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A responsive County Council providing good quality and efficient services
This is the Annual Progress Report (APR) for Year 2 of our five-year Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2001 to 2006. It describes the progress made in 2002/03 in delivering the integrated transport strategy for North Yorkshire as envisaged in the LTP. It has been prepared in accordance with the guidance issued by the Department for Transport (DfT).

The focus of this report is on the successful implementation last year of a wide variety of schemes and supporting initiatives. These are now making a significant contribution to meeting both national and local transport objectives and the challenging targets which have been set in the LTP.

We have spent all the money made available to the County Council by the government for transport for 2002/03 along with the underspend carried forward from 2001/02. We spent £15.289m on the structural maintenance of the road and bridge network and £11.564m on integrated transport schemes.

During the course of last year we have constructed 70 local safety schemes, completed 650 new or upgraded pedestrian crossing facilities and improved over 700 bus stops. We have also undertaken major refurbishments of three bus stations and commenced or continued construction of cycle networks in seven towns. In addition we have carried out almost 100 structural maintenance projects, 40 new and refurbished footways and strengthened 45 bridges to cater for 40 tonne lorries. These achievements and others are fully described in this APR and supporting Appendices.

We reviewed our targets in last year’s APR to make them more focused on outcomes. A total of 30 targets were set, of which only five are not currently on track. Two have been met ahead of schedule and 21 are on track to be achieved with the remaining two awaiting monitoring data.

We are particularly pleased that bus patronage in the area of North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) unless indicated otherwise – i.e. they exclude the City of York. Similarly, references to the ‘LTP’ mean the Local Transport Plan 2001-2006 for the area administered by NYCC (there being a separate LTP for the City of York). Consequently, the words ‘we’ and ‘our’ are used in reference to the policies, strategies, actions, responsibilities for transport matters use the abbreviation DfT in all cases even though the relevant Department has undergone a series of name changes.

Executive Summary

Enhancement of Ripon Market Race - Award-winning scheme in cycling trips in those towns where local cycle plans are now being implemented. Substantial improvements were also made in accessibility for the mobility impaired and these have been commended by local Disabled Action Groups.

We have set a new challenging target on bus patronage and have entered into a Local Public Service Agreement with government aimed at achieving stretched targets on casualty reduction over the next three years.

This report also explains how the transport strategy supports the corporate priorities of the County Council and the emerging Community Strategies. The links with both National and Regional transport and other wider objectives are also illustrated.

We have worked with many partners within and outside the County in the delivery of schemes and in sharing good practice. Numerous examples of this are provided in the report.

We have consulted widely with the community and our key stakeholders and have undertaken a ‘mid-cycle’ health check of our progress. This demonstrates widespread agreement with the overall strategy, the key objectives and our progress to date.

We are already making excellent progress in the delivery of the current year’s schemes and making plans for the roll forward of the LTP programme through to 2010/11.
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Current Position
We are now almost half way through the implementation of our current Local Transport Plan. This Annual Progress Report describes the progress we have made during 2002/03, our plans for 2003/04 and our funding bid for 2004/05.

The County Council has seized the opportunity afforded by the LTP to carry out extensive improvements to the transport network in North Yorkshire which are consistent with both government and local objectives and, most importantly, have the support of the local community.

We have risen to the challenge presented by the major increase in transport funding made available by the government. Expenditure on provision of integrated transport schemes is now more than three times the level in 2000/01.

The Local Transport Plan is not of course about spending money. It is about delivering a variety of schemes which are essential to the success of the integrated approach ... the ground are clearly demonstrated on the plan opposite. The trend over the last three years in terms of expenditure and scheme delivery on integrated transport is shown on page six.

What has gone before
The preparation of Local Transport Plans was a wholly new process introduced by the government in 2000. The challenge presented by the increased funding for transport was just one of many which had to be tackled.

Staffing structures and means of delivery have changed, links with the local communities, other organisations and of course transport users have been strengthened and new skills have been acquired. While all this change was taking place we were doing the important job of delivering improvements in transport facilities and making progress in line with our targets.

During the last year we have:
• Improved over 700 bus stops
• Refurbished three bus stations
• Completed 70 local safety schemes
• Introduced or upgraded over 650 pedestrian crossing facilities to assist the mobility impaired
• Commenced cycle route networks in seven towns
• Completed seven traffic calming schemes
• Addressed problems caused by the school run through 15 school travel plans
• Constructed 15 new footways and refurbished a further 25
• Carried out almost 100 structural maintenance projects
• Strengthened 45 bridges to cater for 40 tonnes lorries...

These measures have made a notable contribution towards our aims and objectives including a significant increase in bus patronage on quality bus corridors, increases in cycling trips and greater than the national average reductions in road accident casualties in the County.

What is still to come
We are now in a strong position to complete the remainder of the current five-year LTP programme and would like to do more than our current allocations allow. We feel that our performance in 2002/03 demonstrates our capacity to deliver an enhanced programme. The consultations we have undertaken show the community fully supports the approach being followed. They also demonstrate that much remains to be done.

We have already started preparation of the roll forward of our Local Transport Plan. We have sought feedback on what we have done so far, what we have done well and what we could have done better. We aim to make our next Local Transport Plan better than the current one both in its content and delivery.
Introducing

This section of the APR gives details of the implementation of the Local Transport Plan during 2002/03. Substantial progress has been made towards meeting the objectives and targets in the LTP.

The key LTP objectives are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The County Council has also adopted a number of specific targets as the means by which we are able to measure our performance in realising the above objectives.

Details of the targets and progress made towards achieving them in 2002/03, along with our new and revised more stretching targets, are shown in the Progress Table included as Annex A. Examples of how schemes contribute to the delivery of National Targets are given in Annex B.

The remainder of this section is a summary of the progress for each topic area and is supported by appendices which expand on the information stated here and also provides information on proposals for 2003/04.
Traffic Trends
(Appendix A)

North Yorkshire is predominantly rural in character covering approximately 3,000 sq miles. There are three towns with resident populations of over 20,000 namely Harrogate (70,800), Scarborough (53,470) and Selby (21,340) and two National Parks.

Whilst the County does not suffer from the high levels of congestion experienced in other major towns and cities in the country, there are settlements where congestion is an issue and traffic levels cause severance and adverse impact on the local environment.

We have set challenging targets to restrain traffic growth in the three largest towns and within the two National Parks. The implementation of strategies to achieve these targets has a positive impact on all seven key LTP objectives.

Based on a cordon of 74 automatic traffic counters around the County covering Trunk and principal roads, the average traffic growth between 2000 (the base year) and 2002 was 5%. In comparison, growth within the two largest towns and the Yorkshire Dales National Park has exhibited some measure of restraint. The results, in terms of traffic growth, of the measures implemented to date are given below. Details of specific measures implemented in 2002/03 are given in the respective sections of this APR.

Harrogate

We have reinforced our commitment to addressing the adverse impact of traffic on the community by sustainable means. In December 2002 the County Council rescinded the proposal for the construction of the Harrogate Western Relief Road. The long term plan in favour of a strategy largely based on encouraging walking, cycling and public transport. A comprehensive review of the current strategy for Harrogate and Knaresborough will commence in 2003. The outcome of this work will be used to inform the roll forward of the Local Transport Plan.

Scarborough

Achieving the challenging target of restraining traffic at 2000 levels over the period of the LTP in Scarborough is dependent on the implementation of all elements of the Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme (SITS).

Implementation of elements of the transport strategy for Scarborough during 2002/03 has been effective in achieving the zero growth in traffic between 2000 and 2002. With the major elements of the SITS to be implemented, we are confident that the target for restraining traffic growth over the Plan period will be met.

Selby

The construction of Selby Bypass by the Highways Agency continued throughout 2002/03. Completion of the bypass is programmed for Spring 2004. Monitoring sites have been established in the town to enable the impact of the bypass on traffic levels to be assessed. A comprehensive Selby Traffic Management Study is programmed for 2003/04 which will identify measures to complement the bypass and restrain any future growth in traffic in the town centre.

National Parks

The main thrust in suppressing traffic growth in the National Parks is through the provision of improved public transport. The outbreak of Foot and Mouth in 2001 had a significant impact on visitor numbers and hence traffic levels. With the economy of the area heavily dependent on tourism there has been an aggressive campaign to attract visitors back to the National Parks. The success of this campaign is reflected in the considerable increase in traffic in 2002 compared with 2001. Nevertheless, compared with 2000 base traffic levels there has still been a reduction of 2% in traffic in the Yorkshire Dales National Park, although in the North York Moors National Park there has been an 8% growth over the same period. The traffic volumes in the National Parks will be affected to a greater extent by weather and local issues. Whilst there is a need to carefully monitor trends, the targets of 1% and 2% below national traffic growth in the North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales National Parks respectively, are retained over the Plan period.

Travel Awareness & Travel Plans
(Appendix B)

During 2002/03 the travel awareness programme has matured and begun to focus on areas where it is known to have most impact. We are carrying out a review of the School Travel Plans completed to date to establish their effectiveness.

Closer links have been established this year with the “Healthy Schools” initiative. All schools completing a school travel plan and at least two activities are being
sent a ‘Healthy School Travel’ certificate. Following requests from a senior civil servant we are now advising the Department of Education and Skills about our approach to school travel.

The marketing strategy has been completed and is in the process of being implemented. The seven adverts on the theme ‘If you're not going far, forget the car’, produced by our award-winning agency, have now appeared in every local newspaper in North Yorkshire. Public Relations activities have also reached national newspapers, local radio and TV. 25 UK authorities have now started using our campaign material.

Action towards workplace travel plans is on target. Every large business has now received direct communication including mailshot and follow up telephone call(s) to encourage them to consider a travel plan.

Expenditure has focused on areas of maximum impact. The County Council has continued to supplement the income received as a result of a successful bid to the Department for Transport for a school travel bursary. Rather than constrain activities to stay within the bursary limit, the travel awareness budget has supplemented this by £30k. The marketing project has been funded to £25k per annum, and a wide range of other awareness raising activities makes up the rest of the expenditure in 2002/03.

The expenditure on awareness raising activities continues to be highly cost effective. As an example, the purchase of an electric bicycle for £800 has generated positive press coverage that would have cost an estimated £13,000 to purchase as advertising space. The bicycle is now being used on the successful ‘Wheels to Work’ scheme in Selby, an area of high unemployment.

The expenditure on travel awareness now represents exactly 1% of the integrated transport component of the LTP in line with our target in this respect.

The progress on school travel plans is in excess of expectations. The production of travel plans continues to improve both in quantity and quality. In terms of the difference made, this varies between schools but is averaging from 2% to 5% reduction in car use on the school run.

Travel plan progress is slower in workplaces than in schools. Many businesses are still recovering from Foot and Mouth setbacks and other external difficulties. Planning applications are increasingly incorporating travel plans as a result of the new County Council requirements in this respect.

In recognition of the need to work with human behaviour, rather than against it, the targets for travel plans were carefully set to reflect the need to first raise awareness, then develop an appreciation of the need for action, before moving on to make changes.

All awareness and appreciation targets for School Travel Plans are now met. At this stage a total of 43 travel plans would be expected. There are actually now 48.

With respect to Green Travel Plans, all large employers in the County are now aware of the need for travel plans. Around 50% have requested information from us... ahead of schedule. We have engaged a business contact management specialist to monitor progress in this important area.

During 2003/04 it is proposed that guidance will be produced to help businesses make best use of tax efficiency in travel plans. This will include, for example, a review of car share schemes using company-owned minibuses that may have large potential in rural areas.

The Transport Issues and Development Guide produced by the County Council includes a section on road layouts that promote walking. This will be augmented to include reference to urban design and behavioural features such as accessibility through and linkages to adjacent developments and the overall network to encourage walking.

School travel activities will aim to extend a successful trial in Scarborough of ‘Park & Stride’ in which parents and children are encouraged to walk the last five minutes of their journey.

A successful bid to the Department for Transport has resulted in an innovative project in Knaresborough. School pupils will receive specific advice on travel alternatives tailored to their personal needs. This aims to reduce car dependence habits triggered by the transfer to Secondary School.

We are active members of a regional ‘TravelWise’ group. As joint organisers of a travel awareness training package, we have gained greatly from increased contact with regional expertise. Our innovative experience of incorporating travel awareness into the curriculum has been disseminated through this programme.

Based on the conclusions of the first individualised marketing campaign, it looks likely that a large proportion of the benefits might accrue from targeted delivery to households by postcodes. A leaflet will be produced promoting walking and showing 10, 20 and 30 minute walking distance contours of Harrogate town centre and will be sent to those who live there.

Consultation is an important part of the travel awareness programme. A number of major changes (such as amending the name of ‘Walk to School Week’ to ‘School Walking Week’) have come about as a result of feedback from customers.
A questionnaire to all schools with travel plans to establish their effectiveness is now in place.

As part of our work with Leeds and Sheffield Universities, in-depth interviews and focus group work is taking place with residents in locations with different levels of actual rural accessibility to compare this with perceived accessibility. The marketing strategy has also involved focus groups and proposals are now being drawn up to test the effectiveness of the strategy.

**Traffic Management**

[Appendix C]

The County Council is continuing its integrated approach to the development of traffic management for the major urban areas of Harrogate/Knaresborough and Scarborough, and the other main centres of population (the market towns and coastal resorts) in North Yorkshire.

We believe our holistic approach to traffic management in these urban areas better addresses the key LTP objectives and more effectively contributes towards achieving a number of LTP targets.

In addition, we have adopted a community led approach to traffic management in the rural areas of the County. This approach enables us to focus on the key objectives and targets on highway safety, reducing traffic and its adverse impacts on the environment, providing better facilities for the disabled and other vulnerable road users and giving wider choices for travel in the community.

**Harrogate and Knaresborough**

Since the last APR, the County Council has reviewed the long term strategy for Harrogate and Knaresborough. Previously, this included the construction of northern and western bypasses of the two towns together with a bypass of Killinghall. The County Council has now decided not to pursue a western bypass of Harrogate, but instead to develop an alternative strategy for the longer term based on encouraging the take-up and better provision of pedestrian facilities, cycling and public transport together with the Killinghall Bypass. Further modelling work will be carried out this year to test the benefits of building a northern relief road.

The short to medium term strategy for Harrogate and Knaresborough continues to be based on the primary aim of promoting and encouraging alternatives to car usage by affording some degree of priority to alternative modes of travel to the private car. The strategy is based on the premise that within the town centres, there will be no significant increase in road space. All traffic is to be managed on the existing road network through a combination of appropriate parking controls, priority measures for pedestrians, cyclists and bus users and by managing any loss of traffic capacity with suitable comprehensive traffic signal control systems.

The strategy also extends to the treatment of residential areas adversely affected by traffic avoiding congested main roads. The approach is to traffic calm these areas to minimise extraneous traffic and to improve safety and environmental quality for those residents who are affected.

Otley Road, Harrogate - Striking a new balance

Good progress was made during 2002/03 on the A59 corridor with the extension of the ‘SCOOT’ traffic signal control system onto Knaresborough High Street which includes provision for bus priority. In addition, facilities for pedestrians have been provided at the main junctions on the High Street. Congestion monitoring equipment was installed on Skipton Road in Harrogate, and a number of passenger transport improvements were carried out along the A59 between Harrogate and Knaresborough involving the provision of new bus shelters, low floor boarders and real time bus information.

To protect the residential areas, traffic calming schemes have been introduced on Backwith Road, Aspin Lane and Pannal Ash Road. A number of safety measures have been implemented at five other locations in the town.

The SCOOT system will be extended to the A61, Ripon Road in 2003/04, and will be accompanied by bus and pedestrian improvements. The study into traffic congestion on Skipton Road and Wetherby Road, which was started in 2002, will be completed in 2003/04, with implementation of any proposals to be carried out in future years.

Improvements are planned to upgrade pedestrian facilities in James Street which is situated in the heart of the Harrogate Town Centre Conservation Area. Despite initial technical difficulties with the GPS bus tracking system, it is now possible to initiate the trials for the provision of bus priority at traffic signals. During 2003/04, trials will be undertaken at three junctions on the A69 corridor; Bond End in Knaresborough and East Parade and Station Bridge in Harrogate. If these trials are successful then these priority measures will be rolled out as part of the public transport improvements on the main road corridors in Harrogate and Knaresborough. The services operating on the A61 within the urban area of Harrogate will be the priority for the latter part of 2003/04.

A number of local safety schemes, incorporating improvements for pedestrians and cyclists, are to be carried out during the coming year at locations with poor accident records. In addition, Safer Routes to Schools projects will be introduced at four schools and traffic calming schemes will be constructed at four other locations in the town.
Scarborough

The main thrust of the traffic management strategy for Scarborough continues to be aimed at a reduction of traffic penetration into the town centre. This is to be achieved by the implementation of the Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme (STS) which was approved in 2002 at a value of £26.9m. This will be used to fund a major route diversion south of the town, provide two park and ride sites, improve bus infrastructure with bus priority facilities, and upgrade the town centre Urban Traffic Control system. A further key element of the strategy is the introduction of appropriate town centre parking controls in relation to both on and off-street parking.

On-street parking demand is managed by payment for parking in the town centre, and commuter penetration into the central urban streets has been reduced by the introduction of the STS measures and a reduction in the number of commuter parking permits.

Many of the residential areas adjacent to the town centre suffer from short-cutting traffic, and the strategy focuses on measures designed to mitigate the effects of this extraneous traffic.

Good progress was made during 2002/03 with planning consent obtained for the A165 Park and Ride site, and consent for the A64 site pending. An Inspector’s report is awaited to enable the major route diversion to proceed.

A number of other major improvements have been completed during the course of 2002/03, including:

- Revised signal arrangements and layout at the A64/A171 junction.
- Upgrading of five signal controlled crossings.
- Enlargement and enhancement of bus terminal facilities in Westborough/York Place.
- Bus corridor improvements on the A171 Scalby Road and A64 Seamer Road.
- Park and Ride Improvements at Weaponness, and a new coach drop-off and pick-up point on Sandside.
- Creation of a new cycleway into the town centre from the north.

In 2003/04, the SITS will be progressed, with the following measures to be addressed:

- Surveys of key routes
- Assessment of bus routing options
- Establish framework for consultations
- Extend traffic model
- Establish practicable options
- Letting the contract for the construction of the Scarborough to Lebberston Diversion and the A165 Park and Ride site.

In addition, two high risk accident locations are to be dealt with and an area traffic calming scheme will be implemented. More cycle parking facilities in the town centre are planned, and key pedestrian routes will be signed or created. The signalised crossing upgrade programme will be completed.

Market Towns and Coastal Resorts

Significant progress was achieved in 2002/03 on six of the town centre traffic management strategies which had been commenced in 2001/02. These are at Hawes, Helmsley, Richmond, Tadcaster, Skipton and Whitby.

For all of these market towns, strategies have been adopted, costed implementation programmes over a four/five year period have been agreed, and construction work has commenced on a wide variety of integrated transport schemes. Expenditure on the development of strategies and delivery of schemes amounted to £430k in 2002/03 and it is anticipated that this will rise to some £1,992k in 2003/04.

For Northallerton, options are now agreed for public consultation in the summer with the aim of adopting a strategy later in the year. This will enable a start on a number of schemes before the end of the financial year including improved pedestrian facilities and bus stop improvements.

Also during 2002/03, studies commenced for Malton/Norton and Easingwold in accordance with the process established for the first tranche of studies, and as reported in last year’s APR.

Based on our experience in developing the first six strategies, and on the response to an evaluation questionnaire circulated after each of the stakeholder workshops, we are confident that the process that has been adopted is an appropriate one, with only minor modifications needed to ensure feedback is provided to the community.
However, as a result of comments received, we have now introduced an additional stage into the process. This involves circulation of a questionnaire to a 10% sample of all properties in the study area which seeks to ensure that the range of issues to be addressed has been agreed by a wider representation than the stakeholder group.

In Easingwold, the strategy options were presented for public consultation in June and analysis of the community’s response is now underway with the aim of adopting the traffic management strategy in August.

The Malton/Norton study is much more extensive and the strategy is programmed to be adopted in December this year.

We are expecting to commit £100k in each town to the implementation of the first phase of schemes which will be included in the two adopted strategies. Also, during 2003/04 it is intended to commence two further studies for Selby and Leyburn.

The success of this approach has resulted in a level of requirement for funding which exceeds the current budget allocations. Therefore, this area of work is the subject of a supplementary bid as detailed later in this report.

Other Traffic Management Issues

We recognise that a wide range of independent traffic management measures need to be introduced throughout the County to address specific problems. Our approach to the introduction of such measures is to respond to the needs of particular communities having regard to the need to prioritise the requests to match the resources available.

During 2002/03 we dealt with 735 traffic related requests for a variety of measures county wide including Heavy Commercial Vehicle restrictions, new speed limits and signing and lining schemes at a cost of £285k.

Before implementing many of these measures, we carry out a range of consultations with interested parties. We intend to review our consultation procedures during 2003/04 taking into account good practice in other authorities.

It is also intended to produce a county wide protocol in consultation with key stakeholders, for traffic signing, an updated Traffic Signing Policy and a design guide for highway engineering and public transport measures in environmentally sensitive areas.

**Public Transport**

[Appendix D]

Our targets for public transport are concerned with improving accessibility, increasing the number of people travelling and the overall quality of services provided. Because most of the bus network is provided commercially our activities are focused on stimulating commercial markets as well as providing services directly.

**Publicity and Promotion**

The County Council has developed a bus information strategy which was submitted with our APR in 2001. This strategy outlines our proposals to improve the type and availability of information. A further copy of the strategy is included in Appendix D.

Our activities during 2002/03 can be summarised under the following headings:

Service Quality

We have continued to work towards improving the image and quality of public transport in the County and were delighted when Harrogate & District Travel won the ‘Bus Operator of the Year’ award in 2002. This kind of accolade is vital to change public perceptions.

In 2002/03 we introduced ‘Premier Specification’ contracts onto our network of services in Wensleydale reinforcing our belief that rural areas should not be deprived of high quality accessible services. Premier Specification contracts offer low floor easy access buses, a dedicated publicity budget and drivers trained in customer care. In the case of Wensleydale, the introduction of high quality services corresponded with infrastructure improvements at bus stops.

The County Council now has three ‘Premier Specification’ contracts which continue to be popular and demonstrate growth in passenger numbers. During 2002/03 we carried out passenger surveys on...
our Premier Specification contract which operates between Northallerton and Stokesley. The response indicated very high levels of satisfaction with the quality of service being provided.

School Transport
The County Council provides an extensive network of school transport services both for pupils who are entitled to free home to school transport as well as those who want to pay a fare. In 2002/03 we replaced double deck vehicles in Harrogate with a network of ‘Yellow Buses’. In 2002 the County Council amended its home to school transport policy to provide assistance with transport for students aged between 16 and 19 who live over three miles from their school or college. This is an important development in ensuring access to a wide range of courses for pupils who live in rural areas. The Council’s home to school transport policy is included in Appendix D.

Infrastructure
It was noted in last years APR that passenger infrastructure in the County is generally poor. In 2002/03 we have been able to implement schemes which have made significant improvements. Our main priorities have been terminal facilities and key corridors. During 2002/03 we have re-developed bus stations at Whitby, Tadcaster and Harrogate. We have provided high quality passenger waiting facilities which have been carefully designed to address issues of passenger comfort and security and which blend in with the surrounding area. Each of the shelters is etched with the County Council’s distinctive logo.

New Whitby Bus Station - Widely acclaimed

In smaller market towns as part of our Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies we are developing ‘on-street facilities’. These are an integrated part of an overall strategy which also addresses the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and car users.

In 2002/03 we have upgraded the passenger infrastructure on 11 key bus corridors. The first to be completed was between Northallerton and Bedale where low floor bus boarders were provided at all stops. The bus services along this corridor are provided commercially by Dales & District and Arriva North East. Several months after the completion of the corridor, both companies have upgraded the standard of vehicle used and most journeys are now operated by low floor easy access vehicles. This is a good example of how the County Council can invest and stimulate the commercial market.

We have carried out passenger feedback surveys in relation to our infrastructure developments in Northallerton and between Northallerton and Bedale. The results confirm that there is strong support for our strategy for public transport.

Last year we upgraded facilities at over 700 locations throughout the County. Some of these do not fall within our key corridor programme but are important points on our public transport network.

Unconventional and Community Transport
We have maintained our range of unconventional services which include Post Bus services and demand responsive taxis. The Rural Transport Partnerships have gradually expanded their successful schemes such as ‘Wheels to Work’ and ‘Wheels for All’. During 2002/03 each of the partnerships has reviewed their action plan which leaves them well placed to support the objectives of our Local Transport Plan over the next few years. In order to support this further, the County Council has agreed to co-ordinate a Community Transport Strategy for the County. Consultants will be appointed during 2003 and a final report will be available at the end of the year.

Rural Bus Challenge
Once again we have made successful bids for Rural Bus Challenge schemes, securing funding for five new projects. We have also progressed the implementation of schemes from previous years. The TRAVELINKS scheme, for example, provides services between Harrogate and Skipton which connect with services operating between Pateley Bridge and Otley. In 2003 the interchange facilities between these two services will be significantly improved through partnership working with a commercial developer. Both services are operated with new low floor easy access buses. These schemes allow a unique opportunity to demonstrate the benefits of high quality services and ensure that marketing and publicity are given a high priority.
Rail Services
We have continued to pursue a variety of rail projects, notably the re-opening of the Malton to Pickering line and the construction of a new station at Crashtills. It is our intention to apply to the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) for Rail Passenger Partnership (RPP) funding for both these projects.

We have continued to play a role in the development of the Esk Valley Railway Development Company as well as the Wolds Coast Partnership. The Esk Valley Partnership has advanced to the stage where a full-time partnership officer can be employed and this will provide an opportunity for a major boost in promotional activity in the area served. In Harrogate, we are working with adjacent authorities on the Harrogate Line Route Strategy, which includes the potential for new stations including Bilton and Knaresborough East as well as examining the opportunities for an increased frequency between Harrogate and York.

As part of the ongoing study into rail links to Threshfield Quarry, we are also investigating the potential for the provision of passenger services on this line.

In 2003/04 we are commencing our programme of improved access to rail stations based on the accessibility audit already undertaken.

Road Safety
[Appendix E]

Good progress has been made during 2002/03. Although last years total of Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) casualties showed a 5.1% increase compared with 2001, we have still achieved a significant improvement in the number of KSIs compared with our 1994 to 1998 baseline figures. Furthermore, we continue to outperform (at a 19% reduction by the end of 2002) the progress achieved nationally, which presently indicates an approximate reduction of 16% against the baseline figures. Progress in achieving reductions in the number of child KSI and KSI casualties is even more marked. Despite the overall county wide increase in

KSI last year compared with 2001, child KSI has continued to fall, from 53 in 2001, to 48 in 2002. Therefore, we are well on course to meet our revised target for child KSIs of 43 by the year 2010. This revised target was set in last years APR and was based on a 60% saving by the year 2010 instead of our initially adopted 50% figure, which had been based on the government’s national targets. We do not propose to further amend the 60% revised target at this stage. However, as with the overall KSI target (which for the time being is to remain at 40%), we will continue to monitor the situation and will review the position next year when the impact of our work in relation to the Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) Casualty Reduction Target has been assessed.

During 2002/03, we implemented 23 local safety schemes, 17 traffic calming schemes, 14 20mph zones and 16 safe routes to school projects. These schemes are now being monitored annually to test their effectiveness in terms of accident and speed reduction. In addition, we have now embarked on a plot of post-completion public perception surveys covering five typical traffic calming schemes implemented in villages across the County. The aim is to test community reaction to the schemes in order to determine whether any modifications are necessary to make the schemes more acceptable and to learn any lessons for schemes yet to be designed. Our consultation procedures prior to scheme implementation are also under review to identify the most effective approach consistent with ensuring an appropriate level of community involvement.

Following discussions with our Agents, we propose to pilot a process involving the selection of focus groups to steer the project from preliminary design stage to construction on site. These groups will typically contain representatives of residential and business properties in the project area, along with Parish Council (if appropriate) and local County Council Member representation.

We also intend to make more widespread use of vehicle actuated signs (VAS) following the encouraging findings of the recent Transport Research Laboratory report, both at individual accident blackspots, and as part of our local safety/traffic calming scheme programme. To that end we have acquired ten such ‘all-purpose’ VAS for temporary deployment at high risk accident sites across the County. The intention is to monitor the effectiveness of these signs which will be erected for a period of six months. Permanent VAS will then be provided at the successful locations.

Along with North Yorkshire Police, City of York Council and Highways Agency colleagues, we will also be submitting a North Yorkshire Safety Camera Partnership bid to the Home Office, with a view to commencing a safety camera project in April 2004. We have identified over 30 locations which meet the stringent criteria laid down, and are confident that the project will be rolled-out to additional sites in the County over the following years.

As in previous years, we have undertaken a wide range of education, training and publicity activities amongst which the following two are notable:

• The high casualty rate among young drivers and their passengers has led to the development of ‘Drive Time’, a whole day event held in...
secondary schools. Involving agencies including the Driving Standards Agency, St John’s Ambulance as well as Road Safety staff, the day focuses on the responsibilities of car ownership and use. An integral part of the event is the inclusion of a presentation by the parents of a young man killed in a crash, who recount the circumstances of the incident and the long term effect on family and friends.

- Equally successful has been the further development of the Lottery Roadshow event, in which the concepts of risk are explored in a fun way with students. Both Drive Time and the Roadshow have proved an extremely popular method of promoting road safety issues of direct relevance to this target audience.

The County Council’s Road Safety Strategy will continue to focus on the achievement of its principal casualty reduction targets. Following last year’s APR, and the recent successful negotiation of the LPSA, some of these targets are now more demanding than those set out by the Government in ‘Tomorrow’s Roads Safer for Everyone’.

We firmly believe that our basic strategy is appropriate, and should continue to comprise the following elements:

- The implementation of a programme of safety schemes which seek to reduce collisions and inappropriate speed, and which gives priority to those locations with the highest incidence of road casualties.
- A programme of re-targeted road safety, education training and publicity initiatives.

However, our research into a number of issues will lead to a modification of our overarching county wide approach to casualty reduction, starting in 2003/04. These include the correlation between social deprivation and increased incidence of road casualties, the problem of high incidence of motorcycle KSIs compared with other areas, and the disproportionate number of child car passenger casualties in North Yorkshire.

Our activities for 2003/04 maintain the focus on delivering a programme of prioritised safety engineering measures coupled with county wide education, training and publicity initiatives. In addition we are implementing a series of targeted interventions. These will seek to break the road accident causal chain in three identified areas in the County which suffer social disadvantage. 2003/04 is also the first year of our LPSA during which we have allocated ‘pump priming’ funds to specific motorcycle enforcement and child seat belt wearing campaigns, amounting to just under £200k over two years.

The LPSA includes a stretched target for a further reduction of 36 KSIs to be achieved at the end of the 2005 calendar year.

Cycling
(Appendix F)

The principle means of providing for cycling in the County is through the development and implementation of Local Cycling Plans. Plans for Harrogate/Knaresborough, Scarborough, Northallerton, Thirsk, Sherburn in Elmet and Filey have been completed and implementation of these plans is continuing.

A significant proportion of the networks for Harrogate/Knaresborough and Northallerton have been constructed, and mapping and promotion of the routes has commenced.

Local Cycling Plans for Hawes, Helmsley, Tadcaster, Richmond, Whitby and Sleights have been developed as part of the Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies. Implementation of these plans has now commenced with further routes to be provided during 2003/04.

The Cycling Plans for the North York Moors National Park and the Yorkshire Dales and Nidderdale AONB have also been developed. The County Council, in partnership with the National Park Authorities and AONB Management Board, has started the preparation of schemes identified in the plans and will commence implementation of these during the current financial year.

Cycling
(Appendix F)

The Local Cycling Plans under preparation this year are for Malton/Norton, Easingwold, Crosshills/ Glaisburn/Sutton, Bedale/Aske and Ripon. It is anticipated that these plans will be completed early in 2004 with implementation commencing later in the same year.

Full details of the facilities provided in 2002/03 are incorporated in the Appendix. However, some of the highlights are listed below:

a) Completion of Northallerton Route 1 by the provision of 200m of off-road segregated cycle track and a Toucan crossing in the vicinity of the Allertonshire School.

b) Cycle tracks and facilities linking Northallerton town centre to industrial areas north of the town. (In partnership with a number of developers)

c) Provision of a 1.05km shared use footway/cycle track/marching route linking the Army Foundation College at Penny Pot Lane with the Harrogate Cycle Network.

d) A 1.4km off-road footway/cycle track between Thirsk and the neighbouring village of South Kilvington. This also improves a section of Route 66 of the National Cycle Network.

e) The completion of routes 2, 4 and 5 of the Sherburn in Elmet Cycling Plan consisting of
on-road signposted routes and off-road segregated cycle tracks/footways.

f) Harrogate Cycle Network – Completion of 8.6km of new cycle route including further sections of the key strategic route between Harrogate and Knaresborough on Harrogate Road and works at Stonestall Park linking Wetherby Road and Hockstone Chase.

The Council were also very pleased with the acceptance of the supplementary bid for additional funding to implement further sections of the National Cycle Network. Walking with Sustrans, preparation of a scheme on Route 66 east of York has commenced and the full implementation of the Panrine Cydeaway in North Yorkshire is programmed for the current financial year. Should the government continue to support this bid further sections will be implemented during 2004/05.

Whilst the provision of these facilities in themselves is important in terms of reducing social exclusion by providing opportunities for travel by people without access to a car, it is also crucial that they assist in facilitating a modal shift away from personal motorised transport. Whilst it is impossible to measure the impact of individual schemes, and indeed individual elements of an integrated transport strategy, increased cycle use in a town is likely to indicate a successful impact on modal transfer. Early indications are positive with slight increases in cycling activity on a town wide basis and cycling in the vicinity of some of our larger schemes increasing substantially.

**Provision for Pedestrians**

(Appendix G)

The key means of identifying and providing for the needs of pedestrians in the County remains through the preparation and implementation of Pedestrian Action Plans for each of the main towns and villages in North Yorkshire. The plans identify missing footway links and improvements to the existing network to encourage walking and aid the mobility impaired. The Council’s aim is to complete all the required plans before the end of 2004 in order to identify, as a matter of priority, what provisions need to be made to comply with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA). The Council is on target to meet this aim with preparation of these plans on-going. Plans for Tadcaster, Northallerton, Richmond, Hawes, Helmsley, Whitby, Skipton, Settle, Scarborough and Grassington/Thirskfield have been completed with the remainder of the plans programmed for completion during 2003/04 or early 2004/05.

Implementation of the improvements identified has commenced with special emphasis being placed on meeting the needs of disabled pedestrians through the provision of facilities such as dropped kerbs, tactile paving and upgraded puffin crossings. During 2002/03 over 650 crossings were improved throughout the County.

Other facilities to assist pedestrians have also been provided. Highlights include the following:

a) A new footway to a holiday caravan park on Field Lane, Scarborough.

b) A joint footway/cycle track/marching route linking the Army Foundation College with Harrogate.

c) Six new Puffin crossings around the County.

d) Footways at Aireville Park and Gisburn Street, Skipton.

e) The award-winning Montpellier Quarter Pedestrianisation in Harrogate.

f) A new footway on Green Lane, Whitby assisting pedestrian access to Whitby Abbey.

The County Council has also expanded its involvement with the Countryside Agency’s ‘Walking the Way to Health’ initiatives. Three such initiatives are currently running in the County in Craven, Harrogate and Hambleton Districts.

Promotion of walking as an alternative to the use of private cars, particularly for journeys to school, is also continuing. Further details are included in the section relating to Travel Awareness and in Appendix B.

**Freight Transport**

(Appendix H)

The volumes of freight coming into and out of North Yorkshire remain significant. For example, 8.2 million tonnes of minerals are currently extracted out of North Yorkshire quarries annually and less than 10% of this is rail-borne. Around 100,000 tonnes of timber is extracted from Forestry Commission woodland annually, with significant tonnages emanating from private sector forests, none of which is currently moved by rail. Other major freight generators are located throughout the County, few of whom are rail connected or utilise rail-freight.
Nevertheless, progress is being made. A study commissioned by the Council on the feasibility of reinstating the link into Threshfield Quarry (near... 

A study on the prospects for transporting timber out of North Yorkshire by rail is now complete. Whilst the scope for significant flows of rail-borne timber out of North Yorkshire is limited, there are particular parcels of timber that could be considered for the Embsay and Bolton Abbey Railway. The Council is currently working closely with key stakeholders on the report’s recommendations in this regard.

The Strategic Rail Authority’s (SRA) surprise decision to suspend Freight Facilities Grants (FFG) unfortunately puts the project in jeopardy. The Council is continuing to work closely with industry and private sector interests to see how this project can be maintained.

The Council is also involved in helping promote innovative rail-freight projects, like the SRA award-winning Minimodal system which is a simple, load-carrying box en route system capable of bridging the gaps in the rail freight network. Work is also ongoing with the lorry routing database to facilitate loading. A number of locations for the use of the system are under current investigation.

Not overlooking the importance of water-freight, the Council also continues to work closely with Scarborough Borough Council on promoting the Port of Whitby to help secure its future development. We are also in discussions with specialist water-freight consultants with a view to investigating the potential for water-freight across the County.

More generally, the first Timber Freight Quality Partnership has met to consider the wider issues surrounding timber transport and is currently working on how to involve and obtain the confidence of the timber haulier industry by engaging them directly in the decision-making process. New partnerships have also been established for other key freight sectors including the Embsay and Bolton Abbey Railway and the Public Nodal Association and National Park Authority. Meetings of this nature also provide the opportunity to promote the Transport Research Laboratory’s (TRL) Fuel Economy Advisors Scheme.

Access for Disabled People

With the expenditure of £675k in 2002/03 good progress has been made in achieving the objectives of the LTP and the North Yorkshire Strategy for People with Disabilities. The Council continues to work closely with the Access Officer to continue the provision of accessible public transport. Attractive initiatives include the provision of accessible public transport and the development of a network of preferred routes for heavy goods vehicle traffic routing through and within North Yorkshire.

Not overlooking the importance of water-freight, the Council also continues to work closely with Scarborough Borough Council on promoting the Port of Whitby to help secure its future development. We are also in discussions with specialist water-freight consultants with a view to investigating the potential for water-freight across the County.

Work is also ongoing with the lorry routing database to facilitate loading. A number of locations for the use of the system are under current investigation.

Not overlooking the importance of water-freight, the Council also continues to work closely with Scarborough Borough Council on promoting the Port of Whitby to help secure its future development. We are also in discussions with specialist water-freight consultants with a view to investigating the potential for water-freight across the County.

Work is also ongoing with the lorry routing database to facilitate loading. A number of locations for the use of the system are under current investigation.
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With the expenditure of £675k in 2002/03 good progress has been made in achieving the objectives of the LTP and the North Yorkshire Strategy for People with Disabilities. The Council continues to work closely with the Access Officer to continue the provision of accessible public transport. Attractive initiatives include the provision of accessible public transport and the development of a network of preferred routes for heavy goods vehicle traffic routing through and within North Yorkshire.

Not overlooking the importance of water-freight, the Council also continues to work closely with Scarborough Borough Council on promoting the Port of Whitby to help secure its future development. We are also in discussions with specialist water-freight consultants with a view to investigating the potential for water-freight across the County.

Work is also ongoing with the lorry routing database to facilitate loading. A number of locations for the use of the system are under current investigation.
A total of 11 Quality Bus Corridors have been completed. Where appropriate on these routes, the bus stops have been upgraded to provide a bus shelter and a raised kerb for improved access. Corridors include Bedale to Northallerton, Leyburn to Hawes and Bedale to Leyburn. The Northallerton to Hawes route is also now served by a new low floor bus. As well as public transport improvements, a number of pedestrian improvements have been completed. A total of 13 signal-controlled crossings were upgraded during 2002/03 leaving 11 more to be upgraded in 2003/04.

Improvements to disabled access by the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving have been carried out in the towns and villages where Pedestrian Action Plans have been prepared. These have been completed to the extent that the new Disabled Access Target has been met in five of the towns. In total over 650 crossings have been improved in 2002/03.

Transport Issues and Development

Whilst the County Council as highway authority undoubtedly has the key role to play in the provision and management of much of the transport infrastructure in North Yorkshire, the impact of land use and development should not be understated. In recognition of the change in emphasis in transport thinking and the associated changes in national and regional planning guidance, the County Council has produced and published a document titled 'Transport Issues & Development – A Guide'. This will shortly adopt it for development control purposes.

This document differs significantly from the previous guidance. It replaces the Parking Design Guide which simply detailed minimum parking standards and traffic generation figures for junction capacity assessment. The new guidance now advocates that developers and planners assess the transport needs of a development from first principles and consider all modes of transport. Because of the significant changes brought about by the new guidance, the County Council is providing training for users of the document. These users include Government Offices, local planning authorities, developers and Consulting Engineers. Following on from this, training has been given to Planning Committee Members at Craven District Council. Further training sessions are planned for other Local Planning Authority Members and officers.

