. In response to the various options for changes to the traffic arrangements in the Market Place the District Council favours no change, although options A
and C2 are considered to be more favourable than any of the others. The District Council have expressed concerns about the proposed extent of the controlled parking area suggesting that Grove Square should not be included. The possibility of a residents parking scheme on part of Grove Square is suggested. Any proposal to introduce parking controls would be the subject of further consultation and this suggestion could be explored as part of this process.

3.14 The estimated annual cost of a disc parking scheme is questioned by the District Council. Further details on the elements that make up this cost are contained in section 3.16. Neither of the controlled parking options are opposed by the District Council but in the case of introducing parking charges they have stated that there would have to be strong local support before they could back such a proposal.

Leyburn Town Council

3.15 Leyburn Town Council requested additional information to help them to formulate their views. This included a spatial analysis of the responses to the parking strategy, see paragraph 3.6. The Town Council is in agreement with the dropped kerbs and tactile paving, but expressed concern about the pavement widening at St Matthews Terrace to Park View and on Richmond Road near Salon 82 where it was felt the road was too narrow to add footpaths. The Town Council supports upgrading the bus stops, improved passenger interchange at the railway station, extension of the 40mph limit on Harmby Road, extension of the 30mph limit on Wensley Road, central area 20mph limit but would not wish to see a significant increase in the amount of markings on the road or speed bumps. The Town Council also support the measures to improve awareness of the 30mph limit on Moor Road, and the School Safety Zone on Richmond Road. The Town Council does not support the cycle routes and cycle parking, changes in the Market Place (existing loading facilities are considered to be fine but they have expressed concern at the level of enforcement), the car-free environmental area in Market Place, and the proposed Parking Strategy.

3.16 A preliminary assessment has been made of the costs of implementing a disc parking scheme in the off-street parking areas in Leyburn as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business rates</td>
<td>£ 5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water rates sewerage charge</td>
<td>£ 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking discs (net of advertising revenue support)</td>
<td>£ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time enforcement</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and repairs</td>
<td>£ 1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£20,012</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.17 As such a scheme would offer free parking for a limited time period the only income would be through penalties and the net cost would have to be met by the Town Council.

3.18 It is anticipated that a pay & display parking scheme in Leyburn would at the very least be self financing.
North Yorkshire Police

3.19 North Yorkshire Police have commented on the proposals put forward in the strategy and these are considered in detail in Appendix 3. They have reserved judgement on the proposed speed limit extensions on Harmby Road and Wensley Road pending further detailed examination. These proposals would be developed in full consultation with the police to ensure that they are self-enforcing and within the criteria for such speed limits.

3.20 The police have indicated that they do not support any of the proposed options for changes to the current traffic flow arrangements in the Market Place. This is based on the view that the new one way sections would restrict loading and unloading facilities and reduce the number of alternative routes available when a route is blocked by a temporary obstruction. All of the options include dedicated loading bays and a one way section on Market Place to reduce the width of carriageway that pedestrians are required to cross in this key area. The concerns of the police are recognised but it is anticipated that these can be addressed as any proposals are developed in detail.

4.0 CONCLUSION

4.1 Given the levels of support for the various measures referred to at 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 above, your officers recommend that those proposals which could be progressed without additional significant consultations should be developed for implementation in the early years of the programme. The timing of these works and those of a more complex nature such as the School Safety Zone on Richmond Road, 20 mph speed limit with traffic calming in the central area, will need to be subject to further consultation and review as part of the roll forward of the capital programme. Members are, however, reminded that a sum of £150k was included in the provisional 2005/06 Capital Programme for Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy implementation and it is hoped that a similar annual sum can be allocated from the capital programme in each of the next four to five years. This will of course be dependent on future allocation through the LTP process. Any disruption caused by the installation of schemes will be kept to a minimum and the possible timing of works will be considered in a further report to members on the proposed phasing plan for implementation.

4.2 The remaining issues are the alterations to traffic flows around the Market Place in Leyburn and to the car parking arrangements in the town, as envisaged in Options A, B, B2, C, C2 and C3. Although 63% of respondents favoured some changes to traffic flows around the Market Place, with Option A being most supported, Leyburn Town Council and North Yorkshire Police do not support making any changes. In order to implement any of the Options it would be necessary to make changes to the off-highway car parking layout in the Market Place on land that is controlled by the Town Council. It is therefore an essential pre-requisite that the Town Council should be a supportive partner to any changes. It is recommended therefore that further discussions should be held with Leyburn Town Council and North Yorkshire
Police to explore whether less significant changes might be developed to improve traffic arrangements in Leyburn Market Place.

4.3 In recent years significant improvements have been made to the quality of the bus services in the Wensleydale corridor. This includes the introduction of low floor easy access buses, which together with the provision of raised ‘Kassell’ kerbs for level boarding at stops, contributes to North Yorkshire County Council’s compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. Raised ‘Kassell’ kerbs have yet to be provided in Leyburn Market Place. There is therefore a need for the County Council to consider ways in which the bus stops in Leyburn Market Place can be altered to allow for the provision of raised kerbs. It is recommended therefore that Officers should be asked to continue discussions with both Leyburn Town Council and Richmondshire District Council to see how this could be achieved.

4.4 Regarding the proposals for controlled parking in the Market Place, Commercial Square and Grove Square, these are not supported by Leyburn Town Council. Support of Leyburn Town Council and Richmondshire District Council is essential to the delivery of a controlled parking scheme in Leyburn. It is recommended therefore that the proposals for controlled parking in Leyburn should not be taken further at this time, but that discussions with the Town and District Councils should be continued.

5.0 FURTHER INFORMATION

5.1 Members are asked to note that the decision on the Traffic Management Strategy to be adopted for Leyburn is a matter which is delegated to the Director of Environmental Services.

5.2 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 significant local interest.

5.3 It will also be noted, at Appendices 2 and 3, that a variety of other issues and requests have been raised by respondents. These will be further assessed and, where appropriate, additional investigations will be undertaken to determine whether they should be taken forward, as part of the implementation of the strategy in consultation with the Area Committee.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 That the intention to proceed to the detailed design and implementation of a number of the short term measures referred to in paragraph 3.2 of this report in the 2005/06 financial year be noted.

6.2 The Director of Environmental Services be informed that the Committee recommends that a Traffic Management Strategy for Leyburn which includes proposals in paragraphs 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4, be approved, subject to the requirements for further consultation set out in paragraph 4.1.
6.3 That Officers are requested to prepare proposals for improving the access from Market Place to Yoredale Avenue for further local consultation.

6.4 That further discussions be held with Leyburn Town Council and North Yorkshire Police to explore whether less significant changes might be developed to improve traffic arrangements in Leyburn Market Place.

6.5 That Officers are requested to continue discussions with both Leyburn Town Council and Richmondshire District Council to consider ways in which the bus stops in Leyburn Market Place can be altered to allow for the provision of raised kerbs.

6.6 That the proposals for controlled parking in Leyburn not be taken further at this time, but that discussions with the Town and District Councils should be continued.

6.7 That in relation to the proposed car free environmental improvement area within the Market Place no further action be taken.

6.8 That Officers are requested to present a further report to a future meeting of this Committee, setting out a proposed phasing plan for implementation of the approved strategy for Leyburn.

M O MOORE  
Corporate Director, Environmental Services

Background Papers - None

Author of Report: C J Brown  
Presenter of Report: B Mason

News report
APPENDIX 1

Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy
Summary of Overall Response

1.0 Consultation Process

The consultation process for the Traffic Management Strategy for Leyburn consisted of: an Exhibition held at Thornborough Hall, Leyburn, between Friday 22 October and Thursday 28 October, and a well attended Public Meeting at the same venue on Thursday 28 October.

A leaflet and questionnaire were produced both as a paper version and on the Internet.

A total of 3,939 paper leaflets and questionnaires were distributed to stakeholders, statutory consultees and all addresses in Leyburn and surrounding parishes. Over 31% of questionnaires distributed were returned. In addition 20 questionnaires completed on the internet. In total the number of responses was 1,241.

2.0 Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 1: Do you support the proposed 'Pedestrian Action Plan Improvements' including dropped kerbs, tactile paving, footway and route improvements?
75% of the respondents supported the proposals, 20% did not support the proposals and, 5% did not offer an opinion.

Question 2: Do you support the development of a network of cycle routes and the provision of secure cycle parking?
60% of the respondents supported the development, 35% did not support the development and, 5% did not offer an opinion.

Question 3. Do you support the proposed public transport measures?
  a. Upgrading of bus stops
  68% of the respondents supported the upgrading of bus stops, 25% did not support the upgrading of bus stops and, 7% did not offer an opinion.
  b. Provision of improved passenger interchange facilities at Leyburn Railway Station
  69% of the respondents supported the improved interchange facilities, 20% did not support the improved interchange facilities and, 11% did not offer an opinion.

Question 4. Do you support the proposed changes to speed limits?
  a. Extension of the 40mph limit on Harmby Road
  66% of the respondents supported the proposals, 30% did not support the proposals and, 4% did not offer an opinion.
  b. Extension of the 30mph limit on Wensley Road
  69% of the respondents supported the proposals, 27% did not support the proposals and, 4% did not offer an opinion.
  c. Creation of a Central Area 20mph speed limit
  66% of the respondents supported the proposals, 30% did not support the proposals and, 4% did not offer an opinion.
  d. Measures to improve the awareness of the 30mph limit on Moor Road
  75% of the respondents supported the proposals, 20% did not support the proposals and, 5% did not offer an opinion.

Question 5. Do you support the creation of a School Safety Zone on Richmond Road outside Wensleydale School?
83% of the respondents supported the proposals, 12% did not support the proposals and, 5% did not offer an opinion.
Question 6. Do you support the proposed changes to the Market Place, including alterations to traffic flow, and improvement of pedestrian, public transport and loading facilities?
63% (782) of the respondents supported the proposals, 26% did not support the proposals and, 13% did not offer an opinion.

Of those respondents supporting the proposed changes to the Market Place
34% (266) supported Option A – Access to all car parking via the link to the west of the Information Centre
26% (203) supported Option B – One-way traffic flow
23% (180) supported Option B2 – As Option B but retaining two-way traffic flow on High Street
19% (149) supported Option C – Access to all car parking via the northern side of the Market Place
27% (211) supported Option C2 – As Option C but with two-way access to car parking
13% (102) supported Option C3 – Additional bus stop provision on the carriageway

* The percentages shown here add up to more than 100% as people were given the opportunity to vote for more than one option.

Question 7. Do you support the creation of a car-free environmental improvement area for community and visitor enjoyment?
35% of the respondents supported the proposals, 56% did not support the proposals and, 10% did not offer an opinion.

Question 8. Do you support the proposed Parking Strategy?
57% (707) of the respondents supported the parking strategy, 30% did not support the parking strategy and, 12% did not offer an opinion.

Of those respondents supporting the Parking Strategy
57% of respondents supported Disc Parking.
43% of respondents supported Pay and Display.
Less that 1% did not specify an opinion.

Parking Strategy - Spatial Analysis
Of the responses received, 33% (404) were identified through the postcode information provided to have originated from Leyburn residents.
62% of Leyburn residents supported the parking strategy.
48% of Leyburn residents did not support the parking strategy.

Of those Leyburn residents supporting the parking strategy
46% supported Disc Parking
53% supported the introduction of Pay and Display parking
1% did not specify a preference.
Question 1: Do you support the proposed ‘Pedestrian Action Plan Improvements’ including dropped kerbs, tactile paving, footway and route improvements? The following additional comments were provided:

- The provision of a pedestrian crossing between Market Place and Commercial Square would improve pedestrian access and safety (21)
- Oppose the proposed pedestrian crossing between Market Place and Commercial Square as: it is considered unnecessary (5); would cause congestion (3); would endanger pedestrians (2)
- Provide a pedestrian crossing across High Street close to the Moor Road junction (9)
- Provide footway access:
  - Between Leyburn and Bellerby (9)
  - between Maythorne and Richmond Road (via Auction Mart) (2)
  - Along Moor Road (19)
  - Leyburn and Middleham (4)
  - Between Dale Grove and Brentwood (1)
  - Between Brentwood and St Matthews Terrace (3)
- Do not implement tactile paving (4)
- Remove cobbles as they prevent disabled access (5)
- Remove parking from outside the sand piper pub as they park on footway and pedestrians then have to use the carriageway
- Upgrade pedestrian access and street lighting to RDC car park (9)
- Richmond Road footway:
  - Support the introduction of a footway (22)
  - Oppose this proposals as it would cause congestion along Richmond Road (8)
  - Route footway behind the cottages (3)
  - Concern was expressed that the priority working would increase congestion along Richmond Road (11)

Question 2: Do you support the development of a network of cycle routes and the provision of secure cycle parking? The following additional comments were provided:

- Oppose the proposed cycle-ways (20)
- Additional cycle parking facilities are not required (9)
- Provide a cycleway between Leyburn and Bellerby (4)
- Cycle way proposed along Wensley Road will be dangerous to all road users (3)
- Cycleway proposed along the A684 will endanger cyclists (2)

Question 3: Do you support the proposed public transport measures? The following additional comments were provided:

Public Transport Improvements

- Proposed changes to the Market Place bus stop location and facility is not required as the existing facilities are considered adequate (15)
- Provide a bus service and bus stop for Brentwood surgery (13)
- Create a bus parking area at Leyburn Railway Station (7)
• Oppose upgrading bus stops as they are never used (6)
• Convert field opposite entrance to Auction Mart into a coach park (2)
• Leyburn Railway Station will not be used by locals therefore the provision of bus
  stops is not required (2)
• Oppose bus shelter outside the Black Swan as this would destroy visual aesthetics
  of this area (2)
• Create a bus stop with shelter in Commercial Square (1)
• Create bus pull-in bays on Maythorne as buses use pavements to pass parked
  cars, endangering pedestrians (1)
• Integrate services with train services
• Provide a bus interchange facility in Grove Square
• Improve the northbound bus stop on St Matthews Terrace (1)

Question 4 : Do you support the proposed changes to speed limits? The
following additional comments were provided:
• Existing speed limits are not enforced (53)
• If existing speed limits cannot be policed then do not implement additional speed
  limit restrictions (19)
• The proposed speed restrictions will be meaningless without enforcement (15)
• Enforce 30mph speed limit from Wensleydale School to High Street (13)
• Oppose the introduction of speed humps (10)
• Introduce a 20mph for:
  • Dale Grove (3)
  • Moor Road (7)
  • Richmond Road (3)
  • St Matthews Terrace (2)
• Provide buffer zones on all approaches into Leyburn (3)
• Introduce speed reducing measures on Bellerby Road (2)
• Introduce speed cameras at Middleham Bridge (2)
• Convert Brentwood into a cul-de-sac to reduce speeding within this area (2)
• Reduce speeding on St Matthews Terrace (2)
• Introduce speed cameras on Richmond Road (1)
• Reduce vehicle speeds along Brentwood (1)
• Introduce speed restrictions at the entrance to the RDC car park as cars speed
  across the footway (1)
• Introduce speed hump on Brentwood in the vicinity of the junction with the A684
• Introduce traffic calming on Moor Road near Thornborough Gardens and Riseber
• Use CCTV within the town to enforce speed and parking offences
• Introduce speed humps on Daleway (1)

Question 5 : Do you support the creation of a School Safety Zone on Richmond
Road outside Wensleydale Road? The following additional comments were
provided:
• School run parking provision is required at Wensley School (3)
• Oppose the proposed school safety zone as this will add to congestion (2)
• Implement a park and stride scheme from the Auction Mart (1)

Question 6 : Do you support the changes to the Market Place, including
alterations to traffic flow, and improvement of pedestrian, public transport and
loading facilities? The following additional comments were provided:
• Oppose the one-way option (26)
• Support a one-way option for traffic flow (21)
• Oppose any changes to the Market Place (19)
• Oppose option A (14)
• None of options are acceptable (11)
• Option B would force all HCVs to travel down the north-side of the Market Place which reduces safety for all road users (6)
• Only implement changes if delivery restrictions were imposed (3)
• Pedestrianise the back road to the market place
• Just increase security in RDC car park to enable people to use car park safely

Question 7: Do you support the creation of a car-free environmental improvement area for community and visitor enjoyment? The following additional comments were provided:
• Support the proposal for an environmental area with public seating (7); is essential to increase tourism (3)
• Locate an environmental area near the War Memorial (4)

Question 8: Do you support the proposed Parking Strategy? The following additional comments were provided:
• Support the introduction of short stay parking in central Leyburn (51)
• Support disc parking within Leyburn (27)
• Oppose any changes to layout or charges (23)
• Retain free parking within central Leyburn (18)
• Retain free parking for locals and shoppers (17)
• Do not reduce the number of car parking spaces within the Market Place (13)
• Any changes to the existing parking arrangement would affect trade (13)
• The introduction of a disc parking scheme will resolve the numerous parking and issues and thus eliminate the need for any improvements (9)
• Introduce disc parking to the whole of Leyburn (9)
• Pay and Display parking would penalise the residents of surrounding villages who use Leyburn as their local centre (9)
• Provide additional disabled parking spaces within Leyburn (8)
• Fully support the relocation of long-stay parking from the Market Place to RDC car park (8)
• Provide parking for residents and employees within the Market Place (8)
• Proposals will reduce trade in the town (6)
• Introduce pay and display in the town centre and make the RDC car park free of charge (5)
• Provide annual residential parking discs for Leyburn residents (5)
• Support Disc parking if charges are less than 50p per hour (4)
• Provide a Market Day park and ride facility for Leyburn (4)
• Provide residents parking permits if any scheme is introduced (4)
• Provide free parking for locals and employees (4)
• A pay and display regime would discriminate against those who live outside Leyburn but depend on it as their local centre (3)
• Pedestrian the Market Place (3)
• Retain the existing scheme but enforce parking throughout the town (3)
• Pay and Display parking would aid the economy of the town (3)
• Convert RDC car park into a car park for employees and town residents only (2)
• Operate a Pay and Display parking scheme in the Market Place, Grove Square and Commercial Square and a disc parking scheme throughout all other areas (2)
• Provide additional motorcycle parking spaces in the Market Place (2)
• Provide resident and employee pass for RDC car park(1)
• Provide free parking for Leyburn residents (unlimited) (1)
• Pay and display money to be used for the local community (1)

General Comments:

Parking Issues:
• Install parking restrictions at Brentwood and Middleham Road junctions onto the A684
• Shawl Terrace access is blocked by parking at Dalesman / Campbells supermarket – need double yellows and reclassified as Residents only from the current Access Only restriction (4)
• Provide additional car parks for the town (4)
• Provide a sign warning sign indicating concealed exit of RDC car park or a site line mirror (2)

Commercial Servicing and Loading bays
• Enforce loading bays to improve traffic flow (18)
• Convert loading bay lettering to say ‘deliveries only’
• Restrict deliveries to before 0800 and after 5pm (3)

Signing
• Poor sign-posting at Shawl Terrace as it is mistaken for Moor Road (3)
• Provide an elderly people warning sign on Moor Road due to the high percentage of elderly residents in this area (1)
• Provide signing along Richmond Road to indicate the presence of Woodburn concealed entrance (1)
• Repair signing for Park View Estate (1)

Middleham Road junction
• No proposals are suggested to solve problems encountered at this junction (1)
• Introduce signal control at this junction (3)
• Introduce a mini-roundabout at this junction (12)

Brentwood junction
• Improve sight line from exiting from Brentwood right turn (1)
• Reverse one-way traffic flow outside the Sandpiper Pub to improve safety and visibility as most traffic from Brentwood turns right into Leyburn (2)
• Improve this junction (3)
• Provide a mini-roundabout at this junction (5)
• Introduce signal control at this junction (3)

School Issues
• Fords Lane should be used for school pedestrian access route and for school bus parking
• Controlled crossing in vicinity of St Peters & St Pauls school required (2)
• Encourage children to walk to school or to use the school bus

HGV access
• Restrict HGV access through Leyburn (6)

Street lighting
• Improve lighting along:
  • Richmond road
  • between Dale Grove and Woodside
  • within Leyburn (3)
• along Harmby Road
• along St Matthews Terrace
• Provide streetlights for the pedestrian snicket between Daleway and Richmond Road (1)

TMS General comments
• TMS proposals were a waste of public money (19)
• None of the proposed improvements are necessary (69) of which:
  • 18 stated that it would spoil the character of the town;
  • 4 stated that the tourist traffic problems were acceptable;
  • 14 stated that the required signing and lining involved would not be acceptable
  • 5 stated that it would be detrimental to the economy of the town
  • 19 stated that enforcement of traffic regulations would suffice (5)
  • the introduction of a parking regime would suffice (7)
  • Simply enforce loading bay outside Co-op and Towlers (3)
  • Care must be taken to ensure that the proposals do not destroy the character of the town (3)

Other Comments
• Provide a bypass for the town (9)
• No through roads in residential areas (2)
• Road surface repair required along Old Dale Grove (1)
• Provide a carriageway between Dale Grove and Brentwood
• Provide Yellow box junctions at entrances and exits to all of the Squares in Leyburn (2), at the entrance to Shawl Terrace/Shawl Mews (4)
• Relocate the Auction mart and convert into car park (3)
• Double white lines are required on the approaches to the bend at the Pheasant Inn (both sides) (1)
• ‘A’ boards and street furniture should be removed from frontages and replaced with public seating (1)
• Need permanent large roundabout at Dale Grove / Bellerby Road as mini-roundabout does not reduce vehicle speeds (3)
• Provide a minibus service via the residential areas of Leyburn (1)
• Repair the surface of Dale Grove (1)
## LEYBURN TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

### VIEWS OF THE STAKEHOLDERS AND STATUTORY CONSULTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire County Council</td>
<td>NYCC Conservation Officer’s Comments</td>
<td>Noted. Detailed design will incorporate materials appropriate to the conservation area and in consultation with the conservation officers. For the larger schemes further consultation will be carried out with local people, Town Council, District Council, English Heritage, and other statutory consultees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan. Subject to the use of appropriate materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YES to the cycleroutes and cycle parking. Subject to appropriate design and being sited unobtrusively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a YES to upgrading the bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station. Subject to the use of appropriate materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c YES to central area 20mph limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road. Subject to the measures not being too visually intrusive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 YES to changes in the Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6a-f Options C2 preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 YES to car-free environmental area in Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7a Area A preferred. Subject to design and use of natural materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 YES to proposed Parking Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8a Disc parking preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmondshire District Council</td>
<td>In broad terms, Richmondshire District Council accepts the issues that have been identified - although there is some doubt as to whether the proposed solutions are entirely satisfactory.</td>
<td>Noted. Detailed design will incorporate materials appropriate to the conservation area and in consultation with the conservation officers. For the larger schemes further consultation will be carried out with local people, Town Council, District Council, English Heritage, and other statutory consultees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is a matter of considerable concern that the document does not refer anywhere to the designation of Leyburn as a Conservation Area. NYCC is a planning authority and is thus statutorily required to have regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of the Conservation Area. There is reference to improving the local environment, but there is a need for a clear commitment to ensuring that all new works, signs etc will be of a quality and design that is consistent with the importance of the area. The District Council has worked closely with Leyburn Town Council to provide high quality surfacing in the cobbles in the Market Square and Commercial Square. Furthermore the Conservation Area is subject to an &quot;Article 4 Direction&quot; which imposes stricter planning controls than any other part of the District Planning Area. Consequently the Council would expect to be consulted on the details of any proposed works and it is likely that there would be objections to any proposals of inadequate quality. <strong>Pedestrian Action Plan</strong> With traffic levels as they are, is it realistic to create a give-way arrangement on Richmond Road? I think that you have correctly assigned the priority, but overall it is likely to cause considerable congestion and frustration. Would it be better to create a pair of designated crossings both north and south of the pinch point so that pedestrians could cross to the one continuous path in safety? Accept the proposed footway opposite St Matthews</td>
<td>statutory consultees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officers consider that traffic levels on Richmond Road are not too great to preclude the introduction of priority working, and that the benefit to pedestrians afforded by the provision of a continuous footway on the east side of the road, with consequential removal of the need for pedestrians to cross the road twice, significantly outweighs any delay to road traffic. There is likely to be a further benefit through reduced traffic speeds along this road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church.</td>
<td>It is very unfortunate that there is no proposal to upgrade the unpleasant footway between the Golden Lion and the Jewellers which links the Council Car Park to the Market Place. I am aware of the difficulty of land ownership etc., but I am also aware that the County Council as Highways Authority have strong permissive powers to create highways. The proposals for new paths etc in this strategy are generally welcome, but in terms of public benefit, and support to the parking strategy, improving this path would be of greatest significance.</td>
<td>The County Council welcomes the opportunity to work with the District Council to see what improvements to this path can be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>The design of the bus stop arrangement would be critical. &quot;New poles signs timetables and raised boarding kerbs&quot; seem to be a potential for great harm to the character of what is at present a simple open space.</td>
<td>New poles signs timetables and raised boarding kerbs are essential to the provision of quality bus services and compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limits</td>
<td>Subject to some questioning of the extended speed limit to the cemetery, there is no comment on these proposals.</td>
<td>A review of existing signing has been carried out. This will be used to reduce sign clutter, replace damaged signs and improve directional signs for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing</td>
<td>There is a commitment to reducing signing clutter, but the proposals generally suggest more signs which will increase clutter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyburn Market Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic conditions in Leyburn Market Place may occasionally be somewhat confused but generally work perfectly acceptably given that this is a market place - not the open road. The significant congestion that does occur results largely from failure to observe/enforce parking restrictions. That will continue unless there is a commitment to more enforcement by the highways authority - which is not given in the document. The District Council's preferred option is no change. If there has to be an option, perhaps Options A or C2 are the least unacceptable. One-way traffic along the carriageway on the north side of the Market Place would simply increase traffic speeds A speed table is proposed outside the Golden Lion, but in the text (in the consultation leaflet) under speed limits, it is stated that road humps are not being proposed. I can see that there may be a distinction between speed tables and road humps, but I would welcome clarification of the point. Parking Strategy A range of parking initiatives is submitted on the basis of 75% questionnaire thinking that introducing parking control was important. How many of these respondents had in mind the lack of enforcement of existing restrictions, with the result that HCV's servicing the shops have to park in the main carriageway, and occasional blockage on the north side of the Market Square. It is also true that a number of people park in</td>
<td>On street parking enforcement is a police function and is carried out in accordance with available resources and competing priorities. It is correct that there is a distinction between tables and road humps. A raised table is proposed to the east of the car park access to discourage through traffic from using the narrow back road leading towards the Sandpiper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Market Place all day. Understand that the problem about parking controls on &quot;common land&quot; has been overcome and would welcome confirmation of the point. The Valuation Office has written to Leyburn Town Council confirming that National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR) is payable even if there is only a free disc arrangement. Notwithstanding the liability for NNDR, consider that the prediction of £20,000 p.a. may be somewhat pessimistic as it depends on the level of enforcement that the Town Council would wish to commission. However, there is undoubtedly a net cost to the Town Council. While recognising the merits of Pay and Display in terms of managing the space, paying for the service, and providing a revenue stream for the Town Council, this Council would only wish to promote or approve the proposal with clear evidence of local support, which seems at present to be lacking. Presumably Leyburn Town Council could simply reject the proposals for the parking areas it controls. Cannot see that the controls should extend over the whole of Grove Square. This provides resident parking as well as shopping parking. Perhaps a resident scheme could be applied. The resident exemption area indicated in the Parking Strategy Map should be reviewed. If this proposal is to be progressed, would welcome further discussions. The prospect of three authorities dealing separately</td>
<td>The problem about parking controls on the open space (not common land) could be overcome by declaring that the land is no longer needed for open space. Legal advice has been obtained to identify the mechanism by which this could be achieved and it appears to be reasonably straightforward. Liability for NNDR is a matter for the Town Council to resolve with the Valuation Office. Noted. If proposals were to be taken forward then there would need to be further discussions with both Town and District Councils as the parking strategy would need to be supported by all three authorities to make it work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with parking in Leyburn would need to be avoided. This Council would be able to offer a rechargeable resource to Leyburn Town Council, and possibly to North Yorkshire County Council. Wish to be kept informed as to the progress of this consultation and further reports to Committee etc.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyburn Town Council</td>
<td>1 In agreement with the dropped kerbs and tactile paving, but expressed concern re pavement widening at St Matthews Terrace to Park View and on Richmond Road near Salon 82 where it was felt the road was too narrow to add footpaths. 2 NO to the cycleroutes and cycle parking 3a YES to upgrading the bus stops 3b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station 4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road 4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road 4c Agree with central area 20mph limit but do not want lots of markings on the road or speed bumps. 4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road Councillors felt all the above measures needed extensive enforcement by police to be effective. 5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road 6 NO to changes in the Market Place. Existing loading facilities are fine but not run properly or policed properly. 7 NO to the car-free environmental area in Market Place 8 NO to proposed Parking Strategy. Councillors feel parking should be left as it is. Councillors were surprised at the survey result figures, as they felt that at the Public Meeting and on talking</td>
<td>Preliminary investigation indicates that there is sufficient width at these locations. More detailed design work will be required prior to further consultation if these proposals are taken forward. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with members of the public, that the majority of people did not want to see any changes to the parking in Leyburn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Leyburn Community Office | 1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan  
2 NO to the cycleroutes and cycle parking  
3a NO to upgrading the bus stops  
3b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station  
4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road  
4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road  
4c YES to central area 20mph limit  
4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road  
5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road  
6 YES to changes in the Market Place  
6a-f Option A preferred  
7 NO to the car-free environmental area in Market Place  
8 NO to proposed Parking Strategy | Noted. |
| Leyburn Livestock Auction Mart | Continuous footways along Richmond Road between primary school and Kings Head PH.  
Noted that when the Mart is very busy queues of traffic can form along Richmond Road from the mini-roundabout to the Mart entrance.  
Noted that southbound traffic will be required to give way to northbound traffic and presume that this will help to alleviate any problem. | Noted. |
| St Peter and St Paul Roman Catholic Primary School | 1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan  
2 YES to the cycleroutes and cycle parking  
3a YES to upgrading the bus stops  
3b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station  
4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road  
4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road  
4c YES to central area 20mph limit | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 YES to changes in the Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6a-f Option B2 preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7a Car-free environmental area in Market Place Area B preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 YES to proposed Parking Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8a Disc parking preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For safety of children walking to/from school a better pavement is vital.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic calming measures or 20mph speed restriction is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motorists need to be more aware that they are passing a school.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Friends (Quakers)</td>
<td>1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YES to the cycleroutes and cycle parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a YES to upgrading the bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c YES to central area 20mph limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 No preference stated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 No preference stated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8a Disc parking preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If disc or pay &amp; display parking apply on a Sunday would it be possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to have a certain number of residents' permits for members of the meeting?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G A Private Hire</td>
<td>1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YES to the cycleroutes and cycle parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a YES to upgrading the bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c YES to central area 20mph limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 YES to changes in the Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6a-f Option A, C &amp; C3 preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 NO to car-free environmental area in Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 YES to proposed Parking Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8b Pay &amp; Display preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Information Centre</td>
<td>1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YES to the cycleroutes and cycle parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a YES to upgrading the bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4a NO to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b NO to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c YES to central area 20mph limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 YES to changes in the Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6a-f Option A, C &amp; C3 preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 NO to car-free environmental area in Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 NO to proposed Parking Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustrans</td>
<td>Would like to see a cycle link to Leyburn from the NCN between Reeth and Bedale, and also to see the NCN connecting to the Wensleydale Railway at Leyburn.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC (Cyclist Touring Club)</td>
<td>1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YES to the cycleroutes and cycle parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a YES to upgrading the bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c YES to central area 20mph limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 YES to changes in the Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6a-f Options C, C2, C3 preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 YES to car-free environmental area in Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7a Area A preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 YES to proposed Parking Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8b Pay &amp; Display preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Railway station should provide good integration also</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with cycling/walking. Cycle parking facilities need to be well located</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eg to serve toilets/TIC etc, some covered/secure/sheltered parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Transport Association</td>
<td>essential. Partnership with commercial sector would be desirable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YES to the cycleroutes and cycle parking provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that the routes are not shared with pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a No preference stated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c YES to central area 20mph limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 No preference stated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 YES to car-free environmental area in Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7a-b Area A and B preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The FTA support car parking control provided that</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>there is provision for commercial vehicles making or collecting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deliveries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| North Yorkshire Police      | **Pedestrian Action Plan**  
Support for general improvements on key pedestrian routes.  
Concern that priority give way on Richmond Road should have adequate visibility.  
Concern at reduction of carriageway width on Railway Street in order to provide a footway on this main through route for heavy traffic.  
**Cycle Routes**  
Support for measures that separate cyclists from vehicular traffic provided that pedestrian safety is ensured.  
**Public Transport Measures**  
Support for the provision of off-road facilities at Leyburn Station. Request that suitable coach drop-off points should be provided.  
**Speed Limits**  
Would wish to be satisfied that the proposed limits meet the necessary criteria before supporting the proposals with particular regard to the 40mph limit between Harmby and Leyburn. Would need to see more detailed proposals together with relevant speed data before making more detailed comment.  
Would support measures to improve awareness of existing 30mph limits.  
**School Safety Zone**  
Support subject to seeing full details.  
**Market Place Traffic Flows**  
No issues with current traffic flow arrangements and do not support the alternative proposals. Any changes involving one way traffic flows would restrict the current flexibility with regard to vehicle loading, unloading and alternative routes when temporary obstructions are caused. It is accepted this may have an impact on the proposed pedestrian crossing at the western end of the | Noted. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market Place due to the proximity of 2 junctions and this may need further consideration. Environmental Improvement Area</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is for the local community to decide whether such an area is required. Preferred location Area A. Parking Strategy</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with current parking arrangements. Changes to the Market Place should be a matter for Leyburn Town Council. Concern that if any restrictions were to be made this may impact on other areas of the town. The police accept that further waiting restrictions would be necessary to deal with such a problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of Passenger Transport UK</td>
<td>1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YES to the cycleroutes and cycle parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a YES to upgrading the bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c YES to central area 20mph limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 YES to changes in the Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6a-f Options B2, C and C3 preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 YES to car-free environmental area in Market Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7a Area A preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 YES to proposed Parking Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8b Pay &amp; Display preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arriva North East</td>
<td>1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YES to the cycleroutes and cycle parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a YES to upgrading the bus stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c YES to central area 20mph limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 YES to changes in the Market Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a-f Option C3 preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 YES to car-free environmental area in Market Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a Area A preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 YES to proposed Parking Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b Pay &amp; Display preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Action in Richmondshire</td>
<td>1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 YES to the cycleroutes and cycle parking provided</td>
<td>2 YES to the cycleroutes and cycle parking provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a YES to upgrading the bus stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b YES to improved passenger interchange at the railway station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c YES to central area 20mph limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 YES to changes in the Market Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a-f Option B2 preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 YES to car-free environmental area in Market Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a Area B preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 YES to proposed Parking Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b Pay &amp; Display preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk to Bellerby Parish Concil</td>
<td>Opposed to Pay &amp; Display in the Market Place. Would like to see disc parking in the Market Place. Supports the provision of a footpath from Bellerby to Leyburn as soon as possible.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Town Parish Council</td>
<td>1 NO to the Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 NO to the cycleroutes and cycle parking provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Carperby-cum-Thoresby Parish Council | that the routes are not shared with pedestrians  
3a NO to upgrading the bus stops  
3b No preference stated  
4a NO to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road  
4b NO to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road  
4c NO to central area 20mph limit  
4d NO to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road  
5 NO to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road  
6 NO to changes in the Market Place  
7 NO to car-free environmental area in Market Place  
8 NO to proposed Parking Strategy | Noted.                                                                       |
| Redmire Parish Council              | 1 YES to the Pedestrian Action Plan  
2 NO to the cycleroutes and cycle parking  
3a NO to upgrading the bus stops  
3b NO to improved passenger interchange at the railway station  
4a YES to extension of 40mph limit on Harmby Road  
4b YES to extension of 30mph limit on Wensley Road  
4c YES to central area 20mph limit  
4d YES to improve awareness of 30mph limit on Moor Road  
5 YES to School Safety Zone on Richmond Road  
6 NO to changes in the Market Place  
7 NO to car-free environmental area in Market Place  
8 YES to proposed Parking Strategy  
8b Pay & Display preferred  
Improvements to footpaths are welcome.  
Note that closure of village amenities has put more traffic pressure into Leyburn and other Market towns. Also that small developments in Leyburn have no local amenities which puts additional pressure on the Market place. | Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. |
Appendix 9 - Area Committee Minutes and Decision Record
NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
RICHMONDSHIRE AREA COMMITTEE

Minutes of the special meeting held on Friday, 25 February 2005 at Thornborough Hall, Leyburn.

PRESENT: –

County Councillor Oliver Blease (in the Chair); County Councillors John Blackie, Roger Harrison-Topham, Michael Heseltine and Carl Les.

IN ATTENDANCE:–

Barrie Mason (Group Engineer, Traffic Management and Road Safety, Environmental Services Directorate), Matthew Steele (Mouchelparkman), Ruth Gladstone, Margaret Gray and Mary Davies (Committee Services) and approximately 15 members of the public/press.

APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE:–

An apology for absence was received from Town Councillor Tom Burrows (Representative of Parish Councils within the Catterick and Richmond Electoral Divisions).

COPIES OF ALL DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED ARE IN THE MINUTE BOOK

339. PUBLIC QUESTIONS OR STATEMENTS

Members of the public were invited to speak about the Leyburn Traffic Management Strategy at the time when the Committee was discussing that item of business. Members of the public raised no questions or statements about other matters.

340. LEYBURN TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Note: Prior to consideration of this item of business, County Councillors John Blackie and Michael Heseltine each declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a member of the Richmondshire District Council which was one of the main consultees and the owner of the Pay and Display car park in Leyburn.

CONSIDERED -

The report of the Corporate Director of Environmental Services advising of the outcome of the public consultation exercise on the Traffic Management Strategy options for Leyburn and inviting the Committee to make various recommendations.

In presenting the report, Barrie Mason advised that, subsequent to publication of papers for this meeting, one additional comment had been received, namely, that some comments had not been included within Appendix 2 to the report. Barrie Mason advised that, if a Traffic Management Strategy for Leyburn was adopted, those comments would be included within a report to the Area Committee concerning the Implementation Plan.

County Councillor Roger Harrison-Topham, the local Member, referred to the high level of anxiety experienced within Leyburn when the proposals had been first published and advised that the public meeting, and the comments received in response to consultation, had been most useful. He emphasised that the ultimate
outcome of any Traffic Management Strategy for Leyburn should be what the people of Leyburn and surrounding villages wanted.

County Councillor Roger Harrison-Topham felt that the recommendations within the report would preserve the important character and prosperity of Leyburn. With regard to the proposed Parking Strategy proposals, which 57% of respondents to the consultation supported, he felt that the recommendation, that discussions should continue with the Town and District Councils, was correct because Pay and Display parking would put Leyburn in a bad competitive position compared to nearby towns but, at the same time, Leyburn residents should not have to pay the costs of Disc parking via the Town Council precept.

In response to a question from County Councillor Roger Harrison-Topham, Barrie Mason confirmed that the proposed cycle routes requiring cycle lanes and associated signs and road markings would be the subject of further consultation.

The following members of the public addressed the meeting:-

- Mr Shepherd of Ellerclose Road, Leyburn, who emphasised problems with “Option A” relating to Leyburn Market Place; stressed that most Leyburn people favoured some form of parking control; and identified Knaresborough and Boroughbridge as towns having Pay and Display parking with time-limited free/cheap parking for local people.

- Mr Kane of Brentwood Avenue, Leyburn, who expressed opposition to the proposal for Disc parking in Leyburn because it would increase Leyburn Town Council’s precept.

- Mr Wilson of Maythorne Avenue, Leyburn, who asked how much profit was currently made from the Pay and Display car park and suggested that, because that car park appeared to be mainly empty on many days, parking at that location should be free.

In response to Mr Wilson’s second question, County Councillor John Blackie, as Leader of the Richmondshire District Council, responded that Leyburn’s Pay and Display car park was owned by the District Council and that the District Council also owned several other car parks within Richmondshire for which Pay and Display charges applied. He advised that, if the District Council decided not to charge for parking in its Leyburn car park, it would have to treat its other car parks similarly. However, the District Council relied on the income from its Pay and Display car parks in order to provide its many services to Leyburn.

County Councillor Roger Harrison-Topham moved the recommendation set out in the report, subject to “in principle” being inserted within the recommendation at paragraph 6.2. The motion was seconded by County Councillor Michael Heseltine.

**RESOLVED –**

(a) That the intention to proceed to the detailed design and implementation of the following short term measures in the 2005/06 financial year be noted:-

(i) Dropped kerb crossings.
(ii) Extension of the 40 mph speed limit on Harmby Road, subject to further consultation with North Yorkshire Police.
(iii) Extension of the 30 mph speed limit on Wensley Road, subject to further consultation with North Yorkshire Police.
(iv) Measures to improve awareness of the 30 mph limit on Moor Road.
(v) Bus stop upgrades.
(vi) Secure cycle parking and signed and advisory cycle routes.
(vii) Phase 1 of sign rationalisation.

(b) That the Corporate Director of Environmental Services be informed that the Committee recommends that a Traffic Management Strategy for Leyburn, which includes the following proposals, be approved in principle, subject to the requirements for further consultation set out in paragraph 4.1 of the report:-

(i) Dropped kerb crossings.
(ii) Extension of the 40 mph speed limit on Harmby Road, subject to further consultation with North Yorkshire Police.
(iii) Extension of the 30 mph speed limit on Wensley Road, subject to further consultation with North Yorkshire Police.
(iv) Measures to improve awareness of the 30 mph limit on Moor Road.
(v) Bus stop upgrades.
(vi) Secure cycle parking and signed and advisory cycle routes.
(vii) Phase 1 of sign rationalisation.
(viii) School Safety Zone on Richmond Road outside Wensleydale School.
(ix) 20 mph speed limit with traffic calming in the central area of Leyburn.
(x) Improved passenger interchange facilities at Leyburn Station.

(c) That Officers be requested to prepare proposals for improving the access from Market Place to Yoredale Avenue for further local consultation.

(d) That further discussions be held with Leyburn Town Council and North Yorkshire Police to explore whether less significant changes might be developed to improve traffic arrangements in Leyburn Market Place.

(e) That Officers be requested to continue discussions with both Leyburn Town Council and Richmondshire District Council to consider ways in which the bus stops in Leyburn Market Place can be altered to allow for the provision of raised kerbs.

(f) That the proposals for controlled parking in Leyburn be not taken further at this time, but that discussions with the Town and District Councils should be continued.

(g) That, in relation to the proposed car free environmental improvement area within the Market Place, no further action be taken.

(h) That 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 approved Strategy for Leyburn.
NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

DECISION RECORD

Re: LEYBURN TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

This record is produced in accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000.

This form should be used to record:

- EXECUTIVE decisions (key or otherwise) taken by an Individual Executive MEMBER; and
- KEY decisions taken by an OFFICER (either alone or in consultation with an Executive Member)

(One form per decision)

The following executive decision has been taken: -

1. To proceed to the detailed design and implementation of a number of the short term measures referred to in paragraph 3.2 of the report to the County Council's Richmondshire Area Committee on 25 February 2005 in the 2005/06 financial year.

2. That a Traffic Management Strategy for Leyburn which includes proposals in paragraphs 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 of the report be approved in principle subject to the requirements for further consultation set in paragraph 4.1.

3. To prepare proposals for improving the access from Market place to Yoredale Avenue for further local consultation.

4. That further discussions be held with Leyburn Town Council and North Yorkshire Police to explore whether less significant changes might be developed to improve traffic arrangements in Leyburn Market Place.

5. To continue discussions with both Leyburn Town Council and Richmondshire District Council to consider ways in which the bus stop in Leyburn Market Place can be altered to allow for the provision of raised kerbs.

6. That the proposals for controlled parking in Leyburn not be taken further at this time, but that discussions with the Town and District Councils should be continued.

7. That in relation to the proposed car free environmental improvement area within the Market Place no further action be taken.

8. To present a further report to a future meeting of the Richmondshire Area Committee, setting out a proposed phasing plan for implementation of the approved strategy for Leyburn.

By whom: M O Moore – Corporate Director, Environmental Services

(insert name of Meeting, Member or Officer)

On: 21 March 2005

(insert date decision taken)
Reasons for decision: -

To enable the implementation of the traffic management strategy for Leyburn to proceed.

Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: -

None.

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>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed …… .................................

(Name)  Mike Moore

Directorate: Environmental Services

Publication Date: 21 March 2005

Note: This decision will come into force, and may then be implemented, on the expiry of 5 clear working days after publication, unless any 6 members of the Council object to it and call it in by notice in writing (including e-mail) to the Head of Committee Services.
Contact for further information: barrie.mason@northyorks.gov.uk

Contact for copy of report considered: barrie.mason@northyorks.uk

To: Margaret Gray, Committee Services – for onward circulation to:

- all Members of the Council
- all Group Research & Communications Officers
- Stephen Knight, Head of Committee Services
- Catherine Whitehead, Monitoring Officer
- John Moore, Chief Finance Officer
- Ray Busby, Corporate Policy & Performance
- Amanda Fry, Staff Officer to the Chief Executive Officer
- Hugh Williamson, Head of Scrutiny and Corporate Performance