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1. **Introduction**

North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC), in its role as the Highway Authority for Richmond, has traditionally targeted local issues and problems by introducing appropriate remedial measures. This approach has generated some success, but it is felt that the time has been reached when 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 Helmsley is to be assured.

The overall aim for the Traffic Management Study for Richmond 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.

A copy of the Consultants brief for the study is included as Appendix 1. Whilst not totally prescriptive, it sets out 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, Deposit Draft (dated August 2000). These plans have been produced within the wider scope of national guidance including Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 (PPG13): Transport, that sets objectives to integrate planning and transport decision making at all levels.

In addition, transport and access issues have been high priorities within Richmond for a number of years, featuring extensively in both the Richmond Town Centre Action Plan and Richmond Town Centre Strategy. Both of these processes involved consultation with representatives of local authorities and interested parties to identify concerns and possible solutions.

The study has continued this participatory approach, building on the foundations laid by the aforementioned documents, to ensure that the views of local people, Richmond Town Council and Richmondshire District Council, English Heritage, transport operators, police and emergency services, and other key partners have been taken into account at each stage in the study process. A list of those consulted 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 and a local Cycling Plan are being published as separate documents, but have been prepared as an integral part of the strategy. They are included as Appendix 3 and 4 respectively.
2. The Richmond Study Area

2.1 Location

Richmond is located at the eastern end of Swaledale bordering the Yorkshire Dales National Park. The town centre is five miles South West of the A1 at Scotch Corner, and a similar distance West of Catterick Village. To the South, the centre of Catterick Garrison is three miles, and to the South West, Leyburn is 11 miles. Richmond has also traditionally had links to Barnard Castle, some 15 miles to the North West and Darlington, 13 miles to the North East (Figure 1).

The study area includes the built up area of the town in its entirety (Figure 2).

Figure 1: Richmond - Wider Location
2.2 Character of the Town

Richmond is characterised by its ‘Historic Core’ the extent of which closely matches the study area highlighted in Figure 2. Traditionally Richmond has prospered as a local service centre and market town, offering a wide range of goods and services to both its residents and wider rural community. The retail core of the town is still centred on the Market Place and the main routes leading in to it, namely Queens Road, King Street, Finkle Street and the lower part of Frenchgate, known locally as ‘The Channel’. Although large areas of the ‘Historic Core’ are residential, the extent of the Richmond Conservation Area and the large percentage of the buildings that are listed, means that the core has been largely untouched by the more recent residential development within the town, occurring outside the study area to the North, East and West. That said, that character of the town has begun to become more tourism orientated as Catterick Garrison has developed its own warehouse style retail facilities, including a TESCO superstore.
On-street parking within the town centre, including the Market Place is controlled by free parking discs with a limited duration of two hours, and the off-street parking is subject to charging. This means that there is always conflicting demands for space, particularly on market day (Saturday) when a large number of the spaces in the Market Place are taken over by stalls. Too often, pedestrians have been relegated to peripheral areas although this has been remedied on Finkle Street which has been largely pedestrianised.

Facilities available in the town include: a wide range of shops, public houses, hotels, guest houses, churches, two post offices, a school, hospital, town hall and leisure facility which includes an indoor swimming pool. The main industrial functions within the town are located on the Gallowfields Trading Estate on the north-western extremity of the town outside the study area.

The principal tourist attractions are: the town itself including the Market Place, Richmond Castle, The Green Howards Museum, The Richmondshire Museum, The Georgian Theatre Royal and Friary Gardens. The town also boasts a Georgian Racecourse, which subject to funding being found could become a significant tourist attraction. The Richmond Business and Tourism Association estimates tourist spending in Richmond is over £11 million per annum.

Within the wider context, Richmond acts as a gateway to the rugged beauty of Swaledale and is a key overnight stop on Wainwright’s Coast to Coast Long Distance Walk.

2.3 Demography

The resident population of Richmond was estimated at approximately 7830 in July 2001. Within Richmond there is a significant elderly population, and it is estimated that the elderly and retired will account for 31% of residents by 2011. 14.6 % of households in Richmondshire do not have access to a car, whilst of those aged 16 to 74 in employment 58% travel to work by car, 18% on foot, 3% by public transport, and 2.4% by bicycle.
2.4 Access

Richmond is located on the A6108, five miles South West of the A1 at Scotch Corner.

The other principal access routes into Richmond by road are:

- From the A67 and A66 to the North of Richmond, on the B6274;
- From Brompton on Swale on the B6271, also providing onward links to Scorton and Northallerton;
- From Catterick and Catterick Garrison on the A6136; and,
- From Swaledale and Wensleydale to the West on the A6108.

Richmond is not connected to the national rail network. The nearest railway stations are at Darlington and Northallerton. Plans are also being developed by the Wensleydale Railway Company to reinstate scheduled services between Northallerton and Leyburn.

Richmond has excellent bus connections to both Darlington and Catterick Garrison, as well as better than daily services to most of the villages located between Richmond and Darlington, to Barnard Castle, Bedale, Leyburn, Masham, Northallerton and Ripon.

The town has a wide range of on-street and off street car parking.

2.5 Historical Development

Although there is evidence of human activity in the Richmond Area dating back to the Neolithic period, Richmond itself became prominent following the Norman Conquest, when it was gifted to Alan Rufus of Brittany. Rufus began to construct the castle in 1071, which unlike many Norman defensive sites was constructed of stone from the outset. The castle keep which remains standing today, was added to by subsequent generations and completed by Henry II, the current Market Place originating as the outer bailey of the castle. In the medieval period before the dissolution of the monasteries, Richmond also maintained an important religious function with the House of the Greyfriars of which only the town remains and a number of other chapels, a college for priests and two small hospitals.
The outward appearance of Richmond, and particularly the Market Place is Georgian, many of the earlier medieval buildings being replaced with a prosperity generated from early industries including lead mining in Swaledale and knitting of the local wool particularly into caps and stockings, the latter said to have supported a thriving export market to the Low Countries. Two of the most impressive buildings within the Market Place, The Kings Head Hotel and Town Hall (Formerly an assembly room) were constructed in 1718 and 1756 respectively, and the current Obelisk replaced an earlier Market Cross in 1771.

Richmond was at the forefront of developing public utilities, the water supply being continuously improved throughout the 18th and early 19th Centuries to keep up with demand from the growing town. Lead pipes were used for all water supplies from 1749 and concurrent with the construction of the Obelisk a 12,000 gallon reservoir was provided under its base. In 1837 a further reservoir was constructed to the North of the town providing a supply of 150 gallons per minute. Town gas was introduced to Richmond as early as 1820, and from the middle of the 19th century the town was one of the first to have public street lighting.

2.6 Transport development

The Richmond area has always benefited from good transport links, including the route of the A1, which dates back to Roman times as Dere Street. In 1788/89 Green Bridge was constructed to cross the River Swale as the start of the Richmond to Lancaster Turnpike, and the railway arrived in 1846 as a branch of the Darlington and Stockton Railway, cutting the cost of transporting lead from Swaledale to Stockton by a third. Mercury Bridge was constructed at the same time, linking the station to the town, but it was not until 1915 when German prisoners of war extended the road from Richmond Station to the current Catterick Garrison. The railway station was closed in 1969.
3. Transport in Richmond

3.1 Main traffic generators

The main traffic generators in Richmond Town Centre are located in and around the Market Place, which has traditionally been the focal point in the town for those living within Richmond and its hinterland including Catterick Garrison. Although its role as the prime retail centre for the district has diminished over a number of years with the growth of retailing on Gallowfields Industrial Estate and at the Garrison. As the centre of the town it still provides a number of key functions including convenience, comparison and specialist retailing, banking and financial services, leisure and tourism. The large cobbled Market Place, one of the largest in England and originally the outer bailey of the castle, is a tourist attraction in its own right, but can only be appreciated outside of trading hours when the number of parked cars is reduced.

- Tourist Attractions - In addition to the Market Place, Richmond has a number of tourist attractions. The main attractions are:
  - Richmond Castle, which attracts 51,000 visitors per year dates back to 1071, and is accessed off the south side of the Market Place between the Town Hall and Market Hall.;
  - The Green Howards Museum covers the history of the famous infantry regiment and is located in the centre of the Market Place in the former Trinity Church. It attracts 10,200 visitors per year;
  - The Richmondshire Museum attracts 5,000 visitors per year and is located on Ryders Wynd. The museum includes the James Herriot set from the TV series ‘All Creatures Great and Small’
  - The Georgian Theatre Royal reopened in 1963 and the Theatre Museum opened in 1979, are located on the south side of Victoria Road, opposite Friary Gardens. The buildings are currently being restored and modified to facilitate access by the mobility impaired.
  - Friary Gardens is home to a 15th century bell tower, which once formed part of the Friary of the House of Greyfriars on the site. The gardens are a popular public space, particularly in the summer months.

- Employment - The many businesses within the town centre, including those on Victoria Road, Queens Road, Rosemary Lane, King Street, Dundas Street, The Channel and within the Market Place provide vital employment. Recognition must also be given to the numerous small hotels and guesthouses dotted throughout the study area, particularly the concentration on Frenchgate. Outside the town centre the main employment centre is the Gallowfields Trading Estate.
• Residential - The whole of the town centre is residential, including the Market Place, where the upper floors of a number of buildings have been converted in recent years.

• Education - The only school within the town centre is the ‘Lower’ site of Richmond School, the former Richmond Grammar School building, which caters for slightly less than 250 pupils. A number of schools located on Darlington Road outside the direct influence of the study area, although they have been acknowledged and catered for within the accompanying Pedestrian Action Plan and are subject to a separate study by North Yorkshire County Council.

• Other Facilities - Richmond has a Community Hospital accessed from Queens Road and Friary Gardens, a Library located at the junction of Queens Road and Dundas Street and a Swimming Pool and Leisure complex situated to the south of Mercury Bridge. The to south west of Mercury Bridge is ‘The Batts’ a large open grassed area that is popular in summer and is home to ‘Richmond Live’.

3.2 Major pedestrian activities

Due to the local topography of Richmond, walking around parts of the town can be difficult for some, including the mobility impaired. Nevertheless, the area between the western end of the Market Place, the top of Cravengate and Quakers Lane, encompassing the Hospital, Library, Co-op Superstore and main long stay car park at Nun’s Close is relatively level. The main areas of pedestrian activity in Richmond are:

• Between Nun’s Close Car Park, Newbiggin and the Market Place;
• Within the Market Place, including the peripheral footways and pedestrian strips within the cobbled, but also from High Row at the western end of the Market Place to Trinity Church Square in its centre;
• Between Queens Road and the Market Place, both using existing footways on Queens Road and King Street, but also paths thorough Friary Gardens and the snicket adjacent to the Georgian Theatre;
• Along Quakers Lane, Pottergate, Frenchgate and Darlington Road, linking residential areas to the West of the town centre with the schools to the East of the town centre;
• Down (Upper) Frenchgate and through ‘The Channel’ into the Market Place;
• Along Station Road from Frenchgate to the Swimming Pool, linking the leisure trails on The Batts and the old railway line; and,
• Between the Market Place, The Batts and waterfalls, using both Millgate and the snicket off ‘The Channel’.

These routes are described in detail in the Pedestrian Action Plan.
Comprehensive pedestrian count data was collected for the central area of Richmond in March and April 2000. Even out of season this revealed considerable pedestrian activity, the highest flows being recorded in the Market Place between King Street and Finkle Street, over 300 pedestrians being observed on a typical Saturday between 09:00 and 17:00. Between Monday and Saturday, over 1200 pedestrians were observed at this location.

17 pedestrian accidents resulting in injury were recorded in Richmond between May 1998 and April 2001. One accident resulted in a fatality when a pedestrian stepped in front of a bus as it began to move off from the bus stand in the Market Place. Two accidents resulted in serious injury, in the first a pedestrian was hit whilst in the carriageway near to the exit from Nun’s Close Car Park on Victoria Road, and in the second, a car failed to stop after hitting a pedestrian on the Dundas Street zebra crossing. Five accidents occurred on the route between Nun’s Close Car Park and the Market Place, three within the Market Place and a further five on the route between Queens Road and the Market Place. Of the remaining accidents, an eight-year-old child stepped in front of a vehicle, a vehicle failed to stop for a police officer and hit the officer, and a drunk pedestrian had his foot run over in the vicinity of the Georgian Theatre.

3.3 Major cyclist activities

Casual observations highlight some cycling to school in a corridor to the North of the town between the schools located on Darlington Road and the residential area of Westfields, also utilising Quakers Lane. The steep gradient on a North South axis through the town make access to the swimming pool from all residential areas, and access to Gallowfields Trading Estate from some residential areas, difficult. The cobbles within the Market Place, on Bargate, Frenchgate an Newbiggin also inhibit cycling in these specific locations. However, there is considerable potential for cycle tourism with many recreational tour operators providing a coast to coast route through the town and a potential future link to national cycle network.

Cycling is discussed in more detail in the Cycling Plan. The only traffic count available for Richmond undertaken on Queens Road, indicates a 12 hour two-way flow of 38 cyclists.
3.4 Public transport facilities and services

Buses serving Richmond stop in the Market Place (Plate 1) which acts as an interchange between the town and dales bus services and the main bus route between Catterick Garrison, Richmond and Darlington, service information being detailed overleaf. There are four marked bus bays in the Market Place between the Obelisk and Town Hall. Pedestrian access to these is poor, there is no formal waiting area or shelter and timetable information posted outside the Green Howards Museum on Trinity Church Square is incomplete and often water damaged. There are a number of other stops without specific facilities on the bus routes into and around the town (Figure 3).

Plate 1: Passenger Transport Facilities in the Market Place
Richmond is served by a number of conventional bus services, with Arriva North East operating under a virtual monopoly situation, only. These are:

- Services 27, 27B, X27 and 28 - provide a direct link from Richmond to Darlington and Catterick Garrison. Buses are operated every day except bank holidays by Arriva North East. Monday to Saturday, the first service leaves Richmond at 06:21 arriving at Darlington Railway Station at 06:54, the last direct return service being 22:00 from Darlington, arriving in Richmond at 22:36. The first bus to Catterick Garrison leaves at 06:34, arriving at 06:51, the last return service leaving Catterick Garrison at 23:35, arriving in Richmond at 23:48. In combination roughly 40 return services per day are provided on the route.

- Service 29 - connects Richmond and Darlington with the villages immediately to the West of the A1 (Gilling West, Melsonby, Aldbrough St John and Manfield). There are seven return services per day, Monday to Saturday, operated by Arriva North East

- Service 30, supplemented by 522 on schooldays - provide the bus service within Swaledale, offering a daily service to Keld, with a further 2 or 3 services operating only as far as Gunnerside Bridge. The timetable of the service is somewhat dependent on school travel and local market days.

- Services 31, 31A and 31B - comprise the North Yorkshire County Council supported ‘Richmond Town Service’, which links the main residential estates to the town centre with a 30 minute service frequency Monday to Saturday and hourly operation on Sunday and bank holidays.

- Services 33, 47, 47A, 531 and 548 - Link Brompton on Swale with Richmond and Hudswell. The services operate on an erratic timetable and are supported by the County Council, operators including Arriva North East, Town and County Coaches and R Handley and Sons.

- Service 34 - connects Richmond, Catterick Garrison and Darlington with the villages immediately to the East of the A1 (Catterick Village, Moulton, Middleton Tyas and Barton). The service is operated by Arriva North East and runs roughly hourly throughout the day with additional late services leaving Richmond at 21:04 arriving in Darlington at 22:25, returning 22:30, arriving in Richmond at 23:53. A limited service operates on Sunday and bank holidays with four return services from Richmond, all in the afternoon and evening.

- Services 47, 47A, 55 and 548 - provide a sporadic service throughout the day between Richmond and Brompton on Swale. Service 55, operated by Dales and District continues on to Northallerton, a journey of approximately 54 minutes.
• Service 54 - also operated by Dales and District provides an additional three return services between Richmond and Northallerton, taking a southerly route and entering the latter from the South, with a journey time of 55 minutes.

• Service 73 - follows a similar route to Service 54, stopping additional at Bedale. The service is operated by Arriva North East as a service for commuters, leaving Richmond at 06:55 and 07:45 with return services from Northallerton at 17:05 and 18:05.

• Service 79 - provides a roughly two hourly service, Monday to Saturday, between Richmond and Barnard Castle. Operated by Arriva North East, the first service departs Richmond at 07:40, the last return service departing Barnard Castle at 17:10 on weekdays and 15:50 on Saturday. The service is operated with financial support from both North Yorkshire and Durham County Councils.

• Service 159 - links Richmond with Leyburn, Masham and Ripon. An hourly service between Richmond and Leyburn being operated by Dales and District, services alternate hours continuing to Ripon.

• Service 807 - is operated by Keighley and District Travel Ltd on Sundays and bank holidays between Easter and the end of October, providing a single round trip between Skipton and Richmond via Gargrave, Settle, Horton, Ribblehead, Hawes, Thwaite, Muker, Gunnerside, Reeth and Grinton. The journey time is slightly over three hours in each direction, those using the service having a four hour break to enjoy Richmond.

Figure 3: The Richmond Bus Network
3.5 Rail

The National Rail network has not served Richmond since the 1960s; however as noted in the previous section, there are over 40 return bus services per day between Richmond and Darlington Railway Station, the latter providing links to both East Coast (GNER) and Cross Country (Virgin) Intercity Services across the UK, and local services within North Yorkshire (Arriva).

3.6 Taxis

A taxi rank for up to 12 taxis is located in the Market Place, on the East and North sides of Trinity Church Square. There are a number of operators including Amalgamated Taxis, H & K Taxis and Richmond Cabs.

3.7 Motorbikes

Richmond does not currently experience problems related to motorcycling, the main cross-country runs preferring Wensleydale further South. Two small areas of motorcycle parking are allocated in the Market Place.

3.8 Major vehicle activities

The main traffic flows within Richmond are on the A6108 (Reeth Road, Victoria Road, Queens Road, Pottergate, Frenchgate, Darlington Road) passing through the town, on the A6136 (Station Road) to Catterick Garrison and on the B6271 (Maison Dieu) to Scorton. Traffic flows in to and around the Market Place are also significant, in part due to it’s function as a short stay car park. Only two traffic counts are available for Richmond, a Manual Classified Count on Victoria Road undertaken in July 2000, a summary of which is shown in Figure 4, and an older unclassified turning count for the junction of Pottergate, Gallowgate and Frenchgate (which is now signal controlled) revealing 12 hour two way flows of 14403, 4220 and 12775 vehicles respectively1.

Traffic can be attributed to a number of distinct sources:

- Local shopping and visitor traffic
- Service and delivery vehicles serving business premises particularly in the Market Place
- Commercial vehicles passing through the town and serving the Gallowfields Trading Estate

---

1 Subsequent to the study an extensive data collection exercise was undertaken by Count-On-Us, under instruction from NYCC and Mouchel. The results of this study are presented in separate reports relating to Rosemary Lane, the junction of Station Road and Frenchgate (The Channel), and the Junction of Frenchgate and Maison Dieu.
- Parents and buses dropping off children at the schools on Darlington Road - being considered as a separate study.

### Manual Traffic Count - Victoria Road - July 2000

![Figure 4: Manual Traffic Count - Victoria Road - July 2000]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cars</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>M’cycle</th>
<th>Stay</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nun's Close</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>P&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorke Square</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>P&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fosse</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>P&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>P&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Pool</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Road North</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>P&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Road South</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>P&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Superstore</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Customer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.9 Car parks, off-street and on-street parking, coach parking, waiting restrictions.

There are currently 8 off-street car parks serving Richmond Town Centre,
Parking is also permitted in Richmond Market Place which provides 190 short stay spaces 10 of which are allocated to those with disabilities. Free reusable parking discs allow up to 2 hours free parking and are available from most shops. There is a general feeling within the town, supported by research undertaken by the Richmondshire Business and Tourism Association as part of its evidence to a Local Plan review, that the disc parking system is abused with drivers both overstaying and moving their vehicles (Section 3.12).

In 2002, Richmondshire District Council’s car parking charges were:

- Short Stay - Maximum 2 hours = 70p
- Long Stay - First 2 hours = 50p: Each hour thereafter = 30p (Maximum £1.40 per day)

Two types of waiting restriction are present in Richmond Town Centre, ‘no waiting at any time’ and ‘no waiting Monday to Saturday 8am - 6pm’. The extent of these restrictions is shown in Figure 5.

**Figure 5: Waiting restrictions in Richmond**
3.10 One-way streets, roundabouts, weight-height-width-access restrictions, speed limits

Access to and from the Market Place was revised following extensive trials in the early 1990s, resulting in the current one-way restrictions on Frenchgate ('The Channel') into the Market Place and on King Street out of the Market Place. There is still considerable debate within elements of the business community as to whether the one-way system operates in the correct direction.
Traffic flow within the Market Place is unrestricted, but, generally observes a clockwise flow with the exception of the Taxi Rank on the North side of Trinity Church Square. A short section of Millgate is also one-way towards The Fosse car park and Riverside Road.

The only roundabout in Richmond is at the junction of Queens Road and Dundas Street which also forms the entrance to the Co-op Superstore.

The only weight restriction in the study area is on Park Wynd where a 17 tonne limit is in force because of a weak road. There are no height or width restrictions.

The whole of the study area is subject to a 30mph speed limit.

3.11 Traffic signals, pedestrian crossings and footways

There is one traffic signal controlled junction in Richmond, located at the junction of Pottergate, Frenchgate and Gallowgate. There is one pedestrian ‘Zebra’ crossing located on Dundas Street (Plate 3) outside the NYCC Richmond Library.

Dropped kerbs are present at many locations in the town. Tactile paving is limited, but has begun to be introduced recently with advise from Disabled Action in Richmondshire (DAIR).

A footway survey has been carried out and is described in detail in the Pedestrian Action Plan.

3.12 Known traffic speed problems, law breaking and enforcement

Speed, not necessary law breaking, but better described as travel at inappropriate speeds through the Market Place and other areas with significant pedestrian flows was considered to be a problem. A number of speed surveys were therefore undertaken using loop detection equipment. A summary of the recorded 85th percentile speeds is shown in Table 1.
Table 1: Summary of Speed Surveys undertaken in Richmond November 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>85th Percentile Speed</th>
<th>12 hour Avg.</th>
<th>Highest hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station Road o/s Richmond School</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakers Lane o/s Ronaldshay Park</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cravengate</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Road o/s Car Park</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargate</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also some concern about the lack of enforcement of the Disc Parking restrictions within Richmond Town Centre. Work undertaken as part of the Richmondshire Local Plan review process, surveys suggest that overstaying within the disc zone accounts for over 800 car/hours on weekdays and nearly 800 car/hours on Saturdays. This clearly represents a deficiency in the parking management regime, although, it is reported that the situation has improved recently with additional enforcement by a Traffic Warden.
3.13 Road traffic accidents

45 road traffic accidents including one resulting in fatality and two in serious injury were recorded in the study area between the beginning of May 1998 and the end of April 2001. The fatal accident occurred in the Market Place when an elderly pedestrian stepped in front of a bus as it began to move off from the bus stand. The two serious accidents also resulted from collision between pedestrians and vehicles, the first being in the vicinity of the pedestrian access to Nun’s Close Car Park on Victoria Road and the second a vehicle failing to stop after hitting a pedestrian on the zebra crossing at Dundas Street shown in Plate 3.

In total, two-thirds of the accidents occurred on the main route (A6108) within the study area and a further six in the Market Place. From West to East, junctions of particular concern on the A6108 are:
• **The roundabout at Victoria Road, Queens Road, Ryders Wynd and King Street (four accidents)** - The accidents at this location lack a common causal factor, two involved pedestrians, one of whom was hit whilst crossing Ryders Wynd, the other being drunk outside the Georgian Theatre. The third accident involved a car failing to give way at the roundabout and the fourth a bus breaking sharply resulting in injury to four passengers.

• **The roundabout junction of Queens Road and Dundas Street (10 accidents)** - No common causal factors were apparent, 3 of the accidents were rear end collisions, one of which occurred when a vehicle stalled, 3 of the accidents were caused by vehicles failing to give way at the roundabout, 3 of the accidents including one of the serious accidents already noted were vehicles hitting pedestrians on the Dundas Street zebra crossing, the remaining accident being a car pulling out into the path of a moped.

• **The traffic signal junction of Pottergate, Gallowgate and Frenchgate (6 accidents)** - 5 of these accidents were rear end collisions, the remaining accident being an emergency vehicle skidding through a red light and hitting a passing car. All but one of the accidents occurred with a wet road surface. Anti-skid surfacing is currently present at the junction.

All of the five non-fatal accidents in the **Market Place**, occurred in fine weather during daylight. Three of the accidents involved pedestrians but all in different circumstances, one a driver being hit by an adjacent vehicle whilst assessing a car, one a vehicle reversing into a pedestrian at low speed, and the third a vehicle failing to stop and hitting a police officer. Of the remaining two accidents, the first was a rear end collision at the eastern end of the Market Place and second a run-away HCV that ended up embedded into the frontage of Woolworths, again at the eastern end of the Market Place.

Of the six remaining pedestrian accidents:

- A reversing vehicle hit a pedestrian at low speed on Finkle Street
- A pedestrian was hit on the leg by a motorcyclist on Rosemary Lane
- A pedestrian was hit whilst crossing the road at the junction of Westfields, Victoria Road and Cravengate.
- A child stepped in front of a vehicle on Station Road in the vicinity of the swimming pool.
- A pedestrian stepped in front of a vehicle at the junction of Victoria Road and Hurgill Road
• A motorcyclist overtaking a stationary car hit a pedestrian crossing Victoria Road in the vicinity of Rosemary Lane.

Only one accident involved a cyclist, this being at the junction of Station Road and Frenchgate, the cyclist skidding off the pavement in front of a moving car.

### 3.14 The views of the public

A stakeholder workshop was held in Richmond on Monday 11th February 2002, attended by 28 stakeholders and 4 NYCC officers. A full list of attendees is included at Appendix 2. The workshop consisted of a presentation by Mouchel, a brainstorming session to identify key issues, a vote on the issues and a number of smaller focus group type discussions to add detail to the issues and attempt to identify potential solutions. The key issues were identified as:

- **The Market Place**
  - Consideration was thought to be needed in relation to reversing the entry to, and exit from, the Market Place, King Street appearing to be the most desired entry point. Research was undertaken before the workshop in to the earlier trial of this system which led to major problems outside the Market Place, the circulatory pattern not fitting in with the rest of the town. The entrance to the Market Place from King Street also has poor sight lines. In addition it was noted that the current arrangement filters out traffic not needing to enter the Market Place, and a general consensus was reached that such proposals should not be taken further,

  - Pedestrian access from High Row to Trinity Church Square, possibly via The Obelisk, was thought to be the key route in the Market Place where pedestrian provision is lacking, although alternative routes are available across pedestrian strips from the Town Hall and end of King Street. Concern was also expressed that such a facility would lead to the loss of car parking spaces given their current layout. It was noted that 25% of people walk to the shops in Richmond and that their needs must be afforded a higher priority. It was also noted that discussions are ongoing about repairing the cobbles within and footways around the edge of the Market Place over the next four years.

  - Improving bus waiting facilities in the Market Place was seen as a key issue, a bus shelter being seen as desirable, but the seemingly irresolvable questions being one or two? and located on the cobbles or on the pavement? Some of those present raised the length of bus layover in the Market Place and suggested removing the buses and creating a new interchange outside Friary Gardens on Queens Road. It was also asked whether The Obelisk could be converted into a bus shelter?
• Pedestrian and bus conflict in the Market Place was seen as a key issue in light of a recent fatality, although it was seen a symptomatic of the current inadequacy of the waiting facilities.

• Car Parking and Servicing

  • The fundamental issues were raised of whether cars are desirable in the Market Place and whether charges should be levied on such premium spaces. It was suggested that workers currently park for two hours and then move their car to another space, and that some degree of 1-hour short stay parking might discourage this.

  • The existing long stay parking was not considered to be ideally located, the pedestrian route from Nun’s Close via Rosemary Lane being poor, the Co-op Superstore limiting parking to customers and then to two hours, and the Station Road car park not being available for the general public on weekdays.

  • Signing to the car parks was considered to be lacking, both for vehicles and pedestrians, although it was noted that too much signing could also be detrimental. Signing to the Market Place was considered to be particularly poor, particularly from Green Bridge.

  • Residents parking is a problem and it was suggested that there is a need for designated ‘Residents Parking Areas’ including in the vicinity of the Market Place.

  • It was thought that better parking enforcement would alleviate many of the parking issues, and it is understood that levels of enforcement were improved following discussions between Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire Police. Nevertheless, it was estimated that an extra 50 parking opportunities could be created in the Market Place, each day, through better enforcement.

  • Vehicles service premises throughout the day and although Richmond Town Council investigated limit loading time, it was not considered to be feasible because of the small consignments being delivered to businesses within the town. Rear access to premises is almost impossible in many cases and to improve it would mean large scale demolitions.

• Other Issues

  • It was noted that travel to the schools, particularly those on Darlington Road causes problems although this is outside the study area for the Town Centre Study and is being addressed separately by North Yorkshire County Council. Arriva North East noted a number of minor collisions with buses on this stretch of road.
• It is understood that a coach bay had previously been proposed on Queens Road, and the question was asked why it had not been taken forward.

• Competition from Catterick Garrison and the TESCO store in particular was at the forefront of much discussion.

• In conclusion, solving existing transport problems in Richmond was seen as key to the town’s long-term survival. Key elements to this were:
  • Attracting passing trade;
  • Making access and egress user friendly;
  • Improving the local environment; and,
  • Developing a coherent parking policy.

Plate 4: Parking in Richmond Market Place

The discussion notes from Workshop 1 have been included at Appendix 5.

3.15 Other Problems and Issues

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

4.1 Local Transport Plan Overarching Objectives

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

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

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

- Promoting Economic Prosperity – by facilitating opportunities for economic regeneration and growth and improving the operational efficiency of the transport system and provision for tourism.

- Improving Community Life – through traffic management and measures to reduce pollution and opening up/maintaining access to social facilities for all age groups.

- Improving Safety – through controlling speed/routing/traffic orders, giving priority to cyclists, pedestrians and people with disabilities.

- Protecting and Enhancing Environmental Quality – by integrating land use and planning and all forms of transport as a means of minimising environmental impact and reducing the need to travel.

- Promoting Social Equality and Opportunity – by providing genuine choices of travel mode and meeting the travel needs of the socially and physically disadvantaged.

4.2 Local Transport Plan Local Objectives

Richmond is located in NYCC’s ‘Central’ policy sub-area, which includes parts of Hambleton and Harrogate as well as Richmondshire. To take account of the special qualities of the sub-area, NYCC has set a number of local objectives within the LTP. These include:

- Safety and Environmental Improvements, including the introduction of traffic calming schemes, pedestrianisation and traffic management measures such as control of parking, in market towns and where the incidence of accidents is highest.

- Improved Public Transport Facilities - including covered waiting areas and seating at the main bus stops in each town and improved access to properly marked boarding points at a height which allows easy access to buses.
• Improved Public Transport Services - including improvements on the Darlington - Richmond - Catterick Garrison Corridor.
• Improved access for People with Disabilities - including providing suitable facilities for people with disabilities at road crossings, like dropped kerbs.
• Improved Pedestrian Facilities - on key pedestrian routes identified within a Pedestrian Action Plan for each urban area.
• Improved Cycling Facilities including the provision of a Local Cycling Plan for each Market Town, to be integrated with the Pedestrian Action Plan where appropriate.

4.3 Local Plan Developments and Constraints

Planned developments and development constraints within the study area are detailed in the Richmondshire Local Plan. The current deposit draft is dated August 2000.

Likely future developments are limited to 45 additional housing units on Gallowgate and 1.9 Hectares of land to the north-east of Gallowfields Trading Estate. An additional opportunity area was identified to the East of Queens Road and it was suggested that this may be suitable for a range of town centre uses, including housing.

Richmondshire District Council also set out their desires for pedestrian movement in the Market Place and public transport in the Town Centre.

• Pedestrian Movement
  • Improvement schemes must keep to a minimum their impact on the listed cobbles, and offset any losses through the sensitive use of replacement natural materials. Schemes should also take account of:
    • The townscape benefits which can result from strategically place open areas, including a less cluttered setting for the Obelisk;
    • Pedestrian flows, and 'desire lines' that are not currently safeguarded for pedestrians;
    • The needs of disabled people;
    • Links to improved facilities for users of public transport;
    • The need to retain as much public parking space as possible; and,
    • Safe traffic movement.

• Public Transport
  • Improved facilities for people using public transport will be accommodated in Richmond Market Place, including the development of a bus shelter. Any development should:
• Be sited in a convenient and safe position for passengers;
• Provide passenger information close to where passengers wait;
• Integrate with the improved arrangements for pedestrians;
• Ensure that there is no unnecessary loss of public parking space; and, have due regard for safe traffic movement.

4.4 National Planning Policy Guidance

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

• To reduce the growth in length and number of motorised journeys;
• To encourage alternative means of travel which have less environmental impact; and,
• To reduce reliance on the private car, including through the designation of maximum rather than minimum parking standards on the basis that a balance has to be struck between encouraging new investment in town centres by providing adequate levels of parking, and potentially increasing traffic congestion caused by too many cars.
• PPG 13 states that:

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

• Reducing community severance, noise, local air pollution and traffic accidents;
• Promoting safe walking, cycling and public transport across the whole journey;
• Improving the attractiveness of urban areas and allowing efficient use of land;
• Helping to avoid or manage congestion pressures which 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; and
• Producing better and safer local road conditions in rural areas and reducing the impacts of traffic in sensitive locations, while facilitating the access that is important to maintaining a vibrant rural economy.
• When desirable, the strategy will also take account of PPG 7, which provides guidance on development in rural areas and PPG 15, which covers development in historic environments.
4.5 Traffic Management Strategy Objectives for Richmond

The overall aim for the Traffic Management Study for Richmond is to produce an integrated strategy for the Town Centre aimed at securing long lasting improvements, especially for vulnerable road users, whilst maximising the economic and environmental well being of the town and minimising existing or potential sources of detrimental impact. To enable delivery of this aim, a number of objectives have been determined. These are:

- Upgrade routes for pedestrians and the mobility impaired, including:
  - Access to the town centre from the Nun’s Close car park;
  - On desire lines within the Market Place; and,
  - On the Frenchgate access to the Market Place (The Channel).
- Increase provision of cycle parking within the town centre and assess the potential for cycle access between the Riverside and town centre, and within the town.
- Improve facilities for public transport users including the provision of information, shelters and platforms for level boarding. In addition cater for tourist coach pick-up and drop-off.
- Optimise the use of existing parking spaces by residents, workers, shoppers and visitors, including the potential for reorganising parking arrangements within the Market Place.
- Improve and consolidate signing within the town, especially in respect of changes resulting from measures developed as part of this strategy. This will included changes to directional signing for pedestrians and cyclists and motor vehicles.
- Encourage the repair of cobbles and footways within the town centre to enhance perceptions of the physical environment.

4.6 Finance and Implementation

NYCC Traffic Management Priority System

North Yorkshire operates a system by which various problems and potential solutions to traffic management issues in and around Richmond are sent to the Area Traffic Manager. These are then prioritised in a report to the NYCC Richmondshire Area Committee. The Committee decides which matters are worthy of further investigation. Five issues were outstanding of relevance to the Strategy:
- RD/A1.398 – Various Streets, Richmond – Waiting Restrictions
- RD/A1.497 – Bargate, Richmond – One Way System
- RD/A1.515 – Various Locations, Richmond - Pedestrian Crossing Facilities
- RD/A1.540 - Castle Hill, Richmond - Residents Parking Scheme
- RD/A1.541 - Roper Court / Pottergate, Richmond - Waiting Restrictions.

**Programmed schemes with indicative levels of funding**

The NYCC budget for capital expenditure on transport schemes is set annually by central Government with indicative allocations for future years. NYCC programmes schemes based on priority and the levels of this settlement. Schemes in and around Richmond, of relevance to the Traffic Management Strategy are detailed in Table 2.

**Table 2: NYCC Programmed Schemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scheme</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety</td>
<td>Queens Road / Dundas Street</td>
<td>£32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety</td>
<td>Richmond Market Place</td>
<td>£32,500*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Strategy</td>
<td>Crossing upgrade Darlington Road</td>
<td>£24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>Infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>£25,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Scheme awaiting result of Traffic Management Strategy
5. Developing the Traffic Management Strategy

5.1 Identification of Options

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

- Option A: Road Safety Improvements including:
  - The introduction of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at crossing points on key pedestrian routes;
  - The improvement of a number of bus stops outside the Market Place to a minimum standard including a bus stop pole, flag, timetable and where footway space allowed a ‘Kassel’ boarding kerb to facilitate level access on to buses;
  - Footway repairs within the Market Place;
  - Improvement to the footway between Nun’s Close car park and Rosemary Lane;
  - Improvement to the informal pedestrian crossing point on Maison Dieu;
  - Footway improvements and the introduction of one-way traffic flow on Rosemary Lane;
  - Improvement to the footpath along The Batts to create an unsegregated joint-use route for both pedestrians and cyclists;
  - Increased provision of secure cycle parking in the Market Place;
  - Creation of a one-way westbound traffic flow along riverside road to facilitate pedestrian improvements;
  - Introduction of a 20mph zone covering Victoria Road, Queens Road and Kings Street with a second zone on Bargate; and,
  - An improvement scheme for Frenchgate including provision of a continuous footway on the South side of the carriageway, an improved raised table in the vicinity of Ryders Wynd, and a loading bay at the southern end of the Market Place outside Woolworths.

- Option B: Building upon Option A, including:
  - An extended 20 mph zone, also encompassing Rosemary Lane, Newbiggin, Dundas Street, Station Road, Lower Frenchgate and The Channel, The Market Place, Ryders Wynd and Millgate;
  - Advisory cycle lanes on Station Road to facilitate cycle access between the Swimming Pool and proposed National Cycle Route, to the Market Place;
• A raised zebra crossing in the vicinity of the Richmond (Lower) School on Station Road; and,

• Improved pedestrian facilities on Millgate, and between the Market Place and the Batts via Frenchgate.

• Option C: Alternate Parking and Public Transport Arrangements in the Market Place, including:

  a) Retention of the existing area for bus facilities, but with room for three buses, level boarding on to buses by replacement of small sections of cobbles with another natural material, a bus shelter and seating area.

  b) Removal of buses from the Market Place and the creation of an interchange for five buses utilising both sides of Queens Road outside Friary Gardens.

  c) Provision of two bus stops outside the Town Hall to be used in combination with a facility at The Obelisk or on Queens Road.

  d) Creation of an area around The Obelisk as a dedicated bus stopping area with the provision of raised kerbs and waiting facilities including shelters.

  e) Creation of a facility for two buses to the North of the Obelisk, with a shelter and improved level pedestrian access from High Row to the Obelisk and from the Obelisk to the new facility.

  f) An increase of three parking spaces, with an extended multifunctional space created around the obelisk, a footway link from Finkle Street to this open space, bus pick-up and drop-off in the vicinity of The Obelisk.

  g) An increase of 12 parking spaces resulting from a scheme similar to (a) but with a smaller pedestrian area around The Obelisk.

  h) A reduction of six car parking spaces, the relocation of bus facilities to the area North of The Obelisk, again with a pedestrian link from Finkle Street to this space.

5.2 Stakeholder Workshop

These measures were presented to a stakeholder workshop held in Richmond on 16th May 2002, attended by 26 stakeholders and 6 NYCC officers. A full list of attendees is included at Appendix 2. Following the presentation the stakeholders were given the opportunity to discuss the measures in detail. Key elements of the discussion were:
• Option A: Road Safety Improvements
  • The proposed 20mph zone was discussed at length, including the existing traffic speeds within the area, the needs to engineer speeds down to 20mph rather than relying on Police enforcement in the traditional sense, and the pattern of road traffic accidents within the town and the likelihood of reducing the number and severity of these. Requests were made to extend the zone to include:
    • Quakers Lane and Hurgill Road, thus covering access to the Surgery and Ronaldshay Park;
    • Victoria Road to Cravengate with improvement also to the junction; and,
    • Improved pedestrian crossing point on Victoria Road outside the Tourist Information Centre.
  • The introduction of a one-way westbound traffic flow on Riverside Road was strongly opposed by members of Richmond Town Council, although it should be noted that North Yorkshire Police would like permanent barriers and signs to be erected to allow the road to be closed at times of flood.
  • The introduction of Residents Parking Zones was questioned by Richmondshire District Council in terms of the current North Yorkshire County Council guidelines. It was explained that the guidelines were currently subject to review and that it would be easier in future to introduce such zones. Concerns were raised about displacement of parking from the proposed zones to adjacent residential areas and also the potential for increased traffic speeds if the amount of haphazard parking was reduced. Generally the proposals were welcomed, but, there was a feeling that residents of ‘The Channel’ should be able to park within the Frenchgate Residents Parking Zone, allowing unhindered access to the Market Place being crucial.
  • The introduction of one-way traffic flow on Rosemary Lane was discussed, including the rationale behind the scheme, potential design issues and the requirement for a loading bay. The proposal was generally supported, increasing accessibility for pedestrians and linking to the pedestrian route improvements between the Nun’s Close Car Park and the Market Place.
  • A number of detailed design issues were discussed in retail to the proposed improvements to ‘The Channel’, including, the use and definition of loading bays, the location of the pedestrian crossing points and associated raised table and current abuse of parking restrictions. The width of the remaining carriageway was also questioned, suggestions being made to only widen the footway on one-side.
• Issues discussed to a lesser extent included the provision of additional cycle parking and the design of the existing roundabout at the junction of Queens Road and Dundas Street.

• Option B: Building upon Option A

• The extended 20mph zone was received favourably, although concern was raised by the Business and Tourism Association as to whether the extent of the zone might ‘Starve Swaledale of Tourists’. The DAIR representative also raised concerns about vehicles having to break at, and accelerate away from speed reducing features.

• Option C: Alternate Parking and Public Transport Arrangements in the Market Place

• Public Transport Reorganisation

• Improvement of the existing public transport facilities, including the provision of a shelter, seating area and smooth walkways cross the cobbles did not receive support because it was felt that it did not improve the overall situation.

• Relocation of the bus interchange to Queens Road, with the potential to remove the stops within the Market Place or retain a stop at the Obelisk was well supported, the location seeming logical and the integration of services working logistically. It was noted that coach drop-off could probably be facilitated before such vehicles move to Nuns Close Car Park to layover. The only concern raised was the potential obstruction of the view towards Friary gardens. It was noted that the bus layover would be kept to a minimum and an artists impression was shown of a largely see-through design of shelter.

• Creating two bus stops at the kerb-side outside the town hall was generally disliked. Arriva also raised safety concerns for buses pulling away from these stops.

• Creation of a larger plinth around the Obelisk to facilitate bus pick-up and drop-off was widely supported, although the introduction of shelters was thought to spoil the Obelisk visually. The introduction of a pedestrian strip from the Edinburgh Woollen Mill shop to the Obelisk was also requested.

• Creation of a bus interchange to the North of the Obelisk with a shelter and level pedestrian areas was not supported.
• Parking Reorganisation

The main focus of the discussion was around the option which created three additional parking spaces, this also covering, for example, use of appropriate materials. It was also confirmed that none of the proposals suggested altering the entry and exits to the Market Place, nor the circulatory movements around the Market Place, although it was noted that where changes to parking bays had been proposed that these tended to reinforce existing patterns of movement. A number of concerns were raised by Arriva in relation to bus movements, but, these were later allayed following trials with a bus on the ground. Arriva also stated that they would be very disappointed not to see a bus shelter in the Market Place. The design of the plinth around the Obelisk and how the height of the bus boarder could be accommodated was seen as a key consideration. It was suggested that this could be accomplished using natural materials rather than the pre-cast concrete of the standard ‘Kassel’ kerb. It was also confirmed that a meeting had been held on site with both English Heritage and Richmondshire District Council to discuss suitable materials. The extent of the open space was questioned in terms of the use of the area. The opinion of the stakeholders was split between those seeing it as an asset for the town and those suggesting that such a space would be used by ‘lots of kids hanging around … drinking beer’.

• Whilst there was still some conflict to resolve in the design which resulted in an additional 12 car parking spaces, it was generally favoured by the stakeholders including North Yorkshire Police.

• The option reducing the number of car parking spaces by six, linked to the development of the bus waiting area to the North of the Obelisk was not generally supported and it was agreed not to take the option forward to consultation.

5.3 The Strategy Options in Detail

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

Option A: Focused on improving road safety, enhancing pedestrian and cycle facilities and introducing residents parking areas.
• The creation of a 20 mph zone on Victoria Road and Queens Road from the pedestrian entrance to Nun’s Close Car Park to the Queens Road/Dundas Street roundabout, also extending northwards to include Hurgill Road and Quakers Lane, and southwards to include King Street and Bargate. The 20 mph zone therefore coincides with much of the pedestrian activity outside the Market Place and a considerable number of the road traffic accidents within the Town Centre.

• Improvement to three key areas of pedestrian movement, including: the main pedestrian route from Nun’s Close Car Park to the Market Place via Finkle Street, involving making Rosemary Lane one-way from Victoria Road to Newbiggin in order to widen the currently substandard footways and encourage use; the route across The Batts which would be upgraded to cater for both pedestrians and cyclists; and, routes in and around the Market Place with footway repairs and replacement of the existing pedestrian strips and creation of a new pedestrian strip from High Row to Trinity Church Square.

• Treatment of Frenchgate (‘The Channel’) in a similar manner to King Street, revising the existing traffic calming features and providing continuous footways on both sides of the carriageway.

• Additional Secure cycle parking would be provided within the Market Place and provided at additional locations when Richmond is linked to the National Cycle Network (NCN).

• The creation of Residents Parking Zones on (upper) Frenchgate, The Green and Cornforth Hill, all areas currently subject to conflict between residents attempting to park and other users. Residents within these areas would be able to obtain a permit allowing unlimited parking, whilst those without permits would be restricted to a limited duration, typically two hours. Limited permits would be available for visitors, people resident at guesthouses and businesses. The cost and final form of the scheme being considered with user groups.

Option B: An extension to the measures presented as Option A

• Extending the 20 mph zone to include: Newbiggin; Rosemary Lane; Finkle Street; New Road; the Market Place; Ryders Wynd; Millgate; Dundas Street; (lower) Frenchgate including The Channel; and, Station Road as far as the entrance to The Batts, thus also extending the safety improvements afforded to pedestrians and cyclists whilst also addressing the safety concerns at Richmond School’s Station Road site. A controlled pedestrian crossing could also be provided in the vicinity of the school.
- Further improvement of routes to the riverside with signing on Millgate and enhancement of the route between The Channel and The Batts, including repair of the existing footway surface, lighting and signing, although an alternative route for the mobility impaired could also be signed via Station Road. With the improvement of the route across The Batts, DAIR is keen to promote a circular route from the Market Place.

- Provision of advisory cycle lanes on both sides of Station Road to complement the extension of the NCN to Richmond, extending from the Swimming Pool, across Mercury Bridge to Frenchgate. An advisory cycle lane could also be provided on the West side of Frenchgate around the corner as far as the South side of Dundas Street. The Station Road approach is the gentlest in terms of gradient between the River Swale and town, Millgate approaching a gradient of 1 in 3 and Bargate being steep and cobbled.

Option C: Improves facilities for public transport users within the centre of Richmond, also creating an opportunity to reconsider the arrangement of the parking within the Market Place.

- Buses would continue to serve Richmond Market Place but would no longer wait on the cobbled area. A new passenger boarding and alighting point would be created in the vicinity of the obelisk. The area around the obelisk would be developed to create a pedestrian area with links to High Row and Trinity Church and would include sympathetically designed passenger shelters, timetable displays and raised kerbs for easier access to vehicles. Within this area high quality materials would be used in keeping with the Market Place and its status as a conservation area.

- A new bus and coach waiting area would be created in Queens Road, including passenger shelters, information and raised kerbs, and would provide an interchange point for passengers who need to change buses. It would also cater for the boarding and alighting of coach passengers. Existing access rights and provision for loading for retail premises would be maintained.

- Parking in the Market Place would be re-arranged to maximise the number of available spaces and achieve spaces of a standard size.

- Option C was designed to be introduced with either Option A or Option B.

Other Improvements

In addition to the measures incorporated within the Options, a number of other improvements were proposed, including: the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving on key pedestrian routes and improvement of bus stops, such as, timetable provision and raised boarding areas.
5.4 Public Consultation

The measures and options described in Section 5.3 were presented on a leaflet distributed to approximately 90 stakeholders and statutory Consultees and 4700 households and businesses located within Richmond and the surrounding parishes during the late August and the first week in September 2002. This leaflet was accompanied by a questionnaire, and both are included in this report as Appendix 7.

An exhibition was held between Friday 6th September and Thursday 12th September in Richmond Town Hall, Market Place, Richmond. Both Mouchel and NYCC manned this exhibition on Friday 6th and Saturday 7th September.

In addition the consultation materials were posted on the Internet at a site set up for the consultation exercise [http://www.nycc-consultation.info] and a press release was issued by NYCC on 27th August 2002.

The response rate to the survey was 25%

5.5 Summary of Consultation Responses

Option A

- 72% of respondents supported the introduction of a 20 mph zone, 24% did not support the 20 mph zone and 4% did not register an opinion.
- 80% of respondents supported pedestrian and cycle improvements, 14% did not support such improvements and 6% did not register an opinion.
- 78% of respondents supported the introduction of residents parking areas, 16% did not support such areas and 6% did not register an opinion.

Option B - An extension of the measures included in Option A

- 60% of respondents supported the introduction of an extended 20 mph zone, 30% did not support the extended 20 mph zone and 10% did not register an opinion.
- 70% of respondents supported additional pedestrian and cycle improvements between the Market Place and River Swale, 19% did not support such improvements and 11% did not register an opinion.
Option C

- 57% of respondents supported the changes to the location of bus and coach waiting facilities, 37% did not support the changes and 6% did not register an opinion.
- 65% of respondents supported the creation of a pedestrian waiting area around the obelisk, 14% did not support such an area, and 4% did not register an opinion.
- 53% of respondents supported the creation of a bus interchange on Queens Road, 42% did not support such an interchange and 5% did not register an opinion.
- 71% of respondents supported re-organising parking within the Market Place, 22% did not support such changes and 7% did not register an opinion.

Additional Detailed Comments

A number of additional detailed comments were received. These are summarised in Appendix 8.
6. **The Richmond Traffic Management Strategy**

The consultation results were reported to the North Yorkshire County Council Richmondshire Area Committee on 5th December 2002. The report asked members of the committee for support of the following proposals:

- **Option A** - focused on improving road safety, including:
  - The introduction of a 20 mph zone
  - Enhanced pedestrian and cycle facilities including from Nun’s Close to the Market Place and across The Batts.
  - The introduction of a residents parking areas for upper Frenchgate, The Green and Cornforth Hill.

- **Option B** - building upon Option A, including:
  - An extension of the 20 mph zone in the central area of Richmond.
  - Improved routes for both pedestrians and cyclists between the Market Place and the River Swale

Members were also asked to support further work and discussion before making a decision to proceed with Option C, including:

- Changing the location of bus and coach waiting facilities
- Introducing a bus interchange on Queens Road outside the Friary Gardens
- Creation of a pedestrian waiting area around the obelisk in the Market Place
- Reorganisation of Parking within the Market Place.

The members resolved to support the proposals described above.

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

1. **That a traffic management strategy for Richmond be adopted which includes the proposals contained in Option A and Option B as described in the public consultation leaflet and as indicated on Drawing No’s B9239/011/020B and B9329/011/021B which were displayed at the County Council’s Richmondshire Area Committee on 5 December 2002.**

Drawing nos. B9329/011/020B, B9329/011/021B and B9329/011/026C, the latter outlining Option C, are attached to this report.
6.1 Implementation of the Strategy

A phasing programme has been devised to implement the Richmond Traffic Management Strategy. This is summarised in Table 3, below, and sets out the main measures and options, the timescale for implementation and current estimated cost of the project. North Yorkshire County Council's Richmondshire Area Committee has agreed the programme and an officer group has been established to oversee the implementation of the study.

Table 3: Richmond TMS - Implementation Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dropped kerbs and tactile paving</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>£24,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian route improvements, Nun's Close to Rosemary Lane</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£28,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian route improvements, Market Place</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>£6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian route improvements, Rosemary Lane</td>
<td>2003/04/05</td>
<td>£140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements, The Batts lower Market Place</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road pedestrian crossing</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved crossing point - Maison Dieu</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved crossing point - Station Road at The Batts</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure cycle parking</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling improvements - The Batts</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming - Rimmington Avenue</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming and 20 mph zones, Bargate and Cravengate</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area-wide traffic calming and 20 mph zone</td>
<td>2003/04/05</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriageway and footway improvements - Frenchgate/The Channel</td>
<td>2006-11</td>
<td>£69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Place alterations</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>£137,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents parking scheme - Cornforth Hill and Waterloo</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents parking scheme - The Green</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents parking scheme - Frenchgate</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic sign audit</td>
<td>2002/03/04</td>
<td>£24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger transport improvements</td>
<td>2002/03/04</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>£149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£858,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option C: Public Transport Improvements and Re-organisation of Parking in the Market Place
Appendix 1: Consultants Brief
CONSULTANTS BRIEF FOR THE PRODUCTION OF A TOWN CENTRE TRAFFIC
MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR RICHMOND

1.0  INTRODUCTION

1.1  This brief sets out the requirements for undertaking an analysis of the issues
involving all modes of transport in Richmond, North Yorkshire, and for producing an
integrated strategy aimed at securing long lasting improvements, especially for more
vulnerable road users.

1.2  The proposed strategy must be a practical and pragmatic document; i.e. it must be
capable of realisation both in practical and financial terms, given likely levels of LTP
funding over the next 5-6 years, and taking account of the fact that 6 or 7 town
strategies are likely to be completed in each of the next 5 financial years. The
strategy must identify proposed schemes, budget costs and a suggested priority and
programme.

1.3  In developing the strategy, Consultants will need to ensure that all appropriate
partner organisations are identified, and that they, together with the local elected
member and members of the public are consulted and fully involved before forming
any conclusion at relevant stages of the study. This will involve careful planning and
effective organisation since it is expected that from commencement of study to
completion of final report will take no longer than 8 months. The principal contact
officer during the preparation of the study will be the County Council’s relevant Area
Traffic Manager, and guidance will also be available from the Senior Assistant
Engineer (Traffic Management) SAE(TM), the Passenger Transport Manager (PTM),
and the Senior Assistant Engineer (Forward Planning) SAE(FP) as appropriate, all of
whom are based at County Hall.

1.4  Any issues and/or additional requirements which are specific to the town covered by
this study are listed at Appendices A and B to this Brief. The Consultant will be
expected to include in his work on this study, consideration of all of the particular
issues listed at Appendix A, and to undertake all of the additional requirements listed
at Appendix B.
NOTE: The inclusion of Appendix A with a study brief is to provide the opportunity to ensure that the Consultant includes particular issues already identified as critical in the preparation of the traffic strategy, but which might otherwise not be included.

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

2.0 STUDY FRAMEWORK

2.1 Whilst not intended to be totally prescriptive in terms of the format of the study and the report, it is expected that the following stages will be included in the Consultants work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preliminary Arrangements</td>
<td>Organise brainstorming session involving Area Chairman, Local Member and Officer Sub-Group to identify main issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>An introduction to the area to be studied including preparation of base plans showing main traffic generators, main features including car parks, bus and rail stations, on-street parking areas and extent of waiting restrictions, any one-way streets or other restricted junction movements, including any significant constraint on vehicle movements such as HCV bans, pedestrian crossings, roundabouts and signalised junctions. The text to include a summary of major vehicle and pedestrian activities, including a review of movement patterns, parking numbers, bus stop locations and locations where there are known speed problems and/or a high incidence of personal injury accidents. This work should be based on information obtained from existing survey sources and from Area Traffic Managers knowledge of the town in question; supplemented only by snapshot surveys where no other information is available. Agree first draft with ATM/SAE (TM)/SAE(FP)/PTM/Div Eng (Officer Sub-Group). Also confirm agreement on issues to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LTP context</td>
<td>This stage is required to identify the LTP policy implications insofar as they affect the study area, identifying in particular, LTP priorities, indicated levels of available funding and schemes already programmed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4     | Identify and agree key partner organisations     | List contact organisations in consultation with Officer Sub-Group, make contact with/invite to and arrange first workshop.  

**Aim of Workshop**—To identify current problems and issues, and key partners for representation at future partnership meeting(s).  

| 5     | Production of current problems and issues chapter | It will be the responsibility of the Consultant to ensure that the workshop secures an agreement on the main issues which need to be addressed, and their relative priority. It is expected that the following areas will be covered as a minimum.  

(i) Pedestrian problems and needs.  
(ii) Cycling and cycle facilities.  
(iii) Public transport including rail (if appropriate), buses and taxis.  
(iv) Servicing.  
(v) Vehicular traffic—congestion/parking/demand management.  
(vi) Mobility/Disabled access considerations.  
(vii) Safety problems, and vehicle speed issues.  
(viii) Environmental concerns including identification of locations/sites likely to benefit from either school or Green Travel Plans.  
(ix) Land use allocations in District Local Plan so as to identify any future major traffic generators.  

Having obtained a consensus view from the workshop, the Consultant will be required to independently review the areas of concern identified, produce appropriate plans and a written summary of the issues, which will form a chapter of the final report. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6     | Strategy Objectives | Completion of this stage is a vital milestone in the study and should draw together the main factors identified in Stage 5, and formulate a set of critical objectives for the strategy. Initially these, together with the current problems and issues chapter, must be agreed with the Officer Sub-Group and then with the key partners at a study partnership meeting to be organised by the Consultant. It is anticipated that the consultant will be guided by the County Council's principle objectives which, in priority order, seek to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and vehicle drivers, having particular regard to meeting the County Council's road safety objectives and targets.  

**Aim of meeting** - To agree a final draft of the current problems and issues chapter and to agree the critical objectives for the strategy. |
| 7     | The Strategy | The formulation of an integrated management strategy for the town.  

This stage should include the production of appropriate plans to demonstrate the way various proposals will integrate as part of an overall strategy. The text will be expected to describe in detail the approach to meeting the critical objectives, indicate areas for priority treatment, identify individual schemes for implementation and indicative budget costs, and produce a prioritised programme of work having regard to likely funding levels in the LTP which will need to be ascertained by discussions with the appropriate Client Officers. Any potential sources of 3rd party funding for particular elements of the strategy should be identified. Where separate walking and cycling strategies are called for, separate priority lists for pedestrian and cycling facilities must be identified, together with outline implementation programmes based on the likely available funding levels in the LTP. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A draft of this chapter must be produced for agreement by the Officer Sub-Group, and then circulated to key partners for comment. A further workshop meeting should then be arranged to discuss any suggested amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other consultations</td>
<td>The draft of the document incorporating stages 1-7 will then be circulated for wider consultation with the public. The consultant will be responsible for production of a questionnaire/explanatory leaflet and any exhibition material and will be expected to allow for the attendance of one officer at the public exhibition for an 8-hour period. The response to this round of public consultation must be collated and appropriate responses formulated prior to the production of any amendments to the draft document. The draft should be circulated to key partners if it is agreed with the Client Officer Group there are any significant changes arising from the public consultation stage. A further partnership meeting would, in this eventuality, need to be organised to discuss and agree any changes. The draft document must then be reported to the appropriate County Council Area Committee for approval. The Consultant should allow for the production of an amended document, suitable display drawings for the Committee meeting and for attendance at the meeting. At this stage, the final draft should also include an implementation programme, identification of additional sources of funding, LTP funding profile, and proposals for monitoring the outcomes of the various scheme elements and the criteria by which they should be monitored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Final draft</td>
<td>Following the Area Committee meeting, the Consultant will be responsible for producing any amendments to the document, for circulating a copy of the final draft to key partners and for producing 6 copies with bound-in plans to the Client.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

3.1 The Consultant will be expected to undertake each market town study (from commencement to completion and circulation of final draft) in an 8-month period. The Consultant will be responsible, within 1 week following the issue of the commission, for producing, for approval, a detailed programme of study activities, including all partnership meetings and consultation stages. This programme will be used by the Client to monitor progress on the study.

3.2 It is emphasised that all studies are to include the whole of the urban area of the town, but should concentrate on major corridors of movement. It is not expected that issues in particular residential or industrial areas of the town should be examined in detail. However that is not to preclude, for example, consideration of residential parking schemes if particular problems with commuter and/or shopper parking in residential areas close to the town centre have been identified.

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

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

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

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

Appendix B1 – Pedestrian Action Plan

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

The report should include the following sections.

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

The Pedestrian Action Plan should be produced giving due consideration to the IHT publication Guidelines For Providing For Journeys On Foot.
## Appendix B2 – Local Cycling Plan

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

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

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

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

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

All routes and facilities included in the Local Cycling Plan should be in accordance with the NYCC Guidelines on Provision of Cycling Facilities.
Appendix 2: Richmond Workshop Attendees
Workshop Attendees 11th February 2002

Stakeholders

County Councillor Oliver Blease  
County Councillor Michael Heseltine  
County Councillor Carl Les  
Cllr Grace Buckle - Richmondshire District Council and Richmond Town Council  
Cllr Katherine Carr - Richmondshire District Council and Richmond Town Council  
Cllr John Harris - Richmondshire District Council and Richmond Town Council  
Cllr Jane Metcalfe - Richmondshire District Council and Richmond Town Council  
Paul Steele - Richmondshire District Council - Planning  
Dr Peter Clarke - Richmond Town Council  
PC Paul Lax - North Yorkshire Police  
Kevin Poskett - Arriva  
George Peach - Confederation of Passenger Transport  
Mr Sowards - Cyclists' Touring Club  
Ken Allinson - Richmond Business and Tourism Association  
Shirley Thubron - Richmond Civic Society  
Peter Warne - Richmond Town Centre Forum  
Valerie Burrows - Richmond Town Centre Forum - Traffic and Access Group  
Clive Crawford - Richmond Town Centre Forum - Traffic and Access Group  
Lewis Harrison - Richmond Town Centre Forum - Traffic and Access Group  
Roger Jenkinson - Richmond Town Centre Forum - Traffic and Access Group  
Betty Robinson - Richmond Town Centre Forum - Traffic and Access Group  
David Squires - Richmond Town Centre Forum - Traffic and Access Group  
Neil Bacon  
Alison Butterfield  
Rod Ellis  
Mr Paterson  
Nigel Phillips  
Jim Whiteman

NYCC

Graham Cressey - Traffic Management and Development Control  
Elywn Williams - Forward Planning  
Mary Welch - Passenger Transport  
Melanie Davies - Area 1 Traffic

Mouchel

Alan Bunting  
Colin Brown  
Rob Turnbull  
Mathew Steele
Workshop Attendees 16th May 2002

Stakeholders

County Councillor Oliver Blease
County Councillor Michael Heseltine
Cllr Grace Buckle - Richmondshire District Council and Richmond Town Council
Cllr Katherine Carr - Richmondshire District Council and Richmond Town Council
Cllr John Harris - Richmondshire District Council and Richmond Town Council
Cllr Jane Metcalfe - Richmondshire District Council and Richmond Town Council
Paul Steele - Richmondshire District Council - Planning
Karen Scott - Richmondshire District Council
Dr Peter Clarke - Richmond Town Council
Tom Burrows - Richmond Town Council
Sgt. Mike Griffiths - North Yorkshire Police
Kevin Poskett - Arriva
Mel Martin - Arriva
Linda Curran - Disability Action in Richmond
Ken Allinson - Richmond Business and Tourism Association
Mike Nichols - Richmond Business and Tourism Association
Shirley Thubron - Richmond Civic Society
Peter Warne - Richmond Town Centre Forum
Clive Crawford - Richmond Town Centre Forum - Traffic and Access Group
Andrew Scott - Richmond Town Centre Forum - Traffic and Access Group
David Squires - Richmond Town Centre Forum - Traffic and Access Group
John England - England and Lyle
J M Hay - Hay’s Caterers
Dianne Scott - Hay’s Caterers
Neit Smith - Carlin House
Miles Templeton - Channel House

NYCC
Graham Cressey - Traffic Management and Development Control
Elywn Williams - Forward Planning
Richard Owens - Passenger Transport
Mary Welch - Passenger Transport
Melanie Davies - Area 1 Traffic
Mike Woodford - Divisional Engineer

Mouchel
Philip Wade       Rob Turnbull       Colin Brown
Matthew Steele   Edwina Dowling
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B9329/011/027B Pedestrian Action Plan
1. Introduction

1.1 This Pedestrian Action Plan has been produced in parallel to the Richmond Traffic Management Strategy, adopted by North Yorkshire County Council on 24th December 2002, and developed in partnership with Mouchel Consulting Limited.

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

1.3 This report sets out:

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

1.4 The outcome of the Pedestrian Action Plan is summarised in Appendix A and on Drawing 027B. The programme for implementing the plan is included as Appendix B.

2. Objectives

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

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

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

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

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

2.2 Specific Objectives

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

- To identify key pedestrian routes based on an assessment of demand and potential demand;
- To determine any shortfall in facilities along these key routes and any significant shortfalls on any other important pedestrian routes;
- Identify actions and/or facilities to address any shortfall; and
- Prioritise proposals for improvements required to these routes.

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

3.1 Market Place - The Market Place has traditionally been the focal point for those living within Richmond and its hinterland including Catterick Garrison. Although its role as the prime retail centre for the district has diminished over a number of years with the growth of retailing on Gallowfields Industrial Estate and at the Garrison, its role is still important. As the centre of the town it still provides a number of key functions including convenience, comparison and specialist retailing, banking and financial services, leisure and tourism. The large cobbled Market Place, one of the largest in England and originally the outer bailey of the castle, is a tourist attraction in its own right, but can only be appreciated outside of trading hours when the number of parked cars is reduced. Pedestrian activity in the Market Place increases on Saturday, an open market being held throughout the year.

3.2 Tourist Attractions - In addition to the Market Place, Richmond has a number of tourist attractions. The main attractions are:

- Richmond Castle attracts 51,000 visitors per year and is accessed off the south side of the Market Place between the Town Hall and Market Hall. The site dates back to Norman times with the current stone keep being constructed in the 12th century.

- The Green Howards Museum covers the history of the infantry regiment and is located in the centre of the Market Place in the former Trinity Church. It attracts 10,200 visitors per year.

- The Richmondshire Museum, attraction 5,000 visitors per year, is located on Ryders Wynd. The museum includes the James Herriot set from the TV series ‘All Creatures Great and Small’

- The Georgian Theatre Royal reopened in 1963 and the Theatre Museum opened in 1979, are located on the south side of Victoria Road, opposite Friary Gardens. The buildings are currently being restored and modified to facilitate access by the mobility impaired.
• Friary Gardens is home to a 15th century bell tower, which once formed part of the Franciscan Friary on the site. The gardens are a popular public space, particularly in the summer months.

3.3 Residential Areas - All of the area under consideration within the plan are residential, including the Market Place, where the upper floors of a number of buildings have been converted in recent years. More recent residential areas are present to the West of the town centre, off Hurgill Road and Reeth Road and to the North and East of the town centre, stretching in an arc from Roper Court and Alexandra Way to Maison Dieu.

3.4 Education - The only school within the town centre is the 'Lower' site of Richmond School, the former Richmond Grammar School building, which caters for slightly less than 250 pupils. All of the other schools: Richmond CofE Primary School; Richmond Methodist Primary School; St Mary's RC Primary School; St Francis Xavier School; and, the main site of Richmond School, are located on or in the vicinity of Darlington Road. The importance of providing links to these schools is acknowledged and included as ‘Primary Route D’ in Section 4 of the plan. The importance of the Public Right of Way leading from Maison Dieu to Richmond School should also not be underestimated, many parents choosing to driver to Maison Dieu and drop-off children in the vicinity of the bridleway.

3.5 Employment - The many businesses within the town centre, including those on Victoria Road, Queens Road, Rosemary Lane, King Street, Dundas Street, The Channel and within the Market Place provide vital employment. Recognition must also be given to the numerous small hotels and guesthouses dotted throughout the area of the plan, but notably on Frenchgate. Outside the town centre, the main employment centre is the Gallowfields Trading Estate, which can be accessed on foot via Green Howards Road (Primary Route H) in Section 4 of the plan, or via Quarry Road using route highlighted in yellow on Drawing B9329/011/027A and in cross-section in Figure 1.
3.6 Other Facilities - Richmond has a Community Hospital accessed from Queens Road or Friary Gardens, a Library located at the junction of Queens Road and Dundas Street and a Swimming Pool and Leisure complex situated to the south of Mercury Bridge. The to south west of Mercury Bridge is ‘The Batts’ a large open grassed area that is popular in summer and is home to the ‘Richmond Live’.

3.7 Trails - There are a number of trails and semi-guided walks focused within the area of the plan. These include the ‘Richmond Drummer Boy Walk’, the ‘Richmond Town Trail’ and the ‘Richmond Plaque Tour’. It should also be noted that Richmond is a key located on the long distance Coast-to-Coast walk.

4. Pedestrian Routes

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

A. Reeth Road to the Market Place, including Nuns Close Car Park, Newbiggin, Rosemary Lane and Finkle Street. - In addition to linking the residential areas adjacent to Reeth Road to the town centre, the route to the west of the Market Place links the main long stay car park within the town and the numerous disk parking spaces located on Newbiggin with the Market Place. The footways on Reeth Road are typically of widths between 1.2m and 1.3m, falling on occasion to 1.1m adjacent to lamp columns and 1m to the East of the Post Office where space is restricted by buildings. On the opposite side of the carriageway at this point a 2m wide raised path is provided in the vicinity of the residential home for the elderly. The footway on Victoria Road narrows to 1.15m at the exit from Nun's Close Car Park at 1.15m (Plate 1), at which pedestrians either:

- Stay on the north side of Victoria Road crossing the wide entrance to Wellington Place, dodging poorly positioned road signs and the entrance to a small car park.
Cross to the south side of Victoria Road, negotiating the petrol station opposite Wellington Place, parked cars on the wide pavement, an area of setts and again a small car park, this time where vehicles reverse directly over the footway to reach the carriageway.

At Rosemary Lane, footway widths reduce significantly, to in the order of 0.7m, creating difficulties for pedestrians, the mobility impaired and those with children (Plate 2). Those approaching Finkle Street from Newbiggin fair little better, having to cross a cobbled area. For those on the south side of Newbiggin, the carriageway also falls away to the south whilst crossing Bargate. Finkle Street itself was largely pedestrianised a number of years ago.

This route provides access to a number of secondary routes both within and outside the area of the Plan, including Hurgill Road, Bargate and the cut through between Victoria Road and Newbiggin.

Plate 1: View from Pedestrian Exit of Nun’s Close Car Park
B. The Market Place - The cobbled nature of the Market Place causes problems for those with mobility difficulties and a number of smoother ‘pedestrian walkways’ (1.0m in width) have been provided. These do not facilitate all movements including the key route from High Row to the Obelisk and Trinity Church Square (Plate 3). The walkways are in various states of repair, the tarmac walkway outside Kwik Save being in poor condition and the brick walkway outside the Indoor Market Hall beginning to subside. Around the outside of the Market Place footway widths vary between 3.2m on High Row to 1.9m in the vicinity of the Market Hall, and although these have deteriorated in recent years, a rolling programme of improvement has now commenced. Whilst meeting the needs of disabled people in such an historic environment is difficult, attempts are also being made to provide dropped crossings in traditional materials. The Market Place typically has a gradient of 10%, height increasing from East to West. The area around High Row is flatter and is used for the weekly open market. A monthly farmers market is held on the sloping cobbles to the north of Trinity Church Square.
Also within the Market Place:

- Facilities for bus passengers are not ideal, boarding and alighting are on to a cobbled surface at road level. As noted below in section 4.2, a fatality was also recorded when an elderly pedestrian was hit by a bus.

- ‘A’ type advertising signs are used by a number of businesses limiting pavement widths. The use is partly seasonal which also coincides with the highest pedestrian flows, exacerbating the problem.

C. Queens Road and King Street to the Market Place - This route provides a link between the Market Place and ‘Primary Route D’ serving Darlington Road, but also serves a function in its own right, providing access to a number of retail premises including the Co-op superstore, the library and hospital. A roundabout was provided on the route with the construction of the Co-op and a zebra crossing installed on Dundas Street. The crossing (Plate 4), located on the eastern mouth of the roundabout has been the site of a number of pedestrian accidents. The layout of the junction is currently being revised as part of a NYCC Local Safety Scheme. Footway widths on the east side of
Queens Road are in the region of 3.0m, whilst those on the west side adjacent to Friary Gardens measure 2.8m. A pedestrian route is also provided through Friary Gardens from the Hospital to Victoria Road. The latter route is not fully accessible to wheelchair users.

Plate 4: Zebra Crossing on Dundas Street

D. Quakers Lane to Darlington Road - This route provides relatively level access running east-west to the north of the town centre. It provides key access from the residential areas to the north and links into ‘Primary Route C’ and ‘Primary Route E’. On Quakers Lane, Pottergate and Frenchgate, the route is typified by a high raised footway of width 1.9m, without guardrail to the north of the carriageway, and a lower footway to the south of the carriageway, measuring between 1.8m and 2.8m. There are three particular areas of concern, firstly the junction of the route with Maison Dieu (Plate 5), where pedestrian vehicle conflict exists, particularly during peak periods, secondly the junction of Quaker Lane, where the camber and ramping of the footway makes crossing problematic, and thirdly the area outside the schools on Darlington Road where parking restrictions are widely abused and a local safety study is currently being conducted (Plate 6).
Plate 5: Pedestrian Desire Line across Maison Dieu at Frenchgate

Plate 6: Darlington Road in the vicinity of Richmond School
E. **Gallowgate, Frenchgate and the Channel to the Market Place** - This is a key pedestrian route between ‘Primary Route D’, Station Road and the Market Place, the upper part of Frenchgate being a cul-de-sac and thus having significantly less vehicle movements. It also links to ‘Primary Route H’, providing access to Gallowfields Trading Estate. Apart from the steep gradients on both Frenchgate and Gallowgate, the main problems with the route are crossing either Dundas Street or Station Road and the width of footways in two locations, firstly on the South side between the two aforementioned roads where a stone wall is seriously bowed reducing the available footway width and secondly on the south side of The Channel (Plate 7) where a stepped access to the basement of a property reduces the footway width to 0.32m. On the same section no formal footway is provided outside the Richmondshire District Council office, Swale House.

**Plate 7: Looking down The Channel**

*from the Market Place towards Station Road*
F.  *Station Road* - This route links the swimming pool, Richmond (Lower) School and a number of leisure trails including those across The Batts, with the Market Place (via Primary Route E). A footway is provided only on the east side of Mercury Bridge (Plate 8) forcing pedestrians to cross Station Road at before accessing The Channel. The route is also steep and bounded by high walls reduce forward visibility for vehicles and making the location of formal crossing points difficult, the preferred location involving additional traffic calming measures outside Richmond (Lower) School (Plate 9). The footway on Mercury Bridge is 1.75m in width and Station Road 1.95m and 1.45m on the north and south sides respectively.

Plate 8: Mercury Bridge viewed from the Swimming Pool

G.  *Leisure routes between the Market Place and River Swale* - A number of key leisure and tourist routes, some being Public Rights of Way, exist between the Market Place and the Batts, bounded by Millgate and Station Road. Whilst improved signing of these routes is important to raise awareness, improvements are needed to the stepped access from The Channel and across the Batts itself, only part of which is surfaced.
Plate 9: Station Road opposite Richmond (Lower) School

Plate 10: Millgate
H.  *Darlington Road to Gallowfields Trading Estate* - This route is formed using the residential Fonteney Road, Beechfield Road and Green Howards Road, the latter also providing the main access to the trading estate. The main problem with the route is narrow footways, widths being reduced to 0.8m at pinch points on Beechfield Road and 0.7m at one location on Green Howards Road where the carriageway is at a bare minimum width for use by Heavy Commercial Vehicles and the other side of the footway is bounded by a retaining wall and steep drop, leaving little opportunity for widening.

I.  *Gilling Road* - Provides an essential connection into the residential areas to the North of Darlington Road. There are no significant problems with the route, although poor siting of both telegraph poles and lighting columns causes localised narrowing (Plate 11)

**Plate 11: Gilling Road - Looking towards Darlington Road**
4.2 Of the 45 personal injury accidents that occurred in Richmond between May 1998 and April 2001, 17 involved pedestrians. One accident resulted in a fatality when a pedestrian stepped in front of a bus as it began to move off from the bus stand in the Market Place. Two accidents resulted in serious injury, in the first a pedestrian was hit whilst in the carriageway near to the exit from Nun’s Close Car Park on Victoria Road, and in the second, a car failed to stop after hitting a pedestrian on the Dundas Street zebra crossing. Five accidents occurred on ‘Primary Route A’, three on ‘Primary Route B’ and five on ‘Primary Route C’. Of the remaining accidents, an eight-year-old child stepped in front of a vehicle, a vehicle failed to stop for a police officer and hit the officer, and a drunk pedestrian had his foot run over in the vicinity of the Georgian Theatre.

4.3 The topography of Richmond is problematic for pedestrians with an increase in height of nearly 150m in a straight-line distance of under 1km, a gradient of over 15%. Figure 1, shows the increase in height and gradients over a pedestrian route between the Waterfalls at the River Swale and Gallowfields Trading Estate, a distance of roughly 1 mile. Percentage gradients were generated at 10 metre intervals and interpolated using a 4-point moving average to ‘smooth’ the dataset. A maximum gradient of 30% or greater than 1-in-4 was recorded on Millgate, whilst the gradient between High Row and Nun’s Close is typically less than 5% or 1-in-20, the latter being acceptable for disabled ramps.

4.4 Disability Action in Richmond (DAIR) has produced a mobility audit for Richmond town centre. It raises the following items, suitable for inclusion in this plan:

- Footway narrows to 1.2m approaching the junction of Frenchgate and Maison Dieu. At the junction the ramp on the east side also leads to a cobbled area.

- The path across The Batts is only 1.8m and leads into the middle of a grassed area making it difficult for wheelchair users to continue across to the other path.

- The path at the lower exit of Nun’s Close Car Park is too narrow 1.2m against a recommended 1.8m.
On Newbiggin, there is no crossing at Cravengate and thus no dropped kerbs.

When discussing access to individual buildings, the DAIR report notes the gradient of the pavement. Unfortunately, as discussed in Section 4.3, the topography of Richmond is problematic in this regard and cannot be changed.
5. Proposals and Consultation

5.1 The problems and issues regarding all modes of transport were identified at two stakeholder workshops in Richmond and through observations from a number of other meetings with stakeholders. A large number of the issues raised related to pedestrian and non-motorised accessibility. A visual study was also undertaken of footway widths, condition and obstructions.

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

5.3 Pedestrian related general improvements included:

- Provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving on the key pedestrian routes
- Raised boarding areas at bus stops.

5.4 Pedestrian related measures included within ‘Strategy Option A’ focused on:

- The development of a 20mph zone, encompassing parts of Hurgill Road, Quakers Lane, Queens Road, and Victoria Road, and Wellington Place and King Street. A separate zone would be implemented on Bargate.
- Upgrading of ‘Primary Route A’ from Nun’s Close Car Park to the Market Place, including making Rosemary lane one-way.
- Improving the route across The Batts using eco-blocks to harden the current unsurfaced section.
- Refurbishing footways in and around the Market Place and the provision of a new ‘walkway’ from High Row to Trinity Church Square.
- Footway widening as part of improvements to The Channel.

5.5 ‘Strategy Option B’ developed on ‘Strategy Option A’, proposing:

- a wider 20mph zone, extended to include, Newbiggin, Rosemary Lane, Finkle Street, New Row, the Market Place, Ryders Wynd, Millgate, Dundas Street, (Lower) Frenchgate and Station Road.
- Further improvements to ‘Primary Route G’ including signing on Millgate.
5.6 ‘Strategy Option C’ focused on the Market Place and Improving Public Transport. Suggesting:

- Relocation of the existing bus facilities, providing stops in the vicinity of The Obelisk and on Queens Road.
- Development of an extended pedestrian area around The Obelisk.
- Modification of the parking arrangement in the Market Place

5.7 Public consultation was undertaken during September 2002 and included the distribution of a leaflet and questionnaire to 90 stakeholders and 4700 addresses within Richmond and surrounding parishes. A public exhibition was held in Richmond Town Hall between Friday 6th September and Thursday 12th September. The information and a response form were also placed on the Internet.

5.8 The response rate to the postal survey was about 25% and a number of additional responses and comments were received from visitors to the exhibition. The following support for options and measures were obtained.

- ‘Strategy Option A’
  - Introduction of a 20mph zone - 72%
  - Pedestrian and cycle improvements - 80%
- ‘Strategy Option B’
  - Extended 20mph zone - 60%
  - Additional pedestrian and cycle improvements between the Market Place and River Swale - 70%
- ‘Strategy Option C’
  - Creation of a pedestrian (waiting) area around the Obelisk - 65%

5.9 Given the levels of support detailed above, North Yorkshire County Council adopted ‘Strategy Option A’ and ‘Strategy Option B’ on 24th December 2002. It was also decided to progress the general improvements and undertake an additional study of ‘Strategy Option C’ with key stakeholder participation.
5.10 A number of additional comments concerned with pedestrian issues were received as part of the consultation process. These are summarised in Appendix C.

6. Summary

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

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

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

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

6.5 As a result of the extension of the boundary of the plan, additional dropped kerbs and tactile paving is required on the extensions to primary routes A, D and E, and on routes H and I, at the locations shown on Drawing B9329/011/027A, namely: Reeth Road; Quarry Road; Gallowgate; Beechfield Road; Gilling Road; Fonteney Road; and, Darlington Road.
APPENDIX A - Summary of the Pedestrian Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Reeth Road, Nuns Close Car Park and Newbiggin to the Market Place, including Rosemary Lane and Finkle Street</td>
<td>A1 - Improvement of the route from Nun’s Close Car Park to the Market Place, including improvements to crossing points and traffic calming associated with the introduction of a 20mph speed limit. Rosemary lane will become one-way, allowing footway widening. A new ‘walkway’ will be considered across the cobbles in Newbiggin at Rosemary Lane. A2 - A pedestrian walkway will be provided on Newbiggin at Cravengate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B The Market Place</td>
<td>B1 - A pedestrian walkway will be created from High Row to Trinity Church Square via the Obelisk. The existing walkways will be resurfaced in an appropriate heritage grade material. B2 - Footways will be repaired around the outside of the Market Place. B3 - Subject to the adoption of ‘Strategy Option C’ a pedestrian area will be created around the Obelisk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Queens Road and King Street to the Market Place</td>
<td>C1 - NYCC Local Safety Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Quakers Lane and Darlington Road</td>
<td>D1 - Ramp to be regraded. D2 - Pedestrian facilities to be provided on desire line or junction improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Gallowgate, Frenchgate and the Channel to the Market Place</td>
<td>E1 - Provision of raised table at the entrance to (upper) Frenchgate, tied in to 20mph improvements. E2 - Remodelling of The Channel to create a continuous footway of at least 1.5m width on the south-east side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Station Road</td>
<td>F1 - Provision of a raised pedestrian crossing, potentially as ‘Puffin’ on Station Road at Richmond (Lower) School. F2 - Improvement to the entrance of The Batts on Station Road incorporating an uncontrolled crossing point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Leisure routes between the Market Place and River Swale</td>
<td>G1 - Eco-block footway across The Batts. G2 - Signing improvements on Millgate. G3 - Repair of the steps leading from Frenchgate to The Batts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Darlington Road to the Gallowfields Trading Estate</td>
<td>No action possible due to physical constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Gilling Road</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dropped kerbs and tactile paving to be introduced on Primary Routes as indicated*
APPENDIX B - Summary of Pedestrian Action Plan Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Pedestrian Route Improvements - Nun's Close up to and including Rosemary Lane</td>
<td>Signing, improvement of surfaces, gateway features, one-way traffic on Rosemary Lane with footway widening.</td>
<td>£165,000</td>
<td>2003/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Pedestrian Strip - Newbiggin at Cravengate</td>
<td>Included in preliminary study for A1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Pedestrian Route Improvements - Market Place</td>
<td>Footway Maintenance - NYCC Divisional Engineer</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
<td>2003/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Footway Repair - Market Place</td>
<td>Relocation of passenger transport facilities and creation of a pedestrian area around the Obelisk</td>
<td>£137,000</td>
<td>2005/6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Option C Improvements - Market Place</td>
<td>Relocation of passenger transport facilities and creation of a pedestrian area around the Obelisk</td>
<td>£137,000</td>
<td>2005/6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Queens Road Dundas Street</td>
<td>NYCC Local Safety Scheme</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2002/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Ramp Improvement - Quaker Lane</td>
<td>Regrading of ramp to ease access for the mobility impaired</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Frenchgate / Maison Dieu</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian facilities at the junction of Frenchgate and Maison Dieu</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>2004/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Frenchgate Raised Table</td>
<td>Raised table on Frenchgate at Dundas Street</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>2004/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements - The Channel</td>
<td>Carriageway alterations and footway improvements</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
<td>2003/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing - Station Road</td>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing - Type to be determined</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td>2004/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Informal Pedestrian Crossing - Station road / The Batts</td>
<td>Study to assess type - include within 20 mph zone</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td>2003/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Eco-block path across The Batts</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,500</td>
<td>2003/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2/3</td>
<td>Footway Improvements - Market Place to The Batts</td>
<td>Signed pedestrian routes. Signed wheelchair route via Station Road.</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
<td>2004/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Funding will be required to complete the dropped kerb and tactile paving works resulting from the extension of this plan. The cost will be dependent on the technique adopted (stick-on or traditional) and thus may range between £17,500 and £50,000.
APPENDIX C - Summary of Public Consultation Responses

Pedestrian Issues

- 20 comments considered the proposed improvements for pedestrians within the Market Place:
- 6 comments requested a proper pedestrian crossing between Trinity Church Square and the outside of the Market Place, with an additional 4 requesting pedestrian improvements of a similar nature. Suggestions for locations included:
  - Finkle Street to the obelisk (2)
  - High Road to the obelisk (1)
  - Trinity Church to the obelisk (1)
  - Yorkshire Bank to Woolworths (1)
- 5 comments noted that pedestrians cross wherever they like.
- 1 comment suggested that removing the existing bus stops would improve pedestrian access.
- 1 comment asked for pedestrian priority on the crossing strips.
- 13 comments were received regarding cobbles in Richmond. Of these:
  - 7 comments complained about the poor surface cobbles provide for walking on, particularly for the elderly, mobility impaired and those pushing wheelchairs, pushchairs or prams.
  - 5 comments asked for the surface to be maintained or improved.
  - 1 comment suggested that the cobbles should be removed.
- 6 comments asked for a pavement to be created on Cravengate.
- 5 comments requested improved pedestrian access to the Market Place, including 3 from Nun's Close.
- 1 comment asked for a pedestrian handrail on the left-hand side of Millgate down to the falls to aid the elderly going down hill.
- 1 comment asked for the footpath between Quakers Lane and Victoria Road to be made wheelchair accessible, whilst another noted that the path on St. James Wynd and Ryders Wynd is hazardous for the disabled.
Pedestrian Crossings

- 59 comments were received requesting the provision of additional pedestrian crossings. Of these:
- 27 related to Queens Road, including:
  - Between the library and Co-op (13)
  - Before or after the Dundas Street roundabout (5)
  - Across Queens Road (5)
  - Across Quakers Lane (2)
  - Across the entrance to the Co-op (1)
  - At Friary Gardens (1)
- 15 comments were specific to Victoria Road
  - At the tourist information / theatre (6)
  - Near Nun’s Close Car Park (4)
  - At Rosemary Lane (2)
- 9 comments related to Dundas Street, 3 requesting a signal controlled crossing.
  - 1 comment asked for pelican crossings at all schools
  - 1 comment requested a pelican crossing on Pottergate to provide access for the Church of England School.
  - 1 comment asked for a crossing at Mercury Bridge
  - 1 comment asked for a zebra crossing from the funeral building to Flints Terrance.
- 19 comments were received about the proposed zebra crossing on Station Road. Of these:
  - 8 comments stressed support, stating that that area is dangerous for children.
  - 6 comments requested a pelican be provided rather than a zebra.
  - 3 comments asked to the crossing to be locate further down Station Road
  - 2 comments disputed the need for the crossing and said that it would cause congestion and impede traffic flow during the winter months.
Rosemary Lane

- 30 comments were received regarding the proposed treatment of Rosemary Lane. Of these:
  - 14 comments opposed proposals to make Rosemary Lane one-way
  - 9 comments questioned potential displacement of traffic on to Cravengate, Newbiggin, Victoria Road and Bargate.
  - 1 comment each, suggested making: Bargate one-way; Newbiggin one-way; and, Rosemary Lane one-way in the opposite direction to that proposed.
  - 1 comment was concerned about the visibility exiting Newbiggin on to Cravengate.
  - 1 comment asked that indiscriminate parking on Rosemary Lane be addressed.
  - 1 comment supported the proposal.
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1. Introduction

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

1.2 The overall objectives of the strategy are:

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

1.3 Policy 2 of the strategy states:

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

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

- Members and Officers of North Yorkshire County Council
- Members and Officers of Richmondshire District Council
- Richmond Town Council
- Cyclists’ Touring Club
- North Yorkshire Police
- Arriva North Yorkshire
- Confederation of Passenger Transport
- Disability Action in Richmond
- Richmond Town Centre Forum - Traffic and Access Group
- Richmond Business and Tourism Association
- Richmond Civic Society
- Richmond Residents and Cyclists

2. Cycle Routes, Problems and Opportunities

2.1 Richmond is located at the eastern end of Swaledale bordering the Yorkshire Dales National Park. The town centre is five miles South West of the A1 at Scotch Corner, and a similar distance West of Catterick Village. To the South, the centre of Catterick Garrison is three miles, and to the South West, Leyburn is 11 miles. Richmond has also traditionally had links to Barnard Castle, some 15 miles to the North West and Darlington, 13 miles to the North East. The topography within the town rises from less than 100m at the waterfalls on the River Swale to over 230m at the Gallowfields Trading Estate, making North - South movement difficult for all but the fittest of cyclists. The levels are more favourable on an West - East axis, rising from 120m on Reeth Road to 150m in the vicinity of the town’s schools on Darlington Road.

2.2 Although only one cycle count has been undertaken in recent years, revealing a 12-hour two-way flow of 38 cyclists on Queens Road, casual observations highlighted some cycling to school on a corridor to the North of Queens Road between Darlington Road and the residential area of Westfields, also extending to Quakers Lane. Further investigation of the results of hands-up type surveys at the aforementioned schools indicated that over 80 pupils usually cycle to school.

2.3 In recent years, Richmond, and the section of Swaledale between Richmond and Reeth have become increasingly attractive for cyclists, offering a range of on and off-road cycling opportunities, and limited interaction with motor vehicles. Richmond is also a key stop on a number of organised cycle tours including coast-to-coast, and circular rides from York. It has also recently been linked to the ‘National Byway’, a signposted leisure cycling route utilising lightly-trafficked roads, which by the end of 2005, will stretch some 4000 miles. Further increases in the levels of recreational cycling would be expected if National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 71 is constructed through Richmond, linking locally between Northallerton and Appleby. That said, the
alignment of the proposed route is currently shown passing through the Market Place and Newbiggin, both cobbled areas, were riding is at best uncomfortable.

2.4 The main public cycle parking locations within Richmond are two stylised Sheffield type stands (Plate 1) in the Market Place close to Kings Street and three cycle lockers (Plate 2) located in the small car park to the North of Victoria Road, some two minutes walk from High Row and the Market Place via Rosemary Lane and Finkle Street. There are currently no secure cycle parking facilities at the Frenchgate end of the Market Place where cycles are often seen leaning against the frontage of Woolworths, nor at Richmond Castle, the town’s main tourist destination attracting over 50,000 visitors per year.

2.6 As part of the Traffic Management Strategy road traffic accidents resulting in personal injury, occurring between April 1998 and May 2001 were analysed. Only one accident involved a cyclist, this being at the junction of Station Road and Frenchgate, the cyclist skidding off the pavement in front of a moving car.

2.7 Parking is restricted on the majority of main roads within the central area of Richmond, although in many cases carriageway widths are limited. That said, advisory cycle lanes could be provided on Reeth Road, Victoria Road, Station Road, Darlington Road, and potentially Gilling Road, although the latter suffers from parking in the vicinity of its junction with Darlington Road, particularly at each end of the school day, and this would need to be addressed.

2.8 Footway widths are such that neither segregated nor unsegregated shared use routes are appropriate. The only potential exception being the footway to the North side of Darlington Road in the vicinity of the schools which is bordered by a grass verge on both sides. The best use of this space needs to be considered in light of the local safety study being undertaken in the vicinity of the schools and it may be decided that the likely level of pedestrian - cycle conflict that a joint use facility would create at this location would be unacceptable.

2.9 The potential for off-road routes is limited, improvements being considered through The Batts, and from Maison Dieu to Richmond School.
Plate 1: Cycle parking provision in Richmond Market Place

Plate 2: Cycle Lockers in Victoria Road Car Park
3. Proposals for Richmond

3.1 Three cycling improvements were included in the consultation element of the Richmond Traffic Management Strategy, both designed to complement the proposed NCN Route 71, whilst also being improvements in their own right.

- Advisory cycle lanes on Station Road between the Swimming Pool and Frenchgate.

- Creation of a continuous joint-use pedestrian and cycle track across The Batts, using a material such as 'Eco-Blocks'.

- Provision of additional secure cycle parking in the Market Place and new cycle parking provision at Richmond Castle.

3.2 The Traffic Management Strategy consultation exercise supported the proposals and also generated a number of additional comments.

- 31 comments were received regarding the proposed route across The Batts, the majority asking for careful planning of the route.

- 22 comments opposed the provision of cycle facilities, mainly citing the hilly nature of the town and that such facilities would only cater for a small minority of the population.

- 17 comments requested additional routes, including on Darlington Road, Reeth Road, Victoria Road, Gilling Road, and to Catterick Garrison.

- 10 comments questioned the use of Mercury Bridge by cyclists.

- 9 comments supported the provision of additional secure cycle parking facilities in the Market Place.

3.3 The improvements listed in Section 3.1 were supported by the NYCC Richmondshire Area Committee on 5th December 2002, and were adopted as part of the Richmond Traffic Management Strategy by Executive Decision on 24th December 2002.

3.4 In July 2003, NYCC asked Mouchel Parkman to extend the area covered by the cycling plan to encompass the whole of the town, making two further improvements desirable. These are shown on Drawing B9329/011/030, and are described below.
• **The Cross Town Route** - From West to East, the route would begin at the boundary of the built-up area on Reeth Road, either as a signed route or with the provision of advisory cycle lanes. Once within the proposed 20mph zone, the route would split, Quakers Lane providing a signed route to Pottergate avoiding congestion within the town centre, and Victoria Road, either as a wholly signed route, or with advisory lanes in part, linking to Town Centre facilities before continuing to Pottergate via Queens Road. The signed route would continue beyond the 20mph zone to the junction of Frenchgate and Maison Dieu, the provision of dedicated facilities being precluded by a raised narrow footway and limited carriageway width, particularly at the latter junction where a narrow right turning lane is provided. As signed spur would be provided on Maison Dieu, offering cyclists the possibility of continuing to Brompton-on-Swale and Catterick Bridge, whilst the main route would continue on to Darlington Road. In the vicinity of the schools, the road is currently marked with large areas of central hatching, stacking right-turning vehicles into the school premises. This arrangement potentially serves to increase traffic speeds and reduce pedestrian safety, particularly for those crossing the road. Improved cycle provision could be provided through either re-marking the carriageway with advisory or mandatory cycle lanes or by providing an off-carriageway joint use route. A local safety study is currently being conducted in to the area outside the schools and needs to take account of cycle needs and provision. The route also serves the main supermarket, the medical facilities on Quakers Lane and Victoria Road and Richmond Library.

• **The Gallowfields Link** - A signed route would be provided linking the schools on Darlington Road and the main residential areas to the East of the town with the major employment area of Gallowfields Trading Estate, using Fonteney Road, Beechfield Road and Green Howards Road. A further spur consisting of either a signed route or advisory lanes could be provided on Gilling Road.
4. **Cycle Promotion and Education**

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

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

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

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

5. **Local Cycling Targets**

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

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

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

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

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

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

• Target 7 - To spend, in addition to funding from external sources, at least £70 000p.a. of the County Council Local Transport Plan budget on measures to improve facilities for cyclists.

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

• Target 1: To increase cycle use in Richmond so that by 2010, 57 cycle trips are made in each direction, each day, on Queens Road.

The National Cycling Strategy suggests that targets for accident reduction for cyclists should be based on a reduction in the casualty rate per km cycled. This was essentially brought about due to past experience of cycle casualty reduction being brought about by reduced cycle use. Target 3 in the North Yorkshire Cycling Strategy was originally to identify and adopt targets based on this philosophy. At present there is no accurate method of establishing cycle accident rates per km cycled. This plan therefore sets a target to maintain at the present low level the total number of cyclist casualties in Richmond. The maintaining of the number of cyclist casualties when set against increased cycle use would indicate a decreased cycle casualty rate. In order to minimise random variations from year to year targets will be set based on accidents in the three years before the target date.

• Target 3: To maintain the current level of cycle accidents at less than 1 per year within the plan area, through to 2010.

6. Implementation

6.1 £17,000 has currently been allocated to implement the route improvement across The Batts and to provide improved cycle parking as part of the Traffic Management Strategy. Construction of the additional routes with appropriate signing and potential for advisory lanes on Reeth Road, part of Victoria Road and Darlington Road should be budgeted for in the region of £30,000. If a shared use facility was provided for 500m on the North side of Darlington Road from Gilling Road to Richmond School,
then this estimate should be doubled assuming that no additional physical drainage works are required.
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Complete list of issues identified and votes cast
(key issues shown in bold type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Direction of entry to Market Place is wrong</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bus/Passenger/Pedestrian conflict in the Market Place</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Car parking organisation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Taxi rank/pedestrian conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &amp; 8 Bus waiting facilities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bus shelter in the Market Place and the organisation of bus stands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Speed of vehicles in the Market Place + intimidation of pedestrians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Lack of long stay parking for disabled in Market Place</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The effect of the market on Saturdays</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Traffic flows in circles in the Market Place (looking for a place to park)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Dangerous pedestrian crossing points – Station Road &amp; Maison Dieu</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Remove non-essential traffic from Market Place</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Why is the Market Place a through road – New Rd/King Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Perceived accident problem - Junction of New Road/Bridge Street</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Lack of Public Transport Information</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Pedestrian access from High Row to centre of Market Place</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Cycling paths/safe routes into town and within centre, and cycle parking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Poor maintenance of Market Place cobbles and footways</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Buses should turn engines off</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Co-op car park now signed as for Co-op users only – lack of car parking spaces – especially when the Co-op car park is closed.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Conflict between local and tourist parking</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Too much 2 hour car parking – require more options for duration of stay</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Lack of car parking charges in the Market Place</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Cobbles are very difficult for disabled to cross and cars obstruct marked pedestrian routes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Competition from Catterick needs long term solution. How can we ensure that Richmond thrives</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Tourists are not managed – lack of signing and parking issues</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Avoid a proliferation of signs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Signage audit was aimed at car users – need to ensure adequate signing for pedestrians too</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Enforcement Issues: lack of traffic wardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Abuse of Finkle Street by vehicle users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pedestrian access from Finkle Street to Newbiggin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lack of dropped kerbs and disabled access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Narrow footpaths: The Channel and Ryders Wynd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Need to widen pavements in the Market Place also steps into shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Congestion due to school traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Lack of rear access to market place businesses – conflict between delivery and other users – user smaller vehicles? Deliver at other times of day Kwik Save and Breweries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Travel to school by private car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Need raised footway to give access to low floor buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Cycling – Topography does not attract cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lack of facilities for cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Visitors don’t understand the disc parking scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Lack of signing and physical access to the Trading Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Signing / Routing to the Trading Estate (Alternate Access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Lack of a public transport link to the Trading Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Signing of exits from the Market Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Town Maps are confusing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Repair the obelisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Car Park signing for new visitors arriving in the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Success or otherwise of Finkle Street pedestrianisation (How to raise pedestrian priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Need to review tourist coach pick up / drop off / parking issues (and provision of information to coach drivers and operators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Location of coach drop off / pick up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Group discussion notes: Index of issues discussed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Direction of entry to Market Place is wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bus/Passenger/Pedestrian conflict in the Market Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Car parking organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &amp; 8</td>
<td>Bus waiting facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of bus shelter in the Market Place and the organisation of bus stands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pedestrian access from High Row to centre of Market Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Poor maintenance of Market Place cobbles and footways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Competition from Catterick needs long term solution. How can we ensure that Richmond thrives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Enforcement Issues: lack of traffic wardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Lack of rear access to market place businesses – conflict between delivery and other users – user smaller vehicles? Deliver at other times of day Kwik Save and Breweries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Travel to school by private car.</td>
</tr>
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<td>48</td>
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1. **Direction of entry to Market Place is wrong. The entrance to the Market Place should be King Street.**
   - Reversing the circulation in the Market Place could cause confusion.
   - The big difficulty experienced during the earlier trial was outside of the Market Place. Reversing the circulation does not fit with the traffic circulation in Richmond as a whole. Queuing was experienced at a number of locations including back from King Street on to Victoria Road and Queens Road, and on Station Road and Dundas Street.
   - The entrance to the Market Place from King Street has poor sight lines, raising pedestrian safety as an issue.
   - The right-turn, continuing on Frenchgate towards the Market Place at the junction with Station Road is currently problematic.
   - Would closing New Road help to reduce through traffic?
   - The current traffic flows within the Market Place keep traffic speeds down without the need for physical measures and signing.
   - The current situation filters out any traffic not necessarily destined for the Market Place.
   - Options include moving the location of the Market and moving the bus stand to High Row.
   - The consensus is that the direction is probably right the way that it is.
   - Should the clockwise movement of vehicles be reinforced?

2. **Bus/Passenger/Pedestrian conflict in the Market Place**
   - This is largely due to the current location of the bus stand and would need to be revisited depending on resolution of the location issue.
   - Could the town centre forum provide free buses to the Market Place?

3. **Car parking organisation**
   - The main issues are poor signage and a lack of enforcement (Issue 29).
   - There is a need for some short stay spaces in the Market Place (i.e. 1-hour spaces), although workers currently park for two hours and then move to another space. There is a need to displace this parking to Nun's Close.
   - Pedestrian signing from Nun's Close to the Market Place is poor. There is a need to improve the walking environment between Nun's Close and the Market Place. It is a long walk from Nun's Close for those who are not disabled but are partly mobility impaired.
• There is a need to drive into Rosemary Lane to get to the Chip Shop and the parking at the top of Bargate. However, could Rosemary Lane become one way, widening the pavements and improving the route between Nun’s Close and the Market Place.

• There is a need for designated residents parking in the Town Centre, including for residents in the vicinity of the Market Place.

• Do we want cars in the Market Place?

• On Saturdays there is less parking in the Market Place with displacement to Nun’s Close

• How about charging for parking around the edge of the Market Place?

• There is a need to make the town more accessible by public transport.

• How about extending the circular bus routes which currently serve the residential areas, to be routed via the Car Parks.

• It is understood that the Co-op car park is intended for those using the store and parking is limited to two hours.

• Parking in Station Road is a problem, specifically the unavailability on weekdays of the Richmondshire District Council Employees Car Park.

• It was suggested that 4 disabled parking bays could be provided in Finkle Street?

• Could a bus be provided linking the existing car parks?

• There is a need to reconsider the delineation and regulations for parking on Frenchgate?

• There is a need to send out parking disks and disk parking information with tourist information packs.

5. Bus waiting facilities, and

8. Lack of a bus shelter in the Market Place and organisation of the bus stands

• A key issue is whether to locate a bus shelter on the cobbles or on the pavement? A shelter is needed, but only one, two would be seen as intrusive.

• There was a strong feeling in one group favouring the pavement outside the town hall as a suitable location for the bus shelter.

• Trials with buses showed that 3 buses could use the pavement outside the town hall. It was felt that three buses here were preferable to 4 in the current location.

• Some buses use the current stand as a layover for excessive lengths of time. Is this desirable or should it be prohibited?
• Could all buses be moved out of the Market Place and an interchange created elsewhere, for example, outside Friary Gardens or outside Calverts at Queens Road?

• Could real-time information be provided?

• Could more possibilities arise if the tarmac road from New Road to King Street was made one-way?

• Could raised kerbs be provided at the location of the current bus stands?

• There is a need to take account of the bus turning circle in any plans.

• Could the obelisk be converted in to a bus shelter?

16. Pedestrian access from High Row to Trinity Square (centre of the Market Place)

• There is seating currently located outside Trinity Tower and this can be a pleasant location to rest during summer months.

• 25% of people walk to the shops in Richmond and their needs must be afforded a higher priority.

• Picture a Richmond with more room for pedestrians around the obelisk.

• Richmondshire District Council has plans to refurbish the obelisk and stage two would be to increase the area for pedestrians at its base. Funding has been put back to the next financial year although the town council has made an offer of some funding to speed up the process.

• The issue of this route is not seen as a problem by some, a longer route is in existence across the end of King Street.

• There is a need to avoid pedestrian congestion outside the prime shops on High Row.

• Can a route be achieved without the loss of parking spaces?

• Provide build-outs at the current crossing points to protect the crossing points from parking and shorten the crossing distances.

• Can the whole Market Place include a pedestrian priority system?

• Total pedestrianisation is not deliverable, the traders would object most strongly.

• There are no clearly defined rules for users, both pedestrian and vehicles in the Market Place.

• Any route would depend on the future location of bus stands and taxi ranks.
18. Poor maintenance of Market Place cobbles and footways

- The town council is currently talking to NYCC about improving the standard of maintenance. This may result in a programme of improvement over 4 years.
- There is a need to contact English Heritage about the cobbles, when were they originally laid, how were they laid, and what can be done to them, if anything?
- Tactile paving blocks do not fit with the nature of the conservation area and other materials for example, studs in the existing materials should be used.
- There is a need for the existing footways to be upgraded to provide better definition.
- Can trees be planted in the Market Place?

25. Competition from Catterick Garrison needs a long-term solution. How can we ensure that Richmond thrives?

- TESCO at Colburn is seen as a major threat to shops in Richmond.
- There is a need to make access/egress to the town centre, easy and user friendly.
- Richmond needs a pleasant atmosphere - to be attractive - to equal or exceed other areas and - to remain unique.
- Richmond needs to act as a centre for residents and its wider hinterland.
- Focus on capturing trade from visitors. There is a need to improve the environment and visitor pleasure.
- Caution against radical change.

29. Enforcement, lack of traffic wardens

- Richmondshire District Council currently patrol off-street car parks.
- Richmondshire District Council had discussions with NY Police about decriminalised parking but these were stopped when a traffic warden provided improved services.
- Could parking be decriminalised within Richmond?
- There is currently a lack of enthusiasm amongst Richmondshire District Council members for decriminalised parking.
- There is a problem with enforcement of parking restrictions at the top of Station Road.
- Improved enforcement in the Market Place could increase the number of spaces available in the Market Place by around 50 per day (190 places - 2-hour slots).
• Could street wardens or a “Town Centre Ranger” be used to help a Traffic Warden with enforcement?

36. Lack of rear access to Market Place businesses - conflict between delivery and other users - size of delivery vehicles.

• Vehicles deliver at all times of day. The Town Council has investigated limiting loading times but this is not always possible because of the small consignments being delivered to businesses within the town.
• Rear access is only a remote possibility without large-scale demolitions.
• Kwik Save has rear access but the size of delivery vehicles mean that this is not used. However, Kwik Save does schedule most of its deliveries for very early or very late in the day.
• Can a local trans-shipment point be created?
• Double parking is considered to be an annoyance rather than a problem.
• Manoeuvring HCVs can be a problem.

37. Travel to school by private car

• The junction between Maison Dieu and Darlington Road needs to be reconsidered. There is a possible problem with right-turning school buses.
• It is noted that the schools lie outside the study area and that the following problems will be taken forward by NYCC separate from this study process.
  • Problems exist with the lack of parking organisation and illegal parking outside schools on Darlington Road. This causes congestion.
  • Arriva have had problems with a number of minor collisions.
  • When North Yorkshire Police deal with the parking problem it goes away but reappears the following day if not policed.
  • Buses cause a particular problem.
  • Children also cross between the buses.

48. Car park signing for new visitors arriving in the town

• This was covered in the JMP signage audit - refer to the report.
• There is a feeling that too much signing could be detrimental.
• Current signing to the Market Place is poor.
• There is a need to consider directional signing for cars to the Market Place from Green Bridge.
• Is the Market Place the same as the Town Centre?
• There is a need to sign the exit of Market Place via King Street.
• There is also a need for pedestrian signing for visitors between the Riverside and the Market Place.

50. Need to review tourist coach pick up/drop off/parking issues - and provision of information to coach drivers and operators, and

51. Location of coach drop off/pick up.

• This issue had been brought to a conclusion with NYCC with a bay being provided opposite Friary Gardens. Why has this not been taken forward.
• A leaflet had been produced for coach operators visiting the town.
• Display boards could be provided on routes into the town e.g. at Scotch Corner and on the route in from Catterick, including information on routing etc. for coach drivers.
Richmond Workshop 1 - Monday 11 February 2002

Discussion Groups

Group 1

Facilitator: Matthew Steele

Kevin Poskett          Cllr Tom Burrows
Cllr John Harris       Paul Steele
Cllr Michael Heseltine  PC Paul Lax
Melanie Davies         David Squires
Clive Crawford         Shirley Thurbon
Lewis Harris

Group 2

Facilitator: Rob Turnbull

Nigel Phillips          Dr Peter Clark
Cllr Grace Buckle       Neil Bacon
Cllr Carl Les           Mary Welch
Peter Warne             Rod Ellis
Betty Robinson          Mr. Paterson

Group 3

Facilitator: Colin Brown

Ken Allinson           Jim Whiteman
Cllr Oliver Blease      Elwyn Williams
Mr. Swards              Valerie Burrows
Alison Butterfield      Cllr Katherine Carr
Roger Jenkinson         George Peach
Appendix 6: NYCC: Local Transport Plan: Performance indicators and targets
TARGETS AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Objective =

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

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

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

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

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

Objective =

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

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

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

Objective =

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

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

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

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

Objective =

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

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

Target = To establish three quality freight partnerships during the life of the Plan.
Appendix 7: Consultation Leaflet and Postal Survey
Richmond Traffic Management Strategy

Option A
- Improved pedestrian route from Nun's Close to Finkle Street
- Local Safety Scheme

Option B
- Potential zebra crossing
- Extended 20 mph zone
- Advisory cycle lanes
- Signed pedestrian route

Option C
- Potential arrangement of the Market Place
- Joint pedestrian/cycle route across The Batts

Potential Place Key
- Bus Stop
- Pedestrian Cycling
- Disable Cycle
- Loading Bay
- Motorcycle
- Taxi Rank
- Pedestrian Strip

How can you help?

Please read this pamphlet and then, for a clearer understanding of the plans, come to the exhibition to be held between Friday 6 September and Thursday 12 September, in the Town Hall, Market Place, Richmond. At the exhibition you will be able to discuss the proposals with representatives of both NYCC and Mouchel, on Friday 6 September between 12:00 and 18:00, and on Saturday 7 September between 10:00 and 16:00.

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 by folding as shown on the reverse, or completed on the internet at [http://www.nycc-consultator.info]. All comments and questionnaires should be returned by 20 September 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.

M.O. Moore, Director of Environmental Services - County Hall, Northallerton DL7 7AH - Tel: 01609 730 760
Introduction

North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) has afforded transport and pedestrian access related issues a high priority within Richmond Town Centre over a number of years. It is felt that what is needed now is a more comprehensive strategy for managing traffic over the next five to ten years. The aim is to come up with a strategy which provides long lasting improvements, especially for vulnerable road users, whilst helping the local economy and improving the environment for both residents and visitors.

This leaflet looks at the current problems of traffic, parking, public transport and other related issues in Richmond. It also considers what we might aim to achieve and how we might go about it.

Many local organisations and individuals have helped to identify the problems which need tackling. They have also helped to develop the options contained within this leaflet. We would like your views in order to help decide the best way forward.

What are the problems?

- The role of transport in the economic survival of Richmond
- Pedestrian issues
- Cycling
- Disabled access and mobility
- Facilities for public transport and coaches
- Motorised cross-town journeys
- Parking policy and enforcement
- Signing issues
- Pedestrian and vehicular movements in the Market Place
- Maintenance of cobbles
- Retail servicing
- Catering for the needs of tourists

What are we trying to achieve?

The following objectives were used to develop the Traffic Management Strategy options and other improvements. They are not listed in a priority order.

- Upgrade routes for pedestrians and the mobility impaired, including:
  - access to the town centre from the Nun’s Close car park
  - within the Market Place
  - access from Frenchgate to the Market Place (The Channel)
- Increase provision of cycle-parking and assess the potential for cycle access between the riverside and town centre
- Improve facilities for public transport users including the provision of information, shelters and platforms for level boarding. In addition cater for tourist coach pick-up and drop-off
- Improve the efficiency of the use of existing parking spaces by residents, workers, shoppers and visitors, and assess the possibility of reorganising parking arrangements within the Market Place
- Improve and consolidate signing within the town, including changes to directional signing for pedestrians and cyclists and motorists.
- Encourage the repair of cobbles and footways within the town centre to improve the physical environment.

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 Richmond town centre. Three options and a number of other improvements 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 £100,000 has been earmarked for the development of public transport facilities.

For any of the options to be developed further, the necessary level of support would be required from the local community through this consultation process. Progress on the other improvements is not dependent on the selection of any of the other options, so these can proceed even if none of the options is favoured by the community.

Option A

This focuses on improving road safety, enhancing pedestrian and cycle facilities and introducing residents parking areas.

- A 20 mph zone would be created on Victoria Road and Queens Road from the pedestrian entrance to Nun’s Close Car Park to the Queens Road/Dundas Street roundabout. This would also extend northwards to include Hurgill Road and Queens Lane, and to the South to include King Street and Bargate.
- Three key areas of pedestrian movement would be improved. These are; the route from Nun’s Close Car Park to Finkle Street which would involve Rosemary Lane becoming one-way from Victoria Road to Newbiggin; the route across The Bett’s which would be upgraded to cater for both pedestrians and cyclists; and, routes in and around the Market Place, including a new pedestrian route from High Row to Trinity Church Square and improvements to the footways in Frenchgate.
- Secure cycle parking would be improved within the Market Place and provided at additional locations when Richmond is linked to the National Cycle Network (NCN).
- Residents Parking areas would be created on (upper) Frenchgate, The Green and Comforth Hill. Those with premises within these areas would be able to obtain a permit allowing unlimited parking, whilst those without permits would be restricted to a limited duration, typically 2 hours.

Option B

This can be seen as an extension to the measures presented for Option A.

- The 20 mph zone would extended to include: Newbiggin, Rosemary Lane, Finkle Street, New Road; the Market Place, Ryders Wynd, Millgate, Dundas Street; (lower) Frenchgate including The Channel; and, Station Road as far as the entrance to The Bett’s. This option would extend the safety improvements afforded to pedestrians and cyclists whilst also addressing the safety concerns at Richmond School’s Station Road site. This could include a zebra crossing.
- Routes to the riverside would be further improved with signing on Millgate and enhancement of the route between The Channel and The Bett’s. This would include repair of the existing footway surface, lighting and signing, although an alternative route for the mobility impaired would also be signed via Stazon Road.
- With the extension of the NCN to Richmond; advisory cycle lanes would be provided on both sides of Station Road, extending from the Swimming Pool, across Mercury Bridge to Frenchgate. In addition an advisory cycle lane would be provided on the West side of Frenchgate around the corner as far as the South side of Dundas Street.

Option C

Option C has been developed with the aim of improving facilities for public transport users within the centre of Richmond. This would also create an opportunity to reconsider the arrangement of the parking within the Market Place.

- Buses would continue to serve Richmond Market Place but would no longer wait on the cobbled area. A new passenger boarding and alighting point would be created in the vicinity of the obelisk. The area around the obelisk would be developed to create a pedestrian area with links to High Row and Trinity Church and would include sympathetically designed passenger shelters, timetable displays and raised kerbs for easier access to vehicles. Within this area high quality materials would be used in keeping with the Market Place and its status as a conservation area.
- A new bus and coach waiting area would be created in Queens Road. This would include passenger shelters, information and raised kerbs, and would provide an interchange point for passengers who need to change buses. It would also cater for the boarding and alighting of coach passengers. Existing access rights and provision for loading for retail premises would be maintained.
- Parking in the Market Place would be re-arranged to maximise the number of available spaces and achieve spaces of a standard size.

Option C could be introduced with either Option A or Option B.

Other Improvements

In addition to the measures incorporated within the Options, a number of other improvements would be implemented. These include the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving on key pedestrian routes and improvement of bus stops, such as, timetabled provision and raised boarding areas.
Richmond Traffic Management Strategy - Consultation Questionnaire

Option A

1. Do you support the introduction of a 20 mph zone? Yes    No

2. Do you support the pedestrian and cycle improvements? Yes    No

3. Do you support the introduction of residents parking areas? Yes    No

Option B - [An extension of the measures included in Option A]

4. Do you support the extended 20 mph zone? Yes    No

5. Do you support the additional pedestrian and cycle improvements between the Market Place and River Swale? Yes    No

Option C - [This could be introduced with either Option A or Option B]

6. Do you support the changes to the location of bus/coach waiting facilities? Yes    No

7. Do you support the creation of a pedestrian waiting area around the obelisk? Yes    No

8. Do you support the creation of a bus interchange on Queens Road? Yes    No

9. Do you support the reorganisation of parking within the Market Place? 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 DL10 4XX)  

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 8: Public Consultation - Additional Detailed Comments
Options A and B

Option A focused on improving road safety, enhancing pedestrian and cycle facilities, including from Nun’s Close to the Market Place and across The Batts. It also included the introduction of residents parking areas for (upper) Frenchgate, The Green and Cornforth Hill. Option B extended the proposals of Option A with a wider 20 mph zone and improved routes from the Market Place to the Riverside for both pedestrians and cyclists.

20 mph Zone

- 12 comments were received regarding the 20 mph zones proposed as part of Strategy Options A and B. Of these:
  - 11 comments expressed concern about excessive speeds on Riverside Road. Of these:
    - 4 comments suggested that the road be made one-way
    - 2 asked for pedestrianisation
    - 1 asked for inclusion within the 20 mph zone, 1 for traffic calming and a further response a 5 mph speed limit.
  - 2 comments questioned enforcement
  - 1 comment supported the proposals for Bargate
  - 1 comment suggested extending the proposed zone on Bargate as far as The Green.
  - 1 comment asked for 20 mph on Sleegill, Theakston Lane and Rimmington Avenue.
  - 1 comment supported the introduction of the 20 mph zone with the exception of Victoria Road
  - 1 comment supported the introduction of the 20 mph zone with the exception of Station Road and Dundas Street.
  - 1 comment stated that there was no need for a 20 mph zone on Hurgill Road, Quakers Lane and Victoria Road.
  - 1 comment asked for a 10 mph speed limit within the Market Place.

Pedestrian Issues

- 20 comments considered the proposed improvements for pedestrians within the Market Place:
  - 6 comments requested a proper pedestrian crossing between Trinity Church Square and the outside of the Market Place, with an additional 4 requesting pedestrian improvements of a similar nature. Suggestions for locations included:
    - Finkle Street to the obelisk (2)
    - High Road to the obelisk (1)
    - Trinity Church to the obelisk (1)
    - Yorkshire Bank to Woolworths (1)
  - 5 comments noted that pedestrians cross wherever they like.
  - 1 comment suggested that removing the existing bus stops would improve pedestrian access
  - 1 comment asked for pedestrian priority on the crossing strips.
- 13 comments were received regarding cobbles in Richmond. Of these:
  - 7 comments complained about the poor surface cobbles provide for walking on, particularly for the elderly, mobility impaired and those pushing wheelchairs, pushchairs or prams.
  - 5 comments asked for the surface to be maintained or improved.
  - 1 comment suggested that the cobbles should be removed.
- 6 comments asked for a pavement to be created on Cravengate.
- 5 comments requested improved pedestrian access to the Market Place, including 3 from Nun’s Close.
- 1 comment asked for a pedestrian handrail on the left-hand side of Millgate down to the falls to aid the elderly going down hill.
- 1 comment asked for the footpath between Quakers Lane and Victoria Road to be made wheelchair accessible, whilst another noted that the path on St. James Wynd and Ryders Wynd is hazardous for the disabled.

**Pedestrian Crossings**
- 59 comments were received requesting the provision of additional pedestrian crossings. Of these:
  - 27 related to Queens Road, including:
    - Between the library and Co-op (13)
    - Before or after the Dundas Street roundabout (5)
    - Across Queens Road (5)
    - Across Quakers Lane (2)
    - Across the entrance to the Co-op (1)
    - At Friary Gardens (1)
  - 15 comments were specific to Victoria Road
    - At the tourist information / theatre (6)
    - Near Nun’s Close Car Park (4)
    - At Rosemary Lane (2)
  - 9 comments related to Dundas Street, 3 requesting a signal controlled crossing.
  - 1 comment asked for pelican crossings at all schools
  - 1 comment requested a pelican crossing on Pottergate to provide access for the CoE School.
  - 1 comment asked for a crossing at Mercury Bridge
  - 1 comment asked for a zebra crossing from the funeral building to Flints Terrance.
  - 19 comments were received about the proposed zebra crossing on Station Road. Of these:
    - 8 comments stressed support, stating that that area is dangerous for children.
    - 6 comments requested a pelican be provided rather than a zebra.
    - 3 comments asked to the crossing to be locate further down Station Road
    - 2 comments disputed the need for the crossing and said that it would cause congestion and impede traffic flow during the winter months.

**Rosemary Lane**
- 30 comments were received regarding the proposed treatment of Rosemary Lane. Of these:
  - 14 comments opposed proposals to make Rosemary Lane one-way
  - 9 comments questioned potential displacement of traffic on to Cravengate, Newbiggin, Victoria Road and Bargate.
  - 1 comment each, suggested making: Bargate one-way; Newbiggin one-way; and, Rosemary Lane one-way in the opposite direction to that proposed.
  - 1 comment was concerned about the visibility exiting Newbiggin on to Cravengate.
  - 1 comment asked that indiscriminate parking on Rosemary Lane be addressed.
  - 1 comment supported the proposal.
Cycling

- 20 comments opposed the development of cycle facilities because:
  - Richmond is too hilly (7)
  - They only cater for a small minority (5)
  - They are not needed / will not be used (3)
  - They would not provide an obvious improvement (2)
  - They would decrease pedestrian access (1)
  - Too many road markings (1)
  - They would cause traffic congestion (1)
- 12 comments requested additional cycle routes, roads mentioned included:
  - Darlington Road (4)
  - Reeth Road (3)
  - The Channel (two-way)
  - Dial Road
  - Finkle Street (two-way)
  - Gilling Road
  - Victoria Road
  - Routes to Catterick Garrison
- 10 comments thought Mercury Bridge would be too narrow for cycle lanes and two-way traffic
- 9 comments requested improved cycle parking, the majority of these in the Market Place. Specific locations included outside the Green Howard Museum and outside Jacobs Takeaway. 1 comment complained about criminal damage to cycles left in the Market Place overnight.
- 7 comments complained about cycling on footways, stating that it is a danger, especially for the elderly.
- 5 comments requested improved routes to, and facilities at schools, 1 specifically noting Darlington Road.
- 2 comments thought that Station Road was too steep for cycling
- 1 comment asked for mandatory cycle lanes to prevent cars parking within them.
- 31 comments were received regarding the proposed cycle route across The Batts. Of these
  - 7 comments thought that mixing pedestrians and cyclists would be dangerous
  - 8 comments considered The Batts to be a family area, with 2 of these asking for careful planning of the route.
  - 2 comments asked for colour coding of the cycle route.
  - 2 comments asked for the cycles to be routed around the edge of The Batts.
  - 2 comment supported the proposed route across The Batts.
  - 1 comment asked for the path under Mercury Bridge to be improved for cyclists.
  - 1 comment thought that cyclists would not stay on the proposed route.
  - 1 comment thought that cyclists would use The Batts as a racetrack.
  - 1 comment expressed concern about the exit of the path on to Station Road.
  - 1 comment thought that the path was not needed.
  - 1 comment supported the option is provision was made for horse riders.
  - 1 comment thought that the option would be dangerous when icy in winter.
  - 1 comment asked for improvement to the path from The Channel to The Batts.
Residents Parking

• 32 comments were received requesting residents parking in additional areas, these are represented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bargate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Channel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Place</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Square</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Frenchgate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millgate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlegate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallowgate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbiggin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison Dieu</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Road</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Pl.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bargate already has a residents parking scheme

• 32 comments opposed the introduction of residents parking, because:
  • It is unfair to other residents’ (9), including 1 that suggested that it added to the value of property
  • Visitors and those wanting to stay for more than 2 hours would be deterred (13)
  • Do not want to pay charge (3)
  • Parking spaces would be lost (2)
  • There would be displacement to other roads (2)
  • It has not worked in the existing area (1)
  • Parking is restricted for non-residents and employees (1)
  • Residents knew about the lack of parking when they purchased their properties (1)

• 19 comments were received regarding the number of permits issued. Specific requests included:
  • Additional visitors permits (9), including 8 specifically asking for permits for B&Bs.
  • 2 permits per household (5)
  • 1 permit per household (1)
  • No visitors permits (1)
  • Visitors charged (1)
  • Permits issued free to residents without cars (1)

• 12 comments were received on who should be allowed to park within residents parking zones. Of these:
  • 9 comments wanted only residents
  • 2 comments requested non-residents for a maximum of 2 hours
  • 1 comment requested an exemption for doctors and nurses.

• 6 comments were made regarding the existing scheme on Bargate, 2 of these stated that the scheme needed to be revised, whilst 4 asked to the permits to be retained.

• 6 comments suggested that the use of the Yorke Square car park might increase.

• 3 comments questioned how the scheme would be enforced because the current warden patrol is inadequate.

• 2 comments asked the level of the charge for permits

• 2 comments asked that residents of Hurgill Road be allowed to use Nun’s Close car park for residents parking.

• 2 comments noted the proposal for residents parking on Frenchgate, 1 asking that parking be limited to one side of the carriageway, the other stating that it is currently used by council employees and their visitors.

• 1 comment requested that the time period of any proposed scheme be extended into the evening because of problems with people leaving vehicles and going to public houses in Richmond

• 1 comment requested that residential parking be introduced in all residential areas

• 1 comment asked for the construction of residents parking bays.
Option C
Option C aimed to improve facilities for those using public transport. Buses would continue to serve the Market Place but would no longer stop on the cobbles. A pedestrian area would be created around the obelisk to facilitate those waiting for and accessing buses, possibly including the provision of shelters. Interchange for bus passengers would take place at a new facility on Queens Road outside Friary Gardens. The public transport developments would also create an opportunity to reconsider the arrangement of space within the Market Place, including changes to the current arrangements for parking.

Creation of a bus interchange on Queens Road
- A number of responses were received voicing opposition to the construction of an interchange on Queens Road. Of the comments within these responses the following were mentioned a number of times:
  - Traffic turning right on to Dundas Street (73)
  - Obscuring Friary Gardens (46)
  - The physical space available (39)
  - Pedestrian vehicle conflict (22)
  - Fumes (15)
  - Congestion (17)
  - Noise (11)
  - Displacement of traffic (9)
  - Impact on businesses located on Queens Road (5)
  - Litter (5)
  - Too far to walk (5)
  - Vandalism (1)

- 29 comments suggested alternate locations for a bus interchange.
  - Nun's Close car park (possibly with a shuttle bus) (16)
  - Victoria Road car park (4)
  - Bus depot with a shuttle bus (5)
  - Yorke Square (2)
  - At the eastern end of the Market Place (1)
  - Between Pottergate and Dundas Street (1)

- 21 comments questioned the loss of parking spaces, in particular, those in the vicinity of the church and library.

- 12 comments supported the proposals with reservations. These were:
  - Protection of Friary Gardens (5)
  - Stopping buses (1) and coaches (2) entering the Market Place
  - Two lanes of traffic can be retained on the Friary Gardens side of Queens Road (3)
  - Traffic calming should be introduced (1).

- 5 comments asked that buses be relocated from the Market Place to Queens Road.

- 5 comments were received about coaches using the facility, 3 requested drop-off only and 2 that coaches not be allowed to use the facility

- 4 comments asked that buses not be allowed to lay over

- 3 comments requested that buses be kept in the Market Place.

- 3 comments questioned whether both the area around the obelisk and interchange were necessary.

- 2 comments supported the use of the Friary gardens side of Queens Road but without shelters.
Pedestrian area / shelters at the Obelisk

- 132 comments were received regarding the proposals to locate shelters at the Obelisk. These mentioned:
  - Visual intrusion (39)
  - Alternate design more in keeping with the town (39)
  - Vandalism (17)
  - Not liking those shown on the leaflet (12)
  - Adequate seating provision (8)
  - Shelters but not at the Obelisk (6)
  - Verbal abuse by “yobs” (5)
  - Shelters end up looking “tatty” (3)
  - Stops but not at the Obelisk (2)
  - Need a covered waiting area around the Obelisk (1)
  - CCTV is needed (1)

- 45 comments supported the retention of a public transport facility with the Market Place, including 2 who thought that trade may be reduced if buses were removed.

- 44 comments requested an interchange elsewhere within the Market Place, locations included
  - Trinity Church (29)
  - The Town Hall (14)
  - The old Spar shop (3)
  - The bottom end of the Market Place (2)

- 15 comments asked for buses to be removed from the Market Place

- 11 comments thought that the proposal would generate congestion within the Market Place

- 8 comments requested that buses not be allowed to wait at the Obelisk.

- 6 comments requested that coaches be restricted from entering the Market Place and a further 3 that coaches only be allowed to drop-off passengers.

- 5 comments asked how the proposed scheme would function on Market Day and a further 3, during the fayre.

- 3 comments asked for pick up only within the Market Place

- 3 comments suggested that up to 6 buses use the Market Place at any one time.

- 2 comments suggested the provision of shelters at the existing location.

- 1 comment supported an improved pedestrian area around the Obelisk.

Other bus related comments

- 12 comments requested the introduction of shelters at bus stops, of these 2 requested seating and the only specific location given was on Darlington Road opposite the school.

- 4 comments asked for better information provision

- 2 comments requested a service from Hurgill, Sycamore Avenue and residential areas into the town.

Reorganisation of the Market Place

- 55 comments requested that entry and exit to the Market Place be reconsidered. 48 of which wanted the current arrangements to be reversed (i.e. entry via King Street). 1 additional comment requested that each of King Street and The Channel be made two-way. Exits were suggested via The Channel (4) and Finkle Street/Rosemary Lane (4).
• 33 respondents commented upon the haphazard traffic flow within the Market Place, with 25 of these asking for the introduction of a one-way traffic flow.
• 28 comments requested elements of pedestrianisation within the Market Place. Of these:
  • The entire Market Place (21)
  • The top end of the Market Place (5)
• 22 comments requested a reduction of parking provision within the Market Place stating that it would reduce congestion and improve the centre of Richmond visually.
• 16 comments asked for parking charges within the Market Place, 2 of these suggesting that these charges should be the highest in the town, i.e. ‘premium spaces’.
• 10 comments stated that parking in the Market Place is currently problematic. Of these, 2 noted double parking in front of the castle, and 1, the frequent blocking of disabled parking spaces.
• 7 comments requested either free or reduced rate parking for residents.
• 6 comments asked for the ice-cream van to be removed because it is an eyesore.
• 6 comments only supported the proposals if the number of parking spaces was increased. 1 commenting that a reduction in spaces equalled a reduction in trade.
• 5 comments questioned the number of spaces in the taxi rank, whilst another suggested that only two taxi spaces be provided.
• 2 comments requested that the existing disc system be retained, whilst another 3 comments asked for the two hour parking restriction to be enforced, one of these stating that “people move their car after two hours or just nip back to change the time on their disc”.
• 1 comment asked for short-stay parking to be limited to each of 90 minutes, 60 minutes, 45 minutes, 30 minutes and 15 minutes within the Market Place.
• 1 comment thought that parking should be slanted whilst another considered this to be dangerous.
• 1 comment suggested that any changes to the Market Place would adversely affect the character of the town, whilst another, said that a combination of Options B and C would improve the appearance of the town.
• 1 comment complained of the obstruction caused by vehicles parking on the pavement and another that areas key to the disabled and blind are ignored. It was also suggested that additional dropped kerbs are required for motorised scooters.

Other comments

Parking

• 17 comments were received requesting car parking to be free within Richmond. Of these, 5 comments specified employees and 3 residents.
• 15 comments suggested that the peripheral car parks should be free of charge, with charging in the Market Place. Of these, 6 specified Nun’s Close car park. An additional 3 comments asked for charges in the latter to be reduced and a further 5 wanted use encouraged.
• 7 comments asked for limited public parking within the private Co-op store car park.
• 7 comments requested enforcement of existing parking restrictions, whilst additional restrictions were requested on:
  • Gilling Road
  • The Green
  • Hurgill Lane
- Maison Dieu
- Newbiggin
- Quaker Lane
- Rosemary Lane.

- 6 comments asked for increase parking provision, 3 of these requesting unlimited provision.
- 6 comments asked for the Station Road car park to be available for the public rather than just District Council employees.
- 5 comments asked that parking be restricted on Station Road between Mercury Bridge and Frenchgate.
- 4 comments requested the construction of a multi-storey car park.
- 3 comments asked for parking in the town to be made more difficult.
- 2 comments asked for a park-and-ride service from Nun’s Close.
- 2 comments noted that parking on Darlington Road in the vicinity of the schools is a problem.
- 1 comment asked for no changes to the existing parking regime.
- 1 comment requested the introduction of parking meters on Newbiggin.
- 1 comment asked for Victoria Road car park to operate on parking discs whilst another suggested that Richmond residents should be allowed to use disk for free parking in car parks.
- 1 comment said that parking in the centre should be restricted to residents and the disabled. Disabled spaces are also required in the vicinity of the library.
- 1 comment requested that employees park out-of-town.

**Signing**

- 7 comments were received related to signing. Better signing was requested to:
  - The Market Place (2)
  - Newbiggin from Victoria Road (1)
  - Pedestrian routes (1)
  - Yorke Square car park (1)
Appendix 9: Area Committee Report and NYCC Decision Record
NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

RICHMONDSHIRE AREA COMMITTEE

5 DECEMBER 2002

RICHMOND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

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

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

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

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Committee on 7 June this year, a report was presented which provided an update on progress on the preparation of the Richmond Traffic Management Strategy.

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

2.3 The consultation exercise comprised the following:-

- The distribution of 4,700 leaflets and questionnaires to all properties in Richmond and the adjacent area.
- Consultation with other authorities and representative groups.
- A one week exhibition in the Town Hall in Richmond Market Place from Friday 7 September. Staff were in attendance at the exhibition on the first two days to clarify the options being put forward and to answer any questions from the public.

A copy of the consultation leaflet is included with these papers to remind Members of the details of the proposals presented for public comment.

2.4 The summary of the overall response to this exercise is attached to this report as Appendix 1.
2.5 25% of the households and businesses have responded to the consultation. This is a good level of response and compares well with the response rate which can normally be expected in consultation exercises of this kind.

2.6 Many of the questionnaires were accompanied by detailed written comments, and in the case of many of the stakeholders and statutory consultees, more formal written submissions were made. A summary of the questionnaire comments is provided at Appendix 2. Comments have not been reproduced verbatim; rather, particular issues and categories of comment have been assembled together, and an indication of the numbers of respondents supporting or mentioning the issue is given.

2.7 In relation to the formal submissions from Statutory consultees and/or Stakeholders, these are attached as Appendix 3. Nine Statutory consultees/stakeholders have responded by completing the questionnaire. Therefore their responses have been included in Appendices 1 and 2.

3.0 INTERPRETATION OF RESPONSES

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

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

3.3 Option A focuses on improving road safety including the introduction of a 20 mph zone, and enhancing pedestrian and cycle facilities including from Nun's Close to the Market Place and across The Battls. It also includes the introduction of residents parking areas for upper Frenchgate, The Green and Cornforth Hill. These proposals included in Option A received a considerable level of support with 72% of responses supporting a 20 mph zone, 80% supporting pedestrian and cycle improvements and 78% being in favour of residents parking areas.

3.4 Option B which builds on Option A by extending the 20 mph zone in the central area of Richmond and improved routes for both pedestrian and cyclists between the Market Place and River Swale also received a significant level of support. 60% of respondents voted for the extended 20 mph zone whilst 70% supported improved pedestrian and cycle facilities between the Market Place and the Riverside.

3.5 The comments on Options A and B in Appendix 2 raise several concerns related to residents parking zones, number of permits to be issued, and enforcement which will need to be addressed in the development of any residents parking scheme. In addition, a number of comments on Options A and B raised issues relating to the proposed pedestrian improvements and the need for additional facilities for pedestrians. These will be considered during implementation of the approved strategy.
3.6 Given the level of support for Options A and B your Officers consider that these options should be adopted and those proposals which can be progressed should now be developed for implementation subject to appropriate consultation. The timing of these works will need to be subject to further review as part of the roll forward of the capital programme.

3.7 Option C which could be introduced with either Option A or Option B aims to improve facilities for public transport users within the centre of Richmond and rationalise parking within the Market Place. To achieve this requires the relocation of the public transport interchange from the Market Place to Queens Road, although two spaces would still be provided in the Market Place to enable buses to pick-up and set-down. An extended pedestrian space would be created around the obelisk. Depending upon the size of this space up to twelve additional parking spaces could be created in the Market Place.

3.8 Option C received considerable support from the questionnaire responses. 57% of respondents voted for a change in location of the bus and coach waiting facilities and 53% were in favour of the introduction of a bus interchange on Queens Road outside the Friary Gardens. In addition, 65% of respondents were supportive of the creation of a pedestrian waiting area around the obelisk in the Market Place, and 71% supported the reorganisation of parking within the Market Place. Members will also note from Appendix 2 that a large number of comments were received from the public on the questionnaire relating to the creation of a bus interchange on Queens Road, pedestrian area/shelters around the obelisk and the reorganisation in the Market Place.

3.9 As with the other options we have also had comments from several stakeholders and statutory consultees, some of which have not been in favour of some aspects of Option C. Their comments range from concerns regarding the type of materials that may be used to the choice of location. These groups include Richmondshire District Council, English Heritage, Richmond Civic Society, Business and Tourism Association and the Town Centre Forum. The District Council has commented that “They would welcome further work by your team to identify whether there are other candidates for parking and interchange facilities, but recognise the difficulties involved”.

3.10 Members will appreciate that whilst there is significant public support for Option C, several key stakeholders/statutory consultees have serious reservations about the scheme. Therefore it is the view of your Officers that it would not be appropriate for a decision to be taken on this option until further investigation/discussions have taken place. As part of this investigation, alternatives put forward by consultees to provide enhanced facilities for bus/coach users would be considered. Once this additional work has been completed a further report would be presented to a future meeting of your Committee so that Members can consider the way forward on Option C.
3.11 Members will recall that a sum of £50,000 is included in the Integrated Transport Capital Programme in the current financial year to enable a start to be made on implementing the Richmond Traffic Management Strategy. At your meeting in June of this year you identified a number of short term initiatives which could be implemented using the funding in this year’s budget. Further development of these initiatives has been undertaken, and it is anticipated implementation of the following scheme will commence shortly:

- Dropped kerbs and tactile paving in the whole of the study area.
- Bus stop improvements – Poles, flags, timetable cases, low floor boarding at key locations and on key bus corridors.
- Traffic Sign Audit, rationalisation and improvements.

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

4.0 FURTHER INFORMATION

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

4.2 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 great local concern, as underlined by the particularly high level of response to the public consultation exercise.

5.0 RECOMMENDATION

5.1 It is recommended that:

a) The current position on the short term measures identified in paragraph 3.11 be noted.

b) The Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee’s view that Option A, described in Paragraph 3.3 and shown on display Drawing No B9329/011/20B should be adopted.

c) The Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the Committee’s view that Option B, which adds to Option A as described in Paragraph 3.4 and as shown on Drawing No B9329/011/21B should be adopted.
d) Officers be requested to give further consideration to the responses received to the consultation on Option C, including the alternatives put forward to provide improved facilities for public transport users and to present a report to a future meeting of the Committee.

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

M O MOORE  
Director of Environmental Services

Background Papers - None

Author & Presenter of Report: G Cressey
NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

DECISION RECORD

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

THIS FORM SHOULD BE USED TO RECORD KEY DECISIONS TAKEN BY AN OFFICER (EITHER ALONE OR IN CONSULTATION WITH AN EXECUTIVE MEMBER) AND EXECUTIVE DECISIONS TAKEN BY AN INDIVIDUAL MEMBER. (One form per decision)

The following key decision has been taken:

That a traffic management strategy for Richmond be adopted which includes the proposals contained in Option A and Option B as described in the public consultation leaflet and as indicated on Drawing No's B9329/011/020B and B9329/011/021B which were displayed at the County Council's Richmondshire Area Committee on 5 December 2002.

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

On: 24 December 2002
(insert date decision taken)

Reasons for decision:

To enable the traffic management strategy for Richmond 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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed ..........................................
(Name) M O Moore
Directorate Environmental Services

Date 24 December 2002

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

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

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