During 2002/03 our Development Control officers considered and advised on 5,500 planning applications. This is a very important aspect of delivering our LTP objectives in terms of Improving the safety and accessibility of all new developments in the County. Through this process we have also secured over £4.5 million of investment in our highway and transport infrastructure during 2002/03.

Highway Maintenance

North Yorkshire, being the largest County in England, has extensive rural areas interspersed with large towns and villages. The road network is some 8,680 km in total comprising 725 km of principal road and 7,955 km of non-principal road.

Following the extended period of under-investment during the 1990s in the maintenance of the highway network, the commitment by the government via “Transport 2010” has resulted in increased funding for maintenance and this is welcomed. We have reacted positively to this increase in funding and made a step change in the delivery of our service.

The extensive area of the County makes the targets to reduce the length of principal road with negative residual life and those with low skidding resistance difficult ones to achieve. We carried out 32 principal road structural maintenance projects and six principal road skidding resistance improvement schemes expenditure £2.869m in 2002/03. The £7.811 k spent in 2002/03 on non-principal roads involved 65 road structural maintenance projects, 22 urban footway renewals and four rural footway renewals. £2.590k was allocated to surface dressing on both principal and non-principal roads which included 443 sites amounting to 416 km of treatment.

Bids to undertake schemes invariably exceed the budget available and therefore all schemes must be prioritised in order to ensure that the budget is being spent to best effect. All schemes are prioritised on a county wide basis as follows:

(a) Principal Road Structural Maintenance is carried out by a CHART Assessment of each scheme. Deflectograph surveys have been carried out on the network and a proportion of the budget is allocated on an integrity needs basis. Additionally CVI and Rutbar testing are now routinely carried out. It is intended to supersede the CHART/DERLEC...
prioritisation by the use of TRACS Type Surveys with the supplement of UKPMS Detailed Visual Inspection (DVI) where necessary.

(b) Non-Principal Road Structural Maintenance. The use of CHART Assessment is being superseded by Coarse Visual Inspection (CVI) and Rutbar and Detailed Visual Inspection (DVI) where necessary. It is also proposed to introduce TRACS Type Surveys in 2004/05.

(c) Principal Road Skidding Resistance Schemes are being assessed on a county wide basis using Griptester. This will be continued using Griptester 2 and will supplement UKPMS data.

(d) Non-Principal Road Skidding Resistance Schemes (as above (c)).

(e) Footway Structural Maintenance is assessed on a county wide basis using:
   (i) Modified CHART moving to DVI in the current year.
   (ii) Historically, footway works have been supported at a high level of funding which is currently 20% of the County’s structural maintenance budget although footways only represent approximately 10% of the paved area of the network.
   (iii) CHART results demonstrate an improved condition over a period of years on the footway network and this has been supported by an improvement in the insurance position.
   (iv) Emphasis for maintenance purposes is primarily in the urban areas, especially in Harrogate and Scarborough, but a budget is now available to address the improvement and regeneration of rural footways.
   (v) A report on progress towards the provision of footway condition information is included in Appendix K.

We are in the process of developing a pavement management system for the highway network. Increased resources (approximately £400k) have been allocated for 2003/04 to carry out condition assessments of carriageways and footways and to develop the network referencing system. The output from the system is not fully operational but calculations indicate additional investment is required for structural maintenance to fulfil Transport 2010 targets.

A significant increase in expenditure with assistance of capital Local Transport Plan funding in 2003/04 particularly for principal roads, indicates our commitment to meet the government targets.

The remoteness of large sections of the highway network makes the target to ensure 90% of reported incidents of dangerous damage to roads and pavements are repaired or made safe in 24 hours particularly challenging.

Significant effort is being made to reduce disruption of the highway by works carried out by the highway authority. Traffic sensitive street closure for more than 24 hours is avoided if possible with the current indicator for 2002/03 at 0.5 days/km.

A174 Sandsend Cliff Stabilisation

In addition to the routine maintenance matters, one exceptional maintenance issue has arisen.

Instability of the sea cliffs in the Scarborough district has been a perennial problem and some have been on a very large scale, notably the Sandsend cliff failure in the 1960s when the A174 was closed for about two months and more recently the collapse at Holbeck Hall. A study carried out by consultants, High Point Rendell, has identified areas which are particularly susceptible to collapse. The only major area identified which is likely to affect the principal road network is again at Sandsend on the A174.

A report and letter were sent to the Government Office in April 2002 outlining the problem and costing the works with priorities for construction. The total scheme costs exceed £4.5m but it was acknowledged that further works would be required to concrete embankments during years 11 to 12 of the programme although these have not been costed at this stage. So far a payment of £100,000 has been made by the government and this has been used to undertake essential earthworks and drainage works in order to forestall imminent collapse of localised parts of the cliff. Major works are still to be undertaken.

There may be scope for contributions to be made to the cost of the stabilisation scheme from either the DoE or DEFRA. A meeting of all interested parties is to be arranged to determine sources of funding and to firm up the existing construction programme.

Additional information on the length and condition of roads to enable the 2004/05 maintenance allocations to be determined is contained in Appendix K.

In addition, a Street Lighting inventory is included as Appendix O.

Maintenance and Strengthening of Bridges and Structures

The maintenance and strengthening strategy has been developed to complement the overall aims of the LTP. Strengthening of structures is carried out to ensure that communities are not disadvantaged, business growth in rural areas encouraged and sustained and access provided for public transport and modern delivery vehicles.

As we enter the fourth year of the six year programme we have affected approximately half of the strengthenings required to achieve a new stretching target of 95% of the structures in the County having a capacity of 40 tonnes. Due to problems with the Network Rail strengthening programme and their difficulties in the procurement of their strengthening works, no progress has been made on Network Rail structures carrying County roads.

To complement the strengthening programme we have adopted a maintenance strategy to ensure that the structures retain their functionality. Many older structures require maintenance to return them to a steady state. To aid this programme the information

Morton on Swale - Strengthening historic bridges
The figures do not allow for any liability for contributions towards the strengthening of Network Rail structures. Network Rail’s figures have been separated from the bid as they are currently struggling to provide a programme of strengthening which has firm costs and completion dates. The costs for Network Rail’s programme is given in Appendix L, but to date no agreements have been made with regard to these structures. The costs and timing are indicative only.

Following the rail crash at Great Heck in 2001 and the subsequent DfT guidance, the County Council has commenced on a programme of measures to minimise the risk of accidental obstruction of the railway by road vehicles. In 2002/03 barriers and other safety measures were provided at 11 locations at a cost of £558k. Unfortunately, however, government funding for further works has not, as yet, been forthcoming.

A supplementary bid for funding these works is therefore included in this APR. Appendix L includes the additional information on the number of bridges that remain to be assessed and require works. We are confident that, with continued financial support, the new target of 95% of the structures on the network will be capable of carrying 40 tonnes and that steady state maintenance will be achieved within the currency of this LTP.

Major Schemes Programme to 2010
(Appendix M)

The County Council has prepared a programme of Major and Major/Minor Schemes to 2010. In addition to the A165 Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme and A165 Reighton Bypass which have already been accepted, the following programme of bypass schemes have been developed in consultation with the Government Office for Yorkshire and Humberside (GOYH) in line with government advice and is felt to be ‘realistic and deliverable’.

With the announcement by the Highways Agency (HA) of the upgrading of the A1 to motorway standard through North Yorkshire, the Council has included the A684 Leeming Bar/Aiskew/Bedale Bypass in the Council’s Programme. This scheme is complementary to the A1 upgrading proposals. The start date for the Council’s bypass scheme will be influenced by HAs A1 upgrading programme.

The schemes selected for inclusion in the programme provide significant environmental and road safety benefits and a high rate of economic return. Their main objective is the removal of significant volumes of through traffic from communities on major routes. This is complementary to the LTP objectives and to other LTP strategies.
At present, surveys are being undertaken to confirm the presence/absence of great crested newts, a European protected species, on or adjacent to the site of the project. Should the newts be present, a mitigation plan will be prepared so that the necessary licence can be obtained from DEFRA. A Public Inquiry relating to the Statutory Orders was held in December 2002 and the Secretary of State’s decision is currently awaited. Notwithstanding that, the procedures necessary for the appointment of a preferred Contractor through a partnership agreement are being undertaken at this time to expedite the completion of the design and construction of the project. It is expected that a contract will be awarded to the successful tenderer by the end of this year.

A165 Reighton Bypass

This is a bypass of the community of Reighton on the A165 south of Scarborough. The 2003/04 Local Transport Settlement provisionally accepted the scheme “subject to successful completion of the statutory procedures”. Planning approval and Side Road Orders are in place. However, minor amendments to these are being pursued in order to ensure the scheme complies with current design standards. These amendments to the planning consent have now been approved. However, recent investigations have uncovered the presence of badgers, a European protected species, and the possible presence of features of archaeological significance. Further studies are required before renewal of the full planning consent can be presented for consideration in September 2003. The Government Office has recently responded to the draft Side Roads Order amendments and as a result they will be published in Summer 2003. The Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) time lapse in 2000. A new CPO will also be published in Summer 2003.

A19 Burn Bypass

This major/minor bypass scheme is primarily an environmental and road safety improvement for the village in accordance with LTP Objectives C, D and F.
The A63 Selby Bypass is due to open early in 2004 at which time it is likely that the A19 through Burn will replace the A1041 as the most attractive route between the A19 and A63 north of Selby and the M62. Therefore, it is anticipated that traffic flows on the A19 through Burn may increase significantly. There is currently no preferred route for this scheme. The necessary investigations and consultation to establish a preferred route will be undertaken in the near future with an anticipated bid for funding in July 2005.

**A61 Killinghall Bypass**
The purpose of the bypass is to relieve local environmental and road safety problems in and on the approaches to the village of Killinghall. This is supportive of LTP Objectives C, D and F. Following the Government Office's comments, the County Council will be investigating shorter routes and will carry out public consultation on any suitable options. A bid for funding is anticipated in 2006.

**A19 Shipton by Beningbrough Bypass**
As there is currently no preferred route for this bypass, work will be undertaken to establish such a route. The scheme will remove heavy traffic flows on the A19 from the village thereby improving the environment and road safety supporting LTP Objectives C, D and F. A bid for funding is anticipated in 2007.

**A684 Leeming Bar/Aiskew/Bedale Bypass**
This scheme is now included in the programme in light of the decision by the Highways Agency to upgrade the A1 to Motorway standard from Dishforth to Barton. The purpose of the bypass is to relieve local environmental and road safety problems in and on the approaches to the villages of Leeming Bar, Aiskew and Bedale. The timing of the construction of the project, which has a preferred route, will be determined in consultation with the Highways Agency.

The A63 Selby Bypass is due to open early in 2004 at which time it is likely that the A19 through Burn will replace the A1041 as the most attractive route between the A19 and A63 north of Selby and the M62. Therefore, it is anticipated that traffic flows on the A19 through Burn may increase significantly.

There is currently no preferred route for this scheme. The necessary investigations and consultation to establish a preferred route will be undertaken in the near future with an anticipated bid for funding in July 2005.

**A61 Killinghall Bypass**
The purpose of the bypass is to relieve local environmental and road safety problems in and on the approaches to the village of Killinghall. This is supportive of LTP Objectives C, D and F. Following the Government Office's comments, the County Council will be investigating shorter routes and will carry out public consultation on any suitable options. A bid for funding is anticipated in 2006.

**A19 Shipton by Beningbrough Bypass**
As there is currently no preferred route for this bypass, work will be undertaken to establish such a route. The scheme will remove heavy traffic flows on the A19 from the village thereby improving the environment and road safety supporting LTP Objectives C, D and F. A bid for funding is anticipated in 2007.

**A684 Leeming Bar/Aiskew/Bedale Bypass**
This scheme is now included in the programme in light of the decision by the Highways Agency to upgrade the A1 to Motorway standard from Dishforth to Barton. The purpose of the bypass is to relieve local environmental and road safety problems in and on the approaches to the villages of Leeming Bar, Aiskew and Bedale. The timing of the construction of the project, which has a preferred route, will be determined in consultation with the Highways Agency.

### Cross Boundary Working

Transport provision must be contiguous. A transport user need not know, or care, when they cross the boundary between adjacent local authorities or in the case of road transport whether the route is the responsibility of the Highways Agency or the County Council. Therefore, it is essential that close working relationships exist between neighbouring transport authorities.

The County Council has always worked closely with the Highways Agency on both a strategic level and on individual issues and this close partnership working will continue.

Whilst North Yorkshire County Council has always worked closely with its neighbours on specific issues, it is recognised that a more strategic approach to co-operation on transport planning would have additional benefits.

### Public Transport

- Commuting between West Yorkshire and North Yorkshire. Continued working with West Yorkshire PTE to improve rail services between the two Counties.
- Joint funding with Lancashire County Council of a report into the potential for the re-opening of the Skipton to Colne Railway Line.
- Working with City of York Council on the potential re-opening of the Malton to Pickering railway linked to the proposals for new stations at Haxby and Sternsall.
- Working with East Riding of Yorkshire Council on the potential for re-opening the Beverley to York railway.

### Major Schemes

- Continued co-operation with Lancashire County Council on the potential for integration of village bypass schemes on the A56 in Lancashire and North Yorkshire.
- Liaison with the Highways Agency on the possible concurrent provision of the A684 Leeming Bar/Bedale/Aiskew Bypass with the upgrade of the A1 to Motorway standard (see Appendix M).
- A64 broad-based study with City of York Council, Scarborough and Ryedale District Councils, Yorkshire Forward and the Highways Agency.

### Road Safety/Travel Awareness

- Continued sharing of Road Safety publicity material with adjacent authorities through the Local Authorities Road Safety Officers Association.
- Sharing of “If you’re not going far, forget the car” travel awareness publicity material with adjacent authorities and nationally.

### Cycling

- Further development of the National Cycle Network with Sustrans and adjacent local authorities.

### North York Moors National Park

- Discussed with Redcar and Cleveland Council on the review of transport strategy in the Park.

### Heavy Goods Vehicles

- B1365 weight restriction in liaison with Middlesbrough Council.
Progress made during 2002/03

Table A included in Annex A shows the Government’s Core Indicators. The indicators are used to measure performance against the National PSA Targets and 10 year plan targets and indicators, identified below:

National PSA Targets

1. Reduce congestion on the inter-urban trunk road network, and in large urban areas in England, below 2000 levels by 2020.
2. Improve accessibility, punctuality and reliability of local public transport (bus and light rail) with an increase in use of more than 12% from 2000 levels by 2010.
3. Reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured in Great Britain in road accidents by 40% and the number of children killed or seriously injured by 50%, by 2010 compared with the average for 1994-98, tackling the significantly higher incidence in disadvantaged communities.
4. Improve air quality by meeting our national air quality strategy objectives for carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, particles sulphur dioxide, benzene and 1,3 butadiene (shared with DEFRA).

10 year plan targets and indicators (not covered by the above)

5. By 2010 to triple the number of cycling trips compared with a 2000 base.
6. To achieve a one-third increase in the proportion of households in rural areas within 10 minutes walk of an hourly or better bus service by 2010.
7. Provide sufficient resources to local authorities to halt the deterioration in the condition of local roads by 2004 and to eliminate the backlog by the end of the Plan period.

Table B, also included in Annex A, shows progress towards the achievement of the North Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Objectives and Targets. Where these are linked to the National PSA Targets and 10 Year Plan Targets and Indicators they have been identified in the Table.

In our 2002 Annual Progress Report we identified a number of targets which were to be deleted and a number of targets that were to be reviewed after extensive consultation. As a result of consultation the targets have been revised and two new targets have been added to replace a number of targets that were dropped. These new targets are outcome based and replace less meaningful output based targets. The targets are as follows:

A9 Disabled Access
To implement measures defined in Pedestrian Action Plans for main town and village centres to improve access for the disabled (to link transport interchanges, car parks and other important facilities) in accordance with the individual programmes identified in such plans.

B17 Cycling Strategy
To increase cycling in towns for which Local Cycle Plans are prepared and adopted, in accordance with the individual targets established in such plans.

In our 2002 Annual Progress Report we identified a number of targets which were to be deleted and a number of targets that were to be reviewed after extensive consultation. As a result of consultation the targets have been revised and two new targets have been added to replace a number of targets that were dropped. These new targets are outcome based and replace less meaningful output based targets. The targets are as follows:

As well as raising this target we intend to create a new target specifically related to each Quality Freight Partnership. As the Quality Freight Partnerships develop a set of objectives will be agreed. These will form the basis for the Quality Freight Partnerships targets and will be reported in future APR's.

F2 Children under 16 killed or seriously injured
Original target – Reduce by 50% by 2010 compared with 1994/98 average.
New target – Reduce by 60% by 2010 compared with 1994/98 average.

G2 Bridge Stock
Original target – ensure 90% is available for 40 tonne vehicles by 2006.
New target – ensure 95% is available for 40 tonne vehicles by 2006.

New Targets
To increase our emphasis on safety a new target is to be adopted for front and rear seat belt use by children.

New target – An increase in the percentage of front and rear seat belt use by children, to 95% and 90% respectively by the year 2005.

This target will also have an interim target of an increase in the percentage of front and rear seat belt use by children, to 86% and 90% respectively by the year 2005.

The baseline figures are 83% and 73% front and rear respectively.

Modifications to Targets

G3 Lorry routing database for the County

Original target – Establish during the first two years of the Plan.

As well as raising this target we intend to create a new target specifically related to each Quality Freight Partnership. As the Quality Freight Partnerships develop a set of objectives will be agreed. These will form the basis for the Quality Freight Partnerships targets and will be reported in future APR's.
Introducing Interim Targets
There are three targets relating to the reduction of road accidents which have timescales greater than the LTP period. In order to monitor these targets closely an interim milestone of 2005/06 has been set for each of them.

The interim targets will be as follows:

- **F1 Number of people killed or seriously injured**
  - Target: Reduce by 40% by 2010 compared with the 1994/98 average.
  - Interim target: Reduce by 32% by 2005 compared with the 1994/98 average.

- **F2 Children under 16 killed or seriously injured**
  - Target: Reduce by 60% by 2010 compared with the 1994/98 average.
  - Interim target: Reduce by 58% by 2005 compared with the 1994/98 average.

- **F3 Slight casualty rate**
  - Target: Reduce by 10% by 2010 compared with the 1994/98 average.
  - Interim target: Reduce by 5% by 2005 compared with the 1994/98 average.

We feel we are making excellent progress towards the achievement of our targets. Out of a total of 30 local targets we have met two ahead of schedule, 21 are on track, two are awaiting monitoring data and only five are not currently on track. We are particularly pleased with the outcome so far in reducing the number of killed and seriously injured casualties, the increases in bus patronage and cycling and our progress in improving facilities for pedestrians including those with disabilities.

Expenditure 2002/03

**Introduction**
Table 1 sets out the proposed expenditure of LTP funds for 2002/03 identified in last year’s APR along with the outturn expenditure for each category of work. The Table also sets out the proposed expenditure by category of work for the remainder of the LTP period up to 2005/06. An estimate of proposed expenditure for 2006/07, the first year of the next LTP, has also been included. A more detailed breakdown of expenditure for 2002/03 including a comparison of the number of programmed to actual schemes completed is provided in Appendix T along with details of the outturn revenue expenditure.

The budget available for 2002/03 for Integrated Transport was £33.911k, being the £33.500k allocation plus £1.161k underspend in 2001/02 carried forward plus an additional allocation of £250k for Road over Rail.

(a) **Integrated Transport**

It became evident during the course of the financial year, that due to circumstances beyond the Council’s control, bridge maintenance schemes were not progressing on programme and a potential shortfall in expenditure in this element of work could materialise. To counteract this shortfall the delivery of schemes on integrated transport was accelerated and schemes brought forward.

A total expenditure of £33.911k was achieved on integrated transport in 2002/03. This level of expenditure has meant that we have not only spent the allocation given and caught up the underspend from 2001/02, but also fully expended additional money sufficient to counteract the underspend in Structural Maintenance of Bridges. With the step change in delivery in the last two years we are confident that the allocation for 2003/04 will be fully expended in the current financial year.

A detailed analysis of performance against targets/expenditure is given in the Appendices to the APR. A brief explanation of the major factors contributing to the variance in outturn expenditure to programmed expenditure is given overleaf:

**Passenger Transport (overspend £869k)**
In the last financial year excellent progress has been made in delivering passenger transport infrastructure. This has resulted in projects delayed from 2001/02 and many new projects from the 2002/03 programme being completed.

The original planned expenditure (£2,360k) was exceeded with the completion of such projects as Whitby Bus Station (£350k), Tadcaster Bus Station (£312k) Harrogate Bus Station (£320k) and Bedale/Northallerton Quality Bus Corridor (£59k). These schemes were all carried over from 2001/02 and added to the programme of passenger transport schemes delivered in 2002/03.

**Local Safety Schemes (overspend £43k)**
Again, excellent progress has been made on Local Safety Schemes with the land issues for B6161 Penny Pot Lane (£660k) and A59 Moor Monkton Crossroads (£326k) resolved, the schemes progressed and were completed.

The delivery of schemes broadly within programme expectations has meant that the local Safety Schemes expenditure was marginally overspent.

**Traffic Management (underspend £88k)**
Good progress has been made on Traffic Management with measures totalling £1,947k being delivered.

Traffic Management strategies have been approved for six towns. This expenditure was slightly less than anticipated at the start of the financial year. However, it is expected that expenditure will accelerate in 2003/04 with the implementation of the strategies.

**Pedestrian Facilities (overspend £446k)**
Schemes carried over from 2001/02 were completed in 2002/03 which added £200k to the original planned expenditure of £246k.

In addition, new schemes were added to the programme to counter an anticipated underspend in other budget categories. These included a footbridge at Hutton Rudby (£160k), a footway at Glasshouses (£55k), a footway and raised kerb bus stops at Field Lane, Scarborough (£55k).
Cycling (underspend £175k)

Schemes which had been delayed in 2001/02 were completed in 2002/03, and good progress made on the implementation of the Harrogate Cycling Plan (£360k).

A delay caused by extended consultation in Thirsk has meant that construction of Route 2 of the Thirsk Cycle Plan (£200k) was deferred from the last quarter of 2002/03 to the first quarter of 2003/04.

Disabled Strategy (overspend £349k)

The opportunity was taken to accelerate the upgrading of pedestrian crossings (£285k) and the provision of dropped crossings/tactile pavements with the additional finances available.

Road over Rail (overspend £308k)

Good progress has been made in improving safety at 10 locations. A total of £358k was spent, ie £308k over and above the amount identified from integrated transport in our 2002 APR. A further £50k SCA allocation reduced this overspend to a net amount of £58k.

(b) Structural Maintenance

The budget available in 2002/03 for structural maintenance of £16,746k was allocated to Principal Roads (£2,719k), Non-Principal Roads (£7,611k) and Bridges (£6,416k).

Principal and Non-Principal Roads

A total expenditure of £2,739k and £7,611k was achieved on the structural maintenance of Principal and Non-Principal Roads respectively. This has resulted in a marginal overspend of £20k. In recognition of the need to increase the level of funding in the structural maintenance of the principal road network, the Council allocated an additional £500k from its Performance Development Fund for this vital area of work.

Bridges (underspend £1,477k)

Progress on the delivery of a number of bridge schemes was severely affected by factors beyond the direct control of the Council, Network Rail (previously Railtrack) had planned to re-deck the bridge structure at Victoria Avenue, Harrogate with a contribution of £1,000k from the Council’s LTP budget during 2002/03. It became evident during the course of the year that Network Rail were unable to deliver the scheme as programmed and whilst immediate action was taken to re-allocate the resources by bringing forward schemes planned for future years it was not possible to start works on site during the financial year.

In addition to the above, two schemes at Hutton Rudby and East Ayton were delayed by the need to secure Listed Building consents. These schemes commenced on site towards the end of the financial year but were not completed. Similarly the Swing Bridge at Bradley has run over the year end, contributing to the overall underspend, with a minor overrun of two other swing bridge refurbishments.

Sources of other funding

In order to deliver the LTP targets we recognise the need to supplement the LTP funding allocation from other sources.

In 2002/03 we were successful in securing £147k from the Lottery Fund to complete the refurbishment of Ripon Market Place in partnership with Harrogate Borough Council. £30k of on-street car parking income from Harrogate, after taking into account operational expenditure, has been used to fund a range of schemes including, improvement of existing off-street car parks, local safety schemes and safer routes to school. On-street car parking income from Scarborough has been used to offset the set up costs and support the Park and Ride operation from the Weaponness site. Surplus revenue in future years will be used to complement the delivery of other LTP initiatives.

£437k of Rural Bus Challenge funding has enabled services in this vital area to continue. Contributions of £30k from Selby District Council towards Tadcaster Bus Station and £250k from Harrogate & District Travel for infrastructure and implementation of Real Time Bus Information has enabled significant progress to be made in the delivery of improvements to Public Transport. Additionally, Parish Councils have made contributions to the improvements and provision of bus stops throughout the County.

In Travel Awareness, in addition to the £30k pa for school bursary posts, a further £19k for individualised marketing was again secured by competitive bid to the DfT.

Our Development Control section secures works in accordance with the LTP’s aims via developer funded works. These can be split into two categories:

- Improvements to the existing transport network
- Works to create new roads

In 2002/03 works valued in excess of £4,500k were secured. These included:

- Improved pedestrian routes including signal controlled crossings
- Additions to the footway network
- Improved cycle routes
- Additional cycle routes
- Cycle parking provisions
- Residential zones with 20mph design speeds
- Improved safety at schools
- Additional public transport infrastructure
- Traffic calming schemes

Expenditure 2003/04 and future years

A summary of expenditure by category for 2003/04 is shown in Table 1. A more detailed breakdown of the schemes included within each category is included as Appendix T, along with an indicative programme for 2004/05.

The LTP budget available for 2003/04 is £26,254k. This is the base LTP allocation of £26,450k less the net underspend of £196k carried forward from 2002/03. The net overspend of £196k was made up as follows:

a) Overspend in Integrated Transport (+) £1,653k
b) Overspend in Structural Maintenance Principal Roads (+) £130k
c) Underspend in Structural Maintenance Bridges (-) £1,477k
In addition to the LTP budget of £26,254k, £699k has also been provisionally allocated for Scarborough Integrated Transport for which a Supplementary Credit Approval certificate will be provided if the scheme is fully accepted this year.

In determining the allocation of the budget for 2003/04, account has been taken of the underexpenditure in the Structural Maintenance of Bridges in 2002/03, to ensure this vital area of work is brought back on programme. The budget has been allocated as follows:

- £8,547k Integrated Transport;
- £17,707k Structural Maintenance.

Measures to mitigate the accidental incursion of vehicles onto the railway, totalling a further £760k have been identified. A bid for Supplementary Credit Approval has been prepared to cover the work required that is additional to those measures already planned in the LTP.

When allocating the £8,547k available for integrated transport to the individual budget heads for 2003/04, account has been taken of the progress made against targets and outturn against programmed expenditure for 2002/03 included in last year’s APR.

A comparison of outturn to programmed expenditure for 2002/03 has identified divergence greater than 25% from the programme in the following categories:

- Public Transport +39%
- Pedestrian Facilities +78%
- Disabled Strategy +107%
- Transport Studies +65%
- Travel Awareness +51%
- Cycling -30%

The divergence from the programme is due to the allocation of funds to integrated transport in 2002/03 to offset the underspend in structural maintenance of bridges. The funding allocation was undertaken due to the critical need for the continued maintenance of these structures, the high number of closures and the high level of public concern.

Measures have been identified to improve the expenditure situation and bring expenditure closer in line with the original programme, as shown in Table 1.

We have reviewed the expenditure profile of the integrated transport element for the remainder of the LTP period to 2006/07, in order to ensure the programme is funded within the original budget allocations. The Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies continue to enjoy a high level of participation from the public and stakeholders. As anticipated, the studies have been successfully completed and the Network has been approved for the Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies has been prepared which would enable the programme to be accelerated and delivered in a timescale which would be more acceptable to the public.

The total budget for integrated transport for the last two years of the LTP period, ie 2004/05 and 2005/06 is £23,000, ie 23% higher than that submitted in our 2002 APR.

In addition to the LTP budget of £26,254k, £699k has also been provisionally allocated for Scarborough Integrated Transport for which a Supplementary Credit Approval certificate will be provided if the scheme is fully accepted this year.

The programme described above does not include allocations for the following Major Schemes:

- Major Schemes (Appendix M)
- Supplementary Bids (Appendix N)

As described earlier in this report and in Appendix M, the County Council received approval last year for two Major Schemes. Details of the expected expenditure for 2004/05 for these schemes are included in Table 2.

In consultation with the Government Office for Yorkshire and Humber (GOYH), the County Council is submitting four bids for supplementary funding to address these issues. Full details of these bids are included in Appendix N.

National Cycle Network – North Yorkshire

In order to complete the outstanding sections of the National Cycle Network in North Yorkshire the County Council is seeking an additional allocation of £280k for the financial year 2004/05.
A supplementary bid for these schemes was first submitted in 2003/04. The bid for £120k for 2003/04 was accepted and support, in principle, for future years expressed.

Currently preparation of the schemes for 2003/04 is progressing well. The Council feels that the remainder of the works required can be carried out in 2004/05. Therefore, the bid has been revised to reflect this progress and the Council is now seeking an additional £280k for 2004/05 to complete the outstanding sections.

**Integrated Transport Works on De-Trunked Roads**

During the current financial year, the Highways Agency propose to de-trunk and hand over to the County Council sections of the A19, A64, A65, A629 and A1041.

Whilst the arrangements for the transfer of these roads include funding for both revenue and capital maintenance, there are no arrangements for the funding of any necessary integrated transport. Integrated transport funding bids for these sections of road and others that may be de-trunked, will be included in the next LTP. However, there remains a funding gap for 2004/05 and 2005/06.

Therefore, the Council is submitting a supplementary bid for a total of £960k for safety and non-safety improvements of de-trunked sections of road over the next two years.

**Managing the Accidental Obstruction of the Railway by Road Vehicles**

Following the Selby rail crash in February 2001, the DfT issued guidance on the management of road over rail and roads parallel to rail tracks. This set out the protocol for the apportioning of costs and responsibilities for this matter.

Therefore, the County Council has prepared a programme of expenditure relating to the assessment and management of accidental obstructions of the railway by road vehicles. Whilst the programmed assessments may identify further requirements, the current estimated County Council expenditure to conform with the DfT guidelines is £340k. This has been programmed over the three year period 2003/04 to 2005/06.

An SCA bid has been submitted which includes the expected expenditure of £120k for the current year. However, should this be unsuccessful the finance will be provided by the temporary reallocation of other capital funding. Therefore, the Council is bidding for a total of £720k in 2004/05 (£420k to replace reallocated capital for 2003/04 and £300k for programmed works for 2004/05) and £220k for 2005/06.

**Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies**

A key element of the County Council’s proposals included in the LTP was the preparation and implementation of Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies. Further details of these are included in the section on Traffic Management.

This integrated approach to the provision of transport within a community has been much praised and is very successful. However, this approach has resulted in a large number and scope of schemes generated by the unprecedented levels of public involvement in the process.

Whilst the increased expenditure required to implement these schemes will be reflected in the next LTP, the available funding for 2004/05 and 2005/06 is insufficient to meet the aspirations identified by the Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies.

Therefore, the County Council is seeking an additional allocation of £210k over the next two years to address this funding gap.

A summary expenditure profile for the supplementary bids is shown in Table 3.

---

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public Transport</th>
<th>Local Safety Schemes</th>
<th>Traffic Management</th>
<th>Pedestrian Facilities</th>
<th>Cycling</th>
<th>Disabled Strategy</th>
<th>Road over Rail Schemes</th>
<th>Transport Studies</th>
<th>Freight Strategy</th>
<th>Travel Awareness</th>
<th>Performance Monitoring</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>£603</td>
<td>£1,574</td>
<td>£383</td>
<td>£193</td>
<td>£257</td>
<td>£41</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>£668</td>
<td>£2,425</td>
<td>£1,143</td>
<td>£628</td>
<td>£638</td>
<td>£42</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£41</td>
<td>£34</td>
<td>£151</td>
<td>£54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>£2,360</td>
<td>£2,946</td>
<td>£2,035</td>
<td>£627</td>
<td>£748</td>
<td>£326</td>
<td>£326</td>
<td>£139</td>
<td>£70</td>
<td>£151</td>
<td>£60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>£3,229</td>
<td>£2,989</td>
<td>£1,947</td>
<td>£1,073</td>
<td>£573</td>
<td>£675</td>
<td>£675</td>
<td>£230</td>
<td>£66</td>
<td>£51</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>£869</td>
<td>£43</td>
<td>£-88</td>
<td>£446</td>
<td>£-175</td>
<td>£446</td>
<td>£446</td>
<td>£91</td>
<td>£-4</td>
<td>£51</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>£1,800</td>
<td>£2,300</td>
<td>£2,172</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£1,015</td>
<td>£330</td>
<td>£330</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£2,585</td>
<td>£4,595</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>£1,010</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>£1,600</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td>£4,750</td>
<td>£730</td>
<td>£1,110</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£60</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>£1,700</td>
<td>£2,600</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£800</td>
<td>£1,200</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£60</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

1. Overspend offset by additional £250k SCA for Road over Rail Schemes.
2. Expenditure excludes £500k funded from revenue as part of Performance Improvement Fund.
3. Budget allocation £10,200k reduced by net overspend in 2002/03 of £1,653k.
4. Budget allocation £4,600k reduced by net overspend in 2002/03 of £20k.
5. Budget allocation £2,800k increased by net underspend in 2002/03 of £1,477k.
Summary of comments contained in December 2002 settlement letter that indicated a need for improvement or clarification

Progress towards targets and objectives:
Need to show a further shift from process targets to outcome targets and ensure they are robust enough to measure accurately the progress you are making towards objectives.

Delivery of schemes on the ground:
Linkages between schemes delivered and the achievement of LTP and National targets needs to be made clearer.

Consultation arrangements:
Need to demonstrate how consultation results are fed into the LTP process and impact on scheme delivery and outcomes.

Evidence of Improvement

Table 2
Major Schemes Expenditure Profile 2004 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>2003/04 (£000)</th>
<th>2004/05 (£000)</th>
<th>2005/06 (£000)</th>
<th>2006/07 (£000)</th>
<th>Total (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme</td>
<td>699 *</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>17,210</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>26,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reighton Bypass</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Expenditure in 2003/04 is subject to the scheme being fully accepted in-year. If the scheme does not become fully accepted then the profile will be subject to change.

Table 3
Supplementary Bids Expenditure Profile 2004 to 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>2004/05 (£000)</th>
<th>2005/06 (£000)</th>
<th>Total (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Cycle Network – North Yorkshire</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Transport Works on De-Trunked Roads</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Accidental Obstruction of the Railway by Road Vehicles</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Expenditure in 2003/04 is subject to the scheme being fully accepted in-year. If the scheme does not become fully accepted then the profile will be subject to change.

Table 4
Supplementary Bids Expenditure Profile 2004 to 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>2004/05 (£000)</th>
<th>2005/06 (£000)</th>
<th>Total (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Cycle Network – North Yorkshire</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Transport Works on De-Trunked Roads</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Accidental Obstruction of the Railway by Road Vehicles</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultation and Best Practice

Consultation Arrangements
(Appendix P)

Comprehensive and meaningful consultation is the cornerstone to the development and implementation of all our LTP initiatives.

We have consulted on:

- The formulation and review of transport policies, leading to the adoption of relevant and appropriate objectives, strategies and targets.
- The determination of priorities for implementation, leading to the preparation of detailed work programmes reflecting those priorities relative to financial resources available; and
- The development and implementation of individual schemes and projects.

Further details as reported in the 2002 APR is reproduced as Appendix P for information.

The following section summarises the consultations carried out in 2002/03 and highlights enhancements made to improve our performance.

During the past 12 months we have carried out extensive consultation with local authorities, stakeholders, transport operators, businesses and the public.

In our 2002 APR we reported that we were planning to carry out a mid cycle ‘health check’ on the provisions of the LTP and an assessment of our performance to date. The aim of the consultation was to re-visit the issues, problems and potential solutions concerning transportation matters in the County and evaluate the on-going relevance of the LTP’s objectives, strategies and targets.

We maintain regular contact with many bodies and organisations regarded as being our principal LTP partners. To a large extent consultation with these stakeholders on the continuing relevance and effectiveness of the LTP is undertaken on an ongoing basis. However, we were anxious to hear the views of all North Yorkshire residents and those LTP stakeholders with whom there is less regular contact.

Three key elements of consultation have been carried out since our last APR as follows:

a) ‘Transport Survey’ in Autumn 2002 of all of the County’s residents by making use of the Council’s bi-annual newsletter ‘North Yorkshire Reporter’, which is delivered to every home and business in the County.

b) Forum for all LTP stakeholders at which their views on performance to date could be ascertained by the County Council, and also exchanged between the various participants.

c) Consultation forums with all seven District Councils and National Parks in the County and with the adjacent highway authorities.

a) Transport Survey ‘Are We Getting It Right?’

The ‘North Yorkshire Reporter’ article included information on how the budget for integrated transport was allocated and what has been achieved to date against targets. A copy of the article is included in Appendix P.

The responses received to the questionnaire, which were included with the article, are shown overleaf:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q.1 Preparing comprehensive transport plans is the best way of identifying the opportunities and priorities for improvement in the County’s towns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46% (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.2 Road safety should continue to be a high priority and more challenging targets should be set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.3 Improving the quality and frequency of public transport, enhancing passenger waiting facilities and providing better information on services is the right approach to encourage greater use of public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.4 The provision of a comprehensive network of safe and convenient routes for cyclists should form part of the overall plan to improve transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54% (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.5 Improved facilities for pedestrians should remain a priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41% (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.6 The Council should continue to promote transport initiatives such as reducing the impact of freight movements and the development of school and workplace travel plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Figures in brackets indicate response received from delegates at Local Transport Plan Consultation Forum.
The results indicate a high level of support for all aspects of the Council’s approach in the delivery of the LTP. All the individual comments received through this process have been analysed and will be used to inform the review and roll forward of the LTP.

b) Local Transport Plan Consultation Forum

Over 100 groups, organisations and companies were invited to attend a forum at County Hall on 6 December 2002. The consultation forum included a presentation reviewing the progress on the implementation of the LTP. The presentation was followed by Workshop sessions covering:

- Highway and Bridge Maintenance
- Freight
- Public Transport
- Community Transport
- Traffic Management and Road Safety
- Cycling, Walking, Access
- Disabled People and Travel Awareness

Discussions in the workshops were structured to address:

- Implementation of LTP projects to date
- LTP targets and any necessary action
- The way forward

Participants were invited to complete the same questionnaire that had been used for the survey of residents and businesses. As detailed in the summary of results table, the same high level of support as that shown by the residents survey to the Council’s approach in the delivery of the LTP.

A summary of the key issues arising from workshops along with responses received to the questionnaire are included in the Appendix.

c) Consultation forums with other Authorities

We arranged 12 separate LTP consultation forums with District Councils, National Parks and adjacent Highway Authorities. These meetings have established a clearer mutual understanding of a wide range of associated issues including the roll forward of the County Structure Plan, Local Plans and future Planning Frameworks, all aspects of the Local Transport Plan and the development of the community strategies through Local Strategic Partnerships. The meetings were welcomed by all those who attended and in each case it was agreed that they had been useful and informative and should be held on at least an annual basis.

Community Strategies

The preparation of community strategies has provided the opportunity to broaden consultation on the Local Transport Plan. Community strategies are being prepared for each of the District Council areas in the County and Local Strategic Partnerships (LSP) have been established to oversee the development of each. The strategies for Selby, Craven and Scarborough have been published and those for the other four District areas are at various stages of development but should be in place before the end of this financial year.

The County Council is working with the Chairs of the District LSPs to establish a North Yorkshire Strategic Partnership (NYSPP) which will oversee the preparation of a community strategy for the County as a whole. This will provide a context in which policies and programmes best dealt with at a wide area level can be developed through partnership. The LTP will be an important instrument by which the county-wide strategy is delivered and will be included in future consultations on it.

The District level community strategies are being or have been put together by the partners to the LSPs. The importance the County Council attaches to the development of these strategies is reflected in the fact that a County Council Member elected by the relevant Area Committee, along with a senior officer, represent the Council at the Local Strategic Partnership meetings.

As one of these partners, the County Council has sought to ensure that its programmes match the needs of the developing Community Strategy and that the County Council’s programmes to deliver these needs have been embodied in those strategies. Draft plans prepared in this way have been published for consultation by the LSPs and, in two cases, ultimately adopted. In this way, we make sure that the policies and programmes of the LTP and of the community strategies are in line with each other and that the implementation of the LTP policies and programmes at the local level are adapted to the requirements of the local community strategy.

A typical example is the implementation of the Northallerton Cycle Plan. The need to “encourage the provision of cycle paths in, through and to Northallerton” is identified in the Hambleton Community Plan (Draft). The Northallerton Cycle Plan is consistent with the public’s aspirations and implementation of the Cycle Plan and has been given a high priority in the LTP programme. Route 1 of the Cycle Plan is complete and the implementation of further routes are planned for 2003/04.

Consultation Review

A comprehensive review of our consultation procedures is being carried out, taking into account good practice in other authorities and to ensure consistency in approach across all aspects of the LTP. Consultation on the development of the traffic management strategies has continued. As a result of feedback, an additional stage has been introduced to broaden the initial consultation on transport issues beyond the stakeholders group. Questionnaires are now distributed to 10% of all properties in the study area to ensure that the issues to be addressed are agreed by a wider representative group. Improvements have also been made to the process by providing feedback on decisions taken following consultation. Additionally, we have introduced the concept of post-implementation surveys to establish the public’s views on schemes delivered. The information provided through this feedback is used to improve the design and consultation process.

Consultation on Maintenance Issues

The Council also consults widely on maintenance issues. Last year this consultation was on verge Maintenance and led to a review of that policy. It is proposed that this year the consultation looks at changes to Winter Maintenance.
The County Council is fully committed to learning from others and sharing its own good practice. We have included in this year’s APR a separate appendix which provides numerous examples of where we have shared good practice during the course of last year. The format is based on that used by Leicestershire County Council who are recognised as having excellence in this area.

A selection of the examples given in Appendix P (where they are described in more detail) is set out below.

**Learning from Others**

- Joint working with Harrogate & District Travel (‘Bus Company of the Year’) on passenger perceptions of what would make bus use more attractive.
- Working with Metro and City of York on the Leeds – Harrogate – York Line Route Strategy, we have learnt from the experience of others (particularly Metro) in the commissioning and management of a major rail study.
- Membership of Yorkshire Local Information Partnership which includes the two PTEs and City of York Council has led to a joint development of a new journey planner which includes both internet access and a telephone enquiry service now available throughout North Yorkshire.
- An appraisal of Highway Maintenance Best Value inspections revealed excellent performance by Hertfordshire County Council and a visit identified a number of areas where improvements could be implemented in our Authority.
- An ‘Innovation’ group has been formed with our term maintenance contractor (Raynesway Construction Southern) with the initial priority focused on sustainability with recycling initiatives already planned.
- Advice from East Riding of Yorkshire Council on the design of cycle direction signs.
- Revised approach to consultation on provision of cycle routes based on the method used by the City of York Council.
- Visited Cleveland and Lincolnshire Police Authorities to learn from their experience of implementing a Safety Camera partnership.
- Advice on variable message signing from Kent County Council and visited Durham County Council to learn from their experience of the use of these signs.
- Consulted with Doncaster and West Sussex Councils on positioning of kerbside detectors for puffin crossings.
- Sought advice from Kirklees and Doncaster Councils and visited Leeds City Council regarding the form of their tender documents for their traffic signal maintenance contract prior to re-letting the contract for North Yorkshire.
- Following a visit to the beacon council, Hampshire County Council, we have trialed their approach to workplace travel plans. We have also held Workplace Transport Forums similar to those held in Ramsey and Peterfield.
- Our new guidance on transport assessments was based on a similar approach adopted by Sheffield City Council.

**Sharing our Good Practice with Others**

- Our premier specification for bus service contracts on quality corridors which includes new buses, driver training and a publicity package was shared with Durham and Darlington Councils.
- The extensive feasibility work undertaken into the re-opening of the Malton to Pickering railway line is the leading example of this type of work in the region and has been shared with a wide range of other authorities and interest groups. Presentation of work was given at a regional seminar.
- Partnership working with City of York Council on a joint procurement of weather forecast/ice prediction service.
- Preparation of ‘Design Guidelines for Cycle Facilities’ for distribution to potential developers in North Yorkshire to ensure appropriate design of these facilities in new developments.
- Advised a number of other local authorities on our approach to locating the secondary signals at traffic signal junctions.
- Development of a classroom resource to demonstrate the importance of wearing seat belts now purchased by a number of other authorities.
- Our approach to travel awareness has been recognised as particularly innovative and has attracted interest throughout the UK, from Devon to Aberdeenshire; 25 authorities purchased information and network of users set up.
- Presentations to senior civil servants at the Department for Education and Skills on our approach to curriculum-based travel awareness.
- Our guide to OFSTED inspections and travel awareness has been widely distributed. Bath and N/E Somerset Council have adopted this approach and helped us re-write the guidance.
- Our work on how to accommodate School Walking Week into rural schools was featured in the Sustrans video to support school travel plans.
- Responsible for delivering training to 18 authorities in the Yorkshire and Humber and the Government Office for the North East region, put forward by the National TravelWise association as a model of best practice.
- Our travel awareness officer is representing the region at a European ‘Target’ seminar on travel behaviour in June 2003 on our work with measuring and influencing attitudes to car use.
- Advising City of York Council on the development of their Freight Strategy.
- Member of the Transport Visions Network and helped evaluate its ‘Freight and Logistics’ Report.
- Guidance given to neighbouring authorities on setting up Freight Quality Partnerships.

**Membership of Best Practice Groups**

Our membership of Best Practice groups and other Forums is set out in Appendix P.
LTP Contribution to Wider Objectives

(Appendix Q)

The Local Transport Plan has not been prepared or implemented in isolation. It is inextricably linked with a range of other strategies, plans and initiatives developed not only by the County Council itself, but also by a variety of public, private and voluntary organisations and bodies.

Transport is not of course an end in itself but an important factor affecting other policy areas. The following paragraphs provide a brief overview of how the LTP links into and supports wider objectives.

National and Regional Guidance

The LTP takes fully on board government guidance for transport and its aims for the economy, environment, safety, integration and accessibility. It is consistent with national policy, Regional Planning Guidance for Yorkshire and the Humber (RPG 12) and with the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS). The County Council is also fully engaged in the current selective review of this regional guidance and is a key player in the region in terms of ensuring rural transport issues are addressed.

Corporate Strategy

The County Council's priorities as reflected in the new Council Plan, which is currently out to consultation, complement and support the Government and Local Government Association's shared Key Priorities, as shown in Appendix Q. In turn, North Yorkshire's transport policies are fully consistent with and support the County Council's Corporate priorities, the links between these broader Council objectives and the objectives, schemes and initiatives being pursued through the LTP are shown in the table opposite:

Wider Issues

Linkage Between Council Objectives and LTP Schemes/Initiatives

County Council Objectives

Security for all – by promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities (LTP Objectives A, B, C, D, E, F, G)

Growing up prepared for the future through good education and care and protection when it is needed (LTP Objectives A, B, E)

Independence – through employment, opportunity and appropriate support (LTP Objectives A, B, E, G)

Keeping us on the move – with a safe and reliable transport system and powerful telecommunications (LTP Objectives A, B, C, E, F)

Strengthening our economy – by supporting business, developing our infrastructure and helping people improve their skills (LTP Objectives B, C, E, G)

Looking after our heritage – in our countryside and in our towns and villages (LTP Objectives B, D)

Keeping in touch – by listening to your views, by planning to meet your needs and by telling you what we are doing.

Supporting LTP schemes/initiatives

- Road safety schemes
- Travel awareness initiatives
- Improving and promoting environmentally friendly forms of transport
- Improved access for disabled people
- Promoting sustainable movement of goods
- Increasing the use of low noise surfacing in urban areas
- Travel awareness initiatives
- School travel plans
- Road safety education
- Transport to educational facilities
- Improved access to work
- Green travel plans for businesses
- Maintenance of roads and bridges
- Road safety schemes
- Traffic management schemes
- Promotion and support for local bus services
- Improving pedestrian and cycling facilities
- Minimising delays through maintenance works programming
- Highway and transport improvements
- Improving accessibility by all modes to workplaces
- Implementing Traffic Management Strategies for market towns
- Environmental improvements linked to transport schemes
- Maintenance and improvement of the rights of way network
- Transport strategies for two National Parks
- Use of appropriate materials in sensitive areas
- Reviewing verge maintenance policy
- Increasing use of recycling materials within the network
- Extensive consultation on LTP objectives, strategies and individual schemes.
The County Council is working closely with a number of regional and local bodies to develop a strategic approach to assessing and improving accessibility within the County.

The County Council has been involved in the formulation of regional guidance on accessibility standards against which significant new developments will be assessed. This guidance is now incorporated within the selective review of Regional Planning Guidance. It recognises the need for differing standards in the rural areas of the region such as North Yorkshire, and in this respect is consistent with the approach we have recently adopted on parking standards at new developments.

The County Council is working to establish a county wide system for assessing accessibility in partnership with the local planning authorities (LPAs) through the well-established forum of North Yorkshire Planning Officers’ Group (NYPOG). This will:

- enable a strategic view to be taken
- provide county wide consistency
- address cross boundary issues within the County and with neighbouring authorities
- build upon data already held by the county
- link more readily with partners who cross district boundaries
- provide economies of scale

Some discussions have already taken place with the LPAs and work is underway to establish a formal framework for progressing the project. Once this framework is in place, discussions with a wider range of partners will be essential. This will guide detailed work on the system implementation. It is anticipated that the system will be GIS based, building on information already held in this format by the County Council. It will need to take account of the criteria set out in the RPG and be capable of identifying:

- population and facilities base data
- highly accessible locations
- potential development corridors
- areas of existing development requiring improved accessibility
- areas where poor public transport threatens to undermine spatial strategy
- cross border links
- areas with high quality pedestrian and cycle networks
- socially excluded populations where additional resources should be targeted
- input to regional priorities

The consultations with partner organisations such as local communities, disabled access groups, healthcare providers and public transport providers will identify the contributions the partner organisations can make to the data and the output they may require.

Whilst this work to develop a strategic approach is ongoing, we continue to assess the accessibility of sites in North Yorkshire on a case by case basis through Transport Assessments and Travel Plans.

It is intended that the system provided will allow the mainstreaming of accessibility issues into all aspects of transport provision.

The considerable increase in funding for transport both locally and nationally is welcomed by the County Council. However, it has resulted in a shortage of skilled transport professionals and a very competitive jobs market. Whilst the County Council has now implemented successful measures to aid recruitment and retention of staff, the shortage of skilled staff in some areas has placed extra pressure on both the timescale and cost of delivery of projects on the ground.

The skills shortage extends to the County Council’s consultants and contractors. The volume of transport related commissions available from both Local Government and the Highways Agency has increased tender prices and extended delivery times.

As a result of the need for rigorous public involvement in the planning and implementation of projects, the lead-in time for a scheme can be considerable. In previous years, the flexibility to carry over funding into a subsequent year has been very useful in addressing this problem. This flexibility is no longer allowed. Therefore the County Council has adopted a practice of over-programming of schemes to ensure that allocations are fully spent in any given year. This approach has been praised by the GOYH.

The recent poor Formula Spending Share (FSS) settlement, especially for rural authorities like North Yorkshire, has increased concern about the additional demand on revenue budgets resulting from the increased capital expenditure on transport. Whilst the Council has made every effort to minimise the impact of capital expenditure on the revenue budget, this issue needs to be addressed by the government if the improvements in the transport infrastructure and services are to be sustained.

The Council is also concerned that the de-trunking of a significant proportion of the Trunk Road network in North Yorkshire needs to be matched by an increased capital settlement for integrated transport to allow the Council to implement necessary improvements on its extended network of County roads. If an increased capital settlement is not forthcoming and sustained over a number of years,
the increased mileage of highway to be managed will inevitably lead to a decrease in the level of provision which can be made county wide. The County Council has submitted a supplementary bid for funding to finance integrated transport works on these sections of de-trunked roads.

The Council also has concerns about the suspension of Freight Facilities Grants and Track Access Grants, which has jeopardised the delivery of a number of initiatives and could result in high volumes of freight being moved by road as opposed to rail. Similarly the suspension of Rail Passenger Partnership Grants along with the delays in awarding a replacement franchise for Trans Pennine rail has resulted in under investment in the rail network in the County.

As with most areas of Public Service, the actions of the Police are becoming increasingly dominated by the need to meet national targets. Unfortunately, there are no national targets for the Police relating to road safety or the enforcement of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). Therefore, there is a marked reluctance on the behalf of the Police to divert resources away from areas of their responsibility which are target led to the enforcement of TROs and speed limits which are not. The net effect is that many speed limits, heavy commercial vehicle restrictions and parking restrictions are virtually un-enforced. This significantly reduces the effectiveness of many of the measures promoted through the LTP. This issue was discussed at a recent meeting of the Yorkshire and Humberside Casualty Reduction Steering Group and there is concern that a major factor in the increase in casualties last year was the low level of speed enforcement in large parts of the region. In North Yorkshire we are aiming to at least partially address this issue with the introduction of a Safety Camera scheme from April 2004. We are also aiming to extend the decriminalisation of ‘yellow line’ regulations, which has already happened in the Harrogate District, to the remainder of the County. This enables enforcement to be undertaken by local authority wardens with the fine income retained locally.

Despite the above issues, we feel we are still making excellent progress in the delivery of our targets, but more could be achieved if the above barriers were removed.

A series of detailed appendices has been produced to support and supplement the information contained in this summary Annual Progress Report. These are listed below. In particular, the ‘themed’ appendices A to M provide a detailed account of all the individual LTP targets, their baseline positions, the relevant monitoring information and the progress made to date towards meeting the targets.

A) Traffic Trends
B) Travel Awareness and Travel Plans
C) Traffic Management
D) Public Transport
E) Road Safety
F) Cycling
G) Provision for Pedestrians
H) Freight Transport
I) Access for Disabled People
J) Transport Issues and Development
K) Highway Maintenance
L) Maintenance and Strengthening of Bridges and Structures
M) Major Schemes Programme to 2010
N) Supplementary Bids
O) Street Lighting Inventory
P) Consultation and Best Practice
Q) Wilder Issues
R) Finance Forms
S) The Role of District Councils and National Park Authorities
T) Integrated Transport Capital Programme

All the above appendices are available either separately or in a bound volume.

Further copies of this APR and copies of the appendices are available from Environmental Services Directorate, County Hall, Northallerton, DL7 8AH. Telephone number 01609 532408.

All these documents can be made available in other formats (eg large print).

They may also be viewed (and downloaded) from our website at www.northyorks.gov.uk/ltp

List of Appendices

Annex A

Table A - Government’s Core Indicators

Table B - Progress Towards Achievement of the North Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Objectives and Targets.
### TABLE A - GOVERNMENT’S CORE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Indicator</th>
<th>Units/Definitions</th>
<th>Baseline position</th>
<th>Most recent position</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>LA View on progress</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Condition</strong></td>
<td>Principal roads – BV 96</td>
<td>21.68% 1990-99</td>
<td>22.9% 1992-01</td>
<td>Not in Approaching steady</td>
<td>Deflectograph Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-principal classified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More resources have been allocated to get condition data for 2003/04 and establish a baseline position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of bus passenger journeys</strong></td>
<td>Thousands of bus passenger (ie boardings) per year in the Authority</td>
<td>15,398.839 2000-01</td>
<td>16,000,000 2002-03</td>
<td>16,938,722</td>
<td>Good Annual Returns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus passenger satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of bus users satisfied with local bus services – BV104</td>
<td>46% 2001</td>
<td>75% 2006</td>
<td>No clear evidence. NYCC Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of cycling trips</strong></td>
<td>As indicated in the guidance, this indicator is very difficult to measure on an Authority wide basis. These difficulties are compounded in any Authority the size of North Yorkshire with numerous scattered communities. The Council number of cycling trips does not intend to attempt county wide monitoring but rather will concentrate on local measures of cycling activity. See Table B for Local Targets and performance which show significant increases in cycling activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of deaths</strong></td>
<td>Number of people killed and (aged less than 16) on average roads in the Authority</td>
<td>1,037 1994-98</td>
<td>837 2002</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>Good. Local Accident Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children killed and (aged less than 16)</strong></td>
<td>Number of children on roads in the Authority</td>
<td>108 1994-98</td>
<td>48 2002</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Very Good. Local Accident Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Light rail passenger journeys</strong></td>
<td>Thousands of light rail passengers per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There has been no attempt to monitor the number of light rail passengers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of rural households within 800 metres of an hourly or better bus service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There has been no attempt to measure on an Authority wide basis the number of hours or better bus services. The Council planned improvements for 2003/04 have not increased the number of hourly bus services. However, we have implemented improvements to specific routes in the area. Our new increased service on the NYCC service has been announced and the Council is confident that this service will provide a substantial improvement for local residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average time lost per vehicle kilometre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Objectives</td>
<td>Local Performance Source</td>
<td>Local Targets or Baseline</td>
<td>Progress made in 2002/03 against Local</td>
<td>Whether or not National PSA contained in</td>
<td>Indicators contained in</td>
<td>Data Outcomes contained in 10 Year Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote social equity by providing choices of travel with disabilities</td>
<td>Consultants North Yorkshire</td>
<td>A2. Access to rail stations at 50% of stations for people and during the Plan period</td>
<td>There are 46 rail stations in progress to begin 2003/04</td>
<td>On Track 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Facilities at stations</td>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>(a) Introduce at all new crossings</td>
<td>Facilities provided at all new crossings</td>
<td>On Track 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Retrofit all existing crossings for monitoring</td>
<td>166 crossings upgraded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Retrofitting 155 now completed (93%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9. Disabled Access</td>
<td>Pedestrian Action Plans</td>
<td>To implement measures defined in Pedestrian Action Plans for main town and village centres to improve access for the disabled (to link transport interchanges, car parks and other important facilities) in accordance with individual programmes identified in such plans</td>
<td>Progress on implementing Pedestrian Action Plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit traffic growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1. Traffic in Harrogate</td>
<td>Achieve zero growth</td>
<td>On Track 1, 3, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B2. Traffic in the North Yorkshire Dales</td>
<td>Limit growth to 1% and 2% respectively below the national average over key locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B3. Traffic flow on Highways</td>
<td>(a) Reduce by 30% on the A19 through Selby</td>
<td>On Track 1, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Restrain growth</td>
<td>Not to exceed national low growth forecasts</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B6. Subsidised NYCC/Bus services</td>
<td>Reduce the cost per journey</td>
<td>Not on Track 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B7. Total number of local bus journeys</td>
<td>Increase the annual number of local bus journeys made</td>
<td>On Track 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Travel</td>
<td>STP Plans Surveys</td>
<td>(b) Appreciation of STP Plans requirements in 50% of position for some form of STP measure in use in 25% of schools by 2005 of the Plan period)</td>
<td>Completed and achieved</td>
<td>On Track 1, 2, 4 &amp; 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Introduce STPs in 5% of schools by 2003; up to 15% by 2005; with some form of STP measure in place in 25% of schools by 2005 of the Plan period)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Objectives contained in the Local Transport Plan</td>
<td>Local Performance Source</td>
<td>Baseline data</td>
<td>Local Targets or Outcomes contained in the Local Transport Plan</td>
<td>Whether or not National PSA contained in Indicators contained in Data Outcomes contained in the Local Transport Plan Targets or Outcomes meet targets</td>
<td>Target to which is linked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Monitoring</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(b) Reduce the length with negligible residual life to 14% level in 2000</td>
<td>Average 12.3% in 1999-2001</td>
<td>On Track for 1, 4 &amp; 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Monitoring</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(c) Reduce the length with residual strength below investigatory level to 13% level in 2000</td>
<td>Average 8.1% in 2000</td>
<td>On Track for 1, 4 &amp; 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(d) Investigate and identify the level of repair required</td>
<td>69% of incidents reported, 8% of repair response</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(e) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>99.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(f) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(g) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(h) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(i) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(j) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(k) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(l) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(m) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(n) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(o) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(p) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(q) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(r) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(s) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(t) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(u) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(v) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(w) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(x) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(y) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the adverse impact on the Environment and Natural Beauty</td>
<td>NYCC Inspections</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>(z) Inspect roads and pavements</td>
<td>96.7% rectified within 24 hours during 2002/03</td>
<td>On Track for second year in succession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Targets B1, B2 and B3 above also contribute to the achievement of this Objective.
The National Targets are:

1. **National Reduce congestion on the inter-urban trunk road network, and in large urban areas in England, below 2000 levels by 2010.**

2. **National Improve accessibility, punctuality and reliability of local public transport (bus and light rail) with an increase in use of more than 12 per cent from 2000 levels by 2010.**

3. **National Reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured in Great Britain in road accidents by 40 per cent and the number of children killed or seriously injured by 50 percent, by 2010 compared with the average for 1994-98, tackling the significantly higher incidence in disadvantaged communities.**

4. **National Improve air quality by meeting our national air quality strategy objectives for carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, particles, sulphur dioxide, benzene and 1-3 butadiene (shared with DEFRA).**

5. **National By 2010 to triple the number of cycling trips compared with a 2000 base.**

6. **National To achieve a one-third increase in the proportion of households in rural areas within about 10 minutes walk of an hourly or better bus service by 2010.**

7. **National Provide sufficient resources to local authorities to halt the deterioration in the condition of local roads by 2004 and to eliminate the backlog by the end of the Plan period.**

Note: No example of National Target 7 is included as the government is responsible for providing the resources required.

Examples of local schemes which support the above are given on the following pages.
National Target 1

Reducing Delays

Scheme
Integrated Transport in Harrogate.

National Target
Reduce congestion on the inter-urban trunk road network and in large urban areas in England, below 2000 levels by 2010.

Background
Harrogate is one of two large towns in North Yorkshire where the County Council has established targets and a strategy to control traffic growth by facilitating and encouraging alternatives to car usage. The strategy comprises of a number of elements which involve the County and District Councils, user groups as well as local bus and train operators.

Scheme details
Key elements of the overall strategy for Harrogate are as follows:
• Bus Station redevelopment
• Introduction of Real Time Passenger Information
• Investment in high quality vehicles
• Bus infrastructure improvements along key corridors
• Improved network of school bus services
• Market research with bus passengers jointly funded with Harrogate & District Travel

• Bus user group established by Harrogate & District Travel
• Working with adjacent authorities on the Harrogate Line Route Strategy to improve rail services and infrastructure including possible new stations
• Introduction of decriminalised parking enforcement
• Introduction of a Harrogate and Knaresborough cycle route network
• Improved facilities to assist pedestrians with special emphasis on meeting the needs of people with disabilities
• Travel Awareness Initiatives include individual seat marketing campaign in the area

Outcome
Public transport use has increased by 8%, cycling activity has increased and traffic has reduced by 1% from 2000 to 2002.

Contribution to other targets/objectives
National and Local targets
• Improve Air Quality
• Increase bus patronage
• Improve accessibility to buses

Council Plan Objectives
• Strengthening our economy by supporting business, developing our infrastructure and helping people improve their skills
• Security for all by promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities
• Keeping us on the move with a safe and reliable transport system and powerful telecommunications

LTP target
• Limit traffic growth in Harrogate

National Target 2

Improving Public Transport

Scheme
Quality Bus Corridor in Wensleydale.

National Target
Improve accessibility, punctuality and reliability of local public transport (bus and light rail) with an increase in use of more than 12% from 2000 levels by 2010.

Background
This scheme is aimed at providing accessible vehicles and improving the overall quality of the bus service to increase passenger usage. In addition, the County Council has upgraded the infrastructure and passenger waiting facilities.

Scheme details
The County Council has awarded a Premier Specification contract for the bus service between Hawes and Bedale and Richmond and Ripon. The contract provides for:
• Low floor accessible vehicles
• Dedicated team of drivers
• Customer care training
• Specified budget for marketing and publicity
• High quality publicity
• Regular reliability surveys
• Regular customer care surveys

• Passenger charter
• Improved passenger waiting facilities include: Shelters / Seats / Bus timetables / Raised kerbs

In order to maximise the impact of the new service, the passenger infrastructure has been improved. Each stop is clearly marked with a bus stop flag and timetable display case, shelters have been provided at main pickup points. The inserts for the display cases show the departures from that stop in large easily read print.

Outcome
The improvements to both bus service and infrastructure is expected to increase patronage by 30% over the next four years. The observed increase in patronage of 13% between 2002 and 2003 is encouraging.

Contribution to other targets/objectives
National and Local Targets
• Improve Air Quality
• Increase bus patronage
• Improve accessibility to buses

Council Plan Objectives
• Strengthening our economy by supporting business, developing our infrastructure and helping people improve their skills
• Security for all by promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities
• Keeping us on the move with a safe and reliable transport system and powerful telecommunications

LTP Targets
• Improve bus quality
• Traffic restraint in the Yorkshire Dales National Park
Annex B

National Target 3

Improving Safety

**Scheme**
B6161 Penny Pot Lane Roundabout and Footway/Cycle Track/Marching Route.

**National Target**
Reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured in Great Britain in road accidents by 40% and the number of children killed or seriously injured by 50%, by 2010 compared with the average for 1994 to 1998, tackling the significantly higher incidence in disadvantaged communities.

**Background**
This is a scheme aimed at addressing a number of issues at a busy junction located just outside the urban area of Harrogate. The project was designed to improve opportunities for the increasing volume of traffic from the Army Foundation College on Penny Pot Lane to enter the B6161, and to reduce the incidence of personal injury accidents, which had been occurring at the crossroad junction. During the development of the scheme, which was jointly funded through a partnership with the MoD, it was also agreed that a shared use footway/cycle track/marching route scheme should be provided in order to cater for the increasing demand from the Foundation College, which has now grown into a community of some 2,500 people.

**Scheme details**
The scheme involved the construction of a 45m diameter roundabout with over 200m of road widening on the approaches, new Highway lighting and over 1,000m of 2.5m wide integrated shared footway/cycle track. The scheme cost was £750k of which £400k was contributed by the MoD.

**Outcome**
The new roundabout has reduced vehicle speed and should improve road safety. This is being monitored. The footway/cycle track has provided a safe and convenient route into Harrogate for pedestrians and cyclists.

**Contribution of scheme to other targets/objectives**

National and Local targets
- Increase cycle use
- Improve Safety

Council Plan Objectives
- Security for all by promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities
- Keeping us on the move with a safe and reliable transport system and powerful telecommunications

LTP targets
- Reduce casualties from road accidents
- Limit traffic growth in Harrogate

---
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National Target 4

Improving Air Quality

**Scheme**
“If you’re not going far, forget the car” campaign.

**National Target**
Improve air quality by meeting our national air quality strategy objectives for carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide particles sulphur dioxide, benzene and 1 – 3 butadiene.

**Background**
Although no Air Quality Management Areas have been declared in North Yorkshire the Council still wish to contribute towards the general improvement of air quality both locally and nationally. Much work is being done on discouraging inappropriate car use, and consequently emissions, through our travel awareness campaigns.

**Scheme details**
The County Council engaged the award-winning advertising agency Robson Brown to devise a comprehensive marketing strategy, incorporating publicity material advocating alternatives to the private car. The resulting material themed around the slogan “If you’re not going far, forget the car” has been widely used in North Yorkshire and also shared with 25 other local authorities nationally.

**Outcome**
The publicity material has appeared in every local paper in North Yorkshire, in many public places and retail outlets. Whilst it is not possible to measure its direct impact on car use, the initial research on penetration and understanding suggests that the campaign has been well received and is thought provoking.

**Contribution to other targets/objectives**

National and Local target
- Increase cycle use

Council Plan Objectives
- Security for all by promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities
- Keeping us on the move with a safe and reliable transport system and powerful telecommunications

LTP targets
- Increase public transport patronage
- Limit traffic growth in Harrogate, Scarborough and the National Parks

Craven Community Strategy (Draft)
- Aim 5 – Air Quality – Develop and implement projects which minimise air, water, noise, ground and light pollution
National Target 5
Improving Cycling

Scheme
Northallerton Cycle Network – Route 1

Outcome
The route provides a safe and convenient alternative means of transport for residents of Northallerton to access many of the town’s services by cycle. The route contributes towards the increase in cycling in Northallerton, currently 23% between 1999 and 2002.

Contribution to other targets/objectives
National and local target
• Improve air quality
Council Plan Objectives
• Strengthening our economy by supporting business, developing our infrastructure and helping people improve their skills
• Security for all by promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities
• Keeping us on the move with a safe and reliable transport system and powerful telecommunications

LTP target
To increase cycling in those towns for which Local Cycle Plans are prepared and adopted, in accordance with the individual targets established in such plans. (Northallerton)

Hambleton Community Plan (draft)
• The public aspiration to ‘encourage the provision of cycle paths in, through and to Northallerton’

National Target
By 2010 to triple the number of cycling trips compared with a 2000 base.

Background
The scheme is a route identified in the Northallerton Cycle Plan by the Northallerton Cycle Working Group. The route links the main housing areas of Northallerton with the town’s two secondary schools, the County Council, District Council and Rural Payments Agency offices, the Friargate Hospital, Northallerton Leisure Centre and, through other routes in the network, to the High Street and Brompton.

Scheme details
The route consists of sections of quiet road, traffic calmed roads and off-road shared use cycle track and provides a new Toucan crossing outside the Allertonshire School on Brompton Road. The route is a key element of the developing Northallerton Cycle Network. The total cost of the route was approximately £100k.

National Target 6
Improving Accessibility

Scheme
Harrogate Area Transport Review

Contribution to other targets/objectives
National and Local Target
• Increase Bus Patronage
Council Plan Objectives
• Strengthening our economy by supporting business, developing our infrastructure and helping people improve their skills
• Security for all by promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities
• Keeping us on the move with a safe and reliable transport system and powerful telecommunications

LTP Targets
• To increase cycling in those towns for which Local Cycle Plans are prepared and adopted, in accordance with the individual targets established in such plans. (Northallerton)

Hambleton Community Plan (draft)
• The public aspiration to ‘encourage the provision of cycle paths in, through and to Northallerton’

National Target
To achieve a 1/3 increase in the number of households in rural areas within about a 10 minute walk of an hourly or better bus service by 2010.

Background
The County Council reviews all contract local bus services in a four year cycle. As part of each review we consider the extent to which existing services meet local needs and where improvements can be made or changes are necessary.

Scheme details
As part of the review of transport services in Harrogate we have provided increased frequency of service between York, Boroughbridge and Ripon from every two hours to hourly. These changes were introduced during April 2003.

Outcome
The number of people with easy access to an hourly bus service has increased by approximately 11,000.
TRAFFIC TRENDS NORTH YORKSHIRE

1. INTRODUCTION

The County Council has a comprehensive network of 143 permanent automatic counters (ATCs) located throughout the County to monitor the trends in traffic. The data collected from the ATC sites provides a useful indication of the variation in traffic levels over a period of time, and particularly the variation in traffic flows when road improvements and/or major traffic management schemes are undertaken.

In addition to the permanent sites, temporary Automatic Traffic Counters are used primarily to monitor traffic speeds at locations where speed reduction measures have been introduced. The measures include the installation of traffic calming measures, gateways to villages and 20mph zones.

Manual counts are also carried out to complement ATC data by providing detailed information about the type of traffic at a particular location. Manual counts are also used to determine detailed vehicular turning movements at a particular junction and to count pedestrian usage. In addition to the above, roadside interview surveys, registration plate surveys and HCV surveys are carried out to assess detailed traffic movements where necessary.

This report deals solely with the data collected from the permanent ATCs to provide an overview of year on year traffic trends and to provide detailed information in those areas where targets have been set to restrain traffic growth.

Data collected by the Highways Agency on the Motorway and Trunk Road network has also been used in compiling information on traffic growth and volumes to give a comprehensive overview of traffic trends in the County.

2. OVERVIEW

Figure 1 shows the 2002 estimated Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flows on the 'A' and 'B' road network within the County. It should be noted that the plan is an indicative representation of traffic flows. The data collected at the automatic traffic counter sites has been applied to the lengths of road on which the counter is located. Where permanent ATC data is not available, short term count data has been used. There could be local variations in traffic flow along the lengths of road, which are not shown on this plan. The Trunk Road network carries the highest volume of traffic with flows on the A1 exceeding 40,000 vehicles per day.

Figure 2 shows the estimated percentage growth in traffic over the five year period 1997 to 2002 on the highway network. The coverage of the network is not fully comprehensive, however, the information included on the plan is useful in giving overall trends in traffic growth. The A19 and A64 West of York trunk roads along with the B6265 east of Ripon exhibited the highest percentage traffic growth with an increase in excess of 16% from 1997 to 2002.
Figure 3 shows the local traffic growth on the Trunk and County 'A' and 'B' road network compared to national traffic growth on all roads over the period 1997 to 2002. The local traffic growth figure for the Trunk and County 'A' roads is based on 74 ATC sites across the County. The 'B' road growth is based on 14 ATC sites.

The average traffic growth on the Trunk and County 'A' road network over the period 1997 to 2002 is 8%. The growth to the year 2001 follows closely the traffic growth on all roads in Great Britain published by the DfT. (Note: National traffic growth figures for 2002 are not available at the time of writing this report).

The average growth of the County 'B' road network is however less with an average growth of 1% over the five year period 1997 to 2002. Additionally, Figure 3 demonstrates the significantly lower growth on the 'B' road network in 2001, with the average flow being 7% lower than those recorded in 1997. This reduction in traffic flow reflects the impact of the outbreak of foot and mouth in 2001 had on the rural areas.

3. PROGRESS AGAINST TARGETS

The County Council has set challenging targets to constrain traffic growth in Harrogate, Scarborough, Selby, Yorkshire Dales National Park and the North York Moors National Park.

The location of the traffic counters on the highway network, along with the summary of the data collected for each of the locations used to monitor progress against targets is given below.

a) Harrogate

The locations of the ATCs used to monitor traffic growth in the town centre are shown in Figure 4.

The LTP target is to achieve zero traffic growth in Harrogate Town Centre from 2000.

Figure 5 gives a summary of the data collected at each ATC location and the average growth from 2000 to 2002. An average 1% reduction in traffic has been recorded over the two year period indicating the target to be on track.

b) Scarborough

The location of the ATCs used to monitor traffic growth in the town centre are shown in Figure 6.

The LTP target is to achieve zero growth in traffic in Scarborough Town Centre from 2000.

Figure 7 gives a summary of the data collected at each ATC location and the average growth from 2001 to 2002. No growth in traffic has been recorded from 2001 to 2002. It should, however, be noted that the estimated traffic flows in 2001 were derived from limited data. However, based on the data available this target is on track.

c) Selby

The targets for Selby Town are set in relation to the opening of Selby Bypass. The scheme is due to open in 2004.
d) **Yorkshire Dales National Park**

The location of the ATCs used to monitor traffic growth in the Yorkshire Dales National Park are shown in Figure 8.

The LTP target is to limit growth to 2% below the national average over the period of the Plan.

Figure 9 gives a summary of the data collected at each ATC location and the average growth from 2000 to 2002. An average 2% reduction in traffic has been recorded over the two year period compared with a growth in traffic nationally indicating the target is on track. (Note: national growth figures for 2002 not available at the time of writing this report but it is anticipated that the outcome will show a growth in traffic over the period 2000 to 2002).

e) **North York Moors National Park**

The location of the ATCs used to monitor traffic growth in the North York Moors National Park are shown in Figure 10.

The LTP target is to limit growth to 1% below National Average over the period of the Plan.

Figure 11 gives a summary of the data collected at each ATC location and the average growth from 2000 to 2002. An average 8% growth in traffic has been recorded over the two year period. The national traffic figures for 2002 are not available at the time of writing this report. Whilst a growth in traffic nationally from 2000 to 2002 is anticipated it is not expected to be in excess of 9%, indicating that the target is not on track. However, traffic flows need to be monitored over long periods in order to establish trends. It is too early to determine whether the growth in 2002 was in response to the removal of the restrictions imposed due to foot and mouth in 2001.

4. **CONCLUSIONS**

It can be concluded from the above that traffic flows on the Trunk and 'A' road network in the County has shown a steady increase over the five year period 1997 to 2002. Traffic flows on the County 'B' road network have been relatively stable over the same five year period.

During the first two years of the Local Plan period our target of restraining traffic growth in Harrogate and Scarborough town centres and the Yorkshire Dales National Park are on track. Traffic growth in the North York Moors National Park has increased by 8% over the two year period 2000 to 2002 but that may be a short term effect due to the ending of the foot and mouth restrictions. It is intended to retain the current target of limiting growth to 1% below the national average through to 2005/6 in the North York Moors.

Monitoring of existing traffic flows in Selby has commenced. The target for Selby town is set in relation to reductions in traffic flow on the A19 through Selby following the opening of Selby Bypass. The Bypass is not due to open until 2004, hence no data has been reported.

---

*Attachments for Appendix A included in folder ‘Attachments for Appendix A’*
FIGURE 1

IN NORTH YORKSHIRE IN 2002

COMPARISONS OF TRAFFIC VOLUMES ON MAJOR ROADS

Legend:
- Information not available
- Less than 5000 per day
- 5000 to 10,000 per day
- 10,000 to 20,000 per day
- 20,000 to 40,000 per day
- Over 40,000 vehicles per day

Automatic Traffic Counters
Figure 2

Comparisons of Traffic Growth on Major Roads in North Yorkshire from 1997-2002

Legend:
- Reduction in Traffic
- 0-7% Growth
- 8-15% Growth
- 16% or above

Automatic Traffic Counters

No information available
LOCATION OF AUTOMATIC TRAFFIC COUNTERS IN HARROGATE

1. A61 Ripon Road (Cairn Hotel)
2. A61 Leeds Road (Centre) Northbound
3. A61 Leeds Road (Centre) Southbound
4. A6040 York Place
5. A59 Bilton Railway Bridge
6. A661 Wetherby Road (Empress roundabout)
7. A61 Leeds Road (Hookstone)
8. A59 Knaresborough Road
9. B6162 Otley Road

FIGURE 4
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# Harrogate Town Centre

## Annual Average Daily Traffic Flow (AADT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Location of Automatic Traffic Counters</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A61</td>
<td>Ripon Road (Cairn Hotel)</td>
<td>21528</td>
<td>21593</td>
<td>19669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A61</td>
<td>Leeds Road (Centre) N/B</td>
<td>14575</td>
<td>14580</td>
<td>14418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A61</td>
<td>Leeds Road (Centre) S/B</td>
<td>12440</td>
<td>12520</td>
<td>12539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A6040</td>
<td>York Place</td>
<td>18470</td>
<td>18330</td>
<td>19071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A69</td>
<td>Bilton Railway Bridge</td>
<td>27390</td>
<td>27409</td>
<td>26549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A61</td>
<td>Wetherby Road (Empress roundabout)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A61</td>
<td>Leeds Road (Hookstone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Knaresborough Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B6132</td>
<td>Otley Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total AADT (Sites 1 to 5) 94403 94832 93244

Harrogate Traffic Growth Index (from sites above) 1.000 1.005 0.888

Total AADT (Sites 1 to 5 and 9) 104733 103504

Total AADT (Sites 1 to 9) 168133

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Traffic Growth Index</th>
<th>1.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Traffic (All Roads) Billion veh kms</td>
<td>467.7 473.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Figure 5

![Harrogate Traffic Growth and National Traffic Growth](image)
LOCATION OF AUTOMATIC TRAFFIC COUNTERS IN SCARBOROUGH

1. B1364 Peasholm Road
2. A165 Columbus Ravine
3. C237 Woodlands Ravine
4. A171 Scalby Road
5. A170 Stepney Road
6. A64 Seamer Road
7. A165 Filey Road

FIGURE 6
## Scarborough

### Annual Average Daily Traffic Flow (AADT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Location of Automatic Traffic Counters</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001*</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A170</td>
<td>Slapney Road</td>
<td>7979</td>
<td>7980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A171</td>
<td>Scalby Road, Scalby</td>
<td>16046</td>
<td>19049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A165</td>
<td>Columbus Ravine</td>
<td>7456</td>
<td>7451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B1354</td>
<td>Feasholm Road</td>
<td>5863</td>
<td>5861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C237</td>
<td>Woodlands Ravine</td>
<td>7319</td>
<td>7317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A165</td>
<td>Filey Road</td>
<td>17961</td>
<td>17968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A64</td>
<td>Seamer Road</td>
<td>22729</td>
<td>22725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total AADT Sites (1 to 7) | 6 | 85353 | 85381

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scarborough Traffic Growth Index</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Traffic Growth Index</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| National Traffic (All Roads) Billion veh kms | 457.7 | 473.7 |

* Year 2001 AADT's are based on estimates from one month's data

![Graph showing traffic growth in Scarborough](image)

**FIGURE 7**
LOCATION OF AUTOMATIC TRAFFIC COUNTERS IN YORKSHIRE DALES NATIONAL PARK

1. A684 Wensley Bridge
2. B6255 Ribblehead - s/w of junction with B6479
3. B6265 South of Rylstone
4. B6160 North of Bolton Abbey
5. A684 Rigg House, west of Appersett
6. B6265 West of Greenhow Hill
7. B6270 Between Grinton and Fremington
8. B6479 South of Stainforth
9. C393 Malham, South of Car Park

FIGURE 8
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Yorkshire Dales National Park

Annual Average Daily Traffic Flow (AADT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Location of Automatic Traffic Counters</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A684</td>
<td>Wensley Bridge - near Leyburn</td>
<td>4012</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>3720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B6265</td>
<td>Ribblehead - s/w of junction with B6479</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B6265</td>
<td>South of Rylstone</td>
<td>6061</td>
<td>5376</td>
<td>5066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B6160</td>
<td>North of Bolton Abbey</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A694</td>
<td>Rigg House, west of Asperset</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B6265</td>
<td>West of Greenhow Hill</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B6270</td>
<td>Between Grinton and Fremington</td>
<td>2233</td>
<td>2133</td>
<td>2240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B6479</td>
<td>South of Staintoft</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>2147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C393</td>
<td>Malham, South of Car Park</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total AADT (Sites 1 to 9)   21084  18687  20712

YDNP Traffic Growth Index  1.00  0.89  0.98
National Traffic Growth Index  1  1.01
National Traffic (All Roads) Billion veh km  467.7  473.7

![Yorkshire Dales National Park](image)

**FIGURE 9**
LOCATION OF AUTOMATIC TRAFFIC COUNTERS IN NORTH YORK MOORS NATIONAL PARK

1. A170 Hambleton Inn, Sutton Bank Top
2. B1257 North-west of Helmsley
3. C20 North of Lion Inn, Blakey Ridge
4. A169 South of Saltergate Car Park
5. A171 North of Cloughton
6. A174 Hinderwell to Staithes
7. A171 Scaling Dam

FIGURE 10
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appendix a1/14
## North York Moors National Park

### Annual Average Daily Traffic Flow (AADT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Location of Automatic Traffic Counters</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A17C</td>
<td>Hambleton Inn, Sutton Bank Top</td>
<td>4413</td>
<td>4469</td>
<td>4980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B1257</td>
<td>North-west of Holmeley</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>2240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C20</td>
<td>North of Lion Inn, Bilsley Ridge</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A15E</td>
<td>South of Settlegate car park</td>
<td>4319</td>
<td>4121</td>
<td>4915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A171</td>
<td>North of Gruated</td>
<td>5950</td>
<td>6718</td>
<td>6822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A174</td>
<td>Hinderwell to Staithes</td>
<td>3424</td>
<td>3567</td>
<td>3527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A171</td>
<td>Stilling Dam</td>
<td>6703</td>
<td>6076</td>
<td>6365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total AADT (Sites 1 to 7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28141</td>
<td>27609</td>
<td>30276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Traffic Growth Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYMN Traffic Growth Index</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Traffic Growth Index</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| National Traffic (All Roads) Billion veh kms | 487.7 | 473.7 |

---

**FIGURE 11**
TRAVEL AWARENESS AND TRAVEL PLANS

1. INTRODUCTION

A typical North Yorkshire resident will make 1,000 trips per year. Being a rural area there may be no alternative to the use of the car for a large majority of these trips. However, at the margin of choice there may be as many as a hundred journeys when alternatives are possible. The aim of the Travel Awareness strategy is to help people identify occasions when a single-occupant car journey is not essential. A key objective is to do this in a way that preserves the quality of life and raises educational standards.

The travel awareness strategy links very closely to wider initiatives and concerns surrounding health and social exclusion. At a very practical level, school travel plans are used to guide spending on “safer routes to school” infrastructure. More broadly, attitudes towards accessibility to goods and services and social exclusion are being examined for different categories of rural area.

2. REVIEW OF PROGRESS

During 2002/03 an award-winning advertising agency completed the North Yorkshire Travel Awareness marketing strategy. A major roll-out of this campaign is now in place. Advertising material has been placed in every North Yorkshire newspaper. Associated Public Relations (PR) work has attracted national press coverage including radio and TV. Such is the interest in this work that 24 other local authorities and hospital trusts from across the UK have bought copies of the artwork.

During 2002/03, a further 15 schools completed a School Travel Plan (STP). This demonstrates how schools will work together with parents, governors and ourselves to tackle their own issues surrounding car dependence. The targets set for STPs should be achieved. Currently, efforts are concentrating on developing plans in depth and breadth. With a total of 48 schools having created their own travel plan this work area is beginning to make a real difference in level of awareness and attitude to travel.

A key feature of our approach is in the use of qualified teachers for this work. Activities aim to combine the objectives of the national curriculum with travel awareness. A drama workshop event attracted teachers from 50 schools across the county to spend a day with a specialist actor developing a play to use with their own pupils based on the theme of walking to school.

The successful Bus Awareness programme has been developed and continued and is now linking into LEA activities on bus-behaviour. This work will feed into the European Target 2 project in which North Yorkshire is an active participant.

Workplace travel plans are a mechanism to reduce the dependence of businesses and other large organisations on the private car. In practice there are few large businesses in North Yorkshire and many of these are still recovering from setbacks associated with Foot and Mouth Disease. We are taking an active approach to promoting travel plans and have maintained a programme of contacting every large organisation with direct mailings and
follow up telephone calls. Following the example of beacon authority Hampshire CC a “Commuter Forum” is being developed in Scarborough. In Harrogate a business breakfast meeting attracted a large and varied audience to learn about travel plans.

We are active members of regional TravelWise. As joint organisers of a regional travel awareness training package, we have gained greatly from increased contact with regional expertise. Our unique experience in incorporating travel awareness into the curriculum has been disseminated through this programme. Activities of national importance include a successful bid for the DfT Individualised Marketing project and a sponsorship of two PhD students working on the complex link between actual and perceived accessibility.

Overall, rural North Yorkshire presents one of the most testing locations for travel awareness. Despite this, an active programme of activities embracing schools, businesses and the general public is attracting a good deal of interest regionally and nationally – and more importantly is achieving results, for example, in the reduction in cars travelling to the Schools that have produced School Travel Plans.

a) Impact of the above on performance against targets

In recognition of the need to work with human behaviour, rather than against it, the targets for Travel Plans were carefully set to reflect the need to first raise awareness, then develop an appreciation of the need for action, before then moving on to make changes. The targets for School and Green Travel Plans have been sub divided into three components as shown below:

Target B15 : To:-

(a) increase awareness of the School Travel Plan (STP) process in 100% of all schools by 2001;
(b) increase appreciation of STP requirements in 50% of schools by 2005; and
(c) introduce STPs in 5% of schools by 2003, up to 15% by 2005, with some form of STP measure in use in 25% of schools by 2005.

All awareness and appreciation targets are now met. At this stage a total of 43 travel plans would be expected. There are actually now 48.

Target B16 : To:-

(a) increase awareness of the Green Travel Plan (GTP) process in 50% of companies* by 2003 and 100% by 2005;
(b) increase appreciation of GTP requirements in 50% of companies* by 2005; and
(c) introduce GTPs in 5% of companies* by 2003, up to 15% by 2005, with some form of GTP measure in use in 25% by 2005.

(*companies in North Yorkshire with more than 250 employees)

The base line position for this target is zero as there were no (known) travel plans in North Yorkshire in 1999/2000. All large employers are now aware of the need for travel plans. Around 40 (or 50%) have requested information from us signifying that they appreciate the need to have a travel plan. Actual plans exist for 12 organisations, which means we have met the target for 2003.

Data monitoring is by means of direct contact with businesses – this is managed by a business contact management specialist.
3. PROGRAMME FOR 2003/04

Overall Approach

The travel awareness strategy will evolve to incorporate a marketing strategy. The substantial amount of work done in developing strategies has paid off in that there is now a much greater understanding of what are the real issues facing the county. Public consultation (including innovative approaches such as an essay-writing competition) has been combined with input from experts in fields as diverse as psychology, marketing and urban design, has enabled an approach with a sound theoretical and community background.

It is now clear that the approach to Travel Awareness must include consideration of three basic areas.

Obligations

There are many reasons why a person needs to make a journey. Some of these will be essential, some less so. The reason for these needs will vary between those required by external factors (such as work travel) and those with a more internal decision process, such as leisure.

The influence that a local authority can exert over external changes, such as national school selection policies, is limited but the extent to which these influence the choice of journey method and the length travelled to county schools is significant and must be accommodated.

More locally, the need for a person to travel can be influenced by the design of residential neighbourhoods. Those designed as enclaves with only one roadway in or out are less appealing for walking than those with many direct footpaths through and across the development. This is something that the County Council does have some impact on and in which it is hoped to make some progress.

Opportunities

Having reached the stage at which a journey is necessary, the availability of alternatives to the car will be important. Clearly in North Yorkshire this availability is likely to be less than for our urban neighbours. However, the actual provision of alternatives is often better than the perceptions. Buses are more reliable, cycling is safer and walking is quicker than is commonly thought. The travel awareness programme therefore has a duty to investigate the true availability of alternatives and identify the biggest misperceptions. These misperceptions of the alternatives should be fed back to those responsible for their actual implementation to see if extra provision is affordable and if it could help.

Inclination

As a final part of the process, once the obligation to travel has produced an evaluation of the alternatives, the inclination to use each mode will be influential. This is the area most commonly thought of as constituting ‘travel awareness’.
The Marketing Strategy

A more structured approach is also being taken towards the marketing of travel awareness. Using standard marketing techniques (often referred to as the four ‘P’s) sustainable travel, for example, can be regarded as a **Product** that requires people to pay a **Price** - in terms of time or effort, more than cash. This requires that the product should be **Placed** suitably – meaning that it should be made available where people want it and that the marketing should reach the right audience. Finally, the **Promotion** of the product must be considered. This includes, but is not exclusively, the graphic adverts that are regarded by many people as all there is to marketing.

More recent research on social marketing has shown that there may be more ‘P’s involved in the marketing mix. The **People** involved in the process are important, and efforts are now being made to engage all of the County Councils 20,000 officers and members in the debate about car use.

The general awareness raising campaign produced during 2002/3 uses the message “If you’re not going far, forget the car”. This is seen as an essential precursor to a more varied set of messages. Until people accept this very basic level of call to action, they are unlikely to be receptive to more sophisticated messages. During 2003/4 therefore there will be a continuation of the placement of this campaign in the most appropriate media outlets.

Mass Action Plans

Travel awareness is not an abstract activity and it is important to concentrate on real efforts in areas that the theory suggests will have the most impact. The maximum possible level of intervention was tried in 2002/3 in Ripon in which individuals were targeted with specific materials to encourage them to change actual journeys that they currently make. This ‘individualised marketing’ has the best chance of success but the level of input required means that it is an expensive process. Conversely a campaign that reaches everyone (sometimes called ‘carpet bombing’) can be useful in raising awareness but is unlikely to instigate immediate change.

Our approach for 2003/4 takes lessons from our individualised marketing project in that it aims for 80% of the effectiveness from 20% of the expense. Experience from Ripon suggests that rather than using public transport, many people changed to walking for short trips. The production of a leaflet encouraging walking and giving a specific route with timings helped to encourage this. It is therefore proposed to create materials that emphasise the personal health benefits of walking and which include specific information about walking times. These can be sent to targeted households using the Royal Mail postcode delivery system so that only those for whom walking is a realistic option will be targeted.

A further reinforcement of the walking distance message might be possible if additional signs can be produced for display along key routes into an urban centre that say, for example, “Town Centre 10 mins” along with the standard traffic sign walking route symbol.

School Walking Zones

Carrying forward the idea of walking distance zones (isochrones) around town centres, it should be possible to promote a similar message around schools. Signs similar to those
shown could be used to define an area that represents an easy five-minute walk for a school pupil.

The proposed approach is for the County Council to supply six of these signs to each school in a self-wiping adhesive plastic. This will be accompanied by a lesson plan that encourages the school to become involved in pacing out a five minute walk along all of the key routes currently already used by pupils walking to school. Placing the sticker on a suitable landmark can then mark out the five-minute walking zone. This zone can then be marked on a map supplied by us and sent to all parents. The school will be free to decide whether their approach is to encourage ‘Park & Stride’ from suitable points outside this zone, or whether they will reinforce their requests for parents living inside the walking zone to consider walking more often.

A project such as this would benefit greatly from community involvement, rather than relying solely on the head teacher. The District Council LA21 officers are increasingly becoming aware of our work and opportunities for joint working with them and with other experts in community involvement will be sought. Clearly a project such as this if it could get every school in the County promoting walking in their specific area would have very large health benefits and could reduce hazards around the school gate. Discussions are now taking place with insurers and with risk assessors to establish the extent to which it will be possible, along with any authorisations that may be necessary for use of such signs in the highway.

School Travel Plans

Progress with school travel plans has been very good. There is now a good spread of travel plans across the county with only very small gaps in areas (such as Malton/Norton) which are now being specially targeted.

Although the progress on school travel has been monitored with a database, and a careful grading system of travel plans is in place, it has not been possible to establish whether future targets should be based on increasing the amount or the depth of school travel plan coverage.

Although a concentration of effort on a small number of schools may help to make a very effective travel plan, this does not always translate into the greatest reduction in car use. A widespread approach is statistically more likely to catch the attention of a local teacher or parent who has a genuine interest and who could create a truly stakeholder-led plan. Maximum change might be possible in car-dominated schools but this risks diverting resources away from schools that may already have a high degree of social exclusion.

This is, as yet, no answer to the issues of future targets, but North Yorkshire County Council are very aware of these issues and every part of our work with schools takes into consideration these vital issues.

Personalised Journey Planning in Schools
The Knaresborough Personalised Journey Planning Programme follows a successful bid for match funding from the Department for Transport to undertake one of a number of demonstration projects being funded across England and Wales (only 14 were chosen out of 49 bids). The use of Personalised Journey Planners is intended to provoke changes in individual travel behaviour. A secondary benefit is that recipients learn about the impacts of their journey, the hope being that they will, in due course, make a positive change in their travelling behaviour.

The first step in the programme is to make contact with the individual within the community. One of the most successful elements of the Ripon programme was with captive audiences and specifically contacts made to school children. Thus the Knaresborough programme has a particular focus on this approach. The children are asked to complete a questionnaire that ascertains if they would like to receive personalised information about making a specific journey sustainably – whether they want to receive a planner. Similar family questionnaires are then delivered home with an information sheet about the programme via pupil post.

Personalised Journey Planners are then prepared and dispatched back to the children, accompanied by an appropriate incentive, be it a rain mac, cycle clip or free travel credit. The take-up of planner trips will be monitored in both the short term (six weeks) and longer term (10-months), thus monitoring the programme’s ability to change travel behaviour, including during the transition to secondary school.

School Curriculum Work

We continue to work closely with schools and are becoming well-known through, amongst other things, our presentations to cluster groups of schools. A key aim is to integrate travel awareness into the classroom. This is an innovative approach and contact with the few other practitioners working in this way will be maintained, in the UK and overseas. Our work has already attracted widespread interest and presentations are scheduled to numerous seminars and conferences, including to ministers at the Department for Education and Standards.

Modern education is constantly changing. Curriculum areas such as Citizenship are relatively new and schools do not have stored expertise. This offers us a chance to be among the first people to develop lesson materials based on citizenship and increases our value to teachers. A similar review of the need for the next big initiative (said to be ‘creativity’) will be undertaken as soon as guidance is released and relevant activities will be prepared.

Workplace Travel

For businesses in North Yorkshire, the requirement is still for an encouragement of travel plans, rather than keeping up with demand for support. The target for raising awareness has been achieved through all businesses having received at least three mailouts and two phone calls. The aim for appreciation is
demonstrated by a positive response from a reasonable number. The actual call to action, however, is characterised by large numbers of un-returned phone calls, missed meetings and ultimately a failure to deliver.

The encouragement of businesses to have a full travel plan will continue. There is a fine line between encouragement and bothering, however, and forcing businesses (such as soon-to-close coal mines) to devote time where they deem it not just inconvenient but damaging would be against the County Council corporate objective to promote a successful North Yorkshire economy and infrastructure.

A means of contacting businesses that will be further explored is via public relations. As part of a campaign to promote walking and cycling to work, for example, two of the County’s largest businesses had special events that encouraged walking and provided a positive media profile. A more structured approach to maximising PR in this area is to be taken.

It must be recognised that a key aim of rural workplace travel plans will be to raise the efficiency of motorised vehicles, rather than cut them out completely. As the graph shows, typical distances travelled, when combined with rural bus patterns, make alternatives difficult. Every effort will be made to shift short journeys to alternative modes, but it is also important that each journey in North Yorkshire serves as many purposes as possible and each vehicle contains as many people as possible.

**Taxation and Vanpools**

Comparison with American practice (eg www.rideshare.com) shows that extensive use is made there of vanpools, in which volunteer drivers use multi-seat vehicles to take people to work in return for domestic use of the vehicle. Similarity in population densities and differences in fuel costs suggest that there should be a high potential for vanpools in North Yorkshire. That there are not extensive vanpool fleets here can be attributed at least in part to the complexities, uncertainties and imbalances in the tax system that promotes company cars but not company vanpools.

Working with tax specialists from York we have begun to investigate the details of not only how the taxation system applies to travel plans (which has already been done on official websites) but how to extract maximum tax efficiencies. This ensures businesses can achieve maximum cost-benefit from the travel plan. As part of this an answer will be sought to the question of how vanpools can be made more effective and possibly to mounting a trial project.

Our guidance on this will be made available on our website and shared with neighbouring authorities.

**Budget for 2003/04**

1. A sum of £35k has been allocated for the school travel programme.
2. The marketing campaign will be continued, with an emphasis on gaining maximum media coverage for the existing campaign (est £30k).
3. A sum of £10k has been allocated to match the bid payment from the DfT Individualised marketing study.
4. A total of £10k has been allocated to production of professionally produced versions of materials that have now been demonstrated to work. Professional photography and artwork, for example, will add to the impact of school travel materials and targeted leaflets.

5. It is important to be ready to take advantage of opportunities to promote travel awareness. Supporting cycle to work initiatives in Ryedale during bike to work week, for example, and providing small amounts of funding to locally supported projects such as the Whitby Walking Festival.

3. CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Consultation is an important part of the travel awareness programme. A number of major changes (such as changing the name of “Walk to School Week” to “School Walking Week”) have come about as a result of feedback from direct customers. A questionnaire to all schools affected by travel plans is now in place. This aims to provide honest feedback on the extent to which having a travel plan met the needs of the schools involved. As part of the school travel plan process, parents are consulted, and we now have more than 4,000 completed questionnaires that help us understand how opinions vary across the County.

As part of our work with Leeds and Sheffield universities, depth interviews and focus group work is taking place with residents of different categories of rural accessibility. The marketing strategy has also involved focus groups and proposals are now being drawn up to test the effectiveness.

The overall aim of this work is to understand the obligations that make the people of North Yorkshire need to travel. Then to find out what their views are on the alternatives to car travel that are available to them. Finally some indication of their inclination towards these alternatives can be assessed. Using this knowledge, and working with it rather than against it, the process of improving travel awareness can begin. Encouraging acceptance of the need can follow and then everything possible will be done to facilitate optimal action.

The vision for the travel awareness strategy is that “The people of North Yorkshire, despite the lack of a wide range of alternatives, will embrace the need to do their bit to reduce car dependency. Responsible car usage will mean that, despite increasing car ownership, North Yorkshire develops a lifestyle that is economically competitive but maintains a cohesive social structure of lively villages, viable market towns and quiet rural roads.”
Appendix C - Traffic Management
1. INTRODUCTION

The County Council is continuing its integrated approach to the development of traffic management strategies for the main centres of population in North Yorkshire.

In the case of the two major urban areas of Harrogate/Knaresborough and Scarborough, this Appendix reviews the adopted traffic management strategies, together with a statement on progress achieved towards the strategy objectives, and the schemes proposed for 2003/04. The approach to public consultation and scheme delivery is also outlined.

For the other main centres of population (e.g. market towns and coastal resorts), the approach we are continuing for the development of strategies is described along with the consultative mechanism to achieve the agreed plan. The progress achieved in 2002/03 is outlined and the proposals for 2003/04 are also described.

The approach to traffic management strategy in the rural areas of the County is to continue to raise awareness of the need to encourage a shift of transport mode, to provide improved facilities for non-car modes, to provide better facilities for the disabled and to reduce the impact of traffic in rural communities.

This is achieved by significant investment in public transport infrastructure improvements, and better facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. We have a programme for the upgrading of footways and pedestrian crossing facilities to cater for those with disabilities and are introducing a variety of measures to reduce the impact of through traffic, particularly heavy goods vehicles, in rural communities. This latter recognises that, for the foreseeable future, only a limited programme of village bypasses will be possible, and more immediate benefits can only be achieved by a proactive approach to the introduction of lower cost traffic management initiatives.

2. HARROGATE/KNARESBOROUGH

(i) The Traffic Management Strategy

The strategy for Harrogate and Knaresborough continues to be based on the primary aim of promoting and encouraging alternatives to car usage by affording some degree of priority to alternative modes of travel to the private car. The strategy is therefore based on the premise that, within the towns, there will be no significant increase in road space. Therefore, in the short to medium term all traffic is to be managed on the existing road network through a combination of appropriate parking controls, priority measures for pedestrians, cyclists and bus users and by managing any loss of traffic capacity with suitable comprehensive traffic signal control systems.

The strategy also extends to the treatment of residential areas adversely affected by traffic avoiding congested main roads. The approach is to traffic calm these areas to minimise “rat-running” and to improve safety and the environmental quality for those residents who are affected.
The approach to managing traffic in the town centre cores of Harrogate and Knaresborough is to improve the pedestrian environment in the main retail areas by reducing traffic flows. This is coupled with traffic calming and other management techniques elsewhere in the centres to reduce the dominance of vehicular traffic.

(ii) Review of Progress 2002/03

Comprehensive traffic management and SCOOT control was extended to A59 Knaresborough High Street, the town's main shopping centre and major through route, with bus priority and pedestrian facilities at main junctions. This work followed pedestrian improvements to the Market Place and earlier pedestrian friendly measures in the High Street. This scheme also takes account of the proposed opening of the new Knaresborough Bus Station in 2003.

Two new CCTV cameras were installed on the A59 Skipton Road to monitor congestion and incidents. A traffic study was also undertaken on the A59 Skipton Road in an attempt to address ongoing congestion.

Substantial traffic calming has been introduced following consultation in residential areas, to improve safety and deter rat running with schemes being completed for Beckwith Road, Aspin Lane and Pannal Ash Road.

Further safety measures have been introduced in 2002/03 under the Safe Routes to Schools programme – covering Harrogate Grammar School, Castle School, Saltergate School and Rossett School. Other safety measures have been introduced on Penny Pot Lane, Otley Road/Pannal Ash Road, Hookstone Drive/Oatlands Drive, York Place/North Park Road and Jennyfield Drive/Ripon Road.

(iii) Programme for 2003/04

In December 2002 the County Council resolved that the preferred route of a western bypass of Harrogate be rescinded and that an “alternative strategy should be
developed for the medium to longer term based on encouraging the take-up and better provision of pedestrian facilities, cycling and public transport along with the development of a northern relief road together with the Killinghall Bypass”.

The County Council therefore intends to start in 2003/04 the development of a Harrogate Integrated Transport Strategy to cover the period 2006 to 2012. This will be used to identify transport constraints and opportunities on proposed land allocations for the roll forward of the local development plan.

Meanwhile, the existing traffic management proposals for Harrogate will continue to be implemented and SCOOT will be extended to A61 Ripon Road in 2003/04. It will be accompanied by bus and pedestrian priorities on Ripon Road and follows the extension of the Jennyfield Cycleway across Ripon Road, along Luchon Way towards the town centre. The SCOOT database and loop positions will be reviewed on the B6162 Otley Road. SCOOT control is programmed to be introduced in 2004/05. Particular concern has been raised over congestion on A59 Skipton Road and A661 Wetherby Road despite slightly falling traffic flows on this corridor. As part of the Skipton Road traffic study a public meeting was held late in March 2003 to discuss congestion on Skipton Road and Wetherby Road. The study will be completed in 2003/04 and its conclusions will feed into future strategies and proposals.

Improvements are planned to upgrade pedestrian facilities in James Street which is situated in the heart of the Harrogate town centre Conservation area.

As well as being one of the main shopping streets in the town, James Street serves as a major cross town traffic route and there is extensive on-street parking. It is proposed to improve the environment for pedestrians through the construction of junction plateaux and build outs at the main crossing points, measures which will also calm traffic. The above proposals will be subject to public consultation during the Summer and construction is planned for later in the year. Natural paving materials will be used to reflect its location in the Conservation area.

A GPS bus tracking system will also be used to trial the provision of bus priority at traffic signals.

The GPS equipment located within each bus is able to determine whether or not it is running to timetable. Trials will be undertaken using a virtual loop system whereby when a bus travels past a given point (the virtual loop) an assessment will be made to determine if the bus is running late. If it is the bus will communicate with the SCOOT system, which manages the operation of the traffic signal network, by radio via the traffic signal controller, to request priority.

The SCOOT system will then give the late running bus priority by either holding the traffic signals on green or by terminating early the green on the other approaches. Buses running to time or early will not request or be given priority.

In 2003/04 trials will be undertaken at three junctions on the A59 corridor, Bond End in Knaresborough and East Parade and Station Bridge in Harrogate. If these trials are successful then these priority measures will be rolled out as part of the public transport improvements on the main road corridors in Harrogate and Knaresborough, with the services operating on the A61 within the urban area of Harrogate being the priority for the later part of 2003/04.
Local safety/improvement schemes will be carried out at a number of locations with poor accident records. These schemes will also benefit cyclists and pedestrians where possible.

The Safe Routes to Schools programme will work with Pannal School and Bankside School in Harrogate and Meadowside School and King James School in Knaresborough, to improve safety for pedestrians approaching the schools in 2003/04. Provision includes improved crossings, road markings, barriers and footway extension.

It is proposed that traffic calming schemes be implemented for Batchelor Gardens, Crab Lane and West End Avenue in Harrogate and Stockwell Lane in Knaresborough.

The estimated cost of all the foregoing schemes intended to be implemented during 2003/04 is £540k. Developer funding has been secured for a number of traffic calming schemes.

(iv) Consultation Arrangements

A range of consultation arrangements are in place dependent on the nature of the proposals. In relation to the proposed changes to the residents parking scheme in five individual zones (Valley Drive, Valley Road, Park Parade, St Mary's Walk and York Road), general consultation was carried out with every household covered by the existing scheme (approximately 3,400) seeking comment on the existing arrangements.

In connection with traffic management proposals at Parliament Terrace and Pannal Ash Drive, wide ranging consultations were carried out with residents. General consultations were carried out but through public notices and press advertisements in connection with the review of 19 traffic regulation orders in various parts of the urban areas.

3. SCARBOROUGH

(i) The Traffic Management Strategy

The main thrust of the traffic management strategy for Scarborough continues to be aimed at a reduction of traffic penetration into the town centre. This is to be achieved by the implementation of the Scarborough Integrated Transport Package (SITP) and by introducing appropriate town centre parking controls in relation to both on and off-street parking.

Many of the residential areas adjacent to the town centre suffer from short-cutting traffic, and the strategy also focuses therefore on measures designed to mitigate the effects of this extraneous traffic.

On-street parking demand is managed by the payment for parking in the town centre, and commuter penetration into the central urban streets has been reduced by the introduction of residents priority parking zones. These initiatives have led to changes in traffic patterns, and traffic management schemes now in the LTP are designed to improve the handling of essential traffic flows whilst enhancing bus operation, road safety, provision for the disabled and pedestrians and enhancing cycle activit
ii) Review of Progress 2002/03

The SITP was approved in December 2002. This package of schemes is valued at £26.9 million, the bulk of which will go on a major route diversion south of the town and the provision of two Park and Ride sites on the A64 and A165. The remaining funds will provide infrastructure improvements to give bus priority on principal routes into the town, coupled with upgrading of the urban traffic control systems.

A Public Inquiry into the Orders required to prepare for the diversion scheme has been held and the Inspector's report is awaited. Planning consent has been obtained for the Park and Ride site on A165, and consent is awaited on the A64 site.

The bus priority measures and improvements to the urban traffic control systems are being procured by the Borough Council. This is to ensure that schemes currently in progress under the Local Transport Plan and any other measures being carried out locally and which could impinge on the SITP work are co-ordinated. Traffic movements in the area are presently being modelled and the results of that exercise will inform the design process for the SITP.

An extensive range of schemes has also been implemented in the town in 2002/03. Reduction in extraneous traffic and improved road safety in three residential areas have been achieved by the introduction of 20mph zones, with associated traffic calming features. Congestion at one of the town's principal junctions, A64/A171 (Seamer Road/Falsgrave Road) has been reduced by the introduction of a new layout and revised signalling. At the same time, new pedestrian facilities have been introduced, including arrangements for the disabled. Five signal controlled crossings have been upgraded to puffin status and further benefits to pedestrians introduced in the form of signposted walking routes to principal attractions.

New Signal Installation at Prince of Wales Terrace/Ramshill Junction, Scarborough

An additional coach drop-off point has been provided on the seafront at Sandside, which will further stimulate coach travel to the town and thereby reduce car traffic. Improvements have been made to the Park and Ride site at Weaponess to help sustain the use of this facility pending introduction of more comprehensive facilities at A64 and A165 under the Scarborough Integrated Transport Package. Other improvements to public transport include establishment of enlarged and enhanced terminal facilities at Westborough/York Place, and a programme of improvements to bus corridors to provide better information to waiting bus passengers and easier access for the disabled.

Cycling has been supported by creation of a new cycleway from the northern suburbs into the town centre and cycle parking at key destinations. Work on a new traffic model for the town centre has been verified, it will be used to test the effect of
changes to the road network, assist the development of bus priority measures and help to refine the urban traffic control system.

The total cost of these schemes was in excess of £850k.

(iii) Programme for 2003/04

The programme for the year 2003/04 seeks to build on the progress achieved in Year 2 of the LTP. Additional improvements to controlled crossings are proposed together with extensions to the number of roads with dropped crossing points. More pedestrian routes will be signed and the Safe Routes to School Programme continued with at least one additional route provided.

Two known high-risk accident sites are to be dealt with and further area safety schemes introduced in the town centre.

The area of coverage of the on-street residents priority parking scheme is to be slightly extended. A feasibility study on the introduction of decriminalised parking is to be carried out including a review of all traffic regulation orders and their associated signing/markings. Parking tariffs are being harmonised between on and off-street car parks.

A programme of provision of dedicated motorcycle parking bays will be implemented.

(iv) Consultation Arrangements

Consultation procedures were reviewed in the last APR, the most significant of these being the method of consultation on area-wide safety schemes. This has been further refined to ensure better communication of the outcome of focus group deliberations and the resultant formal reporting to elected Members. The opening mailshot to residents in that area is now repeated at the end of the process to inform residents that orders are about to be advertised and to explain the scale and nature of physical measures to be installed as part of the scheme.

For schemes that affect a much wider audience, for example the improvement of bus facilities in the town centre, targeted mail consultation is used for the standing list of consultees and for the businesses and traders directly affected. The travelling public is advised by leaflet distribution starting at an exhibition in the principal town centre shopping complex, followed up by a static display in the Town Hall over a period of a month. This is publicised in the local press. Small working groups are formed to deal with special interests, for example the Chamber of Trade. Once the scheme is refined further as a result of this research there follows formal consultation under the statutory procedures for introduction of traffic regulation orders, which in turn leads to open debate by Members in the usual way with further opportunity for comment by the public.

4. MARKET TOWNS AND COASTAL RESORTS

(i) Strategy Development

We continue to believe it is vital to develop an holistic town centre study approach in order to resolve identified transport issues in the main communities in the County. This approach to traffic management ensures that all the strands of the LTP are
drawn together in assessing the needs of the market towns and coastal resorts. This includes the preparation of complementary pedestrian action and local cycle plans.

Our experience to date supports the view that an essential element in the development of a traffic management strategy for each town is the partnership approach ensuring that key local stakeholders are involved throughout. This has been achieved by holding local workshops with key stakeholders at two critical stages in the study. The initial workshop identifies the relative priority of the problems and issues which need to be addressed, and to indicate some possible ways of dealing with them.

Where necessary, we are carrying out appropriate traffic surveys to assist in the development and assessment of the strategy options.

A second workshop is then held to consider the strategy options which are to be presented for public consultation, and to identify short term measures which could be implemented in the first year of the plan. As indicated in last year's APR, in order to test the effectiveness of the Council's approach the stakeholders who attended the second workshop were asked to complete a workshop evaluation questionnaire which enabled the Council to form a view on whether any amendments to the process were necessary.

(ii) Review of Progress 2002/03

During 2002/03, seven town centre strategies were being developed, at:-

- Hawes
- Helmsley
- Northallerton
- Richmond
- Tadcaster
- Skipton
- Whitby

Of these, by March 2003, six strategies had been adopted, and implementation of various components of each of these had been commenced, with expenditure of almost £480k committed in 2002/03 on a range of measures principally aimed at improved facilities for the disabled, bus stop improvements and new footway schemes.

For all of the towns, except Northallerton a costed implementation programme has been produced which identifies all of the schemes to be implemented over a four to five year period.

For the Northallerton strategy progress has been slower. However, the options to be presented for public consultation have now been agreed and it is hoped to be able to formally adopt a strategy later this year.

In addition to the completed strategies, studies have now commenced for Malton/Norton and Easingwold, where the issues and objectives have been agreed following the initial workshops. The strategies for each of these towns is currently being developed.
For each of the agreed strategies there are a number of common measures. These are:-

- Pedestrian facilities including improvements for people with disabilities and new footway/crossing schemes.
- Improvements to cycling facilities including new cycleways and cycle parking/storage schemes.
- Bus infrastructure improvements, including new bus stop (shelter facilities, better timetabling information and bus boarders).
- Improvements to car parking layouts
- Safety engineering schemes, including gateways, traffic calming measures and lower speed limits.
- Comprehensive pedestrian/cyclist/vehicle signing audits and a programme of signing improvements.

However, each town has its own individual traffic problems.

This has been reflected in the adopted strategies, so much so that a number of measures, tailored to the needs of the particular town, have been identified for implementation. These are as follows:

- New roundabouts Whitby and Skipton
- Signalised junctions Skipton and Tadcaster
- Bus Station and bus terminal facilities Skipton, Whitby, Tadcaster and Richmond
- Pedestrianisation Skipton, Tadcaster and Whitby
- Park and Ride Whitby
- Home Zones Skipton
- Trunk Road Connections Tadcaster
- One-way systems Tadcaster and Richmond
- Residents Parking Schemes Skipton, Whitby, Helmsley, Richmond, Skipton, Hawes, Whitby
- Controls on parking duration

iv. Programme for 2003/04

The programme for 2003/04 includes ongoing implementation of the various schemes comprising each of the adopted six town centre strategies, in accordance with an agreed funding profile. This funding profile is based on enhanced annual funding levels which it is considered can be sustained by the approved LTP capital allocation for 2003/04, and for future years, assuming that the level of the LTP settlement over the next few years is similar to the 2003/04 settlement. This will mean a total expenditure in 2003/04 of £1.6 million.

The implementation programme which has therefore been agreed and which identifies the various schemes to be implemented in each town in 2003/04 and in future years is represented in Annexes 1 to 6 attached to this Appendix.

Following adoption of the Northallerton strategy later this year, a programme of scheme implementation will be agreed. This programme will need to be phased over
a number of years in such a way as to match the agreed funding allocations for delivery of the market town and coastal resort strategies. The funding for Northallerton for 2003/04 is £100k, and, it has been agreed that the following schemes should be implemented prior to formal adoption of the strategy:

- A new puffin crossing on East Road.
- Various dropped kerbs and tactile paving.
- Improvements to pedestrian and cycling facilities on Thirsk Road.

A strategy for Easingwold is to be adopted in August following consultation. The funding allocation in 2003/04 for the first phase of schemes in £100k and it has been agreed that the following projects should be committed:

- Improvements to bus stops including the two layover steps in the Market Place.
- Various dropped kerbs/tactile paving on key pedestrian routes.
- Sign audit and subsequent signing improvements for pedestrians and to car parks.

The strategy for Malton/Norton is programmed to be adopted in early 2004. Again, funds have been allocated in 2003/04 for an initial phase of schemes in the sum of £100k. These schemes will be identified in a 4/5 year programme of works following adoption of the strategy.

During 2003/04 two additional town centre strategies are to be developed, for Selby and Leyburn. Work on the Selby town centre study commenced in April, and the initial workshop with stakeholders to identify the issues and objectives was held in June. The strategy is now being developed for public consultation towards the end of the year, with the intention being to adopt a preferred strategy in March 2004.

The Leyburn town centre study is also programmed to commence April with the first workshop with stakeholders scheduled for July.

(v) Consultation Arrangements

Based on our experience in developing the first six strategies, and on the response from stakeholders to the workshop evaluation questionnaire, we are confident that the process that has been adopted is an appropriate one.

However, as a result of comments received during the exhibition/public consultation stage of the six strategies, we have now introduced an additional stage into the strategy development process. This involves circulation of a questionnaire to a 10% sample of all properties in the study area. This questionnaire seeks the views of the community on the issues and objectives identified by key stakeholders at the first workshop. We believe this to be an essential additional step in the process in order to ensure that the range of issues to be addressed has been agreed by a wider representation than the stakeholder group.

The public consultation process which follows the second workshop is essentially as set out in last year's APR, with some minor modifications.* This process is as follows:-
• Press release giving advanced notice of forthcoming exhibition and leaflet drop.

• Area-wide distribution of comprehensive leaflet, including description of issues, objectives, strategy options and short term measures, together with explanation of what the Council intends to do following the consultation process.

• Exhibition of proposals at local venue, manned for a minimum of two days by NYCC and Mouchel North Yorkshire staff.

• Questionnaires included with the leaflet drop and at the exhibition with freepost arrangements for return. Also available on the internet with response facilities.

• An assurance that the majority view would be an important element in guiding the County Council in its adoption of a preferred strategy.

• * Provision of feedback to community/stakeholders on strategy adopted and schemes to be implemented.

• * Confirmation that further detailed consultation will follow in relation to individual key scheme in the strategy.

5. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT IN OTHER AREAS

(i) Introduction

Whilst we are continuing to strive to achieve coherent traffic management strategies in the main urban communities, we recognise that a wide range of, sometimes independent, traffic management measures need to be introduced throughout the County to address specific problems. Our approach to the introduction of such measures is to respond to the needs of particular communities having regard to the need to prioritise the requests to match the resources available.

The types of measure introduced are wide ranging, and include:

• The installation of traffic signal controls and upgrades of existing installations to meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (the maintenance of all installations, although a revenue funded item, is carried out via a Countywide term maintenance contract which was renewed in April 2003).

• The introduction of Traffic Regulation Orders with all associated signing and lining, including area-wide HCV restrictions, speed limits, waiting restrictions and one-way working.

• Residents parking schemes – in response to requests from various communities for a more flexible approach, the County Council's Residents Parking Policy has been reviewed and extensive consultation involving the District Councils, National Park Authorities and County Council Area Committees has been carried out. It is intended to finalise a policy to be adopted by the County Council later this year.

• Low cost signing and lining schemes to assist the local management of traffic movements.
(ii) Review of Progress 2002/03

During 2002/03, 6 new signal controlled crossings and two zebra crossings were installed, the cost of which was approximately £310k. In addition, the installations at 13 signal controlled pedestrian crossings were upgraded to meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, at a cost of almost £290k. This brings the percentage of such crossings brought up to the required standard to just under 94%, which means that the County Council is on programme to meet the 100% requirement by October 2004.

We also introduced 735 traffic regulation orders and low cost signing and lining schemes countrywide at a cost of £285k.

In July 2002 Decriminalised Parking Enforcement was introduced in the Harrogate District. The surplus monies arising from excess charges in relation to on-street car parking (£980k) were used to augment the programme of traffic management and safety engineering schemes in the Harrogate District. The types of schemes included in this additional programme of work are:-

i) Enhancement of pedestrian improvement schemes

ii) “Safer Routes to Schools” projects

iii) Traffic calming measures and other schemes to reduce injury accidents

iv) Public transport measures

v) Improvements to multi-storey car parks

vi) Travelwise publication and cycling initiatives

(iii) Programme for 2003/04

In 2003/04 it is proposed to introduce 13 new signal controlled crossings at an estimated cost of £410k, and 11 existing signal controlled crossings will be upgraded, at an estimated cost of £205k. The proposed signal upgrades will complete the County Council's programme to meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.
We also intend to spend £285k on the introduction of traffic regulation orders and low cost signing and lining schemes.

In addition, in the Harrogate District, some £1.2m will be available from the on-street car parking income for a range of traffic management and safety engineering schemes, of the type described in 5(ii) above.

In 2003/04 the feasibility of introducing Decriminalised Parking Enforcement in Scarborough and Craven Districts will be assessed. We will also introduce a countywide protocol for traffic signing to ensure consistency of approach following the publication of the new Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions. The existing Tourism Signing Policy is also to be reviewed to take account of new developments/initiatives in the tourism market.

These revised procedures will need to reflect the fact that within the County there are two major National Parks and three Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. To assist the preparation of these procedures, it is intended to customise the CSS/NPA accord to produce a design guide for highway engineering measures in the environmentally sensitive areas.

(iv) Consultation Arrangements

As with other schemes proposed by the County Council as part of its LTP programme, individual traffic management schemes are subject to consultation prior to implementation. This process involves the local community including District and Parish Councils, National Parks were applicable, as well as the emergency services, bus operators and other road user organisations. The decision on the form of the scheme to be adopted is devolved, in cases other than general objections to a proposed traffic regulation order, to the Director of Environmental Services in consultation with the relevant local Member and the Area Committee Chairman, having taken account of the various representations received.

During 2003/04 we intend to undertake a review of our consultation procedures with the aim of achieving a greater degree of consistency of approach countywide, as well as taking account of procedures in place in those authorities regarded as having adopted best practice.

6. CONTRIBUTION TO LTP OBJECTIVES AND TARGETS

We believe our holistic approach to traffic management in the main centres of population better addresses the key LTP objectives and more effectively secures a number of LTP targets.

The development of traffic management strategies for the urban areas focuses on the implementation of a programme of integrated schemes which seek to achieve the following objectives:

i) A wider choice of travel mode for all sectors of the community by increased investment in public transport infrastructure, and in new footway and cycleway schemes.

ii) Reduction in environmental intrusion caused by extraneous traffic, especially in residential areas.
iii) A shift in transport mode by increased investment in passenger transport facilities.

iv) Improvement in standards of safety on the local highway network by the implementation of pedestrian and cycling measures and safety engineering schemes.

v) Promotion of economic growth and regeneration by increased accessibility for all modes of transport, better connections to the primary road systems, and comprehensive signing improvements.

Our community led approach to traffic management in the other areas of the County, enables us to focus on the key objectives of highway safety, reducing adverse impacts of traffic on the environment and providing wider choices for travel in the community.

Traffic Management Strategy Schemes Implementation Programmes available in Appendix C Annexe A
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Skipton
Dropped kerbs and Tactile Paving, Central Area
Dropped kerbs and Tactile Paving, Route 1
Dropped kerbs and Tactile Paving, Route 2
Dropped kerbs and Tactile Paving, Route 3
Dropped kerbs and Tactile Paving, Route 4
Dropped kerbs and Tactile Paving, Route 5
Footway Improvements, Aireville Park to Craven College
Footway Improvements, Guisburn Street & Broughton Road
Footway Improvements, Short Bank Road
White lines, Gallows Bridge
Footway Improvements, Black Walk
Footway Improvements, The Bailey to Regent Road
Footway Improvements, Black Walk, Ramps at Gallows Bridge
Footway Improvements, Broughton Road (Brougton Mews to Station)
Footway Improvements, Gargrave Road
Footway Improvements, Grassington Road
Pedestrian Crossing Upgrade, High Street
Pedestrian Crossing Improvements, Mill Bridge
Pedestrian Crossing Improvements, Brougham Street
Pedestrian / Cycling Improvements, Canal Tow Paths
Pedestrian / Cycling Improvements, Carleton Road / Carleton New Road
Pedestrianisation of Sheep Street
HCV restriction on High Street
Otley Street Pedestrian Improvements
High Street Pedestrian Improvements
20 mph zone, Brougham Street / Westmoreland Road
Traffic Calming Brook Street/Canal Bridge
Traffic Calming Raikeswood Road and Salisbury Street
Traffic Calming Canal Street
Traffic Calming Broughton Grove Area
Traffic Calming Greenacres and Regent Estate
Central Area 20 mph zone
Traffic Calming Raikes and Rockwood Areas
Traffic Calming Moorview Way Estate
Traffic Calming Burnside Estate
Traffic Calming Raikes Road
Traffic Calming Grassington Road
Traffic Calming Rockwood Drive
Traffic Calming Keighley Road / Carlton Road Signals
Traffic Calming Belgrave Street
Traffic Calming Brook Street / Brewery Lane
Traffic Calming Elliot Street

Dropped kerbs and Tactile Paving
Pedestrian route improvements, Nun's Close to Rosemary Lane
Pedestrian route improvements, Market Place
Pedestrian route improvements, Rosemary Lane
Footway improvements, links from The Batts to lower Market Place
Station Road crossing
Improved crossing point, Maison Dieu
Crossing at Station Road / The Batts
Cyclestands
Cycling Improvements, The Batts
Traffic calming, Rimmington Avenue
Traffic calming and 20 mph zones, Bargate and Cravengate
Area wide traffic calming and 20 mph zone
Carriageway alterations and footway improvements, Frenchgate/The Channel
Market Place alterations
Residents parking scheme, Cornforth Hill & Waterloo
Residents parking scheme, The Green
Residents parking scheme, Frenchgate
Traffic Sign Audit
Passenger transport improvements
Bus infrastructure improvements
Total

2002/03
2003/04
2004/05
2005/06
2006/11
2006/11
2002/03
2002/03
2002/03
2002/03
2003/04
2003/04
2006/11
2006/11
2006/11
2006/11
2003/04
2003/04
2006/11
2003/04
2003/04
2003/04
2003/04
2004/05
2004/05
2003/04
2003/04
2004/05
2004/05
2004/05
2004/05
2005/06
2005/06
2006/11
2006/11
2006/11
2006/11
2006/11
2006/11
2006/11
2006/11
2006/11

2002/03
2003/04
2005/06
2003/04/05
2005/06
2004/05
2005/06
2003/04
2005/06
2003/04
2003/04
2003/04
2003/04/05
2006/11
2005/06
2003/04
2003/04
2003/04
2002/03/04
2002/03/04
2004/05

£40,000
£18,200
£18,200
£18,200
£18,200
£18,200
£15,000
£8,800
£6,400
£300
£14,600
£48,600
£220,000
£69,000 PED
£40,300 PED
£17,300 PED
£21,600
£18,000
£36,000
£41,800
£1,000
£25,000
£15,000
£25,000
£130,000
£55,400
£7,800
£26,000
£19,500
£19,500
£130,000
£41,800
£20,000
£104,000
£52,000
£130,000
£65,000
£45,500
£52,000
£39,100
£15,600
£9,100

£24,100
£28,200
£6,700
£140,000
£7,000
£35,000
£30,000
£2,500
£1,500
£6,500
£6,500
£35,000
£120,000
£69,000
£137,000
£10,000
£10,000
£10,000
£24,000
£6,000
£149,000
£858,000

£130,000
£41,800
£20,000
£104,000
£52,000

TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS

£65,000

£41,800
£1,000
£25,000
£15,000
£25,000
£130,000
£55,400

£15,000
£8,800
£6,400
£300
£14,600
(£35,000)
£220,000

£40,000

£24,000
£6,000
£69,000
£748,000

£24,100
£28,200
£6,700
£140,000
£7,000
£35,000
£30,000
£2,500
£1,500
£6,500
£6,500
£35,000
£120,000
£69,000
£137,000

TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
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TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
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TMS
TMS
TMS
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TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS
TMS / PTRAN
TMS

£45,500
£52,000
£39,100
£15,600
£9,100

£130,000

£7,800
£26,000
£19,500
£19,500

£69,000
£40,300
£17,300
£21,600
£18,000
£36,000

£35,000

£18,200
£18,200
£18,200
£18,200
£18,200

£80,000
£110,000

£10,000
£10,000
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£40,000
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£15,000
£8,800
£6,400
£300
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0

£24,100
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£500
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£6,000
£3,000
£0
£33,600

£0
£18,200
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£14,600
£48,600
£0
£0
£0
£0
£21,600
£18,000
£0
£41,800
£1,000
£25,000
£15,000
£5,000
£12,000
£55,400
£7,800
£0
£0
£0
£30,000
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0

£0
£28,200
£0
£70,000
£0
£0
£0
£2,500
£0
£6,500
£6,000
£35,000
£60,000
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£18,000
£3,000
£0
£229,200

£0
£0
£18,200
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£0
£0
£0
£0
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£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
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£0
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£0
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£20,000
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£0
£26,000
£19,500
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£2,000
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0
£0

£0
£0
£0
£70,000
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£35,000
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£0
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£0
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£60,000
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£0
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£0
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>TMS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming Greatwood Estate 2006/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>£52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Area Home Zone 2006/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>£218,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Improvement, Water Street 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£69,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Improvement, Caroline Square 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>£123,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Improvement, Keighley Road / Craven Street 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>£64,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Improvement, Keighley Road / Snaygill Ind Est 2006/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>£260,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to Hail &amp; Ride service 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£7,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Station 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>£800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Parking Zone, Craven St./Church St. area 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Parking Zone, Granville Street area 2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Parking Zone, Sackville Street area 2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>£7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Parking Zone, Duckett Street area 2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>£7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,535,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped kerbs and Tactile Paving 2002/03</td>
<td></td>
<td>£45,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, New Bridge ramps 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£17,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, Beech Grove / Ash Grove footway 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£8,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, Prospect Hill footway 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, Waterstead Lane lighting 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, Waterstead Lane footway 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, Osbourne Terrace / New Bridge footway 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>£13,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, Stakesby Vale area footway &amp; lighting 2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>£51,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, Green Lane footway &amp; lighting 2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>£15,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, future schemes 2005/06/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khyber Pass footway 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£21,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lane footway 2002/03</td>
<td></td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Quay Road build outs 2002/03</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements, Airey Hill School 2002/03</td>
<td></td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway to Hospital 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£14,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway &amp; lighting improvement, Abbey Car Park to Aelfleda Terrace 2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>£28,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway, Royal Crescent to car park 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield Road Bridge safety parapets 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvement Area, Royal Crescent Area 2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>£28,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking on the footway to be resolved, Church Square 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking on the footway to be resolved, Pier Road 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking on the footway to be resolved, Church Street 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Road Pedestrian Improvement Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>£13,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle routes 3/04/05/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic restrictions extended to include New Quay Rd, Swing Bridge and part of Church St 2006/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase short stay spaces near shops 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review spaces for disabled 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawsker Lane Widening Phase 2 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawsker Lane Widening Phase 3 04/05/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echelon Parking Feasibility, John St., Hudson St., Mulgrave Pl. 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£17,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way system and parking improvements, North Promenade 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Strategy 2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Area Green Travel Plan 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of existing car parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay &amp; Display and Residents Parking, West Cliff 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride 04/05/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A174 Sandsend / Love Lane Junction Improvement</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing &amp; Lining Maintenace Div 3</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting Faults</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents parking scheme, Church St. &amp; The Ropery</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>£21,324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents parking scheme, Fishburn Park</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>£21,324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach passenger facilities Marina Car Park</td>
<td>£41,800</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing Audit</td>
<td>£35,400</td>
<td>£25,294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop improvements</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus station refurbishment</td>
<td>£694,700</td>
<td>£694,700</td>
<td>£644,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way traffic, South Terrace / Crescent Place</td>
<td>£4,600</td>
<td>£2,647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved services, Esk Valley Railway</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-opening Whitby-Pickering-Malton Railway</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£4,436,900</td>
<td>£2,529,559</td>
<td>£3,352,200</td>
<td>£1,284,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC TRANSPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

The public transport strategy within the LTP is designed to encourage increased use of public transport services and contribute to the Government’s target to increase bus use by 10% by 2010. We aim to ensure a balanced transport network that encompasses all modes of public transport ensuring that each is able to contribute to maximum effect.

Progress to Date

Publicity and Promotion

We have continued to implement our publicity strategy – a copy of which is attached at Annex 1. In 2002/03 we have concentrated on replacing our internet journey planner in line with the Yorkshire Local Information Partnership. Use of the journey planner is increasing steadily and the new system should be live in Autumn 2003. In Wensleydale we have introduced individual timetable displays at bus stops. These give clear, simple information in an attractive format and have proved popular with our customers.

Buses

The County Council has continued to improve the quality of bus services in the County both through its Area Review programme and infrastructure developments. The Area review programme includes consultation with Parish Councils and communities so that we can be sure that the services we provide meet local needs. In April 2002 new contracts were introduced as part of the Hambleton area review. The consultation process had
identified a number of issues which we sought to address through revisions to contract services. In Northallerton, for example we were able to improve links to the doctor’s surgeries on the edge of town. An improved vehicle specification for Town services in Northallerton and Thirsk has also been introduced as well as a commitment to introduce “TownTraveller” tickets which would encourage more short distance travel. This scheme has been piloted in Northallerton since September 2002. The introduction of the ticketing initiative was complemented by better identification of bus routes in the areas served by the Town Service. Sales of the tickets have risen steadily while use of the town service has increased. In Thirsk improvements were made to both the Town Service and the Station link service. Station link provides a connecting service between the residential areas of Thirsk and the railway station. A more direct service has been introduced and the extent of the area served increased.

The introduction of new contract services in Hambleton coincided with infrastructure improvements in Northallerton and on the bus route between Northallerton and Bedale. Customer feedback from these developments has been very positive and the operators of the commercial bus services have improved the quality of their vehicles – in the case of Dales & District this has meant the introduction of a brand new super low floor bus.

We also undertook some customer research on our existing Premier Specification contract which operates between Northallerton and Stokesley. Again the feedback was very positive indicating wide support for the strategy we have adopted.
Premier Contracts provide for the following:

- Low floor easy access buses, less than 5 years old
- Small team of drivers
- Customer care training
- Dedicated budget for publicity

In January 2003 we introduced new contracts in Richmondshire as part of our Area Review programme. As with Hambleton, consultation was an important factor and identified strong support for the introduction of low floor buses between Hawes and Northallerton. Although this meant an increase in cost, the County Council decided that accessibility was a priority and approved the award of a £1.6m contract to Dales & District. This meant that six brand new super low floor wheelchair accessible vehicles would be used on a network of services in the Wensleydale Area. Once again it was possible to improved infrastructure along the route to maximise the benefits to passengers.

Harrogate & District Travel

In 2002 we worked on a number of projects with Harrogate & District Travel. These included redevelopment of Harrogate Bus Station, introduction of on Real Time Passenger Information and a research project to
  - find out more about consumer attitudes to bus travel
  - inform marketing & strategic decision-making

The conclusions from this work will help us to review strategies for increasing passenger usage. Following the market research exercise Harrogate & District Travel have started a programme of marketing and promotional activities to address the issues identified.

By working together, the bus company and the County Council have been able to introduce a number of examples of good practice which can be shared with other operators and other authorities. For example, the bus company has established and hosts a bus users group. Officers from the County Council attend these meetings to listen to comments and explain the Council's role.

“I would be quite fascinated to know where the buses run. You see a lot around but you don’t know where they’re going.”

“I’d get the bus more in the evenings if they’d put more on. They seem to think nobody goes out after 6. You’d like to be able to pop out & do your shopping later”
Good communication with customers as well as customer feedback is important.

In Harrogate, the bus company produces a Customer newsletter which promotes the work being done by both them and the County Council and provides an easy way for customers to provide feedback. This has provided the catalyst for a number of recent service changes. The informal partnership now established between the Council and the bus company has given Harrogate & District Travel the confidence to invest in vehicles and generally improve the overall quality of its commercial services.

Leisure Services

We have maintained our support for leisure bus services to the Dales, Moors and Nidderdale AONB. In conjunction with the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority we have commissioned a study to identify how public transport in the Dales should develop in order to best meet the needs of both visitors and residents.

In other areas of the County we have sought to maintain a viable network of bus services despite changes to the commercial network. In the north of the County Arriva North East advised us of their intention to close their depot at Stokesley. This meant changes to a number of services which required intervention by the County Council to ensure that communities retained access to essential services. By working closely with the communities involved we were able to modify existing services at no cost to the authority.

School Transport

In the Summer of 2002 we replaced a school network of Double Deck Vehicles in Harrogate with a network of “Yellow Buses” as part of a Premier School Contract with Harrogate and District. In addition to single deck Yellow Buses the following features form part of our contract with the bus company:

- Use of CCTV on vehicles
- Deployment of inspectors for supervision and revenue protection.
- Driver uniforms
- Improved information and publicity
- Introduction of weekly tickets to encourage travel outside school times

This network caters for a mixture of fare paying pupils as well as those who are entitled to free home to school transport. The network is provided by 9 vehicles and carry an average of 450 pupils each day and is now an integral part of the Harrogate & District Travel network of bus services.

The County Council recognises that home to school transport has an important role to play in reducing peak hour traffic. We know that if we want to maximise use by students then they and their parents must be assured that all vehicles are safe and that the County Council has taken appropriate steps in order to ensure that this is so. In order to achieve this the Passenger Transport Group has been strengthened to evaluate the operating procedures used by our contractors and to give advice on best practice. This will include the provision of driver training courses. In 2002 the County Council amended its home to school transport policy to provide assistance with transport for students aged between 16 and 19 who live
over three miles from their school or college. This is an important development in ensuring access to a wide range of courses for pupils who live in rural areas. The Council's Home to School and College Transport Policy is attached as Annex 2.

**Infrastructure**

In 2002/03, the County Council has completed a number of infrastructure schemes. Notably, in terms of cost, the following new or refurbished bus stations at:

The County Council bought Whitby Bus Station in 2001 when its owners, Arriva, decided to sell it. In the time since then we have refurbished the site following extensive consultation with bus companies, bus users and the local community. The bus station redevelopment has been firmly linked to a Traffic Management Strategy for Whitby. As part of the scheme we have developed a Public Transport Quality Partnership for Whitby which commits the County and District Councils and the bus company to the continued development of high quality public transport services in the Town.

Tadcaster Bus Station is owned and managed by Selby District Council. The bus station site encompasses a car park and taxi rank, all of which have been redeveloped as part of the bus station project in partnership with the District Council.

In Harrogate our work with Harrogate & District Travel gave them confidence to invest £1.8m to purchase the bus station in 2002. The redevelopment of the bus station is part of a comprehensive scheme to improve bus services in the town. This includes:

- Bus station redevelopment
- Introduction of Real Time Passenger Information
- Investment in high quality vehicles
- Infrastructure improvements along key corridors
- Improved network of school services
- Market research with Bus Passengers jointly funded with Harrogate & District Travel
- Bus users group established by Harrogate & District Travel
- Improved customer feedback from bus company newsletter

In addition to our major schemes, we have introduced smaller scale schemes in the following Market Towns:

Bentham Town Centre
Hunmanby Town Centre
Kettlewell
Public transport infrastructure has been developed along the following Key Bus Corridors:

- Briarcliffe, Scarborough
- Malton – Hovingham
- Malton – Pickering
- Ripon – Harrogate -Leeds
- Harrogate - Knaresborough
- Seamer – Eastfield - Scarborough
- Skipton – Keighley
- Bedale - Leyburn-Hawes
- Cloughton - Scarborough
- Northallerton - Stokesley & TC stops
- Skipton - Grassington

We have been careful to ensure that the passenger infrastructure we provide is appropriate to the area. In Wensleydale, for example, we have refurbished existing shelters which are of a more traditional construction. Along the Ripon - Harrogate – Leeds corridor we have introduced a number of solar powered bus stops to ensure that illuminated display cases are available to the public. This compliments Harrogate & District Travel's investment of £2.5m in low floor quality vehicles for the service between Ripon, Harrogate and Leeds.
Rural Bus Challenge

In 2002 we finalised the introduction of our Bus Challenge Schemes from 2000.

Travelinks

This provides a conventional bus service using wheelchair accessible vehicles between Skipton and Harrogate and Pateley Bridge and Otley. The service was introduced in November 2002 and usage has been encouraging.

The rural interchange at which services connect will be improved in 2003 as a result of working closely with a commercial developer. The County Council and the AONB will jointly fund transport and tourist publicity at the new interchange.

South Selby Taxibus

This project provides a four seat MPV with access and space for one wheelchair which provides links for rural communities with existing commercial bus services. Usage has been disappointing and discussions are in hand with the Operator and local communities to identify ways in which the number of Passengers can be increased.

Station link and Sherburn Village Bus Service

This project utilises a low floor wheelchair accessible minibus to provide peak hour “Stationlink” services to Micklefield Station and a “Village Bus service” for the villages around Sherburn in Elmet providing links between them and Sherburn in Elmet. Passenger usage has grown steadily and a good working relationship with the contractor will ensure continued growth.

During the year we worked towards the implementation our successful bids from 2001.
These are:

**North Selby Village Bus**

Capital funding of £143,000 to buy a wheelchair accessible MPV and to improve passenger facilities in the area served. Revenue funding over three years to provide peak and off peak fixed and demand responsive services.

**Craven "4 in 1"**

Capital funding of £132,500 to buy two accessible minibuses with revenue funding of £239,663 to fund a wide range of services in the rural area around Skipton.

**Friarage Hospital, Northallerton**

Capital funding of £52,700 for improvements to the access arrangements for bus services within the grounds of the Friarage Hospital plus an enclosed lit waiting shelter for bus users with raised kerbs to allow easy boarding of buses for the elderly and infirm. Provision of timetable information at key locations within the hospital grounds. Revenue funding (£62,000) to provide additional bus services for staff and visitors to the hospital.

**Settle Station Link and North craven Taxi Bus**

Capital funding of £50,000 to buy an accessible MPV and £120,000 of revenue funding to provide new services, for rural communities in North Craven including Stationlink services for Settle and Giggleswick Stations.

**South Harrogate Village bus service**

Capital funding of £130,000 to fund an accessible minibus and provide rural interchange facilities with £151,000 revenue funding for new services. The services will link rural communities in the area south of Harrogate with the Harrogate – Leeds bus service and will include commuter links to existing bus and train services.

**Community Transport**

Community Transport projects are, in the main being led by the five Rural Transport Partnerships in the County. In 2002 each of the Partnerships has reviewed its action plan and made revisions where necessary. While this has meant that progress on new schemes has been less than in previous years there has been an opportunity to consolidate existing schemes. The Partnership Officers and the Countryside Agency have agreed that there is a need to commission a Community Transport Strategy for the County Council. A project brief has been agreed and bids invited from consultants to assist the development of the strategy. A copy of the brief is attached at Annex 3 and the work will be completed in January 2004.
Rail Services

We have a good working relationship with the train operating companies, the Strategic Rail Authority and Railtrack and during 2002/03 worked with them to develop the following projects:

Malton-Pickering
We commissioned a study with the brief to determine whether the re-opening of the railway was a feasible proposition in engineering terms and to estimate the cost of such a proposal. This work was completed in 2001 and it concluded that there were no physical reasons why the route could not be re-opened. It was estimated at the time that the cost would be in the region of £19 million. The County Council then decided to proceed with further feasibility work in the form of a passenger demand study. In the Autumn of 2001, the County Council commissioned Railtrack to undertake this work using the Trans-Pennine Network Model. In addition to North Yorkshire County Council, the Steering Group for the study included the Countryside Agency which co-funded the work, Ryedale District Council, North York Moors National Park Authority, North Yorkshire Moors Railway and Railtrack. The passenger demand study provides information on the likely passenger usage and revenue generated based on two test scenarios ie an hourly service between York and Pickering and secondly based on a through service from York to Whitby. It was hoped to apply for Rail Passenger Partnership (RPP) funding for this project, but this has recently been suspended by the SRA. Whilst alternative funding sources are being investigated, the County Council has commissioned Mouchel to update the costs of the project.

Cross Hills Station
Further to work undertaken in 2001/02 (including a public consultation in September 2001), we have commissioned a piece of work to assess the impact that each of the three options for siting the station will have on the level crossing at Kildwick. This, along with the results of the consultation exercise, will form the basis for a recommendation to County Council members on which option to develop a business case for funding. As with Malton-Pickering, it was envisaged that RPP funding would be sought for this proposal but alternative sources will be investigated.

Esk Valley Line
We are involved in the work of the Esk Valley Railway Development Company (EVRDC), which is registered as a not for profit company with charitable status. Its basic aim is the development of the Esk Valley Railway and the communities which it serves, with a long-term vision of developing innovative forms of local management of the railway and complementary forms of transport. The EVRDC will be discussing proposals for micro-franchising (or micro-management) of this line with the five shortlisted bidders for the Northern franchise as part of the current round of franchise renewals. Funding for a Development Officer has recently been secured through the Countryside Agency’s Rural Transport Partnership fund, and it is hoped that this person will be in post by the summer of 2003.
Yorkshire Coast Line
We are involved in the work of the Yorkshire Coast Community Rail Partnership, which is registered as a not for profit company on broadly similar lines to the EVRDC. Its basic aims and objectives are similar to those of the EVRDC, namely to encourage greater use of services and the development of greater community involvement and “ownership” of the line. Through the Development Officer for the line, the partnership was officially launched on 22 October 2002.

Settle-Carlisle/Leeds-Lancaster Lines
We have continued our work with the Settle-Carlisle Projects and Promotions Groups. We underwrote the costs of erecting a waiting shelter on the Lancaster bound platform at Clapham. We are hoping to provide a new waiting shelter at Giggleswick and are investigating ways in which access issues at Gargrave could be addressed.

Harrogate Line
The County Council chairs the Harrogate Rail Group, which exists to promote and facilitate improvements to the Leeds-Harrogate-York rail line. Members of the group include Metro (West Yorkshire PTE), City of York Council, Harrogate Borough Council, Arriva Trains Northern, Network Rail and the Harrogate Chamber of Trade and Commerce. On behalf of the Group, the County Council, Metro and City of York Council have recently appointed Faber Maunsell to develop a Harrogate Line Route Strategy, which includes the potential for new stations including Bilton and Knaresborough East.

The County Council will be managing a study into the potential for a re-opened rail link between Harrogate, Ripon and Northallerton/Thirsk. This is being funded in partnership with the Countryside Agency and Ripon SRB and will involve the Ripon Railway Re-instatement Association. It is envisaged that this study will be commissioned in July 2003.

Cross-Boundary Fares
We commissioned jointly with West Yorkshire PTE a study into how availability of ‘Metrocards’ in West Yorkshire and not North Yorkshire affected the travel patterns of those living in North Yorkshire, close to the County boundary. The study concluded that fares differentials are perceived rather than actual and we are continuing our collaboration with West Yorkshire PTE to address this. One option under consideration is the creation of an additional Metrocard ‘zone’ to cover rail travel into certain points in North Yorkshire, such as Selby and Skipton.

Northallerton Level Crossings
We have worked with Railtrack and the SRA to look at ways in which delays at the level crossings in Northallerton (on the line to Middlesbrough) can be alleviated. We have identified an option for constructing a bridge over the railway to replace the level crossing at Low Gates to the north of the town centre.

Access to Stations
In the LTP we have set a target to improve access to fifty percent of the stations in the county. In order to help prioritise this work we commissioned Consulting Engineers Halcrow to undertake accessibility audits of all stations in North Yorkshire, with particular reference to the Disability Discrimination Act. These audits will form the basis of work to fulfil our commitment to improve access to at least half of the rail stations in the County, in partnership with the rail industry.

Rylstone Line
We commissioned Halcrow to examine the potential to re-introduce passenger services on this line from Skipton, and extend it to Threshfield/Grassington. The final report is due to be delivered soon.

We have also undertaken the following:

- Offered to pay for the installation of Customer Information Screens at Cononley
- Worked with other local authorities to ensure that rail-related aspirations in North Yorkshire are brought to the attention of the SRA and potential bidders for the new Northern franchise
- Represented the needs of people in North Yorkshire in consultations with the rail industry
- Offered to pay for a new waiting shelter at Northallerton for use when the existing shelters are locked
- Worked with the train operator to develop proposals for better facilities at various stations, including cycle parking at Cononley and information at Thirsk

**Wensleydale Railway**

We are pleased that the Wensleydale Railway Company (WRC) has secured agreement in principle to take over responsibility of the Wensleydale line from Network Rail. The company is to be congratulated for negotiating this unique agreement which will ensure the restoration of passenger services in Summer 2003/2004. The County Council is keen to work with the WRC to help ensure that the project is successful. We have contributed £50k to the cost of platforms at Leyburn and are examining the opportunities for integrated ticketing with bus services.

**Funding & Passenger usage**

We have maintained funding levels for support for bus services in real terms. However, rising tender prices, in part caused by the introduction of higher contract specifications has meant that we have had to review the services we support to ensure that we get value for money and that we can contain expenditure within the budget available.

During 2002/03 it was necessary to reduce the levels of service to some areas. This reduction was introduced following extensive consultation with users and communities and designed to minimise the impact on communities. The following graphs show funding and passenger usage since 1999/2000.

**Planned activities for 2003 / 04**
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Introduce new contract services in Harrogate including an increased “Yellow Bus Network”.
Introduce new contract services in Craven.
Continue infrastructure developments along key corridors and in Market Towns.
Further develop our range of Rail Projects.
Improve Community Transport in Harrogate through the introduction of our Rural Bus Challenge projects.

**Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reduce the cost per passenger journey of subsidised bus services</td>
<td>Subsidy per passenger journey is measured according to the CIPFA formula because it was previously a BVPI. Under this formula, although the number of passenger journeys is increasing, allocated costs are increasing further. The amount of subsidy per passenger journey for 2002/03 was £1.85 – an increase from last years figure of £1.70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from £1.35 (1999/2000) to £1.30 (2000/2001) and by a further 10% by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete

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

There have been problems with the reporting of passenger numbers. We have worked with operators to address this and the graph shows the current position. This represents an increase of 4.2% from the base line figure. This leaves us well placed to achieve this target.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve access for people with disabilities at 50% of rail stations during the plan period.</td>
<td>Work to achieve this target is programmed for 2003, 2004 and 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the total number of public transport journeys made annually in the two National Parks and AONB by 15% by 2005/06.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Public Transport Use in the National Parks" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public transport use in the National Parks has increased significantly and it is appropriate to set a more challenging target of a 45% increase since 2000 / 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that 75% of users are satisfied with local bus services by the end of the Plan period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that 75% of users are satisfied with local provision of public transport information by the end of the Plan period.</td>
<td>These will be measured in 2003/04.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop 16 quality bus corridors during the plan period.</td>
<td>Twelve Corridors have been developed, we are well placed to achieve this target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To complete an accessibility audit of bus and rail stations and the pedestrian links by 2003.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 1

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
PASSENGER TRANSPORT GROUP
PUBLIC TRANSPORT INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY STRATEGY

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The aim of this strategy is to ensure that comprehensive publicity for all transport services is available in a consistent format and to a consistently high standard. The specific needs of disabled people with regard to publicity will be identified through consultation with representative groups.

1.2 The County Council recognises that distribution of information is an essential part of the strategy and experience elsewhere suggests that door to door distribution of attractive, clear and relevant leaflets may increase bus service patronage by up to 3% per annum.

1.3 Similarly, registration documents are a key element in ensuring that accurate publicity can be provided. The County Council supports the principles of the TransXchange project which will facilitate the protocol for the electronic registration of bus services. This will standardise bus stop references as well as timetable layout and should make updating both the journey planner and published timetables much easier.

2. SUMMARY OF MAIN PROVISIONS OF STRATEGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>County Council role</th>
<th>Bus operator role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone enquiry service</td>
<td>Maintain database; co-ordinate funding for the Traveline telephone information service.</td>
<td>Contribute to funding the Traveline telephone information service. To display details of the Traveline telephone information service on all vehicles operating local bus services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey Planner</td>
<td>To maintain a database of journey times that is available through the internet.</td>
<td>To ensure all timetable and registration changes are notified to the County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable booklets</td>
<td>To produce area timetable booklets twice each year.</td>
<td>To ensure all timetable changes are notified to the County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable leaflets</td>
<td>To provide advice on quantities and details of available distribution networks.</td>
<td>To ensure that there is an adequate supply of route specific leaflets giving clear and accurate information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### County Council role | Bus operator role
---|---
Bus stop displays | To provide timetable display cases and inserts. | To ensure that the information in the cases is up to date and comprehensive.
Town centre and Market town displays | To provide public transport and general information at terminal points. | To ensure all timetable changes are notified to the County Council.
Railway Station displays | To provide public transport and general information displays at rail stations. | To ensure all timetable changes are notified to the County Council.
Information on vehicles | To produce cove cards with relevant information. | To notify passengers of impending changes, to make leaflets available on bus, to display information posters supplied by the County Council.
Maps | To produce public transport maps for the County. | To ensure all timetable changes are notified to the County Council.
Distribution | The County Council will work to develop a distribution network for booklets and leaflets. | To arrange household deliveries of route leaflets along key bus corridors.
TransXchange project | To support the development of this project. | To utilise the TransXchange project for bus service registrations.

### Detailed Strategy

#### Telephone Enquiry Service

3.1 In 1999, the County Council established a telephone enquiry service for local bus services by “buying into” the existing services provided by neighbouring authorities and bus operators. The enquiry service uses the national enquiry number 0870 608 2 608; calls are charged at the national rate. This forms part of the Government’s vision for the establishment of a national public transport enquiry service by July 2000.

3.2 In conjunction with the telephone enquiry service a partnership, the ‘Yorkshire Local Information Partnership’ has been formed to develop an “All Yorkshire journey planner” which will provide the core data for the enquiry service. This data comprises the merged databases of North Yorkshire, City of York, West Yorkshire PTE, South Yorkshire PTE, East Riding Council and Hull City Council and was introduced in April 2000.
3.3 A recent development of the project allows the use of the national number across the whole of Yorkshire. This will soon be enhanced by the provision of seamless call transfer between all the call centres to allow callers to benefit from the detailed local knowledge of the telephone operators.

3.4 As part of the Yorkshire consortium the County Council will co-operate in enhancements to the telephone enquiry service to include a GIS facility and information about Community and unconventional transport services.

3.5 Currently, revenue funding for the service is met by the County Council, however if the service is to be properly maintained then the operational costs will need to be met by bus operators. The County Council is working to develop a mechanism to identify an appropriate charge for each operator. For example if the core costs of £50,000 were based on the number of registrations then the charge per registration would be £132 per year. Where the whole or part of a registration is covered by a NYCC contract a proportion of the enquiry service charge will be met by the County Council.

Journey Planner

3.6 A journey planner has been developed in parallel with the telephone enquiry service and will shortly be available on an Internet site giving travel details for the whole of Yorkshire. The developments described above in relation to the telephone enquiry service will be introduced to the journey planner facility.

3.7 It is intended that the availability of this Internet system will be promoted on Intranet sites at main hospitals and major employers. Discussions are taking place at the moment with a view to include local public transport information on the North Yorkshire County Council intranet site for workers based at County Hall.

3.8 The County Council will work with TIC’s and other information providers to enable them to use the journey planner to provide information to personal callers on a face to face basis.

4. PRINTED PUBLICITY

Area timetable booklets

4.1 Booklets have the advantage of being able to detail in a comprehensive manner a public transport network within an area. The County Council intends to produce a series of timetable booklets. Booklets would be locally orientated and broadly based on the seven District Council areas. These could be supplemented by two that would relate specifically to the North York Moors and the Yorkshire Dales National Parks and be orientated towards encouraging public transport use by tourists and visitors. These would replace ‘Getting around the Yorkshire Dales’ and ‘Getting around the North York Moors’ which are currently produced. It is suggested that discussions be held with the two National Parks with a view to increasing the attractiveness of these booklets for visitors. The use of advertising as a source of income should be explored. Contributions should also be sought from other agencies.
4.2 The area booklets will include:

- Comprehensive timetables for all public transport services (train, bus, community transport and taxis)
- A network map
- an index of services and places served
- basic user information
- Operator details
- Routes of cycleways and locations of secure cycle lockers

4.3 Covers will be in full colour, to a corporate house style, which has already been developed.

4.4 Timetable layouts will be simple with a standard set of codes agreed with operators. Timetables will be shown in a standard matrix format, based upon the ATCO 'best practice' guidelines currently being developed and maps showing key town centres including bus routes and main stopping points and bus station layouts will be included.

**Route leaflets**

4.5 Whilst timetable booklets offer a comprehensive network overview, frequent service changes mean that they are soon out of date. In the past 12 months the County Council has been sent over 500 sets of registration details and almost all require a timetable change. It is essential therefore that route leaflets supplement the timetable booklets.

4.6 Leaflets should be produced by operators in appropriate quantities. (An appropriate quantity is an initial production for 150% of households in the main areas served along the line of route). All leaflets should be produced to a standard style which corresponds to the agreed layout. Because the information is being produced for the benefit of the public leaflets must be comprehensive. This means that each leaflet must include details of all relevant services which operate along common sections of route.

**Roadside Information**

4.7 The most common form of roadside information is a static display case of timetable information at bus stops. The information can be presented in a number of different formats ranging from a full matrix timetable for each service calling at the stop, to stop specific departures.

4.8 Over the past two years the County Council has worked with Parish Councils and bus operators to increase the number of timetable displays at stops. Information for the displays is normally provided by the County Council and put into the display case on site by either the Parish Council or bus operator. Through this strategy the County Council will continue to provide the inserts, however the obligation to ensure that all display cases along a route are updated will transfer to those operators with registered services along the route. Where more than one operator serves a particular route agreements will be sought to clarify which operator will update which display cases. The County Council will provide additional display cases at sites to be agreed with Parish Councils and bus operators, subject to available finance.
4.9 Through the Local Transport Plan process the County Council will give further consideration to the introduction of ‘Real time’ information at key bus stop sites.

**Town Centres and Market towns**

4.10 Public transport information at terminal points in town centres and market towns should be provided as part of general information displays giving details of local facilities and services.

**Railway stations**

4.11 As part of the Esk Valley Partnership project local information boards were provided at stations. These provide simple information and useful contacts. This initiative has proved popular and should be extended to all rail stations in the County. The information displayed should be expanded to include details of bus services and directions to the nearest bus stop.

4.12 The County Council will liaise with Railtrack and the relevant train operating companies with regard to the location of these displays.

**Maps**

4.13 Maps aim to explain the public transport network in a visual form. Colour may be used in various ways in order to indicate frequencies, route variations or service numbers. Listings of services, frequencies and other useful information can be shown on the reverse.

4.14 The County Council will produce three separate maps to cover the whole of the County. The areas covered by each map will be East (the area to the east of the A19, Thirsk and the River Ouse), West (the area to the west of the A19, Thirsk and the River Ouse and south to Wetherby and Tadcaster), South (the area of the County south of York, Tadcaster and Wetherby).

4.15 In addition, tourist oriented route maps could be produced for the two National Parks to complement the booklets described above. These would vary from the County route maps in that they would be aimed at ‘selling’ public transport for leisure purposes and should include information on how to use public transport, places of interest that are served by transport services, fares as well as any offers available locally to public transport users.

4.16 Funding for these maps should be sought from a variety of sources.

**Timetable changes**

4.17 It is desirable that timetable changes are co-ordinated to happen at specific times of the year. The County Council will work towards this in discussion with all operators.

4.18 It is essential that existing bus users are informed of impending timetable changes. As part of submitting a registration change operators should liaise with the County Council over the production of an information notice to be displayed on vehicles not less than 10 days prior to the introduction of the change.
5. DISTRIBUTION AND LOCAL AVAILABILITY

5.1 An effective distribution system is essential to the overall success of this publicity strategy. The Traveline service is already promoted through leaflets and at bus stops. However, there is no ‘formal’ system to ensure the effective distribution of timetable booklets and leaflets. This needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

5.2 There are a number of options:

- Household drops by Royal Mail
- Household drops with free newspapers
- Deposits in libraries, Tourist Information Centres, Community Centres and other places regularly accessed by the public.
- Use of volunteers to make household deliveries (residents groups, Parish Councils)

5.3 It is also important to ensure that timetable information continues to be made available locally. Operators must ensure that vehicles used to provide public transport services always carry a supply of relevant leaflets as well as details of the travel enquiry service and other publicity initiatives.

5.4 The development of a distribution strategy/network will include provision for the identification of “essential sources” and a mechanism that will ensure that these locations be assured a supply of up to date information.

Other Initiatives

5.5 A less conventional approach to supplement ‘mainstream’ promotional activity is the use of parish transport representatives as part of a two way process of information, consultation and feedback.

5.6 It is envisaged that each Parish council would nominate a local public transport user (or users in some of the larger councils) to represent the Parish council on transport matters. This person could then act as the main point of focus with the local Planning & Development Officer and local Rural Transport Partnership Officer. Their role might include:

Passing comments to the PTG on proposed changes
Assess adequacy of existing services
Suggest new or enhanced services
Suggest infrastructure improvements
Maintain a reference source
Distribute timetables locally
Update timetable cases
Monitor operation of local services
Act as an advocate for public transport

5.7 Other initiatives could include partnerships with commercial operators to upgrade bus stop plates so as to raise awareness, and the use of appropriate newspaper and media advertising.
**INTRODUCTION**

1.1 **The Legal Framework**

Section 59 of the Education Act 1996, Schedule 19 of the Education Act 2002, and guidelines from the DfES have provided the general principles on which this policy has been drafted. A summary of legal requirements is attached at Appendix A.

1.2 **Guidelines to the Director of Environmental Services**

Guidelines and Requirements from the Director of Education the Director Of Environmental Services are attached at Appendix B. The guidelines take account of the County Surveyors' Society’s “Guidelines for the Assessment of the Safety of Walking Routes to School” which are attached at Appendix C.

**PUPILS ATTENDING SCHOOL UP TO AGE 16**

2.1 **Primary school pupils**

Free transport is provided from the commencement of the school term in which the pupil becomes 5 years of age, up to the end of the academic year in which a child reaches age 11 (ie year 6) where the walking distance, measured by the nearest available route is two miles or more from:

either

a) the school designated by the LEA as the normal school serving the child’s habitual place of residence;

or

b) the parents’ choice of school, if that school is nearer to the child’s habitual place of residence than the normal school.

2.2 **Secondary school pupils**

For secondary school pupils attending up to age 16 (ie including year 11), free transport is provided where the walking distance, measured by the nearest available route, is three miles or more from either:
a) the school designated by the LEA as the normal school serving the child’s habitual place of residence;
or

b) the parents’ choice of school, if that school is nearer to the child’s habitual place of residence than the normal school.

Note: If a pupil attends a school located on split sites, the measurement of the statutory walking distance is taken to the premises where the pupil normally attends.

For pupils attending a Middle School up to the end of Year 6 transport is provided where the walking distance is two miles from school. Thereafter transport is provided where the walking distance is over three miles.

2.3 Pupils up to age 16 with a statement of special educational needs

Entitlement to free home to school transport will be in line with the policy outlined in paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 above. Additionally, free transport will be provided for children under five where this is necessary to facilitate attendance at school. This will be determined by the Authority following consultation as part of the assessment and statementing process.

2.4 Where eligibility for transport exists but:

a) it is not possible because of the need for specialist vehicles to provide transport for part of a route, or;

b) the cost of doing so would exceed the cost of an allowance to parents to transport their children to school and the parents are willing and able to assist in this way, then;

an allowance may be made to the parents at a mileage rate to be agreed annually with the Head of Financial Services.

2.5 Transport To Denominational Schools

If a child attends a school (other than the normal school) because his/her parents choose that he/she be provided with religious education according to the religion or denomination to which the parents adhere, either:

a) free transport will be provided to a denominational school beyond the appropriate statutory walking distance where this is nearer to the child’s habitual place of residence than the normal school for that place;

or

b) assistance with transport will be provided to the nearest denominational school by either:

i) a travel permit on an existing service.

or

ii) payment of a travel allowance as considered appropriate.
Where a travel permit is issued it will normally be to/from a point not further than 5 miles in the case of primary school children and 12 miles in the case of secondary school children from the school attended. Parents will normally be responsible for the arrangements and cost of any transport to this point.

Where an allowance is paid this will normally be at a fixed rate per mile up to a maximum of 5 miles for primary school children and 12 miles for secondary school children.

2.6 Transport to a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU)

Transport from home to a PRU will be provided where the statutory walking distance is exceeded except that the teacher in charge may exercise discretion in individual cases. See Appendix D.

2.7 Travel assistance for pupils who do not qualify for free transport

2.7.1 (i) Children Attending LEA Maintained Nursery Schools/Units and Early Admissions to Primary Schools

Normally, additional transport provision will not be available for nursery children or those who are admitted early to primary schools. However, individual applications will be considered where there are exceptional circumstances. Otherwise such children may travel free on existing hired transport if they live more than the statutory 2 miles from home to school, providing space is available on the vehicle. Such a facility will be withdrawn should space be required by children of compulsory school age who are judged to be eligible for such assistance. (Note: A child is regarded as an early admission if he/she attends school before the beginning of the term in which he/she is five years.)

2.7.1 (ii) Children Receiving Nursery Education Otherwise than at School

Normally, additional transport will not be made available for children attending a private or voluntary sector nursery or play group which is included in the Early Years Development Plan. Such children may travel free on existing hired transport if they live more than 2 miles from home to the nursery or playgroup, providing space is available on the vehicle. Such a facility will be withdrawn should space be required by children of compulsory school age who are judged to be eligible for such assistance.

2.7.1 (iii) Children Attending Nursery Schools/Units; Early Admissions to Primary Schools and those attending a private or voluntary sector nursery or playgroup which is included in the EYDP, but who live less than 2 miles from the school, playgroup or nursery can take up spare places on existing transport at the concessionary rate.
Such children may travel free on existing hired transport if they live more than 2 miles from home to the nursery or playgroup, providing space is available on the vehicle. Such a facility will be withdrawn should space be required by children of compulsory school age who are judged to be eligible for such assistance.

2.7.1 (iv) No transport assistance is offered to children attending a private nursery or playgroup which is not included in the EYDP.

2.7.1 (v) The Passenger Transport Officer may enter into an agreement with a private nursery or playgroup which is included in the EYDP to provide transport providing that this is charged at full cost.

2.7.2 Children attending Schools from Parental Choice (other than those eligible under 2.1 b) above or 2.5 below)

Where parents opt, other than on denominational grounds, for a school that is further away from the normal school serving the habitual place of residence, it is their responsibility to make the necessary arrangements and pay for transport costs.

However, if a child would have been considered eligible for free transport to the normal school

a. he/she may travel on an existing contracted transport service vehicle to the school of parental choice at an agreed concessionary rate, providing a place is available.

or

b) where the authority would have purchased a “Pass” on a commercial bus or train service and this cost is avoided because a pupil attends other than the appropriate school then an allowance will only be paid where it is not possible to offer a journey on a contracted service. No allowance will be paid in lieu of the cost of any additional capacity on contracted services or new services which may have been required for that pupil or a group of pupils had they attended the appropriate school.

or

c) transport may be offered on a contracted vehicle for a journey equivalent to that to the normal school.

2.8 Pupils in Exceptional Circumstances

2.8.1 Change of Home

Where the parents of a pupil enrolled at a secondary school move to another address within North Yorkshire which will then become the habitual place of residence the Authority may provide free transport to enable the child to remain at that school. This will also apply in the case of a child or young person who faces disruption because of their need to be accommodated by the local authority away from the family home. If the distance from the new home to the school exceeds the statutory walking distance, then transport arrangements will be made free of charge so long as it is considered by the
Authority that the child is at a “critical stage” in his/her education. This is defined as: the period following selection of options, when the child is enrolled in either year 10 or year 11.

Where a pupil has received such assistance and subsequently chooses to undertake a course of post-16 study then the policy set out in Section 3, below, applies.

2.8.2 Excluded Pupils

If a pupil is excluded from his/her normal school the Authority will provide free transport to the nearest alternative school where this is located beyond the appropriate statutory walking distance.

2.8.3 Pupils affected by injury or other medical conditions (not including statemented pupils with physical conditions constituting grounds for special educational needs)

A pupil will be provided with free transport if, because of injury or medical condition (supported by a medical note), he/she is unable to walk to school or cannot be conveyed on the transport provided for other pupils. In addition, in exceptional medical circumstances, assistance towards the cost of transport may be provided to other than the normal school.

2.8.4 Pupil attending residential special schools

Where a pupil attends a residential special school, free transport, or a transport allowance, will be provided at mid and full term holidays or as determined by the statement of special educational needs.

2.8.5 Transport to and from respite care

In some cases a child or young person with disabilities subject to a statement of special educational needs is also the subject of a care plan jointly agreed between the Social Services and Education Services Directorates. That plan may include joint arrangements for transporting the child/young person between home or respite care placement and school. Where at the request of Social Services a contract can be extended to provide transport to respite care then this will be arranged by the Passenger Transport Officer with any additional cost being met by Social Services. If parents request transport assistance to or from respite care then, where possible, this will be arranged by the Passenger Transport Officer, with the cost being met by parents who can apply to Social Services for assistance.

2.8.6 Hospital visits from residential schools

Where a pupil attends a special residential schools free transport will be provided from school to home to facilitate attendance at necessary hospital appointments, where a supporting appointment card is provided. Parents are encouraged, wherever possible, to make such arrangements outside of term time.

2.9 Concessionary Travel
Pupils not entitled to free transport can occupy spare places on education transport service vehicles at a fixed charge. If, however, there is an increase in the number of entitled pupils using such a vehicle and as a result space is no longer available, parents will become responsible for making the necessary arrangements.

2.10 Minimum Qualifying Distance

2.10.1 When determining eligibility for assistance with transport, the measurement from home to school is taken from the curtilage of the home to the gate at an entrance to the school following the nearest available walking route which means a suitable footpath or bridle-path. Where a private road or farm track exists this is included in the measurement.

2.10.2 In some cases, it is necessary to have demarcation lines in streets or roads of those living under or over the qualifying distances, although they may join a bus at the same point.

2.11 Responsibility of Parents to Make Transport Arrangements

2.11.1 Where pupils live within the minimum qualifying distance it is normally the responsibility of the parents to make whatever arrangements they consider necessary for their children to go to and from school.

2.11.2 The Authority may consider it necessary to provide transport for pupils living under the qualifying distance. Such cases include:

   i) where the Authority considers that the walking route is such that an accompanied child could not use it in reasonable safety (1)*

   ii) where the Authority agrees that it is not practicable for a child to be accompanied and circumstances (of the child’s age and the route) are such that transport should be provided (2)*

* Notes:

   (1) Decisions about the safety of walking routes follow the Guidelines prepared by the County Surveyors’ Society. These Guidelines assume that the child is accompanied as necessary by a normal caring parent or other responsible person.

   (2) “Not practicable” does not mean inconvenient to the parents.

3.0 PUPILS AND STUDENTS AGED 16-19

Change to policy agreed by Education Executive March 2003

3.1 Pupils and Students attending a School or College of Further Education

The Authority will provide assistance with transport for pupils and students aged 16-18, age is taken as at 31 August prior to the start of the course, provided that;

a) the school/college attended is 3 or more miles from the student’s home by the nearest available walking route;
and

b) the school/college is the nearest school sixth form, sixth form college or college of further education to their home regardless of Local Government boundaries or is the sixth form in the secondary school which is recognised as the normal school for the student’s home address.

or

c) if this establishment does not offer a course which the Director of Education considers suitable to a student’s career choice or one that is a pre-requisite for entry into higher education, to the nearest school/college for his/her home where such a course is available.

3.2 Pupils and Students with Learning Difficulties and/or Disabilities

3.2.1 Pupils with a statement of special educational needs attending a maintained school will be provided with assistance with transport in line with paragraph 3.1, above. Additionally, free transport will be provided where this is necessary to facilitate attendance at school. This will be determined by the Authority following consultation as part of the assessment and statementing process.

3.2.2 Students with learning difficulties and/or disabilities attending a full time course at a college of further education will be provided with assistance with transport in line with paragraph 3.1 above. The Authority will assess the needs of individual students to determine the level of transport assistance which should be provided. The Designated Medical Officer of the relevant Health Care Trust will be consulted as appropriate.

3.2.3 Where a student with learning difficulties is placed by the FEFC at an institution outside the further and higher education sectors, the Authority will consider transport assistance between the parental home and the institution. Where such a placement is residential the assistance offered will be up to 12 return journeys per year for the student and his/her parents or carer usually at a pre-determined mileage rate.

3.3 Students Attending Denominational Schools/Colleges

If a student attends a school or college, other than those described in 3.1 above, on the grounds that his/her parents choose that he/she be provided with religious education according to the religion or denomination to which the parents adhere, then the Authority will provide transport assistance, normally up to a maximum of 12 miles, provided that the denominational school/college is the nearest for the place of residence and is over 3 miles from the student’s home.
4.0 TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONSIDERING ASSISTANCE WITH TRANSPORT AT AGE 19 FOR STUDENTS WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES AND/OR DISABILITIES

4.1 The LEA is responsible for such students to age 19 though paragraph 3.0, above, has the effect of providing assistance to the end of the academic year in which a pupil or student’s 19th birthday falls. In practice some courses, specifically designed for students with learning difficulties, extend beyond age 19 and the Authority will consider on an individual basis, requests for one additional year of transport assistance where the course on which the student is already embarked extends beyond age 19.

4.2 Under the terms of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act, 1970, the Director of Social Services has a duty, where it is considered necessary to meet the needs of a person who is aged 18 or over and meets Social Services eligibility criteria, to provide assistance in taking advantage of educational facilities available to him or her. Subject to assessment this could include personal assistance, equipment, transport etc. The policy of North Yorkshire Social Services Directorate is that where services are wholly or partly funded by the Directorate, access to or use of these services may incur a charge. The Social Services charging policy is reviewed annually.

4.3 The first annual review of a statement of special educational needs after the young person’s fourteenth birthday and any subsequent annual reviews until the child leaves school should include a Transition Plan. This draws together information from a range of individuals within and beyond the school in order to plan coherently for the young person’s transition to adult life. The Authority must seek information from the Social Services Department as to whether a child with a statement is disabled under Section 29 of the National Assistance Act. In the case of a young person wishing to embark on a course of further education which will extend beyond the age of 19, the Transition Planning mechanism enables the need for assistance with transport to be identified and provision made where appropriate.
ANNEX 3

BRIEF FOR DEVELOPING A COMMUNITY TRANSPORT STRATEGY FOR NORTH YORKSHIRE

Aim:

To develop a Community Transport strategy for North Yorkshire, which recommends how the sector might develop in the future and what role Community Transport might play in building a sustainable public transport network for the County.

What is Community Transport?

Community Transport provides transport services to people for whom public or private transport is either inappropriate or unavailable. Organisations providing Community Transport always do so on a not for profit basis although not all Community Transport is purely voluntary. Community car schemes, Community Buses, Dial-A-Ride, taxi vouchers, Wheels 2 Work and minibus group hire are all methods of Community Transport.

Purpose:

• The research will necessitate the involvement of North Yorkshire County Council, Countryside Agency, the five Rural Transport Partnerships, Community Transport Operators, Community Transport users, (existing and potential) Social Services and the Health Authority, Primary Care Trusts and hospital trusts.

• The study should research the scope for co-ordinating Community Transport organisations with each other and how this could make the best use of their resources.

• The research should address the needs of users through the CT operators and identify how Community Transport providers and other agencies may inform people about the services that are offered.

• The study should be sensitive to the local nature of Community Transport which is often organised by a committee of volunteers and delivered by volunteer drivers and escorts.

Introduction:

In its Local Transport Plan, North Yorkshire County Council recognises that both urban and rural Community Transport has an important role to play in a comprehensive Public Transport network.

Since 1998, five Rural Transport Partnerships have worked towards implementing action plans, which were agreed by the Countryside Agency and supported by local communities and include a number of CT based initiatives.

The partnerships have asked the County Council to devise a formal strategy for the development and resourcing of Community Transport in North Yorkshire in order to ensure long term sustainability.
The County Council recognises that their policies have an impact on Community Transport eg accessible transport policies with the LTP and that there are benefits to be gained from the involvement of the health sector (Primary Care Trusts) and other agencies.

**Role of the Consultant:**

- To investigate and report on all existing provision with a brief summary and mapping of the current situation.
- To collate research that has previously taken place within the County relating to the need for community transport and the needs of community transport providers.
- Based on the findings from the research, recommend the ways forward for the provision of Community Transport in the County.
- To give a presentation on the findings and recommendations from the study contained in the draft report to North Yorkshire County Council, the Countryside Agency and Community Transport organisations.
- To produce a final report and recommendations, which will be presented to a wider forum.

**Tasks:**

**1:1 Identify and quantify existing community transport schemes: (See 'Timings' for presenting findings)**

- Identify who refers current passengers to Community Transport organisations.
- Identify existing sources of funding for each scheme.
- Identify the ratio of volunteer time to paid time.
- Identify the areas covered by existing providers of community transport and community car schemes in the county.
- Identify any unmet needs for Community Transport services in terms of areas and groups not catered for.
- Identify any duplication of transport provision – undertake an in-depth evaluation in a pilot area.
- Identify legislative barriers to CT operation eg. section 19 restrictions.
- Identify barriers encountered by existing schemes, eg. funding, lack of volunteers, knowledge of legislation etc.
- Identify eligibility criteria, client databases, the calculation of charges and expenses to volunteers.
- A review of administrative and communication processes for each provider.

**1:2 Identify the strengths and weaknesses of existing Community Transport schemes:**

Use a focus group study to identify the extent to which Community Transport is meeting needs. (Minimum of two focus groups (one urban, one rural.)

**1:3 Identify Development opportunities:**

- Summarise existing training provision and recommend any actions considered necessary.
- Recommend a model for different scales of operation and a support structure for CT, which will ensure that CT providers are able, supported and encouraged to make best use of their resources.
- To recommend how a countywide image for community transport can be established, which prevents any negative stereotypes and encourages a wide range of users.
• Recommend how the long-term sustainability of Community Transport can be achieved.
• Identify areas where there will be benefits from the amalgamation of small schemes.
• Research the scope for increased brokerage of services and sharing of resources.
• To ensure that the community transport strategy applies the principles of ‘best value’ when assessing the appropriate level of support for, and the performance of community transport facilities.

1:4 Identify funding requirements and sources

• To develop a strategy for introducing new funding streams to support community transport services – this should address continuation funding for established projects once the initial start up funding has ceased.
• Ensure that equal opportunities are available and that all funds are distributed according to identified needs and values.
• To develop new criteria for funding which enables the vehicle fleets of community transport schemes to be replaced, taking into account the use of revenue as opposed to capital funding.
• Research how other County Councils support Community Transport through their Local Transport Plan other sources.

Monitoring:

Consultant to attend a monthly meeting with the County Council and the Countryside Agency during the period of the study. All data gathered will be submitted as part of the plan report.

Following consultation there will be a final document produced by 31 January 2004. The consultant will also give a presentation on the results of the study to stakeholders, members of the County Council and others.

Workplace:

There will be some fieldwork involving discussions with Community Transport providers and users. NYCC will provide access to any data held but the majority of work will be carried out at the consultant’s premises.

Timing:

Deadline for submissions: 17 June
Interview Date: 2 July
Contract Start: 9 July 2003
Present findings from initial research: 16 September
Initial Draft Completed: 2 December – Consultant to present the results to NYCC, CA and CT operators
Final Document and wider presentation by 31 January 2004

Management of Contract:

North Yorkshire County Council
Payment:

This document will be jointly funded between North Yorkshire County Council and the Countryside Agency. Up to £30,000 of funding is available.

The price will include two copies of the final report, which will be supplied together with two copies of an electronic version on disk/CD. North Yorkshire County Council will reserve the right to reproduce the document.
1. INTRODUCTION

The County Council's Road Safety Strategy continues to concentrate on reducing the number and severity of casualties arising from accidents on the County's roads in accordance with the Government's road casualty reduction targets for the year 2010.

- The safety activities which are aimed to address this primary objective include road safety education, training and publicity complemented by a programme of safety engineering measures, as well as partnership working with other agencies, in particular North Yorkshire Police, to ensure appropriate levels of enforcement.

- While the primary aim of this work is to achieve the casualty reduction targets, a more general objective is to positively influence road users attitudes and behaviour.

- There are close links with many other elements in the Local Transport Plan (LTP) which in themselves make a contribution to casualty reduction, such as pedestrian and cycling improvements and travel awareness activities. Nevertheless, the County Council has always placed a high priority on casualty reduction, which is why the road safety strategy forms such a significant element of our LTP.

This Appendix goes on to set out, and review, where appropriate

- The principal LTP targets relating to road safety, together with any necessary and relevant baseline information and our performance indicator (Section 2);

- The progress achieved towards meeting these targets during 2002/03, monitoring mechanisms, relevant details of the expenditure incurred and new targets (Section 3);

Reinforcing the Speed Limit - Vehicle Actuated Sign at Foxholes

- What we hope to achieve during 2003/04 (Section 4);

- Our arrangements for consultation (Section 5);
2. **THE ROAD SAFETY TARGETS FOR NORTH YORKSHIRE**

As indicated in last year's APR, our road safety targets have been consolidated to include only the following:

- **F1** To reduce the number of KSI's in the County by 40% by 2010. This means that our target number of KSI's by the year 2010 is 622 based on the 1994 – 1998 baseline average of 1,037.

- **F2** To reduce the number of child KSI's in the County by 60% by 2010. This is a more challenging target, as set out in last year's APR, and means that the new target for the year 2010, will be 43 based on the 1994 – 98 average of 108 (the previous 2010 target was 54).

- **F3** To reduce the slight casualty rate by 10% by the year 2010, expressed as the number of people slightly injured per 100 million vehicle kilometres. The necessary baseline data for monitoring this target is still awaited from DfT.

- New target – to increase the percentage of child front seat passengers wearing seat belts/child restraints to 95% by 2010, and to increase the percentage of child rear seat passengers wearing seat belts/child restraints to 90% by 2010. This compares with baseline surveyed wearing rates in 2001/2002 at selected sites throughout the County, of 83% and 73% respectively.

- Stretched interim target. This is a new target which results from the County Council's LPSA submission which included a revised interim target for KSI's by the end of 2005. The stretched target which has been agreed is a further reduction of 36 KSI's compared with our recently revised 2005 milestone target (based on the 40% reduction by 2010) of 736.

---

**Villagers Make a Commitment to Reduce Vehicle Speeds**

![Image of villagers with sign indicating commitment to reduce vehicle speeds]
3. PROGRESS DURING 2002/03

(i) Measures Implemented

- During the year a wide range of Education Training and Publicity (ETP) activities were undertaken.

- Over 2,000 year 6 pupils took part in the Cycling Awareness programme – this represents about 30% of the potential in this age group.

- Using materials designed by a regional working group, the Junior Road Safety Officer scheme provides specially designed resources for selected Year 6 pupils to use to promote road safety with their peers. Another resource developed in cooperation with regional colleagues is a self contained activity base which can be loaned to primary schools.

- As mentioned elsewhere in this report work is ongoing to reduce the number of children injured while travelling as passengers in cars. 61 presentations have been made to clinics, doctors surgeries, hospitals, child minder and foster parent groups. 35 public car seat checking sessions have been held at locations such as shows, supermarkets, schools, toddler groups, nurseries, library baby days and baby weigh in clinics. Over 650 individual seats have been checked, nearly all were found to need some adjustment and most were judged that its occupant would be at risk from serious injury if the seat were to be in use during a crash.

- In secondary schools, two Theatre in Education presentations toured schools with performances focussing on drinking and driving and speed. Over 3,600 year 10, 11 and 12 students attended these shows. Multi-agency “Drive Alive” days were held at four secondary schools involving over 456 students. Work is underway to develop a resource pack for presentation to each student attending these days. Another innovation has been the development of a spoof lottery show to introduce the concept of risk to secondary students in a fun way. This event has proved very successful in a variety of school settings including, interestingly, a unit for excluded students. Both of these events include a presentation by the parents of a student killed in a crash, who recount the ongoing effects on their lives.

- All of this ETP work was funded from the County Council's Revenue Budget, in the sum of £250k.

- 39 local safety schemes were completed throughout the County during 2002/03 with works on a further 16 having commenced. The 39 completed schemes included 16 Safer Routes to School projects.

- 31 traffic calming/gateway schemes were completed during 2002/03, with work on a further 35 having commenced. The 31 completed schemes included fourteen 20 mph zones which required traffic calming measures.

- Total expenditure in respect of Local Safety and Traffic Calming Schemes during 2002/03 was just under £3 million funded from the LTP, plus an additional £440k from third party contributions.
Local Safety Scheme at High Bentham –
New Footway and Priority Working System

Kerb Build Out to Narrow Carriageway –
Keighley Road, Skipton Traffic Calming
Scheme

(ii) Scheme monitoring

As indicated in last year's APR we are carrying out before and after studies in order to
monitor the effectiveness of the range of safety schemes/traffic calming measures
implemented across the County. For those schemes implemented during 2002/03 the
results of this monitoring work are set out in Annex A to this Appendix. Both casualty and
speed reduction information is provided in relation to each scheme implemented.

In the case of these more recently completed schemes it is again necessary to point out that
it is too early to conclude with any degree of certainty what has been achieved in terms of
the actual reduction in accidents and casualties. However, the impact on speed reduction is
once again more conclusive where those statistics are available. Nevertheless, in general
terms the results are encouraging. It is our intention to continue with the monitoring of
accidents/casualties at all safety scheme locations year on year, to ascertain the longer term
safety improvements which have been achieved and the contribution they have made to the
achievement of our casualty reduction targets. Annexes B and C are summaries of the
ongoing monitoring work carried out on schemes implemented in 2000/01 and in 2001/02
and it can be seen from this information that where local safety schemes, in particular, have
been completed more than a year ago, the casualty reduction figures are even more
encouraging, in that they show further improvements compared with the statistics provided a
year ago.
York Road, Thirsk – Traffic Calming Measures

(iii) Impact on targets

- Target F1 – During 2002/03, there has unfortunately been an increase in the number of KSI’s across the County, a possibility identified in last year’s APR. The number of KSI’s, by the end of 2002, has risen to 837, compared with last year’s figure of 792 (See Chart 1). Nevertheless, despite this upturn in numbers, the total of 837 still represents a 19% reduction against the 1994 – 1998 baseline figure of 1,037, which means we are still ahead of the rate of reduction required to achieve our 2010 target. Furthermore, the situation in North Yorkshire still compares well with the national picture which indicates an approximate 16% reduction against the 1994 – 1998 baseline.

Chart 1 All KSI’s
• Target F2 – Despite the increase in overall KSI's the picture in relation to child KSI's continues to be extremely encouraging as the 2002 child KSI total has fallen to 48 (two fatalities) compared with the baseline of 108 (the figure for 2001 was 53). More detailed analysis of these figures reveals that the % reduction in child KSI's achieved by the end of 2002 was almost 56%. The 2003 APR set a new target for child KSI's by the year 2010 of a 60% reduction which means a total by 2010 of 43. The 2002 year end figure of 48 indicates that we are on course to meet this revised target (See Chart 2)

![Chart 2 Child KSI's](chart2.png)

• Target F3 – In relation to slight casualties the picture also continues to be encouraging with a total countywide in 2002 of 2,933 compared with a baseline figure of 2,947 (See Chart 3). As previously explained, provided the absolute numbers of slight casualties is maintained at, or below, the 1994 – 98 baseline average, a reduction in the rate of slight casualties of 10% by 2010 will be achieved. This is because traffic growth in the County is continuing at approximately 1% per annum.

![Chart 3 Slight Casualties](chart3.png)
(iv) New Targets

- Child Restraints. During 2002, 189 children travelling in cars were injured (of which, 20 were KSI's). This compares with 184 (22 KSI's) injured in 2001. Injuries to child cyclists in 2002 totalled 32 (3 KSI's), and 104 child pedestrians suffered injury (24 KSI's). The above figures serve to underline the particular concern in North Yorkshire in relation to the proportion of child car passenger casualties to total child casualties, which continues to run counter to the national picture. The child passenger casualty figures for 2002 show a slight overall increase over the 2001 figures although KSI numbers are slightly down. These figures reinforce the need to focus on improving child seat belt/restraint usage and diverting resources to this end.

In last year's APR we indicated that a new target was to be created based on child seat belt/restraint wearing rates, the intention being to increase the percentages of front and rear seat belt use to 95% and 90% by the year 2010.

As part of our LPSA submission, we have been engaged in detailed negotiations with North Yorkshire Police on the development of a programme of joint activities associated with the journey to school by car. The proposal is to mount a joint campaign which will involve targeted enforcement supporting publicity and education work which will initially focus on 20 schools spread across the County. Last year, we reported that 10 schools had been surveyed for child seat belt usage, and we are now extending this to 20 to improve the reliability of the sample. The campaign work will commence in the early Summer of this year.

Plans for a major tour of primary schools with the interactive theatre in education production "Are we there yet?" are being made following the successful LPSA bid. The web based teachers resource is to be updated to widen its appeal.

- The County Council's LPSA Road Safety bid has now received approval which means that additional funding will be available from April 2003 to implement the child seatbelt/restraint campaign referred to above.

In addition, we will be using the LPSA funding to enable support to North Yorkshire Police in the resourcing of a motorcycle safety campaign.

This latter campaign has been agreed by North Yorkshire Police for implementation during the 2003/04 (and 2004/05) Motorcycle "seasons" and will involve enhanced targeted enforcement by specialist road policing officers. This work will complement the "Handle it or lose it" campaign promoted by the Hambleton Community Safety Partnership.

North Bay, Scarborough
The LPSA Road Safety bid includes a new interim target for savings in the number of fatal and seriously injured casualties on the County's roads. This requires an additional 36 KSIs to be saved against the revised 2005 KSI total which is anticipated without an LPSA.
4. PROGRAMME FOR 2003/04

(i) ETP Activities

The County Council will continue to actively participate in the development of regional publicity campaigns, which for the first time this year will use regional commercial radio to target young drivers, rather than the posters and bus backs utilised in the past. A member of the Road Safety Team has recently joined the board of Pass Plus representing LARSOA. This will provide an opportunity to influence the development of the Pass Plus initiative with the aim of widening its appeal to new drivers and thus contributing to a further reduction in road casualties. The Drive Alive event mentioned in Section 3 will be developed further and introduced to more secondary schools in the County. An information pack, including a copy of the DSA video and booklet "What if?", will be provided free of charge to every participating student. The lottery show mentioned in paragraph 3(i) will also be introduced to further secondary schools during the year. Theatre in Education (TIE) companies will again visit schools and colleges with the acclaimed plays "Too Much Punch for Judy" and "Legal Weapon".

We are following with interest the development of a new performance, which explores the issue of Drugs and Driving, as there is a dearth of material on this subject at present.

The LPSA funding will allow us to provide performances of the new TIE production "Are we here yet"? for Key Stage 2 pupils developed last year to schools across the County. This is an interactive play which focuses on a family journey by car and which highlights the dangers resulting from a failure to wear seat belts. It is anticipated that this will positively augment the planned enforcement programme, which is being developed with North Yorkshire Police. We will continue to offer an extensive programme of child seat checking sessions, and to provide advice and information sessions at clinics, hospitals and other venues across the County. We are also concerned about the dangers of second hand car seats and intend to raise the profile of this issue during the year. We have had considerable success in involving schools in the development of "their" 20mph zones, and as more schemes are progressed, we will continue to invite school pupils to design the signs.

Consigning Second Hand Car Seats to the Rubbish Bin
Involving School Children in '20 mph' Zone Proposals

Although child cycling casualties form a relatively minor proportion of the child casualty total, we continue to review the supporting resources. A new manual has been produced for the trainers involved in the Cycling Awareness Programme, and this will be progressively introduced during the year.

School Crossing Patrols are an important component of the Road Safety Service in North Yorkshire and for the first time a programme of training days will be provided during the summer holidays. This will allow individual patrols to meet their colleagues for the first time and will provide the opportunity for issues such as incident reporting and Health and Safety matters to be dealt with in some detail away from the workplace. A recently introduced programme of upgrading signage and facilities at individual patrol locations will continue.

Because of the increasing demand for these and other activities the County Council has commissioned an external review of its ETP service in order to assess the most effective means of delivering the ETP element within the Local Transport Plan. This review is ongoing.

School Crossing Patrol in Morton on Swale, near Northallerton

(ii) Social Deprivation issues

In line with the APR guidance this year, we have carefully examined our KSI statistics to determine whether there is any correlation between social deprivation and increased incidence of road casualties.

Of the 10% most socially deprived wards in North Yorkshire there is evidence of increased numbers of casualties in three of them. Two are in Scarborough (Castle and Falsgrave) and one is in Selby (Selby Central).

In each of these three cases the incidence of road casualties is substantially higher (when expressed as a rate per 100,000 resident population) than the wider urban area in which they are situated (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No of Casualties in Ward</th>
<th>Population in Ward</th>
<th>Ratio per 100,000 population</th>
<th>No of casualties in comparison Urban Area</th>
<th>Population in comparison Urban Area</th>
<th>Ratio per 100,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>54,640</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsgrave</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>54,640</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby Central</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21,560</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All Casualty Analysis for Social Deprived Wards in North Yorkshire (2002 Figures)

When these figures are further analysed, it is apparent there is considerable variation in the road user categories (ward to ward) which are more susceptible. Also, in a number of cases the casualty figures (per user group) for particular wards are quite low and it is therefore necessary to treat some of the calculated rates with a certain degree of caution. Nevertheless, it is for example, clearly demonstrated that in the Falsgrave Ward in Scarborough, the casualty rates for car occupants and for pedal cyclists are 60 – 70% higher than for Scarborough town generally. This is for the whole of the age range in the population. Perhaps, surprisingly the child statistics for this particular Ward do not indicate disproportionate casualty rates in any road user category. The pattern for the whole of the age range is also repeated for the Castle Ward although of even more major concern is the rate of pedestrian casualties in this Ward. This is over 450% of the rate in the town generally all age groups, and over 180% of the town rate for child pedestrians.

In Selby Central, the total number of casualties is much lower (to some extent because of the significantly smaller ward size) and therefore the rate comparisons are potentially less reliable. Nevertheless, the pedestrian casualty rate is over 700% (for all age groups) and over 900% (for children) higher than the respective rates for the whole of Selby town. The rate for car occupants for all age groups in Selby Central is also 40% higher than for the town generally.

The correlation between social deprivation and casualty rates in certain wards will influence our proposed programme for 2003/04. In relation to our proposed engineering measures, such as safer routes to schools projects and 20mph zones we will need to focus more schemes of this type on these wards. In terms of our LTP initiatives, some will need to be specifically tailored to address the causation factors which are leading to these high rates of casualties in particular road user groups.

Our agent authority in Scarborough will develop some additional safety engineering schemes for the Falsgrave and Castle Wards which address the more critical accident locations where the incidence of injury to car occupants is higher than average. We have also asked the Borough Council to consider a number of additional pedestrian/cycle improvement schemes in the two wards in an effort to address the disproportionately high incidence of casualties in these two road user categories.

Some additional ETP initiatives have already been introduced in these wards. Pedestrian skills training has been established in Friarage and Hinderwell schools, and new equipment for pedestrian-crossing training has been purchased for use with Key Stage 1 pupils.

For Selby, because the absolute numbers of casualties is fairly low when compared with the situation in Scarborough, it is considered that a more appropriate approach would be to investigate the statistics in rather more detail in the context of the recently commenced Traffic Management Strategy for Selby. This will provide an opportunity to engage with appropriate stakeholders to discuss the potential problems and possible solutions, be they engineering or education/training and publicity initiatives.

The particular problems in Scarborough and Selby aside, our Integrated Transport Schemes Programme for 2003/04 envisages the following works/studies in the road safety field.

- In addition to the 16 Local Safety Schemes on which preliminary design work commenced last year, a further 8 will be commenced in 2003/04. There is also budgetary provision for a number of Safer Routes to Schools schemes, but the actual number of these is yet to be finalised.
• In addition to the 35 Traffic Calming Schemes on which preliminary design commenced in 2002/03, a further 27 will commence in 2003/04. There is also budgetary provision for a number of 20 mph schemes with associated traffic calming measures, and work will be proceeding on a number of these during 2003/04.

• The total financial allocation for all of these capital schemes is expected to be in the order of £2.3 million.

5. CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS

As indicated in last year’s APR, there is extensive consultation, including public meetings, exhibitions and letter/questionnaire drops on all safety engineering projects prior to agreement on the precise form that each project is to take.

In the directly managed (ie non agency areas) of the County the process is as follows:

Sketch proposals are produced and circulated for internal officer comment and then discussed with the local County Council Member prior to carrying out external consultations with road user groups, the relevant parish council, district council, National Park Authority (where applicable), transport operators and the emergency services. In parallel with, or occasionally immediately following this stage, consultation letters with questionnaires (which can be returned by freepost), are circulated to local residents and businesses who are likely to be directly affected by the measures proposed.

All responses to the consultation process are scheduled and analysed, and officer responses are prepared for discussion and agreement with the Area Committee Chairman and Local County Council Member on the appropriate way forward on the particular scheme. This preliminary design/consultation process often takes up to nine months to complete.

Whenever preliminary proposals result in significant adverse reaction, for example in the form of a petition from residents and/or businesses, the matter is referred to the relevant County Area Committee in order to ensure that all Members have an opportunity to influence the way forward. In most cases the decision is to take an amended scheme to a further round of consultation but occasionally it is decided to take no further action where it has been made clear by the community that it is opposed to traffic calming measures of any kind. In such an eventuality, a replacement scheme is introduced into the programme.

As indicated earlier in this Appendix, we are continuing our programme of extensive pre and post scheme surveys in order to objectively test the effectiveness of all safety schemes included in the LTP programme. This is particularly valuable for those schemes which were completed in previous years where there are now more than one year’s post-scheme casualty statistics.

In last year’s APR we indicated that, as part of our monitoring regime we would embark on a programme of sample user-satisfaction surveys in a selection of communities where safety schemes have been introduced. The aim of this is to assist the County Council to focus on those types of solution which are not only effective in terms of proven casualty and speed reduction, but which are also least intrusive/more acceptable to local residents. We have now circulated a public perception questionnaire to all residents in five communities, involving a total of almost 700 questionnaires. We have now received responses from the first of the communities consulted with an encouraging response rate of 50%. Analysis of these responses is now underway. A sample questionnaire an plan is attached as Annex D.
We have recognised from some time that different consultation processes are in use in the two agency areas of Harrogate and Scarborough and in the directly managed areas of the County. This is not necessarily a problem, since it is important to recognise that there may be special requirements for consultation in the larger urban centres. Nevertheless, we have set up a working group with our agents to examine the different methodologies we presently employ across the County. The aim is to determine whether it would be appropriate to adopt a more consistent approach, using the best features of each, whilst continuing to recognise, any special requirements in the main urban areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Total Cost £k inc. fees</th>
<th>No. of Accidents 3yr previous</th>
<th>No. of Casualties 3yr previous</th>
<th>Converted to No. of Casualties per Year</th>
<th>All KSIs</th>
<th>All Slight</th>
<th>Child KSIs</th>
<th>Child Slight</th>
<th>Direction (both needed)</th>
<th>Av. Of the 85%ile speeds</th>
<th>Av. Flow (each direction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B6480 High &amp; Low Bentham TC</td>
<td>62,900</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C377 Bondgate, Ripon TC</td>
<td>93,700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clotherholme Road, Ripon TC</td>
<td>52,300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterstead Lane, Whitby 20 mph TC</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbots Road, Whitby 20 mph TC</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood, Leyburn 20mph TC</td>
<td>37,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspin Lane, Harrogate TC</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramham Driver/Bewerley Rd 20 mph TC (HBC)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osston Lane, Tadcaster TC</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SE Bound</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwic Parade, Selby 20 mph TC</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SE Bound</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1448 Topcliffe Road, Sowerby 20 mph TC</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1248 Commercial Street, Norton TC</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate Road/Lead Lane, Ripon TC</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19 Burn TC</td>
<td>77,400</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawson Lane, Ripon TC</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1039 Muston Road, Filey TC</td>
<td>55,600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6136 Cattlebeck Village TC</td>
<td>53,300</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6271 Brompton on Swale TC</td>
<td>47,700</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Total Cost £k inc. fees</td>
<td>No. of Accidents 3yr previous</td>
<td>No. of Casualties 3yr previous</td>
<td>Converted To No. of Casualties per Year</td>
<td>All KSFs</td>
<td>All Slight</td>
<td>Child KSFs</td>
<td>Child Slight</td>
<td>Direction (both needed)</td>
<td>Av. Speed (85%ile)</td>
<td>Av. Flow (each direction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville Road, Gargrave 20 mph TC</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnside Estate, Skipton 20 mph TC</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinge Road, Cowling 20 mph TC</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street, Sutton in Craven 20 mph TC</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampsthwaite School 20 mph TC</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giggleswick 20 mph TC</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Road, Crosshills 20 mph TC</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest Bank, Kildwick TC</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coxwold TC</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedworth Road, Harrogate TC</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannal Ash Road, Harrogate TC</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.4 5430</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barberry Close, Harrogate 20 mph TC</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.4 2500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C398 Embsay and Eastby TC</td>
<td>60,100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming Summary</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>34.71</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Total Cost (£k inc. fees)</td>
<td>No. of Accidents 3yr previous</td>
<td>No. of Casualties 3yr previous</td>
<td>Converted to No. of Casualties per Year</td>
<td>All KSI's</td>
<td>All Slight</td>
<td>Child KSI's</td>
<td>Child Slight</td>
<td>Direction (both needed)</td>
<td>Av. Speed (85%ile)</td>
<td>Av. Flow (each direction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennypot Lane, Harrogate LSS</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hookstone Drive/Oatlands Drive, Harrogate, LSS</td>
<td>34,300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Place/North Park Road, Harrogate, LSS</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennyfield Drive/Ripon Road, Harrogate, LSS</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipton Road/Grove Road, Harrogate, LSS</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Safe Route, Harrogate, LSS</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltergate School ph 2, Harrogate LSS</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A61 Ripton to Ripley LSS</td>
<td>31,700</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A684 Brompton Road, Northallerton LSS</td>
<td>153,100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>38.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummanby Traffic Island LSS</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6161 Penny Pot Lane Roundabout LSS</td>
<td>710,500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A59 Moor Monkton Crossroads LSS</td>
<td>326,300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A169/A171 Seights Roundabout LSS</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Lane, Giggleswick footway LSS</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A658 Huby LSS</td>
<td>45,400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby Hill Safe Route to School LSS</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C311 Coldhill Lane, Saxton LSS</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramhall/helperby LSS</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>34.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Total Cost £k inc. fees</td>
<td>No. of Accidents 3yr previous</td>
<td>No. of Casualties 3yr previous</td>
<td>Converted to No. of Casualties per Year</td>
<td>All KSI's</td>
<td>All Slight</td>
<td>Child KSI's</td>
<td>Child Slight</td>
<td>Direction (both needed)</td>
<td>Av. Speed (85%ile)</td>
<td>Av. Flow (each direction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A682 Long Preston LSS</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street, Sutton in Craven Safe Routes to School LSS</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eastbound Westbound</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settle Primary School, Bond Lane Safe Routes to School LSS</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Total Cost £k inc. fees</td>
<td>No. of Accidents 3 yr previous</td>
<td>No. of Casualties 3 yr previous</td>
<td>Converted To No. of Casualties per Year</td>
<td>Casuality Breakdown</td>
<td>Speeds</td>
<td>No. of Accidents After</td>
<td>No. of Casualties After</td>
<td>Converted To No. of Casualties per Year</td>
<td>Casuality Breakdown</td>
<td>Speeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A684 Market Place/Emgate, Bedale LSS</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1 3 0</td>
<td>1 - - -</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6265 Studley Road Ripon LSS</td>
<td>59,900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 5 0</td>
<td>1 - - -</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8255 Turfy Hill, Hawes LSS</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>0 - - -</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety Scheme Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>78.34</td>
<td>49 186 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16 25 36.84 3 22 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This scheme has been safety audited and further modifications have been recently implemented.
1. INTRODUCTION

The Aims, Objectives and Policies for providing for cyclists and promoting greater cycling activity as an alternative to motorised transport are set out in the County Council’s Local Transport Plan and the North Yorkshire Cycling Strategy.

As stated in these documents, the key means of planning and providing for cyclists in North Yorkshire is through the preparation and implementation of Local Cycle Plans. These Plans identify and prioritise all the routes and facilities required in each area to provide a comprehensive and coherent network of cycle routes.

Within the current Local Transport Plan period Local Cycling Plans will be prepared, and implementation commenced, for each town in North Yorkshire and for the North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales National Parks.

Provision of facilities for cyclists is accompanied by measures to promote cycling as an alternative to driving. This includes the promotion of recreational cycling as an introduction to cycling, promotion through travel awareness campaigns and the distribution of cycle network maps highlighting the availability of safe and convenient cycle routes within towns.

An increase in both recreational and utility cycling can play a significant role in health policies by facilitating greater physical exercise. Cycling is also a relatively cheap mode of transport and is available to most members of the community, notably those without a driving licence, it therefore has the potential to play a significant role in reducing social exclusion for the transport poor sectors of the community.

2. REVIEW OF PROGRESS IN 2002/03

There is a clear causal link between the provision of good quality facilities for cyclists, increases in cycle use and a corresponding reduction in the use of the private motor car for journeys of an appropriate length and nature. As stated above the preparation, adoption and implementation of local cycle plans is the key means of achieving that desired outcome in North Yorkshire. We will continue to produce such plans for the areas concerned and undertake public consultation as a vital part of that process. At the beginning of 2002/03 Cycle Plans for the following towns had been completed:-

Harrogate
Scarborough
Northallerton
Thirsk
Sherburn in Elmet
Filey
The following plans were commenced in 2002/03 and will be completed during 2003:-

Tadcaster
Helmsley
Hawes
Whitby
Richmond
Skipton

It is recognised that, where possible, a holistic approach to integrated transport provision in towns should be adopted. Accordingly, in order to consider the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, people with disabilities and motorists in an integrated manner, a number of local cycle plans are being prepared as a part of our Town Centre Traffic Management Studies (see Appendix B).

The total expenditure for the provision of cycling facilities in North Yorkshire in 2002/03 was £518k. This included £360k on the implementation of the Harrogate and Knaresborough Cycle Network (see Annex 1). The programmed expenditure as reported in the last Annual Progress Report was £748k. Actual expenditure was therefore 69% of programmed. This shortfall in expenditure was due to delays caused by the consultation process resulting in the late start of two major cycle routes at Thirsk and Northallerton. Work on these routes commenced in late March/early April 2003 with both routes completed in July 2003.

Notable cycling schemes completed in the last year are: -

Northallerton Cycle Plan – Route 1 – provision of 200m of off road cycle track and a Toucan crossing in the vicinity of the Allertonshire Secondary School, Northallerton and other miscellaneous minor highway improvements to assist safe and convenient cycling. This completes Route 1 of the network linking residential areas to the south and east of the town with the Allertonshire School, Hambleton District Council offices, Hambleton Leisure Centre and the satellite village of Brompton.

Cycle Track and Toucan crossing outside the Allertonshire School, Northallerton
Northallerton Cycle Plan – Links to Darlington Road – Completion in partnership with developers, of an unsegregated shared use footway/cycle track linking a new industrial estate on Darlington Road with the town centre. Additional developer funded links from the Darlington Road cycle track to other industrial/retail warehousing areas.

Darlington Road, Northallerton - Before and After

Sherburn in Elmet Cycle Plan – Routes 2 & 5 – provision of an on road and off road cycle route linking Sherburn railway station and the large Moor Lane Industrial Estate to the town. This route involved negotiations with Network Rail/Railtrack to secure a licence to use an at grade footpath crossing of the railway in the vicinity of Sherburn station.

Sherburn in Elmet Cycle Plan – Route 4 – provision of an on and off road cycle track providing a route between Milford Road and Kirkgate via Sherburn High School.

Thirsk Cycle Plan – Routes 2 & 3 – Route 3 comprises of the provision of approximately 3km of on road cycle lanes linking Thirsk with Thirsk Station and the village of Carlton Minniott. Route 2 provides approximately 1.2km of off road footway/cycle track linking Thirsk with the nearby village of South Kilvington. This route also improves part of Route 65 of the National Cycle Network.
Harrogate to Knaresborough Cycle Track (See Annex 1) - 400m of off road cycle track in the verge of the A59 Harrogate Road, Knaresborough. This leaves a further 300m link to complete the Harrogate to Knaresborough link.

Penny Pot Lane, Harrogate – Provision of 1.05 km of off road unsegregated joint use footway / cycle track linking the Army Foundation College on Penny Pot Lane with the developing Harrogate Cycle Network at Queen Ethelburga’s Park. This scheme was jointly funded from both pedestrian and cycle facilities budgets.
Bike Bus Projects. – As reported last year the Council is a partner in a consortium with other local authorities, the Yorkshire Dales National Park and Arriva to provide a trailer that allows cycles to be carried on bus routes from Wakefield (via Leeds, Bradford and Ilkley) to Grassington in the National Park. This project is continuing to run successfully and the County Council is continuing its support. The County Council has also this year contributed towards a study for a similar project for the North York Moors National Park. The final report has now been produced and the partners are currently considering the results.

In addition to the above major developments a number of smaller schemes and cycle parking facilities have also been provided this financial year.
2.1 Progress Towards Targets

As reported in last year's APR, a new headline target was adopted for cycling in North Yorkshire. This target is:

To increase cycling in those towns for which local cycle plans are prepared and adopted, in accordance with individual targets established in such plans.

This philosophy of setting local cycle targets rather than a countywide target is based on the recognition that in a large and sparsely populated county such as North Yorkshire, overall increases in cycle use will be small and difficult to measure. Consequently, this could obscure some localised but significant increases in individual towns.

Baseline positions for this new target will be established for each individual settlement for which a local cycling plan is to be prepared as a part of that process (this has already been done in respect of those places for which plans have already been adopted). Collection of the necessary data will be by way of annual surveys at key locations in each settlement, as will the monitoring of increases in cycle usage following commencement of the implementation of the plans, measures and initiatives. In order to minimise any possible distortion of cycle use as a result of good/poor weather, the cycle surveys for each town will be carried out on two days during summer and two days during a neutral month (April, May, June, September, October). Except in special circumstances all cycle surveys will be 12 hour (0700 – 1900) surveys. Percentage changes will generally be determined based on the total aggregate of the four surveys at the selected representative sites in each town.

Table 1: Target for increased cycle use in the towns where Local Cycling Plans have been adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Longer-term Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate/Knaresborough</td>
<td>To be determined during 2003 following consultation</td>
<td>To be determined during 2003 following consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>To be determined during 2003 following consultation</td>
<td>To be determined during 2003 following consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northallerton</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirsk</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filey</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmsley</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawes</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipton</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baseline positions for the year of adoption of each cycle plan have been established for all the above towns and monitoring is ongoing. The annual change in cycle use in Northallerton, Thirsk, Sherburn and Filey is shown below. Since implementation of the plans has only recently commenced it is not possible to establish any firm trends. Early indications are however positive.

![Percentage growth in Cycle Flow](image)

3. PROGRAMME FOR 2003/04

As stated in Section 1 the North Yorkshire Cycling Strategy sets out the policies relating to cycling for the County. This strategy was adopted by the County Council in June 1999. In order to ensure that the strategy remains relevant and in keeping with the current philosophy, and reality, of providing for cycling periodic reviews and updates are required. A review of the cycling strategy will be carried out during the financial year 2003/04. Stakeholder input and consultation on our performance in the implementing of the currently approved strategy and on new or revised policies will be a key element of this review.

The programme of preparation and adoption of Local Cycling Plans will continue. The Cycling Plans for the County’s two National Parks, the North York Moors National Park (incorporating Kirkbymoorside, Thornton le Dale and Pickering), and the Yorkshire Dales National Park and the Nidderdale AONB (incorporating Leyburn, Pateley Bridge and Grassington) are nearing completion. These are important high profile plans and have been developed in partnership with the National Park Authorities and other local Councils. They are aimed at identifying facilities which provide for both utility trips (cycling to work, school etc) and leisure/tourism trips as an alternative to car based tourism. Copies of the plans are available on request.

Preparation of the following Town Cycling Plans will commence in 2003/04: -

Malton/Norton
Easingwold
Crosshills/Glusburn/Sutton in Craven
Bedale Aiskew
Ripon
Leyburn
Selby
Further work on the implementation of the adopted plans will be carried out. The total programmed expenditure on cycling for 2003/04 is £1.015k, including an allocation of £400k to the Harrogate and Knaresborough Cycle Network.

Key elements of this programme are detailed below:

**Northallerton Cycling Plan** - Route 2 – A mainly on-road route linking the village of Romanby with Northallerton town centre and Route 1. The provision of the route involves traffic calming, the implementation of priority working at a narrow railway bridge and the upgrading and conversion of approx 100m of public footpath.

**Thirsk Cycling Plan** – Routes 1, 2 and 5 – Preparation of routes 1 and 5 will commence with implementation over a two year period. Route 1 links the residential areas east of the town with the town centre, Route 5 links Thirsk secondary school and Sowerby to the town centre. Completion of Route 2 linking South Kilvington to Thirsk Town Centre.

**Sherburn in Elmet Cycling Plan** – Route 1 - Provision of approximately 1km of off road cycle track linking the village of South Milford with Sherburn in Elmet and Route 4 to Sherburn High School.

**Dragon Cycle Route Harrogate (see Annex 1)** - Provision of a Cycle Track from Dragon Road alongside the railway for 500m passing under one of Harrogate’s most congested roads, the A59, before emerging near the town centre. The existing stepped bridge, which connects the Dragon Cycle Route to Bilton, will be replaced with a modern ramped cycle bridge.

**National Parks** - Allocations of £27k each to commence implementation of the North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales National Park Cycle Plans have also been agreed.

**National Cycle Network (£120k)** – The County Council was pleased that the DfT approved the supplementary bid for the current year towards funding the completion of the National Cycle Network in North Yorkshire. The allocation for 2003/04 will contribute to upgrading facilities on Route 65 along the A166 between the County Boundary at Stamford Bridge and Scoreby Lane near Gate Helmsley and towards the implementation of the North Yorkshire section of the Pennine Cycleway (Route 68). The supplementary bid included in last year’s Annual Progress Report was for a three year programme of works between 2003/2004 and 2005/2006. Following discussions with GOYH, it has been decided to accelerate the programme for completion of the National Cycle Network in North Yorkshire. The County Council is therefore re-submitting the bid combining the programmed expenditure for 2004/2005 and 2005/2006. The Council is therefore seeking a total of £280k for the financial year 2004/2005 to contribute towards the completion of the National Cycle Network in North Yorkshire. Full details are given in Appendix N.

For towns where Cycle Plans were prepared as a part of the Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies additional funding for cycle facilities will be available from budgets allocated for implementing these strategies. Examples of this include:

**Tadcaster to Tadcaster Grammar School** – Provision of approximately 1.5km of joint use footway/cycle track between Tadcaster and Tadcaster Grammar School. (Subject to public consultation).

**Linkfoot Lane, Helmsley** – Provision of an off road footway/cycle track adjacent to the A170 linking Helmsley town centre with the Riccal Drive housing area and the minor road to the village of Harome.
Cycle Parking - In all cases cycle parking facilities identified as part of cycle plans and requested by Town and Parish Councils will continue to be provided when and where appropriate. This is a low cost measure that is seen to play a significant role in encouraging utility use of cycles.

The implementation of a number of Local Cycle Plans is now sufficiently advanced for interim maps of the networks to be produced and distributed. An interim map for the Harrogate and Knaresborough urban area has already been produced, a copy of which is enclosed in Annex 1. It is also intended during the next financial year to produce interim maps for the Northallerton and Sherburn in Elmet networks and possibly, depending on progress in implementing the routes in the plan, for Thirsk.

4. CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Consultation on most cycling facilities takes place at two stages in their development. Initial consultation is carried out as part of the development and approval of the Local Cycle Plans with further detailed consultation carried out on an individual scheme basis as part of the design and implementation process.

Local Cycling Plans are developed by the Council in partnership with a Local Cycle Working Group. This is a Group convened and chaired by the County Council specifically to assist in developing the Local Cycle Plan. Membership varies depending on local circumstances but usually consists of representatives from the appropriate District Council, the Police, local town and/or Parish Councillors and two or three local cycle users. The draft plan is then subject to widespread local consultation. This consists of press articles being included in local papers, copies of the plan being sent to key stakeholders and copies made available in local libraries, Council offices etc for inspection by local residents and other interested parties. All responses are reported to members of the County Council and any necessary alterations are made before the plan is adopted.

The second phase of consultation is for individual schemes. Letters giving details of the scheme and requesting a written response are sent to stakeholders and affected local residents. The response rate to this type of consultation has however been poor. To try and improve this response rate and to try to get a wider range of views we have therefore recently implemented a system whereby scheme details are sent out on a leaflet with a post paid questionnaire for responses. Further details of the success, or otherwise, of this revised consultation procedure will be reported in next year’s APR.
During the second full year (March 2002-2003) of implementing the Harrogate and Knaresborough cycle network, 8.6 kilometres of new cycle routes have been provided.

Luchon Way has been upgraded as a cycle track extending the Jennyfield Drive cycle track towards the town centre and a cycle track has been constructed in the verge on Penny Pot Lane to link the Army Foundation College to Queen Ethelburga’s estate. A traffic free connection between these two routes is being developed.

Stonefall Park Cycle Route is under construction providing a traffic free route from Wetherby Road to Hookstone Chase and Woodlands Walk.

The Harrogate Road cycle track in Knaresborough has been extended a further 400m along the verge to link Harrogate and Knaresborough. A final 300m section to complete the link is now a high priority and will be constructed as soon as land negotiations are resolved.

A cycle contra flow lane has been installed on Silverfield Road which permits cyclist access from Granby Road to Kingsley Drive and Bogs Lane, a route which is favoured by cyclists for avoiding the very busy and more hilly A59 Knaresborough Road. It extends the Harrogate-Knaresborough route by about 2½km towards Harrogate.

Work has started on new traffic signals which will exempt cyclists from an obligatory left turn for motor vehicles where Beech Grove meets West Park (the A61). This creates a new route for cyclists across the town centre which avoids the A61 gyratory system. It will be completed in 2003/4.

A footpath has been upgraded to a cycle track linking the Aspin Estate in Knaresborough to King James High School and the town centre.

14 cycle lockers have been installed in Jubilee Car Park and between the railway and bus stations in Harrogate. Over 150 cycle parking places have been achieved through development control conditions in Harrogate.

**Proposed for 2003/4**

Details of proposed by-law changes to allow cyclists to use wide footpaths across Harrogate’s Stray have been developed and consultation is planned this year possibly leading to construction in 2004. Use of certain Stray paths is required for the cycle network on the southern side of Harrogate and for the safe routes to the secondary schools.

The consultation on the Otley Road and Fulwith Mill Lane cycle routes are both unresolved so alternatives are being developed.

A start on site is expected in May 2003 to construct the Dragon Cycle Route along the railway cutting for 500m and pass under one of Harrogate’s most congested roads, the A59, before emerging near the town centre. The existing stepped bridge, which connects the Dragon Cycle Route to Bilton, will be replaced with a modern ramped cycle bridge. Together these two projects will link with existing cycle routes and provide a high quality walking and cycling route from Bilton to the centre of Harrogate. Progress is delayed by site access to rail property.
The Ripley to Harrogate railway line has been disused since the early 1960's and a landowner, opposed to the route, has demolished a 175m long section of embankment. The Council took legal steps to enforce its reinstatement but the landowner appealed. The Council won the resulting public inquiry (and the decision was backed by the High Court in July 2002). The reconstruction of the embankment is due by July 2003, which will simplify the ongoing land negotiations.

A new type of limestone based surfacing material bound with a cement based additive is being trialled on the Bilton Triangle disused railway cycle paths. Initial impressions suggest that it is a hardwearing material that is accepted in some locations where tarmac is considered too formal or intrusive.

Cycle counting was undertaken in July 2001 and repeated in July 2002 at the same locations. A slight decrease was noted from an average (per count site) of 255.8 cycles in 2002 compared to 258.5 in 2001. Counts were from 7.30am to 9.30am. New methods are being sought for assessing cycling.

Cycling events have been organised for Bike Week 2003 in Harrogate. Rides range from short traffic-free rides to commuters' rides and a cycle commuters' breakfast.

A cycle map for Harrogate and Knaresborough has been produced and a copy is attached. The map is combined with the Bike Week listing and it is planned to update the map and reprint one year on.
PROVISION FOR PEDESTRIANS

1. INTRODUCTION

The Aims, Objectives and Policies for providing for pedestrians and promoting greater pedestrian activity as an alternative to motorised transport are set out in the County Council's Local Transport Plan and the North Yorkshire Pedestrian Strategy.

As stated in both these documents the Council has adopted a two pronged approach to providing facilities for pedestrians. For each of the urban areas, cities, towns and larger villages the council will produce and implement a Pedestrian Action Plan. The primary purpose of these plans is to be proactive by identifying all the required improvements to assist pedestrians. Currently, for rural areas the approach is less proactive with the needs and desires for pedestrian facilities being identified by a number of parties (eg local County Council Members and staff, District and Parish Councils, private individuals) and these being prioritised and provided on the basis of an agreed points scoring system.

Provision of facilities for pedestrians is accompanied by measures to promote walking as an alternative to driving. This is particularly relevant to the “school run”. Details of safer routes to school and other travel awareness initiatives are included in other appendices.

Almost all trips include some element of pedestrian travel, whether it be a 30 minute walk to work or 100 metres from the car park to the shops. It is therefore crucial that provision for pedestrians forms an element of all other transport policies and proposals.

Taking regular exercise, such as walking, has been identified as being extremely beneficial to health. The County Council has therefore fostered links with health care organisations to promote walking for health initiatives. Whilst beneficial in its own right encouragement to incorporate walking as a mode of transport in a personal exercise regime has direct links to transport objectives.

2. REVIEW OF PROGRESS IN 2002/03

As stated above the key tool for providing for pedestrians in the urban areas of North Yorkshire is the Pedestrian Action Plan. This should identify all required improvements to assist existing pedestrians and encourage greater pedestrian activity. Whilst identifying improvements throughout the Plan area emphasis will be given to the key pedestrian routes. These are the main pedestrian links between trip generators (eg housing areas) and trip attractors (eg schools, businesses and shopping areas, etc). The Council has identified the requirement to produce a total of 32 Plans (including some of the larger villages) throughout the County. These plans also identify what improvements are required to the network of key pedestrian routes to enable the council to assist pedestrians with mobility difficulties and to comply with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA). Further details of these requirements are included in Appendix I. An example of a Pedestrian Action Plan for a small town (Helmsley ) is included as Annex A). This shows the general principle and format adopted for all pedestrian Action Plans. In order to allow the Council to comply with the
requirements of the DDA it is aimed to complete all Pedestrian Action Plans by the end of 2004. As reported last year Plans for the following areas were in preparation during 2002/03.

Grassington/Threshfield
Northallerton
Skipton
Whitby
Tadcaster
Richmond
Helmsley
Hawes

These have now been completed, adopted and the implementation of the identified improvements commenced.

The following plans were commenced during 2002/03 and should all be completed during 2003:

Easingwold
Malton/Norton
Settle/Giggleswick
Glusburn/Crosshills/Sutton in Craven
Pateley Bridge
Killinghall
Sherburn in Elmet
Great Ayton
Filey
Kirkbymoorside
Knaresborough.

The total expenditure for the provision of pedestrian facilities in 2002/03 was £1119k. The expected planned expenditure for 2002/03 that was reported in last year’s APR was £627k. Actual expenditure was therefore 178% of that programmed. This overspend included schemes carried over from 2001/02 and new schemes to counter the anticipated under spend in other budget categories.

In addition to the pedestrian facilities budget the County Council spent a total of £675k to making specific provisions for disabled pedestrians which in many cases will also be of benefit to all pedestrians. Full details of the provision for disabled people are provided in Appendix I.

Notable schemes completed in 2002/03 are:-

_Penny Pot Lane Footway/Cycle Track/Marching Route_ – Provision of a 1.05km new/improved footway and new cycle track facility between the Army Foundation College at Penny Pot Lane west of Harrogate and Harrogate. This scheme was jointly funded from the contributions from the Army and from pedestrian and cycling facilities budgets._
Military Personnel on the new Footway/Cycle Track/ Marching Route
at Penny Pot Lane

Montpellier Quarter Pedestrianisation - Phase 1 of this award winning pedestrianisation of the Montpellier Quarter of Harrogate Town Centre improving the environment and facilities for pedestrians and shoppers in this attractive part of Harrogate.

Montpellier Quarter, Harrogate

Field Lane, Scarborough – Provision of a new footway alongside Field Lane linking the Scalby area of Scarborough to a holiday caravan park on Field Lane. The new route will assist pedestrian access to the town and North Bay beach area of Scarborough and provides safe access to improved bus stop facilities.
Field Lane Footway and Bus Stops, Scarborough

Puffin Crossing, Kirkbymoorside – provides a signal controlled crossing of the A170 in Kirkbymoorside improving safety and convenience for pedestrians from the West Lund Lane housing area to the village centre and nearby primary school.
Puffin Crossing, Boroughbridge Road, Northallerton – provides a signal controlled crossing facility between a large housing area on the east side of the busy A167 arterial route into Northallerton and a doctors surgery, local convenience supermarket and primary school on the west side of the road. Also at a location where the Council was unable to fill a vacancy for a School Crossing patrol.

Carlton Lane Footway, Helmsley - A scheme to provide a new footway where vulnerable pedestrians, including school children, mothers with pushchairs, and disabled people were previously walking in the road. The new footway follows the kerb line whereas the existing footway is raised and only accessible via a flight of steps.

New Footway, Carlton Lane, Helmsley

A number of other pedestrians schemes have also been provided from budgets allocated for Safer Routes to Schools. Many of these are footways or pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of schools or on main routes to schools. Further details are included in the Road Safety Appendix.

As explained in the Annual Progress Report and included as Appendix J, the County Council has published ‘Transport Issues and Development – A Guide’. The primary purpose of this guide is to advise developers and Planing Authorities of the highway authorities transport requirements for new developments. This guide incorporates the Councils adopted hierarchy of users placing the needs of pedestrians as the highest priority. It is envisaged that this guide will encourage developers to be much more pedestrian friendly both in the location and design of developments.
The County Council has also this year developed links with the health sector and have been actively involved in the setting up of three Walking the Way to Health initiatives. This is an initiative supported by The Countryside Agency to promote walking for health in the community. Working in partnership with Primary Care Trusts (PCT), District Councils. The Countryside Agency and groups from the voluntary sector initiatives have commenced in Hambleton, Harrogate and Craven districts. Whilst these are primarily health initiatives the County Council will develop links with these initiatives to promote the concept of integrating walking for transport with walking for health. Essentially we will promote the idea that walking to work etc. can become part of a persons normal exercise regime.

The Council has also undertaken a number of initiatives aimed at promoting walking as an alternative to private car use, often with special emphasis on trips to school and work. Full details of these are included in the appendix on Travel Awareness and Travel Plans (Appendix B).

There are currently no Local Transport Plan targets that relate specifically to provision for pedestrians. As previously stated however the County Council aims to complete all Pedestrian Action Plans by the end of 2004. The Council is currently on programme to achieve this aim. The Council also aims to maintain expenditure on provisions for pedestrians of £400k or greater each year. This aim is also being achieved. Crucially the completion of the Pedestrian Action Plans should ensure that this high level of expenditure is translated into high quality useful pedestrian facilities for all users that should encourage a modal shift away from motorised transport and have a beneficial impact on social exclusion problems.

3. PROGRAMME FOR 2003/2004

The North Yorkshire Pedestrian Strategy was adopted in March 2000. The strategy was always intended to be a dynamic and flexible document. Therefore, in order to allow the strategy to reflect current thinking and policies on providing for pedestrians and to adapt to changing public expectations it was to be subject to regular reviews. It is the intention of the County Council that this review should be carried out during 2003/04. Full details of the scope of the review have yet to be finalised. It will however be comprehensive and will include a review of the Aims, Objectives and Policies in the current strategy. Stakeholder involvement and consultation will be a key input into the review.

The production and implementation of Pedestrian Action Plans will continue. Preparation of the following plans is due to commence in 2003/04 :-

Selby
Leyburn
Ingleton
Malham
High/Low Bentham
Ripon
Reeth
Pickering
Askrigg
This will leave only six Pedestrian Action Plans to complete in 2004/05. These are listed below: -

Boroughbridge
Thirsk
Bedale
Masham
Stokesley
Middleham

Implementation of adopted plans will continue in 2003/04. Further details are included below.

The total programmed expenditure on facilities for pedestrians for 2003/04 is £444k (excluding allocations for facilities for disabled people). This consists of £302k general allocation and £142k through the Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies. These allocations exclude the specific budgets for making provisions for disabled people.

Notable schemes programmed for 2003/04 are described below: -

High Street, Sutton in Craven – Provision of a missing section of Footway in High Street, Sutton in Craven improving access from residential areas to the primary school.

James Street Pedestrianisation, Harrogate (£200k) – Pedestrianisation of James Street in Harrogate town centre extending the pedestrianised shopping areas and improving facilities for pedestrians and shoppers

A162 Lumby to South Milford (£16k) – A new section of Footway alongside the A162 linking the village of Lumby to South Milford enabling safe pedestrian access to the services provided in South Milford.

Pedestrian Route Improvements Nun’s Close Car Park to Market Place, Richmond - A scheme, to be constructed in phases spread over several years, to improve the entire pedestrian route between Nun’s Close Car Park and the Market Place. In 2003/04, and continuing in 2004/05, Rosemary Lane will become a one-way street which will allow the roadway to be narrowed and the footways to be widened. The road surface will be raised to footway level and block paved creating an environment more in keeping with the character of this historic market town.

4. CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Full details of the consultation arrangements for the review of the Pedestrian Strategy have yet to be finalised. It is however likely to involve the early involvement of key stakeholders (pedestrian groups, disabled peoples groups, a selection of Town Councils, District Councils, etc). These stakeholders will be afforded the opportunity to comment on the current strategy and on how it has been put into practice by the County Council. A revised strategy will then
be subject to a more formal consultation process before adoption and implementation by the County Council.

Pedestrian Action Plans are produced either individually or as an integral part of Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies. Plans produced as part of the Traffic Management Strategies are subject to the consultation arrangements described in the Traffic Management Appendix (Appendix C). Other plans are subject to local consultation. This involves amongst others the appropriate District, Town and Parish Councils, local representative groups (including those representing disabled people), and the emergency services. Comments from these groups are assessed and the Plans revised as appropriate before adoption and implementation.

In addition to the consultation on strategies and plans the County Council also carry out localised consultation on the provision of specific facilities. This involves seeking the views of local people, Town/Parish councils, appropriate emergency services and representative user groups.

The input of local people, as the potential users of facilities, is essential in ensuring a successful well used pedestrian route network. Consultation throughout the process, from strategy to provision, is therefore afforded a high priority.

HELMSLEY PEDESTRIAN ACTION PLAN AVAILABLE ON REQUEST
FREIGHT TRANSPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

The volumes of freight coming into and out of North Yorkshire remain significant. The County has a number of strategic trunk roads and motorways including the A1(T) and A19(T). Over 8 million tonnes of minerals are extracted out of North Yorkshire quarries annually (including National Parks) and less than 10% is currently moved by rail. Over 100,000 tonnes of timber are extracted annually from Forestry Commission woodland alone, with significant tonnages emanating from private sector forests in the Dales and other areas. Other major freight generators are located across the County, few of whom are themselves rail connected or actually utilise rail-freight.

The Council’s freight policy is based on a hierarchy with the promotion of local goods and services, thus minimising the distance that freight is moved, foremost. Recognising that significant amounts of freight will still need to be moved longer distances the next stage is to identify opportunities for modal shift. So the efficient and sustainable movement of goods is considered above the efficient movement of motor vehicles which is an important but nonetheless secondary concern. Demand management is therefore a key priority, with every effort going into localising production, and where this is not possibly achieving a shift towards sustainable modes like rail and water. Despite setbacks in terms of the (temporary) suspension of Freight Facilities Grants (FFG) and Track Access Grants (TAG) which could affect key projects, the Council is continuing to work closely with industry and other stakeholders to achieve sustainable outcomes and contribute to the governments’ targets for rail-freight. In so doing the council shares the key objectives of efficiency, accessibility, equity and environment.

2. REVIEW OF PROGRESS

Cam Woodland Rail Initiative: The Council continues to play a key role in this project that would see 50,000 tonnes of rail-borne timber moved out of the Yorkshire Dales, and which would otherwise have gone by road. The Council had negotiated a favourable lease (that we would fund ourselves), for use of the private Ribblehead Rail Siding and financed and agreed terms between the key users and providers, namely Hanson Aggregates, English Welsh and Scottish Railways, Iggesund Paperboard and other private sector interests. We have also financed and managed the upgrade of the Ribblehead siding from 1 to 2 track to increase throughput and efficiency.

Discussions with the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) would suggest a positive outcome, following submission of the final grant application. It remains to be seen though what the grant allocation will be following the recent changes to the SRA’s criteria for assessing the value of environmental benefit. Whilst the news to restore FFG and TAG is welcomed, the time scale for grant re-instatement might be longer than that for the timber to be extracted. It may therefore have to be moved by road. Given the amount of time and resources that have already been invested, we remain committed to this initiative, and are continuing to work closely with our project partners to achieve a sustainable solution.

Rail Studies:
Good progress is being made on the studies, which were commenced in 2002 and reported, in the last APR. These are now complete and new studies are being commissioned:

Timber Study:
The final report on the Timber Study was produced recently. It concludes that given the relative proximity of woodland to the processing plants, there is little scope for large-scale rail-borne timber flows. It has, however, identified a number of individual forest locations though for which rail may be an option. These are woodland in the North York Moors National Park, centred on the North York Moors Railway (NYMR), in particular Cropton Forest.

The outputs from this Report has, along with concern about other issues concerning timber transport like damage to the highway, have led to the formation of a Timber Freight Quality Partnership which we have initiated as part of the Yorkshire Forest Industry Liaison Group.

**Damage to verge caused by timber haul vehicles**

**Skipton – Swinden/Threshfield Study:**
This study was jointly commissioned by Tarmac and NYCC. The brief asked consultants to consider a number of scenarios, including upgrade of the existing line, and the feasibility of re-instating the line up to Threshfield including the link into the Embsay and Bolton Abbey Steam Railway (EBASR).

Whilst the conclusions reached in the report suggest little scope for line upgrades, extensions or putting the connection back in to the Embsay to Bolton Abbey Line, subsequent consultation with stakeholders has raised a number of issues, requiring additional work. This is envisaged to include a modified Freight Quality Partnership based around a ‘round table’ forum with key stakeholders and the consultants to address the comments received. Work on this is ongoing and detailed discussions about the Embsay railway connection will consider all possible options and the conclusions will be reported in our next APR.
The Missing Link?

Skipton to Colne Disused Railway Study:
Currently Lancashire County Council has sections of the old railway formation earmarked as an alignment for a possible bypass of towns and villages along the existing A56. In order to avoid a situation where traffic comes off the bypass at the County boundary and straight through Thornton in Craven, a bypass scheme is also proposed for this Village. However, the Thornton in Craven Bypass scheme is not currently included in the forward programme and will only be promoted when Lancashire initiates their scheme. Nevertheless before any road scheme can be put forward, it is prudent to undertake a preliminary investigation into the longer-term potential for the reinstatement of the former Skipton to Colne railway line.

We have jointly commissioned a study with Lancashire County Council to consider the prospects for re-instating the link between Skipton and Colne for passenger and rail-freight. The consultants have been asked to consider a range of scenarios including the feasibility of building a new railway along side the A56 proposals where the former rail track bed is used. The recommendations in the recently produced final draft will inform the Lancashire CC Structure Plan review and any decisions taken over the village bypass schemes in North Yorkshire and Lancashire. The draft report has only very recently been produced and concludes that there is little value in re-instating the line for local or strategic freight, or for local rail passenger services. The case for the line hinges more on its value as a strategic passenger route, in the longer term.

Audit of Railway Infrastructure

In conjunction with a leading railway consultant, we have recently completed a study to audit all disused rail lines and infrastructure within North Yorkshire and to make an assessment of their potential for re-instatement and re-use. The results will be used to inform the planning process of the need to protect these routes and locations from adverse development. This has already begun to identify neglected facilities that may have potential to increase the attractiveness of rail freight in North Yorkshire.
Disused Platform Skipton Station - All Change?
Freight Quality Partnerships (FQP)

(Target D3: To establish three Freight Quality Partnership during the life of the Plan)

Good progress continues to be made on the FQP’s that have already been established, and although we have already met this target, we are expanding their number to establish five FQP’s by the end of 2005/6 financial year, to tackle longstanding freight related problems elsewhere in the county. Consideration is also being given to adopting targets for each of the FQP’s to focus on ‘outcomes’ rather than ‘outputs’.

The reasons for early achievement can in part be put down to the fact that there are a number of hitherto intractable problems that exist across the county regarding freight. Stakeholders have often been only too keen to be involved in an initiative that, which has as its aim, the solving of that problem. The challenge remains though to make clear that their establishment is not an end in itself, the FQP is merely a forum within which the issue can be tackled. Therefore establishing an action oriented agenda and managing expectation, is key to a successful FQP. It is also important to acknowledge that the establishment of an FQP is only the beginning of the process.

Sherburn Freight Quality Partnership: This FQP was set up to address long standing community concerns over two local firms that produce significant freight trips. Since the last APR, the FQP, which includes the companies concerned, the police, and community representatives, has investigated rail-freight opportunities for the site. Whilst a meeting held with the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) demonstrated that a private siding off the main York to Scarborough Line was technically feasible, the company felt that initial cost estimates were prohibitive and the needs of its supply chain, not conducive to rail.

Ward Factory in Sherburn Village (one of the largest production complexes in Europe)

Attention is now focused on the scope for constructing an access road from the factory site, direct onto the A64(T), thus avoiding the Village completely. We have jointly commissioned a feasibility study with the Highways Agency (HA) to consider the implications and what alternative site accesses would be suitable for such a proposal. The draft report has now been produced and considered by the FQP. It was agreed that some additional work is required before a final report can be produced. This is ongoing, but the next step will be to consider time scales and possible sources of funding.

The Sherburn FQP has proved valuable in the wider context too. It is through relationships established with local industry that we have been made aware of issues, often commercially sensitive, that we may not have otherwise have been advised of. Armed with this information and working alongside business, we have been able to achieve the most sustainable transport solution possible.
As well as addressing more strategic issues like those referred to above; whilst the focus of the FQP is freight, the FQP also provides a useful forum in which the more day-to-day concerns of the local community, like the siting of bus stops and weight restriction signs, can be addressed.

Settle Freight Quality Partnership: Settle is a town situated between the quarries of Giggleswick, Horton, Arcow and Dry Rigg. Collectively they extract approximately 1.5 million tonnes of minerals per annum, none of which is rail-borne. The joint operations of the quarries produce around 550 heavy goods trips per day which pass through Settle to access the A65(T) and wider trunk road network.

Settle - “21st Century living in a 16th Century Market Town”

The issue has been a sensitive one amongst towns’ people for many years, with no real consensus on how the problem should be tackled. It is since the last APR and against this background that we have established the Settle FQP. The first meeting was held in January 2003 where a broad set of aims and objectives and draft strategy was agreed.

Since this time a comprehensive audit of HCV movements has been planned, to establish a benchmark, and a working group set up to consider technical details relating to strategy. This is already producing results, with proposals to eliminate some of the more immediate problems like early morning running, now gaining momentum.

The Partnership is comprised of over 20 individuals representing 16 different bodies and organisations, including community representatives, the police, NYCC, National Park Authority, quarry operators, hauliers and industry representatives like the Road Haulage Association. It is charged with investigating short and long-term solutions in relation to the impact of goods vehicle traffic on the town from reducing inappropriate early morning running to helping facilitate rail-borne minerals. However, the costs involved in re-establishing rail links and providing connections to the main line are often prohibitive and act as a constraint on projects coming to fruition.

“The aims of this Freight Quality Partnership are to improve the overall quality of life for the local community, to further economic prosperity for Settle’s business and industry and to protect and enhance the local environment”
Whilst the audit will provide baseline data, anecdotal evidence suggests that the FQP is already having a beneficial effect on some of the problems through its existence alone. We are working hard with stakeholders to ensure tangible progress continues to be made.

**Timber Freight Quality Partnership:**
The effects of timber extraction and transport in North Yorkshire have been addressed for a number of years through the Yorkshire Forest Industry Liaison Group, which over time has expanded its remit to cover promotion and development of the region’s timber industry. We first put forward the concept of a timber freight quality partnership to focus purely on timber transport to the Group in November 2001. This idea gained approval following production of the Forestry Foundation Study in 2002.

The first meeting of the Timber Freight Quality Partnership took place in February 2003 and it was agreed for the Partnership to have any credibility, one of its first priorities has to be how to engage the timber haulage industry. We are currently working with our partners within the Forestry industry on ways of encouraging haulier participation. This will require considerable effort as there area a number of small or owner-operator businesses in the timber haulage industry which creates difficulties for haulier participation in such initiatives.

**Lorry Routeing Database**
(Target G3: to establish a lorry routing database for the County in the first two years of the plan)

*Northallerton area weight restriction*

Production of a lorry routing database based on existing knowledge of lorry restrictions was completed within two years of the Local Transport Plan. This exercise, however, revealed that it would be unwise to promote this too widely without full verification of the orders on which the restrictions were made.

Validation of existing weight, width and height restrictions (phase 1) has proved time consuming given their number and often historic nature, and has therefore taken longer than anticipated. The exercise though has highlighted the need for a fundamental appraisal of traffic regulation orders (TRO) generally, which is now likely.

The likelihood of this review means that the target has been changed to the production of a verified database by 2005 since there is little merit in verifying data, which is likely to change. Time assisting in this review should make the information contained in the database more accurate and accessible, and the database itself, more robust.
We are also working with colleagues in the Council's Trading Standards Section who are taking an increasingly pro-active stance on enforcement of Traffic Regulation Orders, to identify bridge locations at which suspected infringements are occurring.

**Water-freight**

Water remains an important element within our sustainable distribution strategy and using our contacts in the private sector we have been working closely with Scarborough Borough Council as owners of the Port of Whitby, to investigate potential new freight flows for the Port, in an attempt to secure its future as a commercially viable port.

Contacts are being maintained with British Waterways and an inventory of water-freight opportunities is being discussed for future LTPs.

3. **PROGRAMME FOR 2003/04**

The recommendations arising out of the Timber Study will be acted upon along with any outputs emanating from the extended consultation period on the Skipton – Swinden/Threshfield study will be translated into an action plan. There may also be additional work following any recommendations that come out of the Skipton – Colne Study. These will be considered as part of planned wider consultations with neighbouring authorities on actioning recommendations contained in a recent ‘Railway Reopenings’ Report commissioned by the Countryside Agency, where appropriate.

The establishment of a Freight Quality Partnership is not an end in itself and actions that arise from existing FQP’s will continue to require significant time and effort. These will be progressed, particularly in relation to developing routes for timber transport, and considering solutions to reducing the impact of goods vehicle traffic on Settle Town and Sherburn Village.

We will also continue investigating the application for rail-freight innovations like ‘Mini-modal’ for North Yorkshire, and notwithstanding any decisions over the future of FFG, identifying new flows suitable for new rail-freight.

The lorry routing database and establishment of a web-based facility is an area that will require further development work, particularly post implementation of any review.

4. **CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

Encouraging active stakeholder involvement in the various freight initiatives is essential if we are to meet the objectives of our freight strategy. Effective consultation is therefore a key element, and particularly so with longstanding freight problems, where little consensus often exists on the way forward.

The nature of the consultation exercise will therefore be dependent on the individual issue at hand. For example, the Timber FQP has developed out of the existing Yorkshire Forest Industry Liaison Group, whereas other FQP’s like Settle have been established from scratch. Nevertheless certain ‘guiding principles’ remain. Haulier involvement in Partnerships is essential if we are to ‘sell’ the outputs to the wider haulage industry/local community. The importance of identifying and persuading ‘lead companies’ to come on board is therefore critical. So relationship building has an important role to play in this regard and persuading lead user involvement by explaining the benefits to them, particularly in terms of their ability to influence the agenda, is essential.
The detailed arrangements for establishing an FQP are critical. In Settle, the approach was to meet ‘key players’ face to face to explain the FQP concept, and what it would aim to achieve. At the same time, invite letters were sent to all stakeholders with background documents, on which feedback is requested along with confirmation of attendance. Where the issue traditionally gets press coverage, we adopt a pro-active approach with the local media, keeping them informed of progress on the FQP.

More widely, through the Northern Freight Group, the West Yorkshire Freight Group and Freight Business Yorkshire and Humber (FBYH), we regularly meet with neighbouring authorities and industry stakeholders to consider issues of mutual interest like cross boundary freight flows.

It is also through FBYH that discussions are currently taking place with the Regional Assembly, on the scope for developing a regional freight strategy; a development we have been calling for, as outlined in the last APR. This will help set the framework for Development Plans and LTP’s across the region. Work is currently on going, and if this proposal goes ahead, we will have a seat on the steering group.

We are also providing assistance to City Of York Council with the development of their freight strategy and will also be consulting with neighbouring authorities on the recently produced ‘Railway Re-openings’ Report.

North Yorkshire is unique in the region for having such a large road network. The significant levels of natural resources extracted annually, and the need to serve a widespread agricultural community and dispersed businesses make it a challenging place for freight movement. In recognition of this NYCC was one of the first authorities in the region to establish a specialist Freight Officer. As a result of this we have been able to make real improvements that are making a difference to peoples lives. This has been accomplished by a structured approach that firstly establishes the facts behind the need for freight movement, then carefully examines the technical and socio-economic barriers to alternative modes. Finally, and even more challengingly, we have begun the lengthy but essential process of working with local people and the Freight Industry to help them recognise the need for a sustainable distribution system in North Yorkshire.
Appendix I - Access for Disabled People

A responsive County Council providing good quality and efficient services
ACCESS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE

1. INTRODUCTION

As stated in the North Yorkshire Strategy for people with disabilities and the Local Transport Plan, the underlying ethos behind transport provision for people with disabilities is to provide for journeys on a "door to door" basis. Whilst improvements are being made to public transport services a lack of accessible pedestrian links in town centres and at public transport termini can create major problems.

The County Council has therefore taken a two pronged approach to provision for the mobility impaired. Whilst recognising the importance of providing modern accessible public transport (both buses and taxis) it is equally important to provide accessible pedestrian routes to and around town centres and public transport facilities.

The benefits from the Strategy for People with Disabilities will also reach parents with small children, the able elderly, children and low income groups who are dependent on public transport.

2. REVIEW OF PROGRESS AND EXPENDITURE 2002/03

During 2002/03 progress was made on a number of fronts towards the aims and objectives of the LTP and the Strategy for People with Disabilities. These come in three key areas: improvements to public transport, pedestrian improvements in town centres and general improvements to aid mobility.

The public transport improvements fall into three categories: improvements to buses, provision of new bus stations and provision of accessible bus stops as part of quality bus corridors. In many cases the provision of new low floor buses is tied in to the award of contracts on new quality bus corridors.

In 2002/03 a ‘Premier Specification’ Contract was introduced. The specification includes for low floor easy access buses, a dedicated publicity budget and drivers trained in customer care.

Premier Contracts have been awarded on the following routes:

Bedale - Northallerton
Northallerton - Stokesley
Hawes - Bedale

The new contract for these routes specifies use of low floor buses and this contract will replace existing contracts when they are due for renewal, if appropriate.

As reported in the 2002 Annual Progress Report, design work had begun on the refurbishment of three bus stations at Whitby, Tadcaster and Skipton.
The bus station improvements at Whitby and Tadcaster have now been completed. At both of these locations adequate provision has been made for the mobility impaired, not only in moving into and around the bus stations but also in boarding and alighting from buses. In both locations the improvements at the bus stations are complemented with aids to mobility improvements within town centres. These features were provided through the respective Traffic Management Strategies.

Progress on the Skipton bus station has been incorporated in the development of the Skipton Traffic Management Strategy. This strategy covered many facets and it was felt that a co-ordinated strategy should be developed ahead of any piecemeal improvements. Now that the strategy has been approved, preliminary design is progressing and facilities for the mobility impaired will again be paramount.

The introduction of quality bus corridors is important, not only in providing better facilities for bus passengers but also in providing better access onto buses to enable the mobility impaired to use public transport.

In 2001/02 progress had been made towards providing a number of quality bus corridors, however only the Bedale to Northallerton corridor was under construction. A further six quality corridors had been at some stage of design. The advance stage of design for some of these corridors has allowed us to construct 10 quality corridors in 2002/03. The routes are as follows:

- Ripon – Harrogate – Leeds
- Cloughton – Scarborough
- Malton – Hovingham
- Skipton – Keighley
- Skipton – Grassington
- Northallerton – Stokesley
- Bedale – Leyburn – Hawes
- Malton - Pickering
- Seamer – Eastfield – Scarborough
- Harrogate – Knaresborough
- Briarcliffe (Scarborough)

The total expenditure on quality bus corridors

The second key area for improving access for disabled people has been through pedestrian improvements in town centres. The catalyst for these improvements is Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies and specifically the Pedestrian Action Plans which form part of the strategies, which are yet to be approved.

In 2002/03 the strategies for six towns have been approved, these are:–

- Hawes
- Helmsley
- Richmond
- Skipton
- Tadcaster
- Whitby

A further three strategies for Northallerton, Easingwold and Malton/Norton are in progress and are due shortly to be subject to public consultation.
The Pedestrian Action Plans will identify key routes for pedestrian movement into and within a town centre. If there are improvements required for disabled access they are highlighted in the Plan. In the six towns, it has been possible to carry out the disabled access improvements in advance of the Plan being approved, required to bring the town centres up to an acceptable standard.

In Skipton a number of key routes are to be improved over the next few years.

In total £110k has been spent on disabled access improvements in 2002/03 as part of the Traffic Management Strategies.

In towns which are yet to have a traffic management strategy or villages without Pedestrian Action Plans, a number of dropped kerb crossings have been constructed. These have been on a less co-ordinated basis with new crossing points being constructed after requests from local mobility impaired residents or through local disabled action groups.

In Harrogate and Scarborough a total of £150k was spent on providing improvements in access for the disabled, mainly in the form of additional dropped kerb crossings.

This type of ad hoc improvement is also used in villages across the rest of the County, for which a further £140k has been spent on ad hoc dropped kerb crossings. If a need for improved access arrangements is perceived, then provision is made where possible. However, as a number of pedestrian action plans for the larger villages are completed then a more structural, coordinated approach can be adopted.

The County Council is in the process of upgrading all signalised crossings in order to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act. In 2002/03 14 crossings have been upgraded at a cost of £Xk. This now leaves 11 more crossings to be upgraded in 2003/04.

TARGETS

Due to a revision of the targets within the Local Transport Plan, there are now only two existing targets which remain and one new target which has been adopted which relate to disabled access improvements.

A2 Access to rail stations for people with disabilities

New work was planned for improving access to rail stations. Works are programmed to begin in 2003/04.

A3 To introduce facilities for people with disabilities at all new signalised pedestrianised crossings and to retrofit all existing facilities by 2004

In 2002/03 eight new pedestrian crossings were constructed, each of them complying with current guidance.

At the start of 2002/03 there remained 25 crossings requiring upgrading to meet current standards of provision for people with disabilities. Good progress this year has meant a further 14 upgrades have been provided this year to reduce the remaining list to 11.
To implement measures defined in Pedestrian Action Plans for main town and village centres to improve access for the disabled (to link transport interchanges, car parks and other important facilities) in accordance with the individual programmes identified in such plans.

In 2002/03 the Traffic Management strategies for six towns have been completed and approved by local Members. As part of the approved strategy there is a Pedestrian Action Plan.

The target is to carry out all improvements to access for the disabled as identified by the Pedestrian Action Plans, therefore they will be set as individual targets as identified by the Action Plan. Although no Pedestrian Action Plans have been approved yet improvements to disabled access has carried on in parallel to developing and approving Plans.

Good progress has been made in the six towns with Pedestrian Action Plans. The towns are as follows:-

- Hawes
- Helmsley
- Richmond
- Tadcaster
- Whitby

A further three Traffic Management studies are in progress for Northallerton, Malton/Norton and Easingwold. Work on improving disabled access will be started once the pedestrian actions plans are approved.

In addition, a number of Pedestrian Action Plans are being prepared for some of the smaller towns and larger villages. Work will begin in 2003/04 in implementing any disabled access improvements. The towns and villages are as follows:-

- Settle
- Glusburn/Crosshills/Sutton in Craven
- Pateley Bridge
- Killinghall
- Sherburn in Elmet/South Milford
- Great Ayton
- Filey
- Kirkbymoorside
- Grassington/Threshfield

Progress towards the target will be reported in the next Annual Progress Report.

3. **PROGRAMME FOR 2003/04**

The good progress made on improvements to disabled access are to be followed with another extensive programme of work in 2003/04.

Firstly the budget for general improvements will remain high with an allocation of £180k. This will be used for small scale improvements such as in a village or one-off improvements if requested.
The second area of work will be the continued provision of facilities in connection with public transport. There are three categories of improvement: the provision of bus boarders on new quality corridors, improved disabled access at infrastructure sites and the improved access to railway stations.

The programme for 2003/04 allows for the provision of nine new quality corridors at a cost of £785k.

Work is to begin on a number of new infrastructure improvements such as bus stations and bus shelters. It is likely that a number of these will be constructed within the financial year. However, the largest project, Skipton Bus Station, may take longer to complete. It is hoped that a start on site will be achieved within this financial year.

In the last financial year good progress has been made on creating disabled friendly town centres for those towns which have an approved traffic management strategy. Work will be continuing in the towns such as Skipton. Also there are five strategies currently in progress for Northallerton, Malton/Norton, Easingwold, Selby and Leyburn. These are all at various stages of progress, when any strategies become approved during the financial year then a start can be made on improved disabled access provision.

Previously an audit had been carried out on the access to all the rail stations within North Yorkshire. In 2003/04 work will begin on improving the access arrangements to a number of stations. In order to carry out this work there is an allocation of £125k.

At the same time as these physical measures are being implemented a number of bus contracts will be re-tendered. These will enable the Council to stipulate low floor buses on key routes, through the use of the ‘Premier Specification’ Contract.

4. CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Consultation is a key element of the planning and design of any transport improvements. In the providing of facilities for the disabled the form of consultation can vary greatly.

The simplest form of consultation comes with provision of ad hoc dropped kerb crossings. On these occasions we may have received a simple request from a resident for a crossing at a particular location or along a particular route. In such a case the location for the crossing point would be agreed in consultation of the local Disabled Access Group.

When a scheme such as a Quality Bus Corridor or bus station improvement is being designed the consultation needs to be much more widespread. The impact of such improvements are far more reaching and the level of consultation would be increased to reflect this. Therefore, consultations would include the local District Council and Parish Councils as well as any local special interest groups such as Civic Societies. Any improvements for disabled access the local Disabled Access Groups would be consulted.

A key element of the Local Transport Plan is to develop strategies for traffic management of towns in North Yorkshire. The strategy also contains a pedestrian action plan which encompasses disabled access improvements. For each town an extensive consultation exercise has been carried out to canvass the views of local businesses and residents.

From these consultations a clearly defined strategy has been developed for traffic management, pedestrians and cyclists. On any of the larger projects which form part of a strategy, further consultations will be required as schemes are developed.
A responsive County Council providing good quality and efficient services

Appendix J - Transport Issues and Development
Foreword

by County Councillor Peter Sowray

Following the Environmental Summit meeting in Rio de Janeiro, the approach to the use of the motor car has undergone a radical change. This document, ‘Transport Issues and Development - A Guide’, not only reflects the revised guidance published by central government in Planning Policy Guidance Notes 3 and 13, but also seeks to assist developers and their consultants in the preparation of the information which must be considered along with their planning applications. I hope you find it a useful guide.

Peter Sowray

Executive Member for Environmental Services
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background
In recent years there has been a growing recognition that continued expansion of highway capacity to meet increasing traffic growth is neither desirable nor feasible. A balanced and integrated transport system is therefore being developed which provides a choice of travel mode and encourages the use of alternative ways to travel.

It is now generally accepted that the availability of car parking can have a major influence on the form of transport people use for their journeys. It is therefore essential that the level of parking at new developments is considered within the broader context of land use and transport policy, whilst giving full consideration to local issues and objectives.

The preparation of revised car parking standards for North Yorkshire has been undertaken against the background of the emerging national transport policies launched by the Government's Transport White Paper, advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 (PPG 13) March 2001, the strategy for the Draft Regional Planning Guidance for Yorkshire and Humber and the County Council’s Local Transport Plan.

In particular, PPG 13 contains clear advice on the use of maximum rather than minimum parking standards and presents a set of national maximum standards. This sets a framework for the preparation of parking standards.

In reviewing the standards, it has been necessary to recognise that North Yorkshire is largely rural and that the predominant means of travel for the majority of journeys is the car. However, the County Council considers that priority attention should be given to promoting a shift in mode from car to more environmentally friendly forms of transport including public transport, cycling and walking.

The standards apply to the whole of North Yorkshire including the Yorkshire Dales and North York Moors National Parks. Information contained within this document will be used as a guideline for all proposed developments but may be amended to take account of specific local circumstances relating to individual proposals.

1.2 Report Content
This document is intended to show how the adopted parking standards fit in to the national, regional and local land use and transport planning policy and provides guidance on their use. It addresses the following specific issues:

- implications;
- transport assessments;
- travel plans;
- application of standards in North Yorkshire;
- guidance on developer contributions.
2.0 Policy Context

2.1 Introduction
This chapter considers the background to the development of the standards, reflecting the policy objectives set out in the Transport White Paper, Planning Policy Guidance Notes and the requirements of Regional Planning Guidance. In addition, reference is made to relevant local policies.

2.2 National Policy

Transport White Paper
The UK Integrated Transport White Paper, ‘A New Deal for Transport, Better for Everyone’ was published in July 1998, and set out a new approach to transport policy and links between transport and other policy objectives. In so doing, it established a framework for detailed policies to be developed and implemented.

A key proposal contained within the White Paper is for Regional Planning Guidance to contain a Regional Transport Strategy, which would be developed by the regional conferences. It states that:

*The regional conferences will use Regional Planning Guidance to integrate the planning of major new development at the regional level and the identification of regional transport investment and management priorities. In doing so, the conferences will need to consider including in the Regional Planning Guidance:

- guidance for development plans on the approach to be taken to standards for off-street car parking provision, relating these to accessibility by public transport.*

At the local level, the White Paper suggests that “…for new developments the planning policies now being implemented should ensure that car parking space is limited to the minimum necessary and that full provision is made for public transport access.”

With regard to planning policies on maximum parking standards, the White Paper states that the Government “will ensure that development plan policies for parking support our policies for the location of development. Parking standards should be devised and applied having regard to the accessibility of locations by modes other than the car.”

Clearly, the Integrated Transport White Paper sets out the framework for the development of parking standards, with guidance provided at the regional level for implementation within development plans.

PPG 13
Pertinent national policy guidance is provided in Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport (PPG 13). In March 2001, PPG 13 was published with the objectives to integrate planning and transport at a national, regional and local level to:
• promote more sustainable transport choices for both people and for moving freight;
• promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling;
• reduce the need to travel, especially by car.

In respect of parking, the document states that it is necessary to use parking policies, alongside other planning and transport measures, to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce reliance on the car for work and other journeys. In addition, the levels of good quality cycle parking need to be increased to promote cycle use. An emphasis is also placed on the requirement for strong locational policies in development plans intended to increase the effectiveness of transport policies and help to maximise the contribution of transport to improving the quality of life.

PPG 13 also states that policies on parking should be co-ordinated with parking controls and charging, and be consistent with the Regional Transport Strategy. In particular, when developing and implementing policies on parking, local authorities should:
• ensure that levels of parking in association with development will promote sustainable transport choices;
• not require developers to provide more spaces than they themselves wish;
• encourage the shared use of parking, particularly in town centres and as part of major proposals;
• take care not to create perverse incentives for development to locate away from town centres;
• where appropriate, introduce on-street parking controls to minimise the potential displacement of parking;
• consider appropriate provision for motorcycle parking;
• require convenient cycle parking in developments.

PPG 13 states that development plans should set maximum levels of parking for broad classes of development. The revised document sets out maximum national parking standards, with regional and local planning authorities being encouraged to adopt more rigorous standards, where appropriate.
The standards in PPG 13 should be applied as a maximum throughout England for all developments above a certain threshold size. For small developments, which will represent a large proportion in rural areas, local authorities should set levels of parking appropriate to reflect local circumstances.

PPG 13 also introduces the use of Transport Assessments to replace Traffic Impact Assessments. In both cases, the emphasis is on the delivery of sustainable transport objectives.

### PPG 3
Policies on the development of housing are set out in PPG 3 Housing. To promote more sustainable residential environments, both within and outside existing urban areas, PPG 3 states that local planning authorities should promote:

- development that is linked to public transport;
- mixed use development;
- a greener residential environment;
- greater emphasis on quality and designing places for people;
- the most efficient use of land.

The guidance reinforces the need for local authorities to revise parking standards to allow for significantly lower levels of off-street parking provision, particularly for developments:

- in locations such as towns, where services are readily available by walking, cycling and public transport;
- which provide housing for elderly people, students and single people; and
- involving the conversion of housing or non residential properties where off-street parking is less likely to be successfully designed in to the scheme.

Developments with more than an average of 1.5 off-street parking spaces per dwelling are unlikely to accord with the Government’s policies relating to sustainable residential developments.

### 2.3 Regional Planning Guidance
Regional Planning Guidance for Yorkshire and the Humber to 2016 (RPG 12) was published by the then Secretary of State for Transport, Local Government and the Regions in October 2001. It set out policies for the future pattern of economic development, the scale and location of new housing, improvements to transport, infrastructure and environmental and natural resource protection.

Policy T2 of RPG 12 states inter alia that there should be a consistent approach to the formulation of parking strategies adopted across the region to assist in reducing road traffic. This includes the introduction of maximum parking standards through planning controls for new developments in step with location and land use type.

Paragraph 7.40 of RPG 12 states that local authorities need to develop an integrated strategy on parking utilising planning policies and transport powers.

Paragraph 7.42 states that in preparing development plans local planning authorities should take account of the parking standards set out in Table 7.4.

It advises that these are maximum parking standards expressed as ranges which provide a framework to enable local planning authorities to set out in their development plans more specific standards based on the particular characteristics of their areas.

Paragraph 7.43 establishes that, in arriving at the appropriate standards for each land use and for
each location type, local authorities should take into account:

- the size of the settlement, particularly the level of public transport provision;
- the relative economic strength of an area;
- proximity to competing areas both within and outside the region taking into consideration the context set by the standards adopted in adjoining and competing areas.

### 2.4 Local Policies

North Yorkshire County Council’s Local Transport Plan contains policies that seek to encourage the use of public transport, cycling and walking. In relation to car parking for new developments, the LTP states that:

- the concept of maximum parking standards is accepted;
- the application of a common set of national standards is not appropriate, as they should reflect the nature of the particular area;
- the adoption of a range of standards, which recognise the variable nature of an area, is supported;
- more wide-ranging Transport Assessments should be undertaken to assess the impact of new developments and to identify the contributions required from the Developer for improvements in highway/transport provision to and from the development site. This will replace the previously adopted commuted payment scheme, which was based on minimum car parking standards.

The County Council is committed to the development and implementation of Travel Plans for both new and existing developments.
3.0 Transport Assessments

3.1 Introduction
Transport Assessments together with Travel Plans are important tools to help show that all modes of travel are being encouraged and how easy it is to get to and from the site by each mode taking into account journey time, safety, public transport frequency, quality and access for disabled people.

To enable the Council to consider the issue of accessibility, Developers who apply for planning permission for larger developments will be asked to submit a Transport Assessment. The amount of work involved in preparing a Transport Assessment will depend on the impact of the development; for smaller schemes this could be little more than a letter, for larger schemes this is likely to be the traditional fully bound report.

At present, guidance on the form of assessment is provided in the Institute of Highways and Transportation ‘Guidelines for Traffic Impact Assessment’, although this is programmed to be updated through new government guidance. In all cases, the need for, and scope of, a Transport Assessment should be agreed with officers of the Council at an early stage in the planning process. Where appropriate, a scoping study should be submitted in advance of the commencement of the Transport Assessment.

In addition, significant proposals, as defined in Paragraph 3.2 below, should be supported by a statement which sets out the applicant's/occupant's company Travel Plan. The Council will be looking to ensure that Travel Plans encourage travel choice by promoting walking, cycling and public transport. Travel Plans are discussed in more detail later. The aims of a Travel Plan should be achievable and measurable. This accords with the Government's advice offered in PPG 13.

A Transport Assessment is expected to be an impartial report undertaken by an appropriately qualified professional employed by the Developer. It describes the effects of a development on the local highway network, and considers its accessibility by all modes of transport equally. This includes outlining both the positive and negative consequences of the development on the existing and/or proposed highway infrastructure.
In all cases it is recommended that a two-stage approach be adopted, since experience has shown that this can lead to a speedier acceptance of the Transport Assessment.

**Stage 1**
Establish the scope of the study, agree basic assumptions and confirm those areas of the study which are not needed with the appropriate officers of the Council, who will seek to deal with your request promptly.

**Stage 2**
Production of the Transport Assessment. Demonstrating how accessible the development is by all modes of transport.

The contents of a Transport Assessment will depend on the size, nature and location of a development. Smaller developments, at or around the trigger levels set out in Paragraph 3.2, will usually only be asked to show the following details, and these can be provided in letter form:

- **Policy framework**;
- **Existing highway conditions**;
  - how accessible the development is by all modes of transport;
  - whether the site access can accommodate the predicted level of traffic, if any;
  - what measures can be undertaken to encourage travel by walking, cycling and public transport;
  - trip generation and distribution;
  - future traffic conditions;
  - road safety;
  - conclusions and recommendations.

Larger developments, and/or those in critical locations, may also be required to investigate road links and junctions remote from the site that might be affected, again where possible these should be agreed in advance. However, in all cases developments should, wherever possible, not be designed on the assumption that the car will be the only realistic means of travel for the majority of people.

The guidance set out in this advice note does not necessarily reflect the views of the neighbouring Highway Authorities. Developers should seek the requirements of the relevant Highway Authority for any proposal that will have a material impact outside this Authority's boundary or on the Trunk Road network.
3.2 Priorities and Trigger Criteria

Developers should be aware that the Council’s Local Transport Plan seeks to:

- promote social equality by providing genuine choices of travel mode;
- limit traffic growth by reducing the need to travel and developing alternative non-car modes;
- provide a safe, efficient and well maintained highway network;
- minimise the adverse impact of traffic on the environment;
- provide a quality public transport system for as many residents as possible;
- reduce the number and severity of casualties arising from road accidents in the County;
- facilitate opportunities for economic regeneration, growth and the sustainable movement of goods.

When planning new developments a balance needs to be struck between different road users. The priorities, in order, are:

- Pedestrians
- Cyclists
- Vehicles

The hierarchy of transport users above sets out the priority for balancing out the competing needs of different road users. It does not mean that those users higher up this list will be provided for regardless of the consequences. As a guide, when providing for vehicular access, pedestrians must not be disadvantaged by severance, whereas when considering improvements for pedestrians the loss of some vehicular capacity could be considered, provided it would not cause congestion or delays.

As a guide, the following table sets out the site area, or minimum gross floor area (GFA), above which the Council would expect a planning application to be supported by a Transport Assessment. [Please note that the Council reserves the right to request a Transport Assessment in other instances; for example where the location and/or nature of the development are of a particularly sensitive nature.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Site area</th>
<th>GFA/units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food-retail</td>
<td>0.2 Ha</td>
<td>1,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-food retail</td>
<td>0.8 Ha</td>
<td>1,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (B1)</td>
<td>0.8 Ha</td>
<td>2,500m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry (B2/B8)</td>
<td>2.0 Ha</td>
<td>6,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.0 Ha</td>
<td>80 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>60+ vehicle movements in any hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the detailed consideration of other modes of transport, the Transport Assessment must consider (as a broad guide) any link or junction where total flows and/or individual turning movements are likely to be increased by 5% or more during any individual hour. In locations where, in the opinion of the Council, problems are already being encountered a smaller percentage may be considered a material concern, and therefore may also require investigation.

For developments with little or no car parking, but exceeding the above trigger levels, a Transport Assessment would still normally be required to consider in detail access by foot, cycle or public transport.

3.3 The Contents of a Transport Assessment
The contents of any individual Transport Assessment will be dependent on the size and complexity of the development proposal, but as a guide larger schemes should address the following points. To assist, a checklist is included in Appendix D.

Introduction
This should include a summary of the development including details of the proposed floor area, site composition, existing/historic use(s) of the site, and current traffic generation. The site location should also be described in relation to the local highway network.

Policy Framework
This should set out, in summary form, relevant local and national policies that shape the priority and focus of the Transport Assessment. Compliance with other local policies, especially the Local Transport Plan, current Regional Planning Guidance, the Government’s Planning Policy Guidance Notes and the relevant District Wide Local Plan must be demonstrated.

Existing/Future Highway Conditions
The existing highway layout should be described in relation to the proposed development. Existing traffic flows at all critical periods, as agreed between the developer and the Council, should be set out in the appendices to the report. The prevailing highway conditions should also be described, including existing facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport etc. The injury accident record (for the previous three-year period) must be examined to identify existing and potential problem areas.

Data can be supplied upon payment of the appropriate fee. Proposed or committed highway works, along with other developments (for which planning consent has already been granted, or is currently being sought) should be described in the Transport Assessment, detailing how these works will alter the existing traffic conditions. This is known as establishing the “base-traffic conditions”.

Attraction
The potential generation of the site must be described. Traditionally this has focused on car generation. However, to check the infrastructure adequacy, pedestrian, bicycle and public transport attraction should also be quantified. To do this it is important to consider the likely numbers of people arriving by each different mode of transport, then assess the suitability of such routes/modes. When considering vehicles, the use of 85th percentile trip rates will be expected. Trip rate methodology should be explained and justified, mindful of local travel patterns. Furthermore, the trip rates used must relate to the car parking levels being proposed within the site and the modal split assumptions. Car and bicycle parking should accord with the Council’s parking guidelines.
**Catchment**
Assumptions on numbers of pass-by, diverted, multi-purpose and newly generated trips should be justified and agreed with the Council.

**Future Traffic Conditions**
This should be the base-traffic conditions modified to reflect traffic growth in the design year, 15 years after opening, and altered to reflect the impact of the proposed development. The appendices must clearly demonstrate how the various changes to the base-traffic conditions have been built up (base flows + other committed developments + growth + network changes + new development traffic). In all cases growth assumptions must be justified. In addition consideration must be given to other critical times such as weekends, evenings and holiday periods.

**Assessment**
The Transport Assessment will be required to assess how easy it is to get to the site by comparing the different modes.

**Pedestrians**
Research suggests that 83% of pedestrian journeys are up to 1 mile in length. Direct pedestrian routes to/from/within the development, linking to the surrounding residential/business/shopping areas, public transport facilities and other attractions should be described. The suitability of routes (widths of footways, carriageways, surfacing, lighting, safety, dropped crossings, tactile paving, signing etc.) should be considered, especially for the less mobile. Conflict with vehicular traffic must be mitigated (which might include speed reduction measures) and severance created by roads/railways/rivers etc. addressed. Undertaking a Pedestrian Audit is a good way to go about this exercise. The internal site layout must be designed to encourage walking and the Transport Assessment must show how the layout provides:

- direct routes, which follow desire lines;
- a site which is fully accessible;
- routes that are safe, have natural surveillance and avoid secluded areas;
- routes that avoid the need for pedestrians to have to cross large areas of car parking, wide junctions or areas liable to being obstructed.

**Cyclists**
Research suggests that 95% of bicycle journeys are up to 5 miles in length. Bicycle access to/from/within the site must be considered. Direct links between the development, the local road network and
existing/proposed bicycle routes should be assessed for adequacy. Provision/enhancement of bicycle routes must be considered, including lighting, signing, bicycle lanes, facilities at junctions, off-road routes etc. In addition, the provision of bicycle parking at nearby off-site facilities, such as shops and services, is important in improving their accessibility by non-car modes.

Facilities for cyclists within the site should be provided in accordance with the County Council’s standards. These should be described. Facilities may include covered secure bicycle parking located in prominent and visible locations, shower/changing and locker facilities, etc. Bicycle parking provision must accord to the Highway Authority’s standards. Undertaking a Cycle Audit is a good way to go about this exercise.

Public Transport
The level and frequency of public transport services (bus and train where appropriate) at different times of the day and week must be set out in the Transport Assessment.

The location of stops/stations/park and ride sites must be appropriate to the development. This includes ensuring that services are close by, have quality facilities to encourage use (such as shelters, bicycle parking facilities, lighting, customer information, etc.) and are seen as accessible and safe. Access on foot to/from stops must also be considered. This will include the ability for pedestrians to cross roads to/from the stop/station on the opposite side of a road. In the case of employment, retail or leisure developments the catchment areas by public transport must be analysed, with the aim of highlighting those catchment areas which are poorly served. Dependent upon the scale of the development, appropriate improvements can then be considered, including pump-priming. Again, the internal site layout must be shown to have been designed to encourage public transport use. In larger sites this could mean public transport penetration into the site.
**Vehicles**
Capacity calculations should be undertaken at critical junctions. Capacity of links and junctions should then be established, with mitigating improvements proposed if necessary. Normally this would be when the ratio of flow to capacity exceeds 85-90% or where queues would have an adverse effect. Of particular concern is the consequential impact on residential streets, where problems associated with inappropriate traffic or increased parking could be introduced/increased.

**Other Issues**
Consideration must also be given to existing accident data to ensure that problems are not exacerbated. The Transport Assessment should clearly set out the requirement for possible Traffic Regulation Orders that might affect the local highways. Servicing, parking and manoeuvring within the site must also be considered. Where changes are being proposed to the highway layout, improvements should include adequate provision to accommodate the needs of the disabled, cyclists and pedestrians. The use of railways/waterways for freight transport purposes is particularly encouraged at appropriate sites as this avoids unnecessarily utilising the public highway network. Air quality, noise and other transport related environmental issues should be discussed at this stage. Accommodation works for neighbouring properties affected by any improvements will also need to be considered. These properties may also be eligible for claims pursuant to the Land Compensation Act 1973. The County Council will pass such claims to the developer.

**Accessibility for Emergency Vehicles**
The Transport Assessment must consider and comment on the accessibility of the development to the emergency services, in particular the Fire and Rescue Service.

**Road Safety**
In many cases, where changes are being made to the public highway or where significant lengths of new roads are being constructed, a Road Safety Audit will be required. The Council can offer further advice on this requirement.

**3.4 Conclusions**
The Transport Assessment must realistically summarise the findings and proposed advantages and disadvantages of the development, clearly detailing any transport measures (including Traffic Regulation Orders) which may be required. This should be written in the form of a non-technical executive summary.

Experience has shown that a scoping meeting with appropriate highway authority officers, prior to the drafting of the Transport Assessment, can save considerable time, money and frustration. Such a meeting is useful to agree the basic assumptions to be used in the Transport Assessment.

A Transport Assessment is a publicly available reference document and may be read by people who are less familiar with technical terms (e.g. members of the public, etc.). Consequently, the report should be written with such an audience in mind and include a non-technical summary. Technical data and calculations etc. should only appear in appendices with the results summarised within the main text of the report.
4.1 Introduction
The adoption of the maximum parking standards assumes that a range of measures will be adopted to encourage the use of non-car modes of transport. The County Council is keen to enable all types of developments from business to retail, residential to leisure, to develop and promote travel choice. This is done through the ‘Travel Plan’ (formally known as a Green Transport Plan). The Travel Plan is a travel policy statement prepared by an individual business which positively increases travel options for staff, visitors and customers. It will affect travel to and from the site as well as travel during the working day. It should comply with local and national policy on transport, be agreed by the Council and have measurable and achievable outputs which relate to the targets set out in the Local Transport Plan.

It is believed that businesses could benefit significantly from preparing and operating a Travel Plan. For example, savings arise through construction and land costs (from reduced car parking numbers etc.) or charging for parking. Savings could then be utilised to fund the other measures. Additionally, within a congested network, experience has shown cycling can be more time efficient than driving for shorter journeys. Walking and cycling is also better for the health of staff, thereby potentially reducing sickness absence. In the March 1999 Budget, the Government introduced a package of tax measures to help employers establish their Travel Plan and in the March 2001 Budget, increased the tax free bicycle mileage allowance to 20p per mile.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 states that the Government wants to help raise awareness of the impacts of travel decisions. The role of Travel Plans should:

- positively encourage sustainable travel choice, by increasing walking, cycling and use of public transport;
- reduce traffic speeds and improve road safety and personal security;
- where practical, consider more environmentally friendly delivery and freight movements, including home delivery services.

4.0 Travel Plans
Although no standard format exists for Travel Plans, a significant amount of guidance is available. When the need for a Travel Plan is identified, it should be worked up in conjunction with officers of North Yorkshire County Council and local transport providers.

4.2 What a Travel Plan Can and Cannot Do

It is important to note that a Travel Plan is not a substitute for a sustainable development. If the Transport Assessment suggests that the proposal is inherently serviceable only by car, then a travel plan will not be sufficient to rectify this. Government estimates suggest that a 20% reduction in car traffic is possible in urban areas with good public transport provision. For North Yorkshire a reduction of 10% may represent an upper limit.

If local traffic problems are such that planning applications have previously been refused, then unless a 10% reduction in car traffic would rectify these problems then a Travel Plan will not normally be sufficient to make an application acceptable.

A Travel Plan that consists solely of promotional measures (such as provision of bus timetables) may have no measurable effect whatsoever. Where significant change is required, the Travel Plan will have to include both promotional ‘carrots’ and car disincentive ‘sticks’.

A Travel Plan will not be a substitute for other areas of good planning. A site that proposes excessive numbers of car parking spaces may not be redeemable by a Travel Plan.
4.3 Triggers
The submission of a Travel Plan will be required as part of the supporting documentation for planning applications which are likely to have significant transport implications, and will include:

- all major commercial, retail and leisure development; this could involve a number of smaller employers joining together;
- smaller commercial, retail and leisure developments which could result in traffic levels being raised, in or near to air quality management areas or in other locations where local traffic reduction initiatives have been set;
- new and expanded school facilities should be accompanied by a school travel plan. Schools are a special case in which the majority of users will be encouraged to arrive on foot. In North Yorkshire, school bus passenger numbers can approach 1,000 pupils at a large secondary school and this will need careful treatment;
- where a Travel Plan would help to address a particular local traffic problem, which may have resulted in a planning application being refused;
- the parking provision proposed is in excess of the recommended maximum standard.

4.4 Issues for Inclusion
There are many measures that could be included in a Travel Plan. Some ideas are:

- setting targets for the use of alternative means of transport based, where available, on the results of a Travel Survey questionnaire;
- annual monitoring of staff travel and submission of a report to the Highway Authority;
- appointment of a travel co-ordinator to manage the Travel Plan, monitor its success and refine it annually in agreement with the North Yorkshire County Council;
- introduction of flexible working hours;
- provision of safe and secure cycle parking;
- use of low emission fuel vehicles especially for pool cars;
- provision of lockers, clothes drying, showering and changing facilities for walkers/cyclists;
- promotion of cycle and pedestrian routes;
- control of parking;
- promotion of local bus facilities;
- where appropriate, restriction of car parking spaces in favour of car sharers/energy efficient vehicles;
- organisation of a car-share database;
- guaranteed lift home (or taxi) in an emergency;
- provision of interest free loans for cycle purchase and/or public transport tickets;
- cycle shop discounts;
- provision of pool cars and pool bikes for the site occupants’ use;
- inclusion of IT services such as teleconferencing within the design of the building to reduce the need to travel;
- home-working;
- improving public transport;
- company bike provision;
- competitive cycle mileage rates.

Clearly this list is not exhaustive, but it should be helpful as a guide.
4.5 Residential Areas
For residential schemes a formal Travel Plan is not expected but the development should promote travel choice. The principle means by which walking and cycling can be encouraged in residential developments is by a road layout that is permeable and legible. Vehicle speeds should be low and ‘Home Zone’ design principles should be used to give walkers and cyclists a perceived priority. A site with fast roads, wide junctions and discontinuous footpaths will not be redeemable by the subsequent addition of ‘token’ cycle parking stands.

Soft measures to be used as incentives to promote travel choice will be dependent upon the size of the scheme, but might include (but not be limited to):

- safe, secure and enclosed bicycle parking;
- offer free or subsidised bicycles to buyers;
- IT links and computers to facilitate home-working;
- develop a site Intranet with travel information;
- include public transport, pedestrian and cycle route information in buyers packs;
- offer free first year public transport season tickets;
- introducing car pooling or shared car ownership (over 200 units are needed to be viable).

4.6 Assessment of Travel Plans
The weight given to the Travel Plan will be influenced by the extent to which it is anticipated to materially affect the acceptability of the development proposed, and the degree to which it can be enforced. Under certain circumstances some or all of a plan may be made binding either through conditions attached to a planning permission or through a related planning obligation, usually in the form of a Section 106 Agreement. Conditions attached to a planning permission will be enforceable against any developer who implements that permission and any subsequent occupiers of the property. Planning obligations will be enforceable against the person who entered into the obligation and any person succeeding in title to that person.

In the case of a speculative development, a planning condition will be imposed, requiring businesses to submit and agree the Travel Plan prior to occupation of the site, although ‘Heads of Terms’ will be agreed at the planning stage.

Further information relating to the preparation and implementation of a Travel Plan should be obtained from ‘The Benefits of Travel Plans’, published by the DETR. There are many useful documents within which further information on Transport Assessments and Travel Plans can be found. Some of these include details of successful Travel Plans.

Advice to assist businesses in the establishment of Travel Plans is available through the County Council’s Travel Awareness Officer.
5.0 Application of Parking Standards

5.1 Approach Adopted
North Yorkshire is essentially a rural county covering approximately 3,100 square miles but having a population of only just over 575,000. Overall, there are on average 185 people per square mile in the County. This compares to:

- 950 people per sq. mile throughout England;
- 1,700 people per sq. mile in York;
- 7,000 people per sq. mile in Middlesbrough.

This low population density in the majority of the County gives rise to a modest number of relatively small towns serving large rural hinterlands. Exceptions to this includes Harrogate/Knaresborough and Scarborough. As a consequence people will often have to travel a significant distance to work and to shop, and for personal business, leisure and education. Such journeys in many cases will be too long to walk or cycle and the paucity of public transport means many are reliant on private cars if they are available.

The modest number of relatively small towns serving large rural hinterlands gives rise to a low population density in the majority of the County.

This reliance on private cars is evident from car ownership data. Whereas the average number of cars owned per household in Yorkshire and Humberside is 0.91, in North Yorkshire the ratio is 24% higher at 1.13 and in Hambleton District is as high as 1.28 per household.

Whilst it is necessary to comply with the national and regional guidance, a flexible approach is required to take account of local circumstances. Consequently, in reviewing parking standards for this document, allowance has been made for particular local circumstances in deriving the appropriate standard.

5.2 Cycle Parking
The Government wishes to promote cycling, which has clear potential as a substitute for short car trips. The National Cycling Strategy included a target of doubling (on 1996 figures) the number of cycle trips by 2002, and doubling them again by 2012. The Transport White Paper subsequently endorsed these targets and reaffirmed the important contribution that cycling can make.

A component part of encouraging cycling is the provision of appropriate cycle parking facilities and cycle route connections within new developments. PPG 13 states that in determining planning applications, local authorities should:

“... seek the provision of convenient, safe and secure cycle parking and changing facilities in developments...”
The adopted cycle parking standards are shown in Appendix A and facilities for cyclists in Appendix B.

In terms of facilities, the following should be taken into account in the design and layout of new developments:

**Employment**
Cycle parking associated with employment development, should be secure and undercover, and where possible within the confines of the building. Shower and locker facilities should also be provided as part of the development.

**Retail and Leisure**
Cycle parking associated with retail and leisure development, should be secure and undercover. The employment component should accord with the specific requirements identified within this policy and should be accommodated on-site. Provision should be made in association with central retail developments and should be accommodated on-street.

Cycle facilities for new developments should seek to integrate with existing and proposed cycle networks, as defined by North Yorkshire County Council. Early discussions should take place with the local highway authority to determine the extent and form of any off-site cycle facilities.

### 5.3 Car Parking
The standards set out in Appendix A give the operational and non-operational car parking requirements for new developments.

These are maximum parking standards, with different values dependent on accessibility to public transport and proximity of differing land uses. The following areas are defined:

| Inner Urban Central Cores                              | Harrogate and Knaresborough  
|                                                       | Scarborough  
| Urban Areas                                           | Harrogate and Knaresborