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1. Introduction

North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC), in its role as the Highway Authority for Tadcaster, 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 Tadcaster is to be assured.

The overall aim for the Traffic Management Study for Tadcaster 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), the Selby District Local Plan, dated April 1999. 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.

Consultation has been carried out to ensure that the views of local people, Tadcaster Town and Selby District Council, Tadcaster Regeneration Group Partnership, 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 Tadcaster Study Area

2.1 Location

Tadcaster is located to the south-west of York on the A64, four miles to the East of the A1 and is one of a number of towns in the area that straddle the River Wharfe (Figure 1). The study area includes the built-up area in its entirety and is constrained by the A64 to the South. The area extends to encompass the junctions on the A64 providing links into Tadcaster (Figure 2).

Figure 1: Location Plan: Tadcaster in its regional context

2.2 Character of the Town

Tadcaster is characterised by an historic core to the West of the River Wharfe (Plate 1). Later areas of residential development abut the core to both the East and West. The developed area is to the North of the current alignment of the A64. The historic core is a conservation area with a number of Grade II listed buildings. It also serves as a small retail centre with a number of shops and a weekly market. In addition, there is a supermarket on the eastern bank of the River Wharfe. The breweries on the southern edge of the town centre dominate the skyline.
A market is held every Thursday on the Central Car Park, but only attracts a small number of stalls, and although taking up a number of parking spaces, does not lead to either significant parking problems or congestion. The market was relocated to Kirkgate for an experimental period early in 1998.

Facilities within the study area include: a library, police and fire stations; a meeting hall; medical and health centres; three primary schools; and, a range of indoor and outdoor sporting facilities. In addition to the breweries, Tadcaster has two main industrial areas, one located close to the town centre between Station Road and Leeds Road, and a second, close to the Tadcaster Bar interchange on the A64 at the eastern extremity of the town.

The principal tourist attractions are currently Tadcaster Viaduct and the Breweries, which operate tours if organised in advance.

**Figure 2: Tadcaster Study Area**

2.3 Demography

The population of Tadcaster is in the region of 6,200 housed in about 2,700 dwellings. Together, the three breweries employ in excess of 1,000 people.
2.4 Access

Access to Tadcaster by road is primarily on the A64 route between Leeds, York and Scarborough, which is carried on a bypass to the South of the town, or on the A659 to Boston Spa. Other routes include the A162 from Sherburn-in-Elmet and Ferrybridge.

Access to the rail network is provided at Ulleskelf, four miles to the South of the town, and from York, ten miles to the north-east of the town. A taxi journey from Tadcaster to York Station costs in the region of £14. The “Yorkshire Coastliner” bus service runs to and from Leeds, York, Malton, Scarborough and Bridlington at approximately 30-minute intervals, serving a number of stops in Tadcaster. Frequent bus services are also provided to Harrogate and Pontefract.

The town has a significant amount of off-street car parking spaces, parking on-street being more limited in the central area.

2.5 Historical Development

Settlement at Tadcaster is likely to have developed because of its location at a fordable point on the River Wharfe. Early in the second millennium, Norman barons constructed a small motte and bailey castle. Later, during the English Civil War on 3 December 1642, the Battle of Tadcaster was fought in the vicinity of the then stone bridge between Sir Thomas Fairfax and the Earl of Newcastle.
In more peaceful times, the main industry within the town has been brewing, which can date its history back to tax records from 1341. It is said that in about 1400, the best ale sold for 1 1/2d per gallon, a price that had doubled a century later. In more recent times, the Old Brewery was established in Tadcaster in 1758, and has been operated by the Smith family since 1847. Bass and Scottish Courage (part of the Scottish and Newcastle Group) also operate breweries in the town.

The Market in Tadcaster dates back to the 13th century and is understood to have originally been held on Kirkgate in the vicinity of the HSBC bank but is now found on the Central Car Park. The market was originally for the sale of agricultural produce being held on Wednesday, but by 1850 interest had begun to decline and the market was changed to Monday and then alternate Mondays.

2.6 Transport development

Tadcaster has been a fording point on the River Wharfe since Roman times, when known as Calcaria, it was a resting point for travellers on the eastern branch of the Great North Road between York and London. A wooden bridge is likely to have predated the first stone structure thought to have been in place by about 1200. The present bridge was constructed in around 1700, was widened in 1780 and in the 19th century.

Tadcaster was one of the first post-towns in England with up to fifty stagecoaches passing through in its busiest period, thirty of which changed horses. Its fortunes declined dramatically with the introduction of railways bypassing the town, but recovered after the opening of the North Eastern Company’s railway from Church Fenton to Spofforth via Tadcaster in August 1847 and later links to Wetherby and Leeds.

Tadcaster viaduct was built in 1849 as part of a direct line between Leeds and York, but the line was never constructed. From 1882 the viaduct was used to carry goods to and from a flour mill on the eastern side of the river. The viaduct was last used in 1955 and is now a Grade 2 listed structure belonging to the Town Council. The rail links to Tadcaster were closed in 1974.
3. Transport in Tadcaster

3.1 Main traffic generators

The main traffic generators in Tadcaster are shown in Figure 3. These include:

- The Breweries - which operate on a 24 hour, 7 day a week basis and also offer guided tours, the latter generating some tourist traffic.
- The industrial estates located between Leeds Road and Station Road and at Tadcaster Bar.
- Primary Schools - Tadcaster East County Primary, Tadcaster Riverside County Primary and Tadcaster St Joseph's Roman Catholic School.
- The Main Retail Area - which provides convenience shopping for local residents and also includes a Safeway superstore on the East side of the River Wharfe, in addition to a number of professional services.
- Leisure Facilities - including Tadcaster Community Swimming Pool, operated by a charitable trust, and indoor and outdoor facilities in the centre of the town. The swimming pool generates in excess of 200,000 one-way trips per year.
- The Bus Station discussed in section 3.4 and both the Central and Britannia Car Parks discussed in Section 3.9.

3.2 Major pedestrian activities

The main areas of pedestrian activity in Tadcaster are:

- York Road, Commercial Street, Bridge Street and High Street - linking the Bus Station, Car Parks, Safeway Superstore, commercial area and the Sam Smiths and John Smiths (Scottish Courage) Breweries.
- Chapel Street and Kirkgate - the core of the town, located either side of the Central Car Park to the North of the High Street.
- Leeds Road - linking the town centre with the residential areas to the west of the town and also forming a route to Tadcaster Grammar School.
- Station Road - linking Chapel Street and Kirkgate with the swimming pool, sport centre, industrial estate and also schools on Wetherby Road and Station Road.
- Wetherby Road - providing access to the Riverside Community Primary School, the western end of the Viaduct Walk and the Coors (Bass) Brewery.
- Stutton Road - providing access between Leeds Road and the residential area to the South West of the town.
The Viaduct Walk - an unsurfaced path, owned by the town council, linking the East and West banks of the River Wharfe, including an unofficial access to Wighill Lane through the grounds of the Barnardo’s Home.

These routes are described in detail in the Tadcaster Pedestrian Action Plan.

Pedestrian counts undertaken during 1998, on Station Road in the vicinity of the primary school recorded between 319 and 375 pedestrians in a 12-hour period. It is acknowledged that pedestrian counts may be desirable in other locations in the study area. Section 3.13 indicates a below average rate of pedestrian accidents in the study area.

There were 3 accidents involving pedestrians during the period 1 January 1999 to 31 December 2001. Accidents occurred when:

- A pedestrian ran across the puffin crossing on Bridge Street after the pedestrian cycle had ended;
- A pedestrian stepped in to the carriageway to retrieve an item of property; and,
- The wing mirror of a moving vehicle caught a pedestrian who was walking along the footway.

3.3 Major cyclist activities

There are numerous factors affecting levels of cycle use, including the provision of facilities, topography and weather. The levels of cycling at detailed locations in Tadcaster have been identified through historical traffic counts undertaken in the study area during 1998 (Table 1). It is felt that these counts are still reasonably representative of current conditions. In common with pedestrian activities, cycling activity is at its greatest within the bounds of the retail area showing in Figure 3.

Pedal cycle counts indicate that cycles account for 0.8% of road vehicles in Tadcaster. Therefore, it is of some concern that cyclists account for 16% of accidents resulting in personal injury.

There have been 8 accidents involving cyclists in Tadcaster during the period 1 January 1999 to 31 December 2001. Three of these accidents occurred on Bridge Street but there is no evidence of a common causal link. Accidents involving cyclists can be categorised as follows:

- Cyclist lost control (1);
- Motorist opened a car door in to the path of a cyclist (1);
- Collision between a cycle and motor vehicle at a junction (3); and,
- Other collision between a cyclist and motor vehicle (3).
Table 1: 12-hour Cycle Count Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/04/98</td>
<td>A659 Leeds Road, towards York</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/04/98</td>
<td>A659 Leeds Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards York</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards York</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards York</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is considerable potential for cycle usage in utilising the disused railway line to the north of the town, which will connect the residential areas in the East, to the brewery, industrial estate and town centre. However, there may be land access issues to resolve on the eastern side of the River Wharfe before an East/West cycle route can be implemented.

3.4 Public transport facilities and services

Tadcaster is served by a number of bus operators, providing services to and from Leeds, York, Malton, Wetherby, Harrogate, Boston Spa, Stutton, Sherburn-in-Elmet, Pontefract, Selby and the East Coast. The following comprises a summary of services:

- Service C1 - Tadcaster to Askham Bar Park and Ride via Bolton Percy - Two hourly.
- Service 78/78a - Tadcaster to Harrogate via Boston Spa, Thorpe Arch, Wetherby and Spofforth - Hourly.
- Service 87 - Tadcaster to York via Wighill and Healaugh - Infrequent.
- Service 491/492/493 - Tadcaster to Pontefract via Stutton, Ulleskelf, Church Fenton, Saxton, Sherburn in Elmet, South Milton and other villages to Ferrybridge and Pontefract - Hourly.
- Service 494 - Tadcaster to Selby - One service on Monday only.
- Service 840/842/843/845/X40/X54 (Coastliner) Half hourly service from Leeds to York and Malton via Tadcaster, with hourly services to Scarborough, Pickering, Whitby, Filey and Bridlington. Also serving York Railway Station.
The main bus station is on the East side of the river and was refurbished by NYCC early in 2003. A Rural Bus Grant is being utilised to enhance the Tadcaster-Pontefract corridor. A survey undertaken as part of developing the strategy identified 23 bus stops at other locations within the study area (Figure 4). The detail of this survey is included as Appendix 5, but in general, the stops are of varying quality and generally do not provide significant amounts of information about services.

**Figure 4: Bus Stop Locations**

![Bus Stop Locations Map](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

### 3.5 Rail

There is no direct rail link to Tadcaster. The nearest station is located at Ulleskelf, 4 miles from the centre of Tadcaster. This provides a limited number of local services to York (6 per day), Leeds and Sheffield. The journey time to York is between 12 and 17 minutes. The station at York is 10 miles from Tadcaster and has frequent connecting services to all parts of the national rail network.
3.6 Taxis

There is a taxi rank located in the Bus Station that has spaces for 2 taxis. Disabled people have reported problems of access to suitable taxis. It was reported in the Tadcaster Town News on 22 November 2001, that a first Hackney Carriage Licence had been issued for Tadcaster, to Calcaria Taxis.

3.7 Motorbikes

Count data for motorcycles using the A659 Leeds Road and Station Road, are detailed in Table 2. No information has been gathered relating to the number of motorcyclists parking in the town or the purpose of their journeys. There is currently no high visibility parking for motorcycles within the town.

Table 2: 12-hour Motorcycle Count Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/04/98</td>
<td>A659 Leeds Road, towards York</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/04/98</td>
<td>A659 Leeds Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/09/98</td>
<td>Station road, towards York</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards York</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards York</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 Major vehicle activities

There are two principal routes leading directly into Tadcaster:

- The A659, which runs East to West through the centre of town as York Road, Commercial Street, Bridge Street, High Street and Leeds Road, branching off North via Wetherby Road to Boston Spa; and,
- The A162 London Road from Sherburn in Elmet, also from the A64 via a limited access junction to the South of the town centre.

Traffic approaching the town from the West can leave the A64 at Headley Bar and travel on the A659. However, there is no eastbound access to the A64 here and traffic from the adjacent villages wishing to travel East on the A64 have to use the A659 into Tadcaster before picking up the A162 leading to the A64 interchange to the South of the town.
Traffic approaching from the East can leave the A64 at the junction with the A659 to the East of the town (Tadcaster Bar) or the junction with the A162 to the South. However, neither of these junctions have westbound access to the A64, so all westbound traffic must use the A659, through the centre of Tadcaster and out to the Headley Bar junction.

These flows are shown in Figure 5. Put simply, once a vehicle leaves the A64 to enter Tadcaster, for example a Heavy Commercial Vehicle (HCV) accessing one of the industrial estates or a brewery, if the driver wants to rejoin the A64 heading in the same direction then travel through the centre of the town is the only viable option.

**Figure 5: Traffic Flows Through Tadcaster**

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. North Yorkshire County Council, Licence No. LA076783, 1999.
Table 3 details traffic counts undertaken during 1998. The counts are for all types of vehicles travelling in a single direction.

The busiest roads are Station Road, Commercial Street, Bridge Street and High Street, with nearly 6000 vehicles recorded (eastbound and westbound) at the Commercial Street/ Mill Lane junction. The figures show that the majority of vehicles, between these junctions, over 2500, turn into Chapel Street to link onto Station Road and 3000 vehicles at the High Street/ Leeds Road junction.

Table 3: 12-hour Vehicle Count Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/04/98</td>
<td>A659 Leeds Road, towards York</td>
<td>2943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/04/98</td>
<td>A659 Leeds Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>2942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards York</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>1691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards York</td>
<td>2977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>3604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/98</td>
<td>Station Road, Towards York</td>
<td>3376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>3766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional count data for the central area of Tadcaster is show on drawing B9329/006/046, attached to this report.

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

Figure 6 shows the car parks and on street parking areas.

Car parking on public car parks is free and available in:

- Central car park (152 car spaces, reduced to 108 on Market Day - owned and maintained by SDC)
- Britannia car park (104 car spaces, 5 disabled bays and 2 taxi spaces - owned and maintained by SDC)

Car park occupancy is reported as follows:

- Central car park - reaches capacity about 9.15am although there is a constant movement of vehicles in and out, it remains at capacity until late afternoon.
- Britannia - generally spaces available throughout the day.
Free on-street car parking is available, limited to 30 minutes on Westgate, Bridge Street and Kirkgate.

On street parking is available after 6pm on High Street, Bridge Street, Chapel Street and Westgate.

Waiting restrictions are in place on many of the central streets in the town centre. These are detailed in Table 4.

**Figure 6: Public off-street and on-street parking**
Table 4: Waiting Restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Extent of Waiting Restrictions. Single/Double yellow lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Road</td>
<td>Parkland Drive through to Commercial street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Street</td>
<td>York Road through to Bridge Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
<td>Commercial Street through to High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>Bridge Street through to Leeds Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds Road</td>
<td>Start of Leeds Road through to Stutton Road/Leeds Road junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>Wetherby Road through to Westgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate/Westfield Crescent (part)</td>
<td>Station Road through to Kirkgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkgate</td>
<td>Westgate through to High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Street</td>
<td>Westgate through to High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph Street</td>
<td>Station Road through to Leeds Road/High Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10 One-way streets, roundabouts, weight-height-width-access restrictions, speed limits

A one-way system operates in the town centre. Chapel Street is one-way Northbound and Kirkgate and Westgate (from its junction with Chapel Street to Kirkgate) are one-way Southbound. All restricted traffic movements are associated with the one-way streets.

There are weight restrictions on Wighill Lane/Commercial street junction of 7.5 tonnes in a northerly direction towards Thorpe Arch and a similar weight restriction on the Wetherby Road travelling north towards Boston Spa.

The speed limit in the built-up area is 30mph, although a 20mph limit has recently been introduced in the vicinity of the primary school on Wetherby Road.

3.11 Traffic signals, pedestrian crossings and footways

There are two sets of traffic signals in Tadcaster. One at the junction of York Road, Wighill Lane and Oxton Lane, and a second at the junction of Commercial Street and Mill Lane. Both have dropped kerbs and tactile paving.

Two puffin crossings were constructed in Tadcaster during 2001. The first is located on Bridge Street (Plate 2) between Kirkgate and the bridge, and the second is located outside St Joseph’s RC Primary School on Station Road. The crossings are equipped with tactile paving and rotating tactile cones to facilitate use by the mobility impaired.
A footway survey has been carried out and is described as part of the Pedestrian Action Plan.

**Plate 2: Bridge Street Puffin Crossing**

### 3.12 Known traffic speed problems, law breaking and enforcement

Stakeholders have not identified speeding within the study area as a particular problem, nevertheless, vehicle speeds on the approaches to Tadcaster, particularly on York Road are considered to be high.

Within the central area it may be that traffic is moving at inappropriate speeds considering the potential for vehicle pedestrian conflict rather than at speeds in excess of current limits. Requests have been made for 20mph speed limits on Kirkgate/Westgate, High Street/Bridge Street/Commercial Street (to Mill Lane) and on Station Road, the latter to link with the existing zone on Wetherby Road.

There is a problem with motorists ignoring waiting restrictions. On closer observation, confusion exists between the current lining and signing of restrictions, a situation that needs to be rectified before issues relating to enforcement can be considered in any detail. Lack of enforcement results in road safety, congestion and other environmental problems.
3.13 Road traffic accidents

Fifty road traffic accidents resulting in injury were reported in the study area between January 1999 and December 2001. As previously noted, three of these accidents involved pedestrians and eight involved cyclists. Accident blackspots are defined by NYCC as locations with four or more accidents resulting in injury during the last three years. There are five such locations within the study area. These are detailed below.

- **High Street / Bridge Street**: 10 Accidents: 1 Serious and 9 Slight (including 2 pedestrian slight and 3 cycle slight).
  - Three of the accidents on this short section of road involved turning vehicles, although all at different locations. Two accidents were most likely speed related. Both accidents involving pedestrians were caused by pedestrians entering the carriageway without looking. In the remaining accidents: a cyclist was struck by the wing mirror of a moving vehicle; a car door was opened into the path of a cyclist; and, a driver was struck when standing beside a parked vehicle.

- **A659 at Toulston Grange**: 6 Accidents: 1 Fatal, 2 Serious and 3 Slight
  - This location is characterised by a bend with a centreline radius of approximately 65 metres. All of the accidents at this location were speed related. In the fatal accident a driver attempting to reduce speed locked their brakes and continued in a straight line off the carriageway.

- **In the vicinity of the Tadcaster Bar junction on the A64**: 6 Accidents: 3 Serious and 3 Slight.
  - Three of the accidents at this location (including one of the serious accidents) occurred when vehicles left the road having exited the A64 towards Tadcaster at excessive speed. Two of the remaining accidents occurred at the junctions between York Road and Turnpike Road, and York Road and Catterton Lane.

- **A162 London Road junction with A64**: 4 Accidents: 1 Serious and 3 Slight
  - All of the accidents had different causal factors. In one case each: wind was responsible for overturning a HCV on the A64 slip road; a head-on collision occurred at the top of the fly-over across the A64; a vehicle entering the A64 collided with a JCB; and, a vehicle on the A162 was in collision with a motorcyclist.

- **On the A64 at Headley Bar**: 4 Accidents: All Slight
  - Two accidents were caused when the lead vehicle in a line of traffic braked, in one case a driver lost control due to excessive speed and in the other a vehicle broke down on the slip road resulting in a rear-end collision with a following vehicle.
3.14 The views of the public

A stakeholder workshop was held in Tadcaster on 25th October 2001. 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:

- Pedestrian Issues - Potential for pedestrian/vehicle conflict is an issue, especially on market days. A request has been made for a 20mph zone, detailed in Section 3.12. The Vision for Tadcaster document published by Samuel Smiths Old Brewery proposes a revision of traffic flow within the historic core, allowing for the pedestrianisation of Kirkgate. The market would then be held within the pedestrianised area.

- Cycling - There is a lack of facilities for cyclists in Tadcaster. The provision of safe cycling routes will be considered as part of the Local Cycling Plan. This will include routes to schools, the possible use of the former railway viaduct and the provision of secure cycle parking facilities.

- Disabled Access and Mobility - There are many barriers for disabled people including wheelchair users and the visually impaired, making journeys into the central shopping, commercial areas and to other facilities. Key routes need to be identified, developed to a suitable standard and signed. Signing to disabled parking bays needs to be improved.

- Public Transport
  - There is a perceived lack of relevant public transport services with large commuting flows at 8am and 5pm not catered for by existing services. There is also limited if any access to community transport services.
  
  - The bus station improvement needs to incorporate the provision of facilities for both pedestrians and cyclists. Redevelopment will also need to remedy problems that have been identified with the current entrance/exit of the bus station on Commercial Street.
  
  - Existing traffic regulation orders at bus stops are not enforced and there is a general lack of shelters at stops around the town. A survey of the current state of bus stop facilities revealed stops without flags or information. For example on High Street, there is a bus shelter with no flag, no pole, no information and no road markings. It has to be recognised that bus stops form an individual’s first point of contact and thus initial perception of the local, regional and indeed national public transport network.
Motorised cross-town journeys - The stakeholder workshop identified a perceived problem of unnecessary cross-town journeys both by private cars and goods vehicles. It was thought that elements of this problem include:

- Traffic travelling between York and Boston Spa cut through the town;
- HCV's and vehicles from Sherburn cut through as best route to A1;
- Inadequate signing;
- No routes for HCV's to bypass town centre; and,
- The school run and school buses from York cause additional congestion in the town.
- Problems are exacerbated by the lack of bi-directional access at junctions on the A64

Off-street parking - Off-street parking both for cars and HCVs was perceived to be a problem. The latter has been remedied by Selby District Council who have banned the overnight parking of HCVs in the bus station.

- The limited parking on St Joseph's Street is considered by some to be too remote from the central area.
- The market is held on the Central Car Park (Plate 3) increasing demand for parking but reducing supply.
- Signing to car parks is inadequate
- Car parks provided by employers are reported to have egress problems which reduces their level of use.

Signing - In addition to signing to and from car parks, directional signing within the town needs to be reviewed (Plate 4). Such a review needs to incorporate the outcomes of this strategy, for example, any changes to pedestrian or cycling routes, traffic flow and parking.

Traffic Calming - The implementation of traffic calming measures need to take into account all road users including those driving and travelling on public transport.

Retail Servicing - Any traffic strategy for Tadcaster needs to recognise and cater for the essential servicing requirements of businesses and public facilities within the town.

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.
Plate 3: The Entrance to Central Car Park

Plate 4: Directional Sign on Kirkgate
4. Policies and Transport Objectives

4.1 Local Transport Plan Objectives

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

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

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

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

4.2 Local Transport Plan Local Objectives

Tadcaster is located in NYCC’s ‘Selby’ policy sub-area. To take account of the particular needs of the area, NYCC have set a number of local objectives within the LTP. These are:

- To manage the overall demand for travel into and through the area and to increase the use of accessible, affordable alternatives to car transport, such as walking, cycling and the use of public transport;
- To reduce the impact of non-essential HCV traffic in both the urban and rural areas;
- To improve road safety and reduce the annual number of road injury casualties; and,
- To enhance the infrastructure in order to underpin the major economic activities of the area.
4.3 Local Plan Developments and Constraints

Selby District Council controls land-use planning in Tadcaster. In relation to this study, reference has been made to the Selby District Local Plan dated April 1999, and also to the ongoing process of revision. The local plan contains a number of main objectives:

- To promote alternative forms of transport to the private motor car and to minimise the need to travel by appropriate location and layout of housing, employment and the other uses.
- To ensure that new development is served or could be served by satisfactory transport networks giving adequate access and taking into account public health, safety and energy/resource efficiency.
- To maintain and support the improvement of transport links while managing the roads network to provide a safe and efficient system to serve different functions.
- To promote appropriate traffic management measures to reduce pedestrian and vehicular conflict and enhance the local environment.
- To support and encourage, and, wherever possible, improve public transport services and associated facilities.
- To provide a better and safer environment for cyclists, pedestrians and those with mobility problems.
- To encourage movement of freight by rail and water as an alternative to road transport.
- To ensure that an appropriate level of car parking is available. (Selby has adopted the NYCC Standards Relating to Provision of Car Parking).

In relation to Tadcaster, there are a number of constraints to development, including:

- The West Yorkshire Green Belt which envelops the western edge of the town.
- The A64 bypass to the South of the town.
- The Magnesian Limestone Aquifer, which is used for extraction by all of the breweries.
- The water-main network in the town has limited additional capacity.

A number of development sites are present in the town including off Station Road and Mill Lane, but as yet no development has occurred. The town centre is within the Tadcaster Conservation Area and Castle Hill is a Scheduled Ancient Monument.
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 Tadcaster

The overall aim for the Town Centre Traffic Management Study for Tadcaster 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:

- Promote the improvement of junctions on the A64 with links to Tadcaster, in order to reduce unnecessary journeys through both the town and historic core;

- Identify and make necessary improvements to establish a network of signed preferred routes for pedestrians and the mobility impaired, between key attractors. The main ones being:
  - The historic core and commercial area;
  - Schools;
  - The bus station and supermarket;
  - Residential areas; and,
  - Key employment locations;

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

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

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

- Improve entry and egress from the Tadcaster Bus Station site;

- Implement remedial measures at known high risk accident location;

- Rationalise on-street parking in the commercial area;

- Eliminate as far as practicable, through traffic within the residential area;

- Review overnight lorry parking in Tadcaster; and,

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

NYCC Traffic Management Priority System

Identified problems and potential solutions to traffic issues in and around Tadcaster are collated by the NYCC Area Traffic Manager (ATM). The ATM prepares a report to the NYCC Selby Area Committee indicating priorities for action. The Committee decides which issues are worthy of further investigation. The only issue within the study area that is outstanding at the current time is a request for waiting restrictions in the area known locally as Islington, adjacent to the easterly junction on the A64.

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 Tadcaster, of relevance to the Traffic Management Strategy are detailed in Table 5.

Table 5: NYCC Programmed Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scheme</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Kerb Facilities</td>
<td>Tadcaster</td>
<td>£24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Station Improvement</td>
<td>Tadcaster</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Developing the Traffic Management Strategy

5.1 Identification of Options

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

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

- Option A - Improving Road Safety and Choice, including:
  - Upgrading of the existing footpath on Leeds Road, for unsegregated shared pedestrian and cycle use, between Garnet Lane and Toulston Grange
  - An extended 20 mph zone covering St Joseph’s Primary School, Swimming Pool, Central Retail Area and Tadcaster Bridge
  - The provision of an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing at Union Corner.
  - The provision of outbound cycle lanes on Leeds Road and Station Road
  - The upgrading of footpaths on Leeds Road, Station Road, through Station Industrial Estate and on to Wetherby Road.
  - The upgrading of zebra crossings on Leeds Road and York Road to ‘Puffin’ standard.
  - Re-alignment of the junction of Stutton Road at Leeds Road to improve egress for cyclists and crossing arrangements for pedestrians
  - Traffic Calming on Leeds Road, Stutton Road and York Road
  - Upgrading of the ‘Viaduct Walk’ for unsegregated shared pedestrian and cycle use, including the formalisation of access arrangements at the eastern end of Viaduct (Plate 5).
  - Provision of an improved footpath link from viaduct to swimming pool
  - The development of a network of signed cycle routes in the residential area to the East of the viaduct
  - Creation of advisory cycle lanes on York Road and an improved link on to the A64 cycle route.
  - Improved vehicle egress from the Bus Station site.
Plate 5: The Viaduct Walk

- Option B - Modified One-Way System, including:
  - Pedestrianisation of Kirkgate.
  - Southbound traffic using Chapel Street.
  - Northbound traffic using St. Joseph’s Street.
  - A residents parking bay at the North end of St. Joseph’s Street.
  - Traffic Calming measures to enforce the 20mph zone.
  - Possible traffic signal control at the junction of St. Joseph Street and Westgate.

- Option C - Two-way Traffic on St Joseph’s Street (Plate 6), including:
  - Pedestrianisation of Kirkgate.
  - Two-way traffic on St Joseph’s Street.
  - Removable bollards on Chapel Street to the North of the Central Car Park.
  - Access only on Westgate
  - A residents parking bay at the North end of St. Joseph’s Street.
• Traffic Calming measures to enforce the 20mph zone.
• Possible traffic signal control at the junction of St. Joseph Street and Westgate.

• Junction Improvements, including:
  • Provision of all vehicle movements at the A64 Tadcaster Bar Interchange.
  • Negotiation with the Highways Agency to provide missing turning movements at the A162 London Road and Headley Bar Interchanges.
  • Local safety improvements at the A659 Toulston Grange junction.

**Plate 6: St Joseph’s Street**

5.2 Stakeholder Workshop

These measures were presented to a stakeholder workshop held in Tadcaster on 8th May 2002, attended by 22 stakeholders and 4 NYCC officers. A full list of attendees is included at Appendix 2. Following the presentation the stakeholders were given the opportunity to discuss the measures in detail. Key elements of the discussion were:
• Short Term Complementary Measures
  • A pedestrian refuge was requested to the west-bound bus stop on York Road.
  • Directional signing from the A1 and through Boston Spa should be revised to discourage through traffic.

• Option A - Improving Road Safety and Choice
  • Support was received for:
    • The proposed traffic calming on York Road.
    • The extended 20mph zone in the Town Centre.
  • A request was made for a new pedestrian bridge across the river Wharfe. The likely cost of such a structure was thought to be substantial.
  • Support was received to investigate a wider footway on one side of the bridge and no footway on the other. A further suggestion was for shuttle working with traffic signals. It was thought that peak traffic flows would make this difficult to achieve.
  • It was agreed to include a 40mph buffer zone beyond the existing 30mph limit on Wighill Lane.
  • A 40 mph buffer zone on Leeds Road received support with additional pedestrian facilities at Union Corner. Lighting improvements should also be incorporated into this measure.

• Option B - Modified One-Way System
  • It was suggested that the scheme be implemented on a trial basis.
  • It was accepted that traffic signals would be needed to accomplish Option B, including at the junction of High Street and Chapel Street where visibility is limited.
  • Comprehensive traffic survey information was collected by NYCC and RPS Consulting. It was agreed that this be used to establish the likely impacts of changing traffic flows.
  • A request was made to display more options for consultation. This did not receive support from the stakeholders.
  • Parking should not obstruct emergency vehicles.

• Option C - Two-way Traffic on St Joseph’s Street
  • It was noted that for increased traffic flows on St Joseph Street, it would be desirable to widen the carriageway, either by localised narrowing of footways or the purchase of land from the Bowling Club.
• Access to the Methodist Church for funerals may be impeded by the introduction of bollards on Chapel Street.
• The concern was raised that the impact on residents and businesses on St Joseph's Street would be unacceptable.
• There was also concern about standing traffic waiting at traffic signals.
• A crossing point would be desirable in the vicinity of the Methodist Church.
• Could a new North - South road be created to take the traffic?

Parking Strategy

• The proposal to provide short stay parking in the Central Car Park was welcomed.
• There was no support for parking charges but a request was made to introduce two-hour disc parking.
• Concern was expressed about the Selby DC decision to remove HCV parking from the Britannia Car Park. It was thought that HCV parking was likely to be displaced to Safeway Car Park and Mill Lane.
• A suggestion was made to re-align the A162 West through the brewery car park.
• Widening footways on Bridge Street was requested

Junction Improvements

• Support was received for the proposed junction improvements.
• It was acknowledged that although the strategy was aimed at producing a 5 year programme junction improvements were looking to the longer term.
• Draft orders for improvements at Tadcaster Bar are likely to be published within 12 months.

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 are:
Short Term Complementary Measures

- The complementary measures include: the introduction of dropped kerbs and tactile paving on key pedestrian routes and the improvement of existing informal pedestrian crossing points and the upgrading of bus stops to a minimum standard including the provision of raised kerbs to aid boarding, the repair of existing and provision of new shelters and improved information provision.

Option A - Improving Road Safety and Choice

- At the core of Strategy Option A is the creation of an extended 20 mph zone from the existing zone on Wetherby Road, encompassing the eastern end of Station Road, Westgate, St. Joseph's Street, Chapel Street, Kirkgate, High Street, Bridge Street, Mill Lane and the western end of Commercial Street. The zone would cover the key areas of pedestrian/vehicle, cycle/vehicle and vehicle/vehicle conflict, both reducing the likelihood of such conflict and the severity of such conflict should it occur. The zone would incorporate appropriate signing and a number of traffic calming features, predominantly speed cushions and junction tables.

- On Leeds Road and Wighill Lane 40 mph buffer zones would be created between the national 60 mph speed limit and existing 30 mph zone. ‘Gateway’ features would be created at these points, also additionally at the 30 mph limit on York Road. Traffic Calming measures would be introduced on Wighill Lane and part of York Road. These minimalist measures would slow traffic on the approaches to the town.

- As part of enhanced pedestrian and cycle networks, the footpath on Leeds Road to Tadcaster Grammar School would be upgraded to facilitate joint pedestrian/cycle use and lighting the path would be considered. Additional footway improvements would be made on:
  - Leeds Road - Cutting back overgrown vegetation and sealing the existing footway on the northern side of Leeds Road and providing an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point at Union Corner. Also upgrading the link thought the industrial estate between Leeds Road and Station Road.
  - Station Road - Repairing the existing footway where necessary, providing additional uncontrolled dropped crossing points to tie in to the Public Right of Way network and to delineate a footway strip at the entrance to the Coors (Bass) Brewery.
  - Wetherby Road - Realign the footway around the corner from Station Road to Wetherby Road outside the brewery, removing the steps in the vicinity of the bus stop, providing access for all users including the mobility impaired.
• The Viaduct Walk, improving the surface of the route to allow formal joint pedestrian/cycle use, and creating a permissive path through the grounds of the Barnardo’s Home, reinstating the boundary fence through the copse where neighbouring properties have encroached.

The existing zebra crossings on York Road and Leeds Road would be upgraded to ‘Puffin’ crossings. Pedestrian and cycle signing would also be introduced to raise awareness of routes and encourage use of these non-motorised modes.

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

• A box junction would be provided to aid egress from the bus station.

• Option B - Modified One-Way System

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

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

• The junctions of High Street with Chapel Street and St. Joseph’s Street will be signalled to improve safety and allow for turning movements by large vehicles.

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

- Option C removes the existing one-way system with two way traffic being retained on St. Joseph’s Street. As with Option B, Kirkgate would be part pedestrianised.
- Chapel Street would have a closure part way along its length.
- The option would also operate within a 20 mph zone; complementary traffic calming measures would be introduced; and the two junctions of St. Joseph’s Street and Chapel Street with High Street would be signalised.
- All junctions in both Options B and C have been designed and tested to cope with both current and predicted future traffic levels.

Parking Strategy

- Selby District Council has funds available for the improvement of both the Britannia and Central Car Parks. Proposals forwarded by Samuel Smiths Old Brewery include the creation of additional car parking spaces at Shaun House and on Robin Hood’s Yard. As additional long-stay spaces are created, particularly on Robin Hoods Yard, a number of spaces would be converted to short-stay within the Central Car Park in order to encourage greater turnover. In parallel, the number of spaces on High Street and Bridge Street could be reduced, creating the potential to allocate additional space for pedestrians, cyclists and environmental improvements.

Junction Improvements

- The first priority for improvement is the Tadcaster Bar junction, which is a committed Highway Agency Improvement Scheme. Agreement has been reached with the Highways Agency to modify this scheme to permit all vehicle-turning movements. It is recognised that improvements are also required at the A162 and Headley Bar junctions. These are subject to future negotiations with the Highways Agency.

5.4 Public Consultation

The measures and options described above were presented on a leaflet distributed to 85 stakeholders and statutory Consultees and 3416 households and businesses within the Tadcaster Area, during the week beginning 15 July 2002. This leaflet was accompanied by a questionnaire, and both are included in this report as Appendix 8.

An exhibition was held between Friday 19th July and Thursday 1st August in The Ark, Kirkgate, Tadcaster. Both Mouchel and NYCC manned this exhibition on Friday 19th and Saturday 20th July.
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 10th July.

Rival leaflets were distributed by the Tadcaster Chamber of Trade and Commerce on 17th July, and another by the Residents and Businesses of St Joseph’s Street on 19th July. The former urged people to support Option C and not support Option B, whilst the latter urged people to support Option B and not support Option C. Both are included in Appendix 8.

1041 questionnaires were returned within the response period, representing a response rate of 29%, including 34 questionnaires completed on the internet. An additional 28 questionnaires were received from those distributed at the exhibition.

5.5 Summary of Consultation Responses

Option A - Improving Road Safety and Choice
- 73% of respondents supported Option A, 15% did not support this option and 7% did not register an opinion.

Option B - Modified One-Way System
- 49% of respondents supported Option B, 41% did not support this option and 8% did not register an opinion.

Option C - Two-way Traffic on St Josephs Street
- 38% of respondents supported Option C, 51% did not support this option and 11% did not register an opinion.

Parking Strategy
- 81% of respondents supported the proposed Parking Strategy. 9% did not support the strategy and 10% did not register an opinion.

Complementary Measures

The level of support for complementary measures
- 89% - Upgrading of bus stops and associated information
- 88% - Improvement of existing informal pedestrian crossing points
- 86% - Dropped kerbs and tactile paving
Additional Detailed Comments

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

6. The Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy

The consultation results were reported to the North Yorkshire County Council Selby Area Committee on 11th September 2002. The report asked members of the committee for support of the following proposals:

- Introduction of dropped kerbs and tactile paving
- Improvement of existing informal pedestrian crossing points
- Upgrading of bus stops and associated information.
- Parking Strategy - Including the upgrading of the Britannia and Central Car Parks by Selby District Council. The Creation of Parking areas at Shaun House and in Robin Hoods Yard by Samuel Smiths Old Brewery and the removal of some on-street parking and improvement of pedestrian and cycle facilities by North Yorkshire County Council.

- Option A - Including:
  - The creation of an extended 20mph zone in the town centre;
  - Various traffic calming measures, including on York Road, Wighill Lane and Stutton Lane;
  - Upgrading of pedestrian crossings on York Road and Leeds Road;
  - Pedestrian and cycle improvements including some minor junction modifications.

- Option B - Involving one-way operation southbound using Westgate and Chapel Street, and one-way northbound on St Josephs Street.

- Junction Improvements - That NYCC hold further discussions with the Highways Agency with the aim or securing improved connections to the A64 at the A162 junction, in addition to the further enhancement of the Tadcaster Bar Interchange.

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

The North Yorkshire County Council Director of Environmental Services, Mike Moore, made an executive decision on 1 October 2002 as follows.
1. That the parking strategy for Tadcaster, as set out in the public consultation leaflet, and shown on drawing no B9329/006/025A, be adopted, to be implemented on a phased basis involving partnership with Selby District Council and the relevant land owners where necessary, and

2. A traffic management strategy for Tadcaster be adopted which includes the proposals contained in Options A and B, as described in the public consultation leaflet and as indicated on the drawings B9329/006/020A and B9329/006/023A which were displayed at the Area Committee on 11 September 2002.

The alternative strategy “C” as described in the consultation leaflet and in the report to Area Committee of the 11 September 2002 was rejected in favour of Option “B”.

Drawing nos. B9329/006/20A, B9329/006/23A and B9329/006/25A are attached to this report.

6.1 Implementation of the Strategy

A phasing programme has been devised to implement the Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy. This is summarised in Table 6, and sets out the main measures and options, the timescale for implementation and current estimated cost of the project. North Yorkshire County Council’s Selby Area Committee has agreed the programme and an officer group has been established to oversee the implementation of the study.
Table 6: Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy - 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>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - Station Road</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - Wetherby Road</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement - Leeds Road to Station Road</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway and Crossing Point improvements - Leeds Road</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Zebra Crossing to Puffin - York Road</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>£41,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Zebra Crossing to Puffin - Leeds Road</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£41,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Parking - Central Area</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Pedestrian/Cycle Path - Leeds Road</td>
<td>2004/05/06</td>
<td>£205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Pedestrian/Cycle Path - Viaduct Walk</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
<td>£14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Town Cycle Route</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
<td>£41,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrianise Kirkgate and Alter One-Way System</td>
<td>2004/05/06</td>
<td>£341,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30mph gateway feature - Leeds Road</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and 40mph gateway feature - Wighill Lane</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming and 40mph buffer zone - Leeds Road</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming and Cycle Lane - York Road</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming - Leeds Road</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Area Traffic Calming and 20mph Zone</td>
<td>2003/04/05</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming - Wighill Lane</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming and Bus Boarders - Stutton Road</td>
<td>2006/11</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing Audit</td>
<td>2003/04/05</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Improvements</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Strategy</td>
<td>2004/05/06-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTION A - IMPROVING ROAD SAFETY AND CHOICE

Key:
- Bus stop improvements
- 20 mph zone + traffic calming
- Pedestrian route improvements
- Traffic calming
- Cycle Routes
- Cycle stands and lockers
- Pedestrian crossing location
- Gateway Feature

Project: Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy

Mouchel North Yorkshire

Options:
- Outbound advisory cycle lane on existing carriageway
- Upgrade viaduct walk for joint pedestrian/cycle use
- Footpath upgraded to unsegregated shared use with potential for lighting improvements
- Footpath upgraded to unsegregated shared use with potential for lighting improvements
- 20 mph zone extended to cover:
  - St John's Primary School
  - Swimming Pool
  - Central Retail Area
  - Tadcaster Bridge
- Formalisation of access across private land
- Potential cycle route widening through planned residential development
- Upgrade existing footpath to unsegregated joint use
- Path linking existing with cycle gateways
- Outbound advisory cycle lane on existing carriageway
- Bus station improvements
- Pedestrian crossing location to aid cyclist turning right from Station Road
- Outbound advisory cycle lane on existing carriageway
- Pedestrian crossing location to aid cyclist turning right from Station Road
- Bus station improvements
OPTION B - MODIFIED ONE-WAY SYSTEM

Existing pedestrian crossing

Pedestrianised area
Raised table
Thermoplastic marking
New kerb alignment

Alternate Junction layout with traffic signals
Appendix 1: Consultants Brief
CONSULTANTS BRIEF FOR THE PRODUCTION OF A TOWN CENTRE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR TADCASTER

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This brief sets out the requirements for undertaking an analysis of the issues involving all modes of transport in a market town in 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 up to 6 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 key partner organisations in consultation with Officer Sub-Group, make contact with invited to and arrange first study partnership meeting.  

**Aim of Meeting** – To identify current problems and issues. |
| 5     | Production of current problems and issues chapter | It will be the responsibility of the Consultant to ensure that the study partnership meeting agrees 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 partnership meeting, 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 second 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. |
<p>| 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. |</p>
<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 third study partnership meeting should then be arranged to discuss any suggested amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aim of meeting</strong> - To secure agreement to the detailed draft strategy, and agree the method of public consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other consultations</td>
<td>The draft of the document incorporating stages 1-6 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The response to this round of public consultation must be collated and appropriate responses formulated prior to the production of any amendments to the draft document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The draft should be circulated to the Partnership Group if it is agreed with the Client Officer Group there are any significant changes arising from the public consultation stage. A 4th partnership meeting would, in this eventuality, need to be organised to discuss and agree any changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The draft document must then be reported to the 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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.
Appendix B1 – Pedestrian Action Plan

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

The report should include the following sections.

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

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

Appendix B2 – Local Cycling Plan

A stand alone Local Cycling Plan for Tadcaster 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: Tadcaster Workshop Attendees
Workshop Attendees 25th October 2001

Stakeholders

County Councillor Jean Ashton
County Councillor Chris Metcalfe
Mrs E Scothern - Selby District Council
Mr Percival - Chamber of Commerce
Mr N Robson - Samuel Smiths
Mr Gillot - Arriva Yorkshire
Mrs Costelloe - Harrogate District Community Transport
Mr Mullins - Yorkshire Coastliner
TC Martin Hemenway - North Yorkshire Police
Mrs Eccles - Selby District Rural Transport Partnership
Mr George Peach - Confederation of Passenger Transport
Mr Ralph Brough - Cycling Group
Mr & Mrs R Rooke - R Rooke Ltd
Mr T Kingston - Riverside Primary School
Sub Officer Hoskins - NY Fire and Rescue

NYCC

Stewart Hurst - Group Engineer Traffic Management
John Laking - Passenger Transport Group
Colin Jackson - Selby Divisional Engineer
Steve Boyne - Area 4 Traffic

Mouchel

Rob Turnbull
Alan Bunting
Debbie Swatman
Lee Foulner
Workshop Attendees 8th May 2002

Stakeholders
County Councillor Jean Ashton
County Councillor Chris Metcalfe
County Councillor John Duggan
Mr & Mrs R Rooke - R Rooke Ltd
Alan Travena - NY Fire and Rescue
Bob Hoskins - NY Fire and Rescue
Mr Ralph Brough - Cycling Group
Mr Mike Knowles - RPS Consulting (For Samuel Smiths)
Mr Peter Bentley - Samuel Smiths
Mr Dave Maher - Highways Agency
Gordon Spencer
John Notley
Richard Burton
Joan Clarke
Amanda Goodechild
Richard Threekin
Patrick Tunney
Richard Sweeting
Kate Taylor
Simon Glazier
Adam Tomlinson

NYCC
Stewart Hurst
John Hodgson
Andrew Bainbridge
Steve Boyne

Mouchel
Alan Bunting
Rob Turnbull
Colin Brown
Matt Steele
Nigel Bradbury
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1. **Introduction**

1.1 This Pedestrian Action Plan has been produced in parallel to the Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy, adopted by North Yorkshire County Council on 1\textsuperscript{st} October 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 Drawings B9329/006/026 and B9329/006/027.

2. **Objectives**

2.1 North Yorkshire County Council 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, particularly for disabled users, 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. The Plan should also identify all improvements necessary to comply with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA).
3. **Principal Facilities**

3.1 **Town Centre** - This area provides the local facilities needed by both the residents of Tadcaster and the wider rural community. Facilities available include: shops; public houses; a community office; banks; a post office and the bus station. A local market is held every week on a Thursday, and is currently located on the northern edge of the central car park.

The major pedestrian activity is concentrated within an area including: Station Road; High Street; Chapel Street; Kirkgate; Bridge Street and Commercial Street. Pedestrian activity is increased on market day.

3.2 **Tourist attractions** - Although there are no major tourist attractions within the town, the breweries do offer guided tours if booked in advance.

3.3 **Leisure facilities** - Include a swimming pool accessed off Westgate and Sports Centre off Station Road. There is also a bowling club on St. Joseph’s Street.

3.4 **Residential Areas are:**

- To the south-west of the town, between Leeds Road and Stutton Road.
- To the west of the town, north of Leeds Road and including developments on and accessed off Station Road and Wetherby Road.
- To the East of the River Wharfe, both to the north and south of York Road.

3.5 **Education** - Tadcaster has one secondary school (Tadcaster Grammar School) located approximately 1 mile to the west of the town, and three primary schools located on Wetherby Road (Riverside Community Primary School), Station Road (St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School) and off Grange Avenue (Tadcaster East Community Primary School). A pedestrian count in the vicinity of St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School, undertaken during 1998, recorded between 319 and 375 pedestrians in a 12-hour period.
3.6 Employment Centres - Large employment centres within the town are the three breweries, Samuel Smiths, Coors and John Smiths as well as a number of small shops and businesses. There are two industrial Estates, one to the north of the Tadcaster Bar junction of the A64 to the east of the town, and the other to the west of the town centre between Station Road and Leeds Road.

3.7 Three accidents were recorded involving pedestrians between 1999 and 2001. In the first, a pedestrian ran across the puffin crossing on Bridge Street after the pedestrian phase, in the second a pedestrian entered the carriageway to retrieve an item of property and in the third a pedestrian was clipped by a vehicle wing-mirror on Wetherby Road at a location with footway widths of 1.6m. Preventing such accidents would be difficult without the introduction of intrusive engineering measures such as long sections of pedestrian guard rail.

4. Pedestrian Routes

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

A. York Road, Commercial Street, Bridge Street, High Street - This route is the main traffic arterial route of the town. The route links the residential area to the east of the River Wharfe with the town centre. A large Safeway supermarket and Tadcaster Bus Station are located on the east bank of the River. Typical footway widths on this section are between 1.5m and 2.0m. The maximum width recorded in the vicinity of the Leeds Arms on York Road was 3.65m. The only location where the width falls below 1.2m is on Tadcaster Bridge where widths vary between 1.35m and 1.10m. It is not feasible to widen the footway on Tadcaster Bridge without removing the footway from one-side and undertaking detailed analysis of loadings on the structure. Pedestrian use of the bridge is also evenly split between the northern and southern footway, serving the Safeway supermarket and Tadcaster Bus Station respectively. Signal controlled working would not be acceptable with existing traffic volumes in peak periods (Plate 1).
B. Chapel Street and Kirkgate - The Central Car Park is located between these two streets, generating a considerable amount of pedestrian activity, including to the two breweries located to the south of High Street. The streets also form the core of the town centre providing a number of shops and facilities as well as housing. Pedestrian activity increases on Thursday with the operation of the market on the car park. The maximum footway width on these streets is between 1.8m and 2.0m whilst at pinch points, notably bay windows of buildings, this falls to between 1.0m and 0.7m. A key element of ‘Strategy Option B’ is to improve conditions for pedestrians within this area and will also remove a number of pinch points on St. Joseph’s Street, where the footway width on the West side is reduced to 0.58m at the entrance to the Bowling Club Plate 2).
C. *Leeds Road* - This route links the town centre with the residential areas to the west of the town. It is also forms a direct route to Tadcaster Grammar School. A home for the elderly is located on the north side of Leeds Road, equidistant between Station Road and Stutton Road. Beyond the built-up area the path is initially 1.70m in width (Plate 3), but this falls to as little as 0.5m further towards Toulston Grange, where the surface on the path is also poor.

D. *Station Road* - This route links the north ends of Chapel Street and Kirkgate with the swimming pool, sports centre, industrial area to the south of Station road and the Coors Brewery, with the adjacent residential areas. The route is also used by school children accessing the schools on Wetherby Road and Station Road. An important pedestrian route also links Station Road and Leeds Road (at Stutton Road) through the industrial area. A typical footway with on Station Road is 1.4m.
Plate 3: Leeds Road - Pedestrian route to grammar school on south side

E. **Wetherby Road** - This route runs from Station Road out to the north of the town. The route provides an access to the Coors Brewery and the Riverside Community Primary School. It also provides a link to the western end of the viaduct walk. Footway widths on Wetherby Road vary between 1.75m and 1.90m, although the footway alignment between Station Road and Wetherby Road is not ideal with steps leading to the bus stop.

F. **Stutton Road** - This route (Plate 4) provides access from the residential area to the south west of the town with the town centre. It also provides an important link to Stutton, located to the south of the A64. Footway widths vary between 1.75m and 1.90m
Plate 4: Stutton Road - Looking South

Plate 5: Viaduct Walk - Looking east across the viaduct
G. **Viaduct Walk** - The viaduct walk (Plate 5) is currently an unsurfaced path of width 2.4m, provided by the Town Council who own the former railway viaduct across the River Wharfe. The path lacks an official access at the eastern end. Over many years an unofficial route has evolved through the grounds of the Barnardo’s Home. This has formed a useful cross-town route linking both residential areas and employment areas. Improvement of this route would not result in NYCC taking over any responsibility for maintenance of the viaduct.

5. **Proposals and Consultation**

5.1 The problems and issues regarding all modes of transport were identified at two stakeholder workshops in Tadcaster, through observations and 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 were proposed.

5.3 ‘Strategy Option A’ was designed to improve road safety and encourage cycling and walking for those travelling around Tadcaster. Measures within option ‘A’ included:

- An extended 20mph zone from the existing zone on Wetherby Road, encompassing the eastern end of Station Road, Westgate, St Joseph’s Street, Chapel Street, Kirkgate, High Street, Bridge Street, Mill Lane and the western end of Commercial Street.

- Traffic calming measures on Wighill Lane and part of York Road.

- The footpath improvement on Leeds Road to Tadcaster Grammar School, upgraded to facilitate joint pedestrian / cycle use (lighting would be considered). Additional footway improvements on Leeds Road, Station Road, Wetherby Road and to the Viaduct Walk, the latter being upgraded to facilitate joint pedestrian / cycle use.

- The existing zebra crossings on Leeds Road and York Road would be upgraded to Puffin crossings.
5.4 'Strategy Option B' modified the one way system with traffic travelling northbound on St. Joseph’s Street and southbound on Chapel Street, whilst ‘Strategy Option C’ provided for two-way traffic on St. Joseph’s Street with a point-closure on Chapel Street. As part of both options ‘B’ and ‘C’ part of Kirkgate was pedestrianised and the junctions of Chapel Street and St. Joseph’s Street with High Street, signal controlled with pedestrian facilities. Either option would operate within a 20mph zone.

5.5 In addition to the strategy options, a number of general improvements were proposed for pedestrians. These included the introduction of dropped kerbs and tactile paving on key pedestrian routes, and improvements to existing informal pedestrian crossing points.

5.6 Public consultation was undertaken during July 2002 and included the distribution of a leaflet and questionnaire to 85 stakeholders and 3416 addresses within the Tadcaster Area. A public exhibition was held in ‘The Ark’, Tadcaster, between Friday 19 July and Thursday 1st August. The information and a response form were also placed on the Internet.

5.7 The response rate to the postal survey was 29% and a number of additional responses and comments were received from visitors to the exhibition. The following results were obtained.

- Support for ‘Strategy Option A’ - 73%
- Support for ‘Strategy Option B’ - 49%
- Support for ‘Strategy Option C’ - 38%
- Support for the introduction of dropped kerbs and tactile paving - 86%
- Support for the improvement of existing informal pedestrian crossing points 88%

5.8 Given the levels of support, ‘Strategy Option A’ and ‘Strategy Option B’ were adopted by North Yorkshire County Council on 1st October 2002.
5.9 66 additional comments concerned with pedestrian issues were received through the consultation process.

- 22 respondents commented on the inadequate width of footways in the centre of the town. Of these, specific locations included:
  - footway across the bridge (10)
  - Kirkgate (4)
  - Westgate Road (3)
  - High Street (5)
- 34 respondents requested improved pedestrian crossing facilities, specific locations included:
  - Station Road near the Fire station (13)
  - Leeds Road (5)
  - Union Corner (5)
  - Stutton Road (4)
  - York Road (3)
  - Chapel Street (2)
  - St. Joseph’s Street (2)
- 7 respondents supported the improvements on Leeds Road to Tadcaster Grammar School, with an additional 3 supporting improved lighting of this route
- 7 respondents requested alteration to Leeds Road/Stutton Road crossing as it was located in a dangerous position with speeding traffic unaware of the crossing hidden by blind bend.
- 6 respondents opposed the introduction of tactile paving as it increased the chance of slipping
- 6 respondents commented on their support for any improvements made to Tadcaster pavements
• 5 respondents did not support the introduction of any more pedestrian crossings

6. Summary

6.1 Key pedestrian routes in Tadcaster 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.
## APPENDIX A - Summary of the Pedestrian Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A** York Road, Commercial Street, Bridge Street and High Street | A1 – Provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at required locations.  
A2 – Upgrading of existing zebra to a puffin crossing. |
| **B** Chapel Street and Kirkgate | B1 - Option B - Detailed design to remove pedestrian pinch points on St. Joseph’s Street. |
| **C** Leeds Road | C1 – Provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at required locations.  
C2 – Option A - upgrading of existing zebra crossing to a puffin crossing.  
C3 - Option A - Cut back vegetation on northern footway and slurry seal.  
C4 - Provide uncontrolled pedestrian point on Leeds Road at Union Corner.  
C5 - Option A - Improve footway to Grammar School for joint pedestrian and cycle use. Provide appropriate lighting as required. |
| **D** Station Road | D1 – Provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at required locations.  
D2 – Improve path between Station Road and Leeds Road through Station Industrial Estate. |
| **E** Wetherby Road | E1 - Consider realigning footway at corner of Station Road and Wetherby Road. |
| **F** Stutton Road | F1 – Provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at required locations.  
F2 - Resurface footway at Leeds Road |
| **G** Viaduct Walk | G1 – Option A.  
Provision and upgrading of Viaduct Walk to allow for joint pedestrian and cycle use, creating a direct route between Wetherby Road and York Road. |
## APPENDIX B - Summary of Pedestrian Action Plan Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Crossing Upgrade - York Road</td>
<td>Option A - Upgrade existing Zebra crossing on York Road to Puffin Standard</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Crossing Upgrade - Leeds Road</td>
<td>Option A - Upgrade existing Zebra crossing on Leeds Road to Puffin Standard</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Footway Maintenance - Leeds Road</td>
<td>Siding, widening and slurry sealing of existing footway on north side of carriageway</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4/D2/E1</td>
<td>Footway Improvements</td>
<td>Footway improvements including provision of an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing on Leeds Road at Union Corner and re-alignment of the footway around the Coors Brewery at the junction of Station Road and Wetherby Road</td>
<td>£32,000</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Joint use path to Tadcaster Grammar School</td>
<td>Joint use pedestrian and cycle path to be created between Union Corner and Tadcaster Grammar School, with appropriate lighting</td>
<td>£205,000</td>
<td>2004-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Viaduct Walk</td>
<td>Improvement of the viaduct walk to allow joint pedestrian and cycle use with a new access provided at the eastern end</td>
<td>£14,600</td>
<td>2006-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1/C1/D1/F1/F2</td>
<td>Dropped Kerbs and Tactile Paving</td>
<td>Dropped Kerbs, tactile paving and raised crossings to be provided as identified by the Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>2002/03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 Tadcaster Cycling Plan has been developed as part of the Tadcaster 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 both Members and Officers of North Yorkshire County Council, and:

- Selby District Council
- Tadcaster Town Council
- Selby District Rural Transport Partnership
- Local Cycling Representatives
- North Yorkshire Police
- North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
- Arriva Yorkshire
2. Cycle Routes, Problems and Opportunities

2.1 Tadcaster is located approximately 10 miles to the south west of York on the A64, and four miles East of the A1, and is one of a number of towns in the area that straddle the River Wharfe. Bramham, Boston Spa, Thorpe Arch, and the nearest Rail Station at Ulleskelf are all within easy cycling distance, the topography around Tadcaster being largely flat. Tadcaster is characterised by an historic core to the West of the River Wharfe and North of the A64, with more recent areas of residential development to both the East and West of the core. Tadcaster serves as a small retail centre with a supermarket on the eastern bank of the river, a number of small shops and a weekly market. The main employers are the breweries that dominate the town’s skyline.

2.2 Although many local journeys in Tadcaster are within walking distance, the linear form of the town means that some cross-town journeys are more suited to cycle or car. The secondary school serving Tadcaster (Tadcaster Grammar School) is also located about a mile to the west of the built up area near Toulston Grange. There is evidence of both utility and seasonal recreational cycle use within the town and a number of 12-hour cycle counts were undertaken in 1998. These are detailed in Table 1 and have been used as the basis for setting a target to increase cycle use in Tadcaster through to 2010. There is also an existing cycle track running adjacent to the A64, used by a number of commuters between York and Tadcaster.
2.3 The area around Tadcaster lends itself to recreational cycling and thus, a number of cyclists use the town’s car parking, shopping and refreshment facilities. Both on-road cycling and off-road cycling (using the local network of bridleways) are possible.

2.4 Tadcaster is on the proposed route of National Cycle Network Route 66, the line of which passes through the town on its way between York and Wetherby. This would include the provision of access to the former rail viaduct from the East.

2.5 Secure cycle parking in Tadcaster is currently limited to a number of ‘Sheffield’ type stands located at the leisure facilities and recently incorporated into the bus station redevelopment. There are no other secure cycle parking facilities for either utility or recreational cyclists.

2.6 There were 8 road traffic accidents involving cyclists in Tadcaster recorded during the period 1 January 1999 to 31 December 2001. Three of these accidents occurred on Bridge Street, although all have different causal factors. In the first, a cyclist lost control whilst turning, in the second, a motorist opened a car door into the path of a cyclist, and in the third, a cyclist was clipped by a vehicles wing mirror whilst both were moving. Two accidents occurred on Leeds Road between Tadcaster and Toulston Grange, on in which a cyclist was forced off the road and a second, resulting in serious injury, when a cyclist attempted to make a right turn towards the Grammar School causing a following vehicle to loose control. In two of the remaining accidents, cyclists failed to give way to other vehicles at junctions resulting in collisions, and in the third the low level of the sun was deemed to be the main causal factor.

Table 1: 12-hour Cycle Count Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/04/98</td>
<td>A659 Leeds Road, towards York</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/04/98</td>
<td>A659 Leeds Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards York</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards York</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/09/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards York</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/98</td>
<td>Station Road, towards Leeds</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7 The majority of roads within the urban area are subject to differing levels of on-street car parking, although on some sections parking is only sporadic and the provision of on-road cycle lanes would be appropriate. Footway widths are such that neither segregated nor unsegregated shared use routes are appropriate, with the exception of the footway along Leeds Road between Tadcaster and the Grammar School where the existing footway could be widened within the extent of the verge. Also of note is the Viaduct Walk, which is unofficially used by cyclists and provides a useful alternative to crossing Tadcaster Bridge and using Bridge Street for cross-town journeys.

3. Proposals for Tadcaster

3.1 A number of cycling plan proposals were incorporated into the Traffic Management Strategy for Tadcaster, specifically, the Tadcaster Cross Town Cycle Route and Cycle Parking in the town centre. Other measures within the strategy including traffic calming on Wighill Lane, York Road, Stutton Road and within the Central Area, the latter becoming a 20 mph zone, also seek to increase road safety and make cycling a more attractive mode for travelling within Tadcaster.

3.2 The Cross Town Cycle Route links to the existing A64 route at Tadcaster Bar, with advisory cycle lanes being provided on York Road between the A64 and Auster Bank Road travelling westbound and between Old Brewery Gardens and the A64 travelling eastbound. Between York Road and Wighill Lane, the route would utilise a number of existing residential roads (Auster Bank Road, Auster Bank Crescent, Parkland Drive, Prospect Court and Ingleby Drive) and footpaths, the latter being upgraded where necessary. From Wighill Lane the route would upgrade the informal access to the Viaduct through the grounds of the Barnardo’s Home, most likely in the form of a permissive route. The surface of the section of route across the viaduct and embankment to Wetherby Road would require some hardening either as a stone track or a made-up surface. From Wetherby Road the route would provide access to the Swimming Pool and Town Centre within the 20 mph zone, and also continue to the West with an advisory cycle lane on Station Road. From Union Corner to Tadcaster Grammar School the existing footpath would be upgraded to provide an unsegregated joint-use cycle and pedestrian path with appropriate levels of illumination. A link would also be provided from Stutton Road to Union Corner, again in the form of an advisory cycle lane over part of the length. Comprehensive signing would be provided both to and along the route.
3.3 Cycle parking in the central area has been proposed to complement Selby District Council’s proposed improvement of the Central Area Car Park. The longer term parking strategy incorporated within the Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy also seeks to reallocate road space for the provision of both pedestrian and cycle facilities on Bridge Street.

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 Tadcaster, 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 Tadcaster 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, building on existing events such as the Tadcaster Community Cycle Rides.

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

5. Local Cycling Targets

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

- Target 1 - To identify current levels of cycle usage in North Yorkshire and to subsequently determine and adopt locally appropriate targets which will contribute to a national doubling of cycle usage by 2002 and a further doubling by 2012
- Target 2 - To identify current and potential levels of cycle use for trips to school and to determine and adopt targets to increase the modal share of cycling by pupils of 10 years or older.
• Target 3 - To identify and adopt targets to reduce the casualty rate for pedal cyclists per km cycled.

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

• Target 5 - To provide on-road cycle training for 20% of 10-12 years olds.

• Target 6 - To identify and ensure that funding bids include significant plans and schemes to benefit cycling, in line with the local cycling strategy.

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

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

• **Target 1:** To increase cycle use in Tadcaster so that by 2010, 130 cycle trips are made in each direction, each day, on Station 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 Tadcaster. 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. In the three-year period 1999 to 2002 inclusive there were on average 2.7 cyclist casualties in the plan area per year.

• **Target 3:** To maintain to 2001 levels, the number of cyclist casualties in the plan area.
6. Implementation

6.1 These measures gained 73% support as part of Option A within the Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy consultation exercise. The North Yorkshire County Council Selby Area Committee was asked to endorse this result on 11th September 2002, and resolved to do so. North Yorkshire County Council adopted the Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy incorporating the measures detailed within this plan on 1st October 2002.

6.2 £265,400 has currently been identified within the Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy to implement this plan, £209,000 in the period up to 2006 and £56,400 after 2006.
Figure 1: Tadcaster Cycling Plan
Appendix 5: Bus Stop Inventory
## Bus stops in Tadcaster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>Shelter Condition</th>
<th>Bus Stop sign</th>
<th>Info.</th>
<th>Markings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. O/S 123 York Road.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fair, windows missing</td>
<td>Yes, on pole</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need replacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Opp. 123 York Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fair, windows missing</td>
<td>Yes, on pole</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Need replacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. O/S 62 York Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fair, windows intact</td>
<td>Yes, on pole</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. O/S Leeds Arms PH, York Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good, windows intact</td>
<td>No sign, No Pole</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opp 2 Stutton Road.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes, on road lighting column</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. O/S The Clothes Line, High Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fair, windows intact</td>
<td>No sign</td>
<td>No pole</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. O/S Commer House, Station Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good, windows intact</td>
<td>Yes on pole</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. O/S 10 Station Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes on road lighting column</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Opp. 22 Wetherby Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor, windows missing</td>
<td>Yes on pole</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. O/S 48 Leeds Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes on pole</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. O/S Riverside School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes on road lighting column</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. O/S 39 Leeds Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Sign on pole</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. O/S 9 Garnet Lane</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Sign on road lighting column</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. O/S 36 Wetherby Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Sign on pole</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Opp Marlborough Drive Garnet Lane.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor, windows missing</td>
<td>Sign on road lighting column</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. O/S 2 Stutton Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Sign on pole</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. O/S 38 Stutton Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor, windows missing</td>
<td>Sign on pole</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. O/S Bass Social Club</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Sign on pole</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. O/S Mandarin Palace, Kirkgate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Sign on pole</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Opp Golf Links Avenue, Stutton Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Sign on road lighting column</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Opp Post Office, Stutton Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Sign on road lighting column</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Opp 33 Oxton Lane</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Sign on road lighting column</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tadcaster Workshop 1 - Thursday 25 October 2001

Complete List of Issues identified (key issues shown in bold type)

1. Cross town traffic.
2. Access to A64 from London Road.
3. Tadcaster Bar.
4. Brewery HCV’s.
5. Hedley Bar.
6. On Street parking.
7. Off Street parking.
8. Pedestrianisation of Kirkgate.
9. Lack of relevant public transport.
10. Open rail station – Copmanthorpe.
11. Leeds Road/ Station Road junction – Pedestrian crossing.
12. Width of footway over bridge.
13. Mill Lane – HCV’s parking overnight.
15. Pedestrians and cyclists to and from Grammar school.
16. A659 Toulston Lane.
17. Pedestrian and cycle facilities at bus station.
19. Traffic speeds on Station Road.
20. Loading/ unloading of HCV’s in town centre.
21. Inadequate pedestrian and cycle facilities on Station Road.
22. Traffic conflicts on Stutton Road – Abuse of bus lay-by.
23. Mill Lane junction – Traffic queues at peak times.
24. Bridge Street puffin controller in footway.
25. Lack of co-ordination of traffic signals.
27. Britannia car par – HCV’s will be displaced.
28. York Road/ Leeds Road speed problems.
30. Tadcaster Grammar School – Parents driving through town centre to drop off children.
31. Lack of dropped kerbs for disabled/ elderly access.
32. Kirkgate – Cobbles no good for disabled and elderly.
33. Tactile paving causes discomfort for wheelchair users.
34. Street furniture clutter.
35. Market impact on car parking facilities.
36. Signage approaching town.
37. Appropriateness of the one way system.
38. Impact of closing Kirkgate.
39. Conflict of movements at Mill Lane junction.
40. Bus Station – Poor quality.
41. Bus Stop Clearway Orders – inadequate and require enforcement.
42. Future traffic calming to be sensitive for all road users.
43. Speed on approaches to Tadcaster.
44. Safe river crossing for cyclists and pedestrians – viaduct
45. HCV parking in bus station.
46. More bus shelters and stops around the town.
47. Access to A64 for emergency vehicles based in Tadcaster.
48  On street parking – problem for emergency vehicles.
49  A659/ Toulston Lane – Blind junction conflict with right turns.
50  Car parking on junctions.
51  Visibility from Kelcbar Road.
52  Britannia car park – no facility for pedestrians to cross to shops and constant flow on one way.
53  Lack of facilities for cyclists in Tadcaster.
54  Pedestrian and vehicle access to health centre.
55  Pedestrian route from Marlborough Road area has to cross Leeds Road.
56  Narrow footways in Tadcaster town centre.
57  Signing to car parks.
Tadcaster Workshop 1 – Thursday 25th October 2001

Group Discussion Notes

Index to Issues Discussed

Issue

1. Cross town traffic.
2. Access to A64 from London Road.
3. Tadcaster Bar.
7. Off Street parking.
8. Pedestrianisation of Kirkgate.
9. Lack of relevant public transport.
17. Pedestrian and cycle facilities at bus station.
37. Appropriateness of one way system.
40. Bus Station - poor quality.
41. Bus Stop Clearway Orders inadequate & require enforcement
42. Future traffic calming to be sensitive for all road users
45. HCV parking in bus station.
46. More bus shelters and stops around the town
53. Lack of facilities for cyclists in Tadcaster
1. **Cross town traffic**

**The Problem**

- Traffic travelling between York and Boston Spa cut through the town.
- Regional access to the A64.
- HCV’s and vehicles from Sherburn cut through as best route to A1.
- No existing signed routes for HCV’s to bypass the town centre.
- Inadequate signing for vehicles going to A64 and London Road.
- School buses from York cause additional congestion in the town.

**Observations**

- Traffic needs to be taken off Leeds Road, Wetherby Road etc.
- St Joseph’s Street has parking on both sides.

**Suggested Options**

- Provide a bypass to the north of the town (this is outside the scope of the study)
- Utilise St Joseph's Street in a more productive way – All eastbound traffic down St Joseph’s Street to A162 and then A64.
- Improve A1 link to Sherburn Enterprise Park.
- Ease the London Road/ Leeds Road interchange. – This would involve using John Smith’s land.
- Improve signing for HCV’s to bypass town.
- Take east-west traffic off Bridge Street – Utilise Station Road and London Road.
- Pedestrianise Kirkgate.
- Close Kirkgate and Chapel Street North to car park entrance. (2 way at other end).
- Reroute school buses.
- Create slip road onto A64 at Tadcaster Bar.

2. **Access to A64 from London Road.**

**The Problem**

- East to west is a very difficult turn at present.
- No access to A64.

**Observations**

- Additional slip roads are required.
- Allegedly, within 2 years John Smiths will be brewing in Tadcaster and transporting to Wakefield London Road will be the main route.
Suggested Options

• Additional slip road onto A64.
• Roundabout at the A162 junction.

3. Tadcaster Bar.

The Problem

• Currently westbound access only.
• Not enough direction signing to Industrial Estates and Breweries.

Observations

• There is a further development to come at the east end of the town, which will require a slip road at this junction.
• Can only access the A64 eastbound by using the outer ring road 5 miles away.
• If you miss the Headley Bar junction, have to travel 9 miles to get back.
• No eastbound access for emergency vehicles.

Suggested Options

• Westbound slip road onto A64.

7. Off Street parking

The Problem

• Only 3 car parks in the town to cater for employees, visitors etc.
• St Joseph’s Street car park is too remote from the central area.
• Insufficient signing of existing car parks.
• Brewery car parks have egress problems – employees won’t use them.

Observations

• Retail and business is growing in the area- an increase in employee’s means more parking space is needed.
• The market is held on the Central car park – increase demand but reduced space.

Suggested Options

• Obtain a balance of long and short stay parking -designate some of the Central car park as short stay and Britannia as long stay.
• Green travel plans – Encourage new and existing businesses to develop one.
• Community Strategy – Car sharing.
• Free short stay parking in central area
• Include residents parking spaces in Central car park.
• Move market.
8. **Pedestrianisation of Kirkgate**

**Observations**
- Would it improve the town?
- Fear from Traders of losing passing trade – 2 would be affected.
- An existing bus route – 1 stop on Kirkgate for Harrogate bus.
- School run traffic causes congestion.
- St Joseph’s Street not wide enough for 2 way traffic.

**Suggested Options**
- Move market to pedestrianised area – would free up car parking.
- Include the lower of Westgate i.e. Church Lane to Peg Lane with access for residents.
- Make St Joseph’s Street one way and reroute traffic up either St Joseph’s Street or Station Road to the bypass.

9. **Lack of relevant public transport.**

**The Problem**
- Large number of commuters between 8am and 5pm
- Lack of communication between neighbouring service providers.

**Observations**
- Tadcaster is well served with services from York City and Leeds.
- John Smiths brewery is the towns largest employer and most employees travel to work by car.
- Larger businesses tend to develop heir own travel plans for employees.
- In Thirsk there is a ‘Bust Bee’ community service which runs around the town. As yet, no local operator has been identified to run such a service in Tadcaster.

**Suggested Options**
- Adjust the public transport to suit industry working times.
- Target services to run to the areas of high employment i.e. Retail parks including cross boundary services to access Thorpe Arch.
- Establish ‘Community Transport’.
17. Pedestrian and cycle facilities at bus station.

The Problem
- Pedestrians crossing the bus station site on a right of way have to negotiate a variety of traffic movements.
- No facilities for cyclists.
- No ‘drop off’ facility for visitors to the health centre. Vehicles double park, which restricts the road and hinders other users.

Observations
- NYCC are currently designing a scheme for the bus station. Weather protected cycle stands are included.
- Cyclists are discouraged in the town centre because of narrow streets, parked vehicles, potholes and a general lack of facilities.
- Bridge Street is very narrow, causing conflict with other vehicles – HCV’s, cars etc.

Suggested Options
- Introduce storage facilities for cyclists i.e. lockers, at the bus station and other stops around the town.
- Introduce cycle and pedestrian access to the bus station.
- Introduce a’drop off” facility for access to the health centre.

37. Appropriateness of the one way system.
- Covered mainly in item 1
- Do we need all the road space on the current system?

40. Bus Station – Poor quality.

The Problem
- Very grotty!
- Landscaping is frequently destroyed, bus shelter panels burnt
- Infrastructure for public transport lacking.
- No enforcement after 7pm, dropping off at health centre hinders buses.
- Flooding problem.

Observations
- As mention in number 17, NYCC are looking at bus station.
- HCV’s park overnight but leave before the buses start running in a morning.
41. **Bus stop clearway Orders inadequate and require enforcement**

**The problem**
- Motorists (including the Police who use the stops on York Road to pull speeding motorists over) abuse bus stops!
- Not all bus stops are covered by a Traffic Regulation Order.
- Lack of enforcement- Police and Traffic Wardens never seen.

**Suggested Options**
- Build outs or lay-bys required in Stutton Road area.
- Residents and driver attitudes need changing.

42. **Future traffic calming to be sensitive for all road users**

**Observations**
- Speed humps and tables cause problems for bus operators due to the introduction of new low floor buses.
- Drivers have complained of back pain due to ‘jarring’.

45. **HCV parking in bus station.**

**The Problem**
- Tends to be through traffic looking for a location to park for the night. Mill Lane and Safeway are also included.
- Nearest secure Lorry Park is at Ferrybridge, junction 32 of the M62.
- HCV’s damage the bus stands and road surface.

**Observations**
- Selby District Council has banned lorry parking, which could cause a bigger problem.
- There is room at the bus station as long as they leave before the buses start running, which is the case at the moment.
- There is a demand for lorry parking in the area.

**Suggested Options**
- Look for a new location for HCV’s to park, somewhere close to the A64 but convenient for town centre facilities. Close to future junction upgrading?
46. More bus shelters and stops around the town

Observations
- Would like to see bus shelters and cycle locks at all stops.
- Commercial organisations will contribute to shelters – advertising.
- Concentrate on quality of shelters at existing stops to encourage users.
- Woodland Avenue needs a shelter
- Passenger comfort issue.

53. Lack of facilities for cyclists in Tadcaster

The problem
- No cycle lane markings but wide roads
- Narrow bridge to cross the river with conflict from other vehicles.
- No cycle parking
- No off road links – pedestrian alleyways are no cycling
- No priority to cyclists anywhere in Tadcaster at the moment.
- No way of getting out of town except on busy roads – such as access to A64 cycleway.

Suggested options
- Use of the viaduct as a cross river facility.
- Create shared use alleyways for links to town centre.
- Create ‘out of town’ cycle routes on less busy roads.
- Introduce marked cycle lanes on popular routes.
Appendix 7: NYCC: Local Transport Plan: Performance indicators and targets
The County Council’s transport objectives have been used to develop a series of headline targets for measuring progress and achievement of the policies in action. A series of causal chains is included in the Plan which identify specific aspects to be monitored in each of the policy areas set out in the “Transport Strategy” section. To enable progress to be measured in the short term a number of performance indicators and targets are also identified in Appendix 1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Objective =

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

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

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

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

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

Objective =

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

• Target = To establish three quality freight partnerships during the life of the Plan.
Appendix 8: Consultation Leaflet, Postal Survey and Rival Leaflets
How can you help? Visit our exhibition to view the plans on display.

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

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

Your views will be considered on an equal basis with those of other people and organisations. The final strategy for implementation will be guided by the majority view indicated by the responses received. At that stage formal proposals will be published for those elements of the strategy options that require detailed local consultation prior to their construction. This pamphlet and accompanying questionnaire are also available on the internet at [http://www.nycgconsultation.info].
Introduction

North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) wishes to afford transport and access related improvements in the Tadcaster area over the next few years. Recent work has focused on the development of a Traffic Management Strategy for Tadcaster. This aims to secure long term transport improvements, especially for vulnerable road users, whilst maintaining economic and environmental well being and minimising any potential for additional travel.

Many local organisations and individuals have participated in the development of the strategy, with many of the measures contained within this report being funded by local authorities and transport operators. The Council hopes that the strategy will help construct a new strategy, with the Council using the measures contained within this report to begin the process of consultation and implementation.

What are the problems?

The problems and issues summarised in the list below were identified at stakeholder workshops in the Tadcaster area during the period.

Pedestrian issues - Pedestrian vehicle conflict, particularly on market days. A 20 mph zone has been requested.

Cycling - The lack of cycle facilities especially in relation to routes to schools and the shortage of cycle parking facilities.

Facilities for Motorised Cross-Town Journeys - A problem is perceived with insufficient cross-town journeys by public transport. The bus stops generally need upgrading by provision of shelters and information.

How can it be achieved?

NYCC has worked closely with its partner consultant Mouchel North Yorkshire to develop a traffic management strategy that provides an overall benefit for Tadcaster. The strategy involves a number of measures, including a series of measures to improve road safety, improve access to and through the town, and improve public transport facilities.

Identify and make necessary improvements to establish a network of signed routes for pedestrians, especially for traffic calming measures and measures to encourage cycling.

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

Limit the speed of traffic in the historic core and adjacent commercial areas.

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

Option B

Option B would create a modified one-way system with traffic travelling northbound on St. Joseph’s Street and southbound on Chapel Street. The system would be designed to operate within a 20 mph zone and additional traffic calming measures would be introduced to keep traffic speeds low. Parts of Kirkgate would be pedestrianised from which all traffic would be prohibited during specified hours of the day.

Option C

Option C removes the existing one-way system with two-way traffic being retained on St. Joseph’s Street. As with Option B, Kirkgate would be part pedestrianised. Chapel Street would have a closure part way along its length. The option would also operate within a 20 mph zone; traffic calming measures would be introduced, and the two junctions of St. Joseph’s Street and Chapel Street with High Street would be removed.

Complementary Measures

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

Parking Strategy

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

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

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

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

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

Complementary Measures

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

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

7. Do you support the upgrading of bus stops and associated information? Yes ☐ No ☐

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

What is the name and/or number of your building

What is your full postcode (for example LS24 3XX)

Other Comments

Thank you for your time and assistance.
This questionnaire is also available for completion on-line at http://www.nycc-consultation.info
TADCASTER TOWN CENTRE
DECISION TIME IS NOW

Members of the Tadcaster Chamber of Trade and Commerce are in favour of 'The Comprehensive Improvement Plan' shown overleaf because they believe it will improve shopping and the environment for Tadcaster residents and visitors.

If you also wish for these improvements to be completed please read the following very carefully.

North Yorkshire County Council is developing a Traffic Management Strategy for Tadcaster. Tadcaster residents have been asked to approve a combination of options, namely A plus either B or C.

**Option A**

Option A has the joint aims of improving road safety and encouraging cycling and walking for those travelling around Tadcaster. The Chamber, in principle, welcomes and supports the objectives of this option.

**Option B**

Option B proposes a modified one-way traffic system travelling northbound on St. Joseph's Street and southbound on Chapel Street. The Chamber believes that the tight turn right from Chapel Street into the narrowest part of High Street would discourage the through traffic travelling east from using the A64 interchange on London Road (A162) and would increase traffic density along High Street, Bridge Street, Commercial Street and York Road to the A64 at Islington. Furthermore this proposal would not encourage the local investment needed to refurbish the town centre and could result in many more years of delay.

**Option C**

Option C retains two-way traffic on St. Joseph's Street together with improved junctions at both ends and traffic calming measures. Chapel Street would not bear through traffic. This Highways proposal closely accords with that of 'The Comprehensive Improvement Plan' which received strong support at the public meeting on 29th April 2002 and would encourage the necessary local investment.

The Chamber members are convinced that Option A plus C is achievable as part of a comprehensive plan if the Tadcaster Community, Selby District Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Samuel Smith's Brewery commit themselves to work together to enable it.

Please complete and return the County Council questionnaire.

**Vote 'YES' to Option 'C'**

**Vote 'NO' to Option 'B'**

*Published by Tadcaster Chamber of Trade and Commerce*
YOUR SUPPORT IS VITAL TO PROGRESS
Please complete and return North Yorkshire County Council's questionnaire and

✓ VOTE 'YES' TO OPTION 'C'

X Vote 'NO' to Option 'B'
PEOPLE OF TADCASTER YOUR HELP & SUPPORT IS NEEDED

WE NEED YOU

You will have recently received a consultation leaflet with traffic proposals for the Tadcaster Management Strategy promoted by North Yorkshire County Council.

The main issue is to choose between Option B & C. If Option C goes ahead, suggested by Samuel Smith’s Brewery and backed by the Chamber of Trade & Commerce, it will not be taking into consideration the people who live in the town centre, and has total disrespect for the residents and businesses of St. Joseph’s Street.

Parents walking their children to school up and down St. Joseph’s Street using inadequate pathways near the Bowling Club, heightened by the danger of increased traffic flow. Traffic calming measures are proposed, so we increase the traffic flow ten fold on St. Joseph’s Street, then add calming measures, peak times can only be interesting from now on.

Select Option B and both Chapel Street and St. Joseph’s Street’s one-way system will keep the traffic in Tadcaster flowing.

Think about these points before voting....

Why are we changing the existing one-way system in Tadcaster? What do we achieve by changing the road system?

People living in the Town Centre & conducting businesses are the ones affected

Think Once, Think Twice – Think Traffic

Think A, Think C – Think Traffic

VOTE FOR OPTION 'B'
Say NOxOption'C'

Your Vote Counts
From the Residents & Businesses of St. Joseph Street, Tadcaster
Appendix 9: Public Consultation - Additional Detailed Comments
Option A – 32 comments
- 12 out of 32 comments did not support the implementation of speed restrictions, mainly regarding the 20mph zone covering the town centre, 3 of these also disagreed with the proposed 40mph buffer zone.
- 16 out of 32 comments did not support the implementation of traffic calming in the form of road humps.
- Improvement in the condition and safety of the pavement along Leeds road leading towards Tadcaster Grammar School was requested in the context of enhancing the safety of those using this route to access the school on foot and by bicycle.

Option B - 49 comments
- 20 out of 49 comments opposed the pedestrianisation of Kirkgate
- 4 respondents commented that St Joseph’s street would be inadequate to handle the increased volumes of traffic and would also be too narrow for traffic flow; whilst 8 respondents commented this for Chapel Street.
- 3 respondents commented on the inability to access the car park and another 3 respondents commented on the inability to access the associated churches.
- 4 respondents commented on the detrimental affect Option B would have on business in terms of isolation with 1 referring to this specifically in terms of loss of on-street parking.
- 5 respondents commented on the proposed one-way traffic flow, suggesting modification by reversing the flow (south bound on St Joseph’s street and North bound on Chapel Street).
- 5 respondents opposed the implementation of additional traffic lights proposed in this option.

Option C - 67 comments
- 22 respondents did not support the pedestrianisation of Kirkgate
- 13 respondents did not support the closure of Chapel Street
- 34 respondents opposed the proposed traffic flow modifications to St Joseph’s Street, with 28 respondents specifically commenting that this street would be both inadequate to handle the increased volumes of traffic and is too narrow for two-way traffic flow
- 5 respondents opposed the implementation of additional traffic lights proposed in this option

A64 - 41 comments
- 41 respondents requested the upgrading of all road accesses onto A64, with 10 of these respondents stating the A162 junction to be given priority (i.e. top of list).

Parking - 86 comments
- 5 respondents voiced concern regarding the lack removal of toilet facilities at off-street parking locations
- 4 respondents stated that they did not want any change to the current system or structure of parking and an additional 6 supported free parking. Regarding on-street parking, 2 respondents supported charging and 4 respondents requested free on-street parking, whilst 2 wished for free but enforced on-street parking.
- 30 respondents supported the implementation of short-stay charges for off-street short stay parking charges, of which 17 respondents cited at this would discourage the brewery workers from parking all day, which prevented and irritated those who only required off-street short stay parking. Of the respondents in favour of off-street short-stay parking charges, only 4 cited support for the county disc method.
Although 10 respondents suggested the removal of on-street parking, particularly along Stutton Road where parking on both sides of road blocks carriageway from free flow of traffic as commented by 6 respondents, additional parking was requested, with:

- 2 respondents suggested more resident parking;
- 2 respondents required more on-street parking;
- 5 respondents requested additional free off-street disabled spaces, 2 of which further requesting formalisation (surface marking) and enforcement of these spaces;
- 4 respondents requested the retention of on-street parking for disabled persons;
- 10 respondents requested the enforcement of parking restrictions, with 4 respondents commenting on the hazardous nature and obstruction caused by parking on pavements; and,
- 5 respondents requested the use of off-street car parks to HGV drivers to be retained, with one of these respondents suggesting that a charge should be applied.

HGV traffic - 43 comments

- 15 respondents requested the upgrading of accesses to the A64, particularly via A162, to reduce HGV traffic on other roads, with speeding along roads noted as problematic by 5 respondents, specially along the Leeds Road, Oxton Lane and Station Road
- 11 respondents requested restricting HGV through traffic, 3 respondents opposed to HGV traffic via St Joseph's street as proposed in Option C, and a further 3 respondents wished for road weight restrictions to be implemented
- 6 respondents requested the removal of parked HGV from roadside with Leeds Road and town centre being identified as the main locations where this existed as a problem, however as mentioned in the parking section above. Another 5 respondents requested the use of off-street car parks to HGV drivers to be retained.

Public transport

- 3 respondents requested improved public transport, 2 for services from Tadcaster to Wetherby, the other for access to surrounding rural area
- 1 respondent: relocation of bus stop closer to Kelcbar
- 2 respondents questioned the need for bus stop/shelters, whilst 3 opposed bus station improvements
- 2 respondents requested improvements to shelters, particular seating
- 3 respondents requested free bus travel to school for pupils in area
- 2 respondents supported traffic-light junction for bus station access/egress

Police/Enforcement - 28 comments

- 17 respondents requested that speed limits should be enforced and an additional 6 respondents suggested the use of speed cameras, particularly for Wighill Lane and Leeds Road/Station Road. The enforcement of speed limits was suggested by 23 respondents, as the alternative to traffic calming by road humps.
- 5 respondents requested the general presence of police in the town

Disabled issues

- 3 respondents requested improvements to pavements
- 4 respondents requested retention of on-street disabled parking spaces with access as close as possible to the shops, etc being cited as the reason for this request.
- 5 respondents requested additional off-street disabled parking spaces
Cycle issues - 36 comments

- 5 respondents disliked the cycle route proposals, with 2 respondents referring this matter to Parkland Drive and Auster Bank, and a further 2 referring to Prospect Drive - both of these locations are mentioned in the context of the danger in exiting onto the respective main roads.
- 5 respondents supported better facilities for cyclists
- 4 respondents supported increased parking facilities
- 3 respondents commented on the presence of cyclists on pavements
- 11 respondents requested a cycle route to Tadcaster Grammar School, of which 2 respondents requested safe cycle crossing on Leeds road to the school, 2 requested safe cycle crossing Leeds road/station road to the school, and 2 requested a crossing on Bramham road to the school.
- 6 respondents requested a cycle route along the Viaduct, 4 of these respondents requested this to allow access to Thorpe Arch and the other 2 requested this access to Riverside School; a further 2 respondents requested cycle route along Stutton Road and to Wetherby, respectively.

Signage

- 3 respondents requested better signage for the bus station
- 3 respondents commented on the excessive number of signs in Tadcaster
- 2 respondents requested replacing signs directing Boston Spa traffic via Tadcaster instead of via A1/A64

Pedestrian issues - 66 comments

- 5 respondents did not support the introduction of any more pedestrian crossings
- 7 respondents supported the improvements to Leeds Road school route, with an additional 3 supporting improved lighting of this route
- 6 respondents opposed the introduction of tactile paving as it increased the chance of slipping
- Respondents commented on the inadequate width of streets in the centre of the town:
  - footway across the bridge - 10 respondents
  - Kirkgate - 4 respondents
  - Westgate road - 3 respondents
  - High Street - 5 respondents
- 6 respondents commented on their support for any improvements made to Tadcaster pavements
- 3 respondents commented that crossing York Road was dangerous and requested a crossing
- 4 comments were made requesting a crossing on St Joseph Street and Chapel Street (2 comments each)
- 13 respondents requested a pedestrian crossing for Leeds Road/Station Road near the Fire station; a further 5 for Leeds road crossing; another 4 for Stutton road crossing; further 3 for Bramham Road crossing; another 5 respondents for a Union corner crossing
- 7 respondents requested alteration to Leeds Road/Stutton Road crossing as it was located in a dangerous position with speeding traffic unaware of crossing hidden by blind bend.

Traffic Calming - 80 comments

- 17 respondents against any proposed speed restrictions
- 12 respondents opposed to traffic calming measures (undefined)
- 10 respondents commented that speed restrictions will be ignored and ineffective
- 32 respondents opposed to traffic calming road humps, 10 of which would prefer alternatives to humps
- 7 respondents requested the extension of 20mph zone along Leeds road, and additional 23 respondents requested this for Station Road; a further 3 respondents requested an extension of 20 mph zone along York Road
• 5 respondents requested traffic calming measures to reduce traffic speed along Stutton Road, a further four requested traffic calming measures on Oxton Lane
• Speeding along roads - see police/enforcement

Other comments
• A total of 17 comments, these mainly refer to upgrading the market or town with investment, improving the appearance of the town for tourism, and a comparison of Tadcaster with other market towns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Horse Society</td>
<td>1. Yes to Options A and B. No to Option C.</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Support objective to amend the A64 junctions to permit east-west</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access which should reduce HGV's in Tadcaster. There is a problem with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the width of the footpaths associated with the bridge in Tadcaster -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they are just too narrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Very much again at two-way traffic in St Josephs Street – it is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>just too narrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Support the 20 mph zone in the centre of Tadcaster and the 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mph buffer zones on Leeds Road and Wighill Lane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster Chamber of Trade and Commerce</td>
<td>1. No to Options A and B. Yes to Option C. No other comments.</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service</td>
<td>1. Yes to Option A. No to Options B and C. No other comments.</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster East County Primary School</td>
<td>1. Yes to all Options. No other comments.</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster Regeneration Group Partnership</td>
<td>1. Yes to Options A and B. No to Option C.</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster Library</td>
<td>1. Initially, yes to all Options.</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R J Brough representing cycling</td>
<td>1. Supported Option A.</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests</td>
<td>2. Supported partnering strategy, dropped kerbs and tactile paving,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvement of existing informal pedestrian crossing points, and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>upgrade of bus stops and associated information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Agree with Option A throughout. Signalling on High Street, Chapel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street or St Josephs Street would create poor movement/through flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of traffic .... Reduction in traffic would only be addressed by taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traffic away from the centre – long term – new roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend M Woodstock-Smith</td>
<td>1. Supported Options A and C, the parking strategy, drop kerbs and</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tactile paving and the upgrade of bus stops and associated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. At the Methodist Chapel there is concern about funeral and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wedding vehicles if two sets of traffic lights are established on St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Josephs Street and Chapel Street corners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend R F Burton</td>
<td>1. Supported Options A and B, the parking strategy, drop kerbs and</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tactile paving and the upgrade of bus stops and associated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs J Welsh</td>
<td>1. A proper slip road at the Islington end of Tadcaster would ease a</td>
<td>1. The County Council has already indicated its support for the additional slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to Tadcaster Civic Society</td>
<td>lot of through traffic.</td>
<td>road and has agreed with the Highways Agency such provision will be included in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the detailed scheme for improvement to the Tadcaster Bar Interchange. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. An all-directions slip road at the John Smiths Brewery would also</td>
<td>Highways Agency hopes to be able to construct this scheme in 2003/04,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ease problems at the A162/A64 interchange.</td>
<td>subject to the outcome of the necessary statutory procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Signs directing traffic from Boston Spa to York via A64 would also</td>
<td>2. Initial discussions have been held with the Highways Agency and, dependent on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>help to keep traffic out of town.</td>
<td>the outcome of the Traffic Management Strategy consultation, a more formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approach to the Highways Agency to investigate the possibilities at this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interchange could be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Discussions to be held with Highways Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P E Turney</td>
<td>1. Stage 1 - supports Option B with phased traffic lights between</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapel Street and St Josephs Street on High Street. 'Introduce the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pedestrianisation on Kirkgate which will accommodate the weekly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>market and upgrading of the central car park and most of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other town centre developments as set out in the documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>put forward by Samp Smiths Brewery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Stage 2 - build a new road to handle two-way traffic between the</td>
<td>2. Whilst such a proposal would undoubtedly increase the capacity of the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A659 Wetherby Road at its junction with Station Road, across the</td>
<td>centre road network and would bring a significant measure of relief to the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>edge of the sports ground to join Leeds Road west of the petrol filling</td>
<td>centre, the scale of funding required far exceeds the budgetary allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>station. This will require the acquisition of some land. Realign</td>
<td>likely to be available for implementation of the traffic management strategy for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a short section of the A162 London Road to align with this new road</td>
<td>Tadcaster, which is, in the main, aimed at optimising the use of the existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and construct two new roundabouts at each end of the new road. Leave</td>
<td>highway network with relatively small scale new works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapel Street and St Josephs Street operating one-way, but for local</td>
<td>3. As with 2 above the scale of these proposals is not within the scope of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access only.</td>
<td>traffic management strategy. There are significant land and planning issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>involved which, even assuming appropriate support was forthcoming, would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Stage 3 - build a new road between Station Road, at its junction</td>
<td>prevent proposals of this scale being realised within the timescale of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Westfield Close and a point on the east side of the river north</td>
<td>traffic management proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the Safeway Stores on Mill Lane. This will require acquisition of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some land. Create a new roundabout to connect the new river crossing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Mill Lane, from which a further new road could be constructed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>along the eastern side of the river to connect to Commercial Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at a new roundabout opposite the bus station. Make use of these new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roads as a one-way gyratory system around the town.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunnane Town Planning on behalf of</td>
<td>1. In relation to Option A, whilst we support the general objectives</td>
<td>1. Objection noted. It is accepted that realisation of this element of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Smiths Old Brewery (Tadcaster)</td>
<td>of this Option we object to the proposed pedestrian/cycle path</td>
<td>proposals would require agreement with relevant landowners and the agreement on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>connection between the viaduct and Wighill Lane through Doctor</td>
<td>a substantial package of partnership funding for refurbishment of the listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnardos land. The Inspector, in his report on the Selby District</td>
<td>viaduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Deposit Draft Local Plan, has recommended the deletion of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed residential allocation on the Wighill Lane side of the Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnardos land because of its harm to the listed building called</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fircroft, which my client owns...... in order to be sustainable in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>long-term as a private single house (Fircroft) needs to be situated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in a small private estate of parkland with its lodges and screens of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trees, a view the Inspector supported. It seems quite unnecessary for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this ...... to be invaded by a cycle track. There has been no feasible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funded scheme put forward for the necessary rehabilitation of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>listed viaduct, which are estimated to cost £500K. Even if made safe,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the proposed pedestrian/ cycle route should be aligned along the route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on the traffic management strategy documents through Mill Lane. Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>we will be developing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS on behalf of Samuel Smiths Old Brewery (Tadcaster)</td>
<td>1. The matter of traffic circulation in the Central Area of Tadcaster was considered as part of the Selby District Local Plan process. Reference to the Inspector’s report shows that the Inspector was supportive of the proposals to rely on St Joseph’s Street to provide for north-south movements through the town in order to improve the central area. Reference is made to an extract from the Inspector’s report which includes the reference to the reliance on St Joseph’s Street if the comprehensive improvement of the town centre focusing on the removal of through traffic from the main shopping streets of Kirkgate, Chapel Street and Westgate is to be achieved. The Inspector acknowledged that proposals of this nature would be undertaken jointly by the District and County Councils following full local consultation.</td>
<td>1. Noted. As indicated in the Inspector’s report, all of these proposals need to be undertaken by the District and County Councils following full local consultation. It is considered that this public participation exercise on the future traffic management strategy for Tadcaster, fully meets the requirement for the level of public consultation with the local community envisaged by the Inspector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. We support Option C but strongly object to Option B. The implementation of Option C would be consistent with the Inspector’s findings…. but Option B would not. RPS indicate that the main reason for supporting Option C relates to a key objective of the County Council of limiting the speed and volume of traffic in the historic core and adjacent commercial areas ……. RPS consider that the benefits to the central area can only be delivered if the speed and volume of traffic are reduced in Westgate, Chapel Street and Kirkgate. Their view is that the benefits would be substantially reduced if traffic flows in Westgate and Chapel Street remain similar to or even become greater than these which currently exist, as would be the case with Option B.</td>
<td>2. Noted, but the Inspector also called for full local consultation, the results of which are now available as part of the covering report. The County Council is seeking to achieve a range of objectives with this traffic management strategy some of which will require compromise in order to meet the community’s expectations. It is important that all views are taken into account and a solution found that attempts to meet the aspirations of as wide a cross-section of the community as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The main criticism of Option C seems to be traffic flows are increased on St Josephs Street an that the road is unable to safely accommodate the additional vehicle movements involved. I understand that the point has been raised primarily by residents of St Josephs Street, the numbers involved being very small in the context of the overall number of people in Tadcaster. It has been stated by your officers and Mouchel that St Josephs Street would be able to cater for the increased traffic volumes with either Options B or C and therefore that there are no technical grounds for rejecting Option C. Adoption of either Option B or Option C will result in increased traffic flows on St Josephs Street. The flow increases are greater with Option C but they are still significant for Option B. Many of the supporters of Option B from St Josephs Street do not seem to appreciate that this is the case. Indeed, there is no information on traffic flows in the Consultation leaflet. It does, however, need to be noted that for either option the peak hour flows on St Josephs Street are still relatively low and are well within the traffic carrying capacity of the road. The likely future flows at other hours of the day will be lower than during the peak hours.</td>
<td>3. It is not only the residents of St Josephs Street who have concerns about the likely level of traffic on St Josephs Street if Option C was to be adopted. Many residents have made similar comments and this may be one reason for the level of opposition to this Option. It is true that either Option would involve increases in traffic on St Josephs Street although much more so with Option C. The traffic figures were made available on plans displayed at the public exhibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Option C will also offer the opportunity of improving the junctions of St Josephs Street with both High Street to the south and Station Road to the north. The introduction of traffic signals at the High Street junction will provide a safer junction layout for both pedestrians and cyclists, whereas the improvement of the Station Road junction can only realistically be implemented in association with Option C as the land to the south-west of the junction, which is necessary for the improvement, as shown on the leaflet for both Options B and C, is owned by my clients.</td>
<td>4. Both Options afford the opportunity to improve these junctions. If Option B were to be adopted and there were problems with agreeing the necessary acquisition of land, the County Council may need to consider an alternative layout, or the use of alternative land acquisition powers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>It is recognised that there are businesses on the eastern side of St Josephs Street (but only 3) but it is not considered that their operation will be prejudiced by the implementation of Option C. It has to be remembered that St Josephs Street is already a two-way road and that, as stated above, the resulting traffic flows on St Josephs Street, with Options B and C, are still well within its traffic carrying capacity.</td>
<td>5. The businesses on St Josephs Street may take a different view. In any event, the main consideration in relation to future traffic flows on St Josephs Street, may be more a question of the environmental impact of the relative traffic flows which arise from the adoption of Option B or Option C, as opposed to the traffic carrying capacity of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The implementation of Option C will result in two additional sets of traffic signals in the Central Area, at the St Josephs Street/High Street and Chapel Street/High Street junctions. The same position would be true with respect to Option B, and therefore any delays to vehicles as a result of having to pass through signals would be similar whichever scheme was adopted. The signalisation of the junction of Chapel Street due to the poor visibility available for vehicles emerging from Chapel Street. It is not clear from the leaflet that both the junctions are to be signalised in Options B and C.</td>
<td>6. It is acknowledged that signal installations are required whichever Option is selected. The display plans at the exhibition indicated that signals would be required at both junctions in either option, as did the consultation leaflet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Option B would result in all southbound traffic using Chapel Street, a reversal of the current direction of flow. The southbound flow is bound to include a number of heavy goods vehicles, including articulated vehicles. Reference to the enclosed drawing shows that the TRACKPLOTS for an articulated vehicle demonstrate that such a vehicle would be unable to turn from Chapel Street to High Street without mounting the pavement on the north-western corner of the junction, a totally unacceptable situation in a town centre where pedestrian flows are high. Whilst Option C would also introduce southbound traffic on to the southern section of Chapel Street, it would only be in the context of egressing the car park. No articulated vehicles would be involved.</td>
<td>7. Option B would involve a reversal of the flow along Chapel Street. This would be a preferable, more efficient and safer, direction of circulation for a one-way system which used Chapel Street and St Josephs Street. The doubt about the operation of the Chapel Street/High Street junction in Option B is noted, but dimensional checks on site indicate inaccuracies in the OS Plans. The road widths and junction radii are, in fact, satisfactory for the heavy goods vehicle turning movements referred to, and there would be no need for such vehicles to mount the pavement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>An additional point I would make is that transferring all southbound traffic from St Josephs Street onto Chapel Street, as in Option B, and therefore making it join High Street further to the east will be more likely to encourage eastbound traffic through the town centre to the east to join the A64 at Islington (Tadcaster Bar) instead of using the A162 junction.</td>
<td>8. This is considered to be a marginal argument, especially as eastbound traffic would still be required to pass through signal installations at Commercial Street/Mill Lane and at Wighill Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs A Thomas, Clerk to Tadcaster Town Council</td>
<td>1. The Council had not had an opportunity to discuss the matter previously and felt that this was no bad thing, because by discussing the issue after the close of the public consultation period they would not be seen as influencing the electors in any way. As a result of that discussion, therefore, the Council have asked me to write to you to let you know that they expressed a preference for Option B, with reservations, whilst recognising that there were difficulties with all the proposed schemes.</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Hemensy representing North Yorkshire Police</td>
<td>1. North Yorkshire Police would support in principle Option B as this would appear to deal with the majority of problems in the most safe and efficient manner.</td>
<td>1. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr J M Notby representing St Josephs Church, St Josephs Street, Tadcaster</td>
<td>1. Firstly, Option A contains many sensible improvements to pedestrian safety, easy access to public transport etc, and I think that you should proceed with it in principle, but listen to the detailed comments from others. As an example, there have been some adverse comments on certain types of traffic calming measures, which some people say can be avoided by motor cycles. I would also comment briefly on parking proposals. There needs to be adequate short-stay parking close to shops/retailers/banks/solicitors/pharmacies etc and sufficient long stay parking for people who come to Tadcaster to work, but for whom a 5-10 minute walk from a long stay car park is less of a nuisance than for shoppers who might well have three swift calls to make, and are then gone, freeing up the space for the next person.</td>
<td>1. Noted. In relation to any of the traffic calming proposals, separate detailed consultations will be undertaken, including local residents adjacent to the proposals. The comment in relation to parking is also noted. The parking strategy attempts to address these points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My main comments refer to plans to close Kirkgate and Chapel Street. Already two opposing camps are emerging, against Option B or Option C, generating more heat than light. Surely we can evolve a satisfactory plan on the basis of evidence, and be for a good plan. Firstly, the town would be more pleasant if Kirkgate were closed to through traffic, and the plans seem to deal with the problems of access to businesses and homes along Wharfebank Terrace. Most people seem to be in favour of closing Kirkgate if possible (Regeneration Partnership, citizens through the Pleda Report, even Sam Smith's Brewery; they opposed Selby District Council's recent attempts to close Kirkgate on Thursdays for the market because it was anything but a comprehensive plan). But you should find out whether 'The Chocolate Box' in Kirkgate also favours closing Kirkgate. Local opinion seems to think that that shop relies heavily on passing trade. Option B allows Kirkgate to be closed now, without causing an extra traffic problem elsewhere. The difficulties getting out of Kirkgate into High Street simply get transferred to the Chapel Street/High Street junction.</td>
<td>2. The points made in relation to Kirkgate appear to be generally well supported, but clearly any proposed restrictions would need to be fully consulted upon, and will also be subject to statutory procedures. The views on Option B are noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I see a problem with Option C. The difficulties at the Kirkgate/High Street junction get transferred to the south end of St Josephs Street (because all the traffic currently using Kirkgate will then use St Josephs Street). We who live in Tadcaster know what they are. Regularly, southbound traffic down Kirkgate finds its exit blocked, so stationary traffic backs up to the Shann House Hotel, and sometimes back to the top of Chapel Street. When this traffic is transferred to St Josephs Street, traffic will back up on the southbound side, past Paynes Plumbers and St Josephs Church, the British Legion car park and Gallery 42, all at the narrowest part of the street.</td>
<td>3. Noted. Whilst Option C is, in our view, a workable solution, there is no doubt that it would occasionally be likely to give rise to more significant congestion, when temporary obstructions do occur, than would be the case on a one-way street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It only needs one parked delivery lorry (e.g. Parcel Force), or one southbound motorist stranded in the middle of the carriageway (trying to pass a parked car, but finding the road ahead blocked) to prevent northbound traffic (the bus, a wide lorry/articulated vehicle) from proceeding north up St Josephs Street. Thus the High Street/St Josephs Street junction will clog up in both directions. We know this can happen. Over the last few years, Westgate/Kirkgate has been closed on several occasions for roadworks, causing all traffic to use St Josephs Street, and the predicted logjam did happen. Option C so far has not addressed this problem.</td>
<td>4. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>There are a number of possible solutions to the problems with Option C. You could ban all parking in St Josephs Street. You could widen the road along its whole length. (Option C proposes to widen it at either end, not at the narrowest section in the middle. When the earlier 'Vision of Tadcaster' was a possibility, widening St Josephs Street was the preferred option for handling the displaced traffic from Kirkgate). Both of these solutions are likely to cause fierce objection.</td>
<td>4. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The third solution is to redirect through traffic away from the centre of the town altogether, and, after a while, people will use the alternative route, 'after a while', because locals do not read the direction signs, as they know where they want to go! When the total traffic flow has been reduced, closing Chapel Street should be possible without bringing St Josephs Street to a grinding halt. In the Plan presented by the Chamber of Trade at the public meeting on 29 April, there is much work with which a developer might proceed before being hampered by through traffic continuing to use Chapel Street (in the reverse direction) (Option B), during which time efforts to redirect traffic away from the centre (see below) might proceed, and make Option C viable.</td>
<td>5. Noted. Consideration will be given to alternative signing possibilities (which do not redirect traffic to less safe areas), including discussions with the Highways Agency in relation to more appropriate signing on the A1. Further improvements to the A64/A162 junction by providing additional slip roads, in addition to the improvements agreed between NYCC and the Highways Agency at Tadcaster Bar would remove substantial volumes of through traffic from the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Eileen Scothern on behalf of Selby District Council | 1. I refer to your presentation to the Economy Board on 9 July 2002. Members at the meeting listened to the various Options, however they decided to defer consideration of their preferred Option to the next Economy Board.  
   At the Economy Board meeting on 28 August the Board resolved to support Option B.  
2. I look forward to our meeting on 13 September 2002 to discuss the outcome of the consultation process and the way forward. | 1. Noted.  
2. It will be very important to continue to work closely with the District Council and other partners, in the implementation of the approved strategy. |
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NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

SELBY AREA COMMITTEE

11 SEPTEMBER 2002

TADCASTER TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

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

1.2 In addition, the report is to make recommendations on the Traffic Management Strategy for Tadcaster.

1.3 The report also indicates those short term measures which have received high levels of support during the consultation process, and which will now be progressed as quickly as possible to the detailed design stage. It is intended that some of these measures will be commenced during the current financial year using funds already identified in the LTP budget allocation for 2002/03.

2.0 BACKGROUND

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

2.2 At the meeting, Members resolved that three options, listed as Options A, B and C, for managing traffic movements in Tadcaster, together with a number of short term complementary measures throughout the town, and a long term parking strategy for the town centre be approved as a basis for the public consultation exercise. All of these proposals are indicated on the exhibition display drawings which will also be displayed at your meeting.

2.3 Over 3,400 leaflets were delivered to addresses within the Tadcaster area and to 85 stakeholders and statutory consultees. An exhibition of the options and other proposals was also held in the Ark on Kirkgate between 19 July and 1 August. This exhibition was manned by County Council and Mouchel North Yorkshire Officers for the first two days. A copy of the consultation leaflet is included with these papers.
2.4 The summary of the overall response to this exercise is attached to this report as Appendix 1.

2.5 Members will note that almost 30% of the 3,400 plus households and businesses, to whom the leaflets were distributed, have responded to the consultation. This is an excellent level of response, which has exceeded our expectations, and is at the higher end of the range of response rates which can normally be expected in consultation exercises of this kind.

2.5 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.

2.6 In relation to the formal submissions from Statutory Consultees and/or Stakeholders, a schedule which summarises their views, together with your Officers’ comments (where these are appropriate), is attached as Appendix 3.

3.0 INTERPRETATION OF RESPONSES.

3.1 Members will note from Appendix 1 that a very wide range of views have been expressed in the responses to this public consultation exercise, from residents and business operators, and from stakeholders and statutory consultees alike.

3.2 It is quite clear from the responses received that all of the short term, complementary measures, were well supported. It is therefore proposed, as indicated to Members in the report to your Committee on 23 May, to proceed to the detailed design and implementation of those items listed in paragraph 5.0 of Appendix 1 from the budget allocation of £100k in the current financial year.

3.3 In addition, almost three quarters of the respondents supported Option A which involves a range of proposals to improve road safety in Tadcaster. These include an extended 20mph zone for the town centre; various traffic calming measures; upgrading of certain pedestrian crossings; pedestrian/cycleway improvements and some minor junction modifications. Given this level of support for Option A your Officers recommend that those proposals which can be progressed without additional significant consultations be developed for implementation. The timing of these works will need to be subject to further review as part of the roll forward of the capital programme.
3.4 Members will also note that the parking strategy received over 80% support. The realisation of this strategy will, of course, require considerable development with partners such as the District and Town Council, landowners and other stakeholders. The parking strategy can only be developed in conjunction with other local authority schemes and private landowner initiatives.

3.5 The remaining issue is the more radical alterations to traffic movements in the town centre streets, as envisaged in Options B and C. Members will see from Appendix 1 that 49% of respondents favoured Option B, involving one-way operation southbound using Westgate and Chapel Street, and one-way northbound on St Josephs Street. 38% of respondents favoured Option C which involves a point closure on Chapel Street leaving the southern end of that street for two-way operation into and out of the central area car park and the northern end for two-way local access only to properties on the street. In this option, St Josephs Street would operate two-way catering for north/south traffic movements. In both of these two options, a section of Kirkgate would be closed to through traffic thereby enabling that part of the street to be effectively pedestrianised for a period of the day.

3.6 Members need to consider which, if any, of these two options to adopt for the future management of traffic movements in Tadcaster Town Centre.

3.7 Your Officers are of the view that significant improvements can be achieved in the town centre if through traffic is eliminated from Kirkgate, and that it would be preferable therefore to introduce changes in the vehicle movements in the town centre in order to achieve this. There is significantly more support for Option B (at 49% of respondents) than for Option C (at 38% of respondents). On the other hand, the concerns about Option B and the support for Option C from the Chamber of Trade and Commerce and from the two representatives who responded on behalf of Samuel Smiths Old Brewery are noted. In addition, North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Services support neither option. However, given the fact that significantly greater numbers of respondents have indicated a preference for Option B and that this level of support for Option B is reinforced by the other two main bodies representing the community, Selby District Council and Tadcaster Town Council (with certain reservations), as well as by North Yorkshire Police, your Officers consider this option should be adopted.

3.8 It is further believed that, given the necessary level of goodwill and co-operation, the measures involved in Option B will bring significant benefits to Tadcaster town centre and whilst they do not totally meet the present aspirations of the Brewery and Chamber of Trade, much of what these two bodies wish to achieve in Tadcaster can be realised with the adoption of Option B provided that there is a commitment to work together to achieve positive results. There is already a great deal of co-operation between the various Councils and other agencies and these partnerships can be built upon to draw in other interests and stakeholders to achieve early progress on the implementation of the strategy.
3.9 Members will also have noted that a high proportion of respondents to the consultation have referred to the need to improve accessibility to the A64, especially at Tadcaster Bar and at the A162 junction. There is no doubt that additional connections at these two locations would greatly assist in reducing unnecessary traffic in Tadcaster. It is therefore recognised that the close co-operation which has now developed with the Highways Agency (HA) in relation to the proposals for Tadcaster Bar interchange needs to be extended to include a thorough examination of the improvements that could be practically achieved at the A162 junction.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that

4.1 The intention to proceed to the detailed design and implementation of the complementary measures listed in paragraph 5.0 of Appendix 1 to this report from the budget allocation of £100k in the current financial year be noted.

4.2 The proposed parking strategy for Tadcaster be agreed, to be implemented on a phased basis in partnership with Selby District Council and the relevant landowners, where necessary.

4.3 The adoption of a Traffic Management Strategy for Tadcaster which includes the proposals contained in Options A and B as described in the public consultation leaflet and as indicated on the detailed display drawing be approved.

4.4 Officers be requested to hold further discussions with the Highways Agency with the aim of securing improved connections to the A64 at the A162 junction, in addition to the further enhancement of the Tadcaster Bar Interchange proposals now agreed between the Highways Agency and the County Council.

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

M O MOORE
Director of Environmental Services

Background Papers
None

Author of Report : Stewart Hurst
Report presented by : Stewart Hurst
SELBY AREA COMMITTEE

Extract of minutes of the meeting held 11 September 2002

TADCASTER TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

CONSIDERED –

Report by the Director of Environmental Services informing of the outcome of the public consultation exercise in connection with the Traffic Management Strategy options for Tadcaster.

County Councillor C W Metcalfe in declaring a personal interest stated, that whilst he owned property in Kirkgate, Tadcaster, he did not consider his interest to be such that it would preclude him from speaking, or voting on this matter.

For the information of Members the Director of Environmental Services outlined the role which the Area Committee had in respect of this matter. A local Member addressed the importance of putting into place works from the budget allocation of £100,000 as quickly as possible, particularly in respect of the pedestrian crossing on York Road, where it had not proved possible to obtain a replacement school crossing patrol person. Local Members also asked that when matters were being considered for Kirkgate, the issue of cobbles in the pavement which were considered to be dangerous, especially to old people, be addressed.

The meeting expressed thanks to Tadcaster Town Council for providing facilities for the Exhibition.

Another local Member reported that at a recent meeting the County Council’s Planning Committee had approved plans for a new bus station in Tadcaster and that the District Council were currently considering plans in respect of the central car parking area in the town.

RESOLVED –

(i) the intention to proceed to the detailed design and implementation of the complementary measures listed in paragraph 5.0 of Appendix 1 to the report from the budget allocation of £100K in the current financial year be noted;

(ii) the Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the view of the Area Committee that the proposed parking strategy for Tadcaster be agreed, to be implemented on a phased basis of partnership with Selby District Council and the relevant land owners, where necessary;
(iii) the Director of Environmental Services be informed that it is the view of the Area Committee that the adoption of a Traffic Management Strategy for Tadcaster, which includes the proposals contained in Options A and B, as described in the public consultation leaflet and as indicated on the detailed display drawing be approved;

(iv) Officers be requested to hold further discussions with the Highways Agency with the aim of securing improved connections to the A64 at the A162 junction, in addition to the further enhancement of the Tadcaster Bar Interchange proposals, now agreed between the Highways Agency and the County Council;

(v) Officers be requested to present a further report to a future meeting of the Area Committee setting out a proposed phasing plan for implementation of the approved strategy.
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 Executive decision has been taken:

i) That the parking strategy for Tadcaster, as set out in the public consultation leaflet, and shown on drawing no B9329/006/025A, be adopted, to be implemented on a phased basis involving partnership with Selby District Council and the relevant land owners, where necessary, and

ii) A traffic management strategy for Tadcaster be adopted which includes the proposals contained in Options A and B, as described in the public consultation leaflet and as indicated on the drawings B9329/006/020A and B9329/006/023A which were displayed at the Area Committee on 11 September 2002.

By whom: Mike Moore, Director of Environmental Services
(insert name of meeting, member or officer)

On: 1 October 2002
(insert date decision taken)

Reasons for decision: -

To enable the traffic management strategy for Tadcaster to proceed.

Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: -

The alternative strategy 'C' as described in the consultation leaflet and in the report to Area Committee of the 11 September 2002 was rejected in favour of option B.
Conflicts of Interest

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Dispensation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed ........................................... Date 1 October 2002

(Name) Mike Moore

Directorate: Environmental Services

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

Should you require any further information, please contact Mike Moore on telephone number 01609-532357

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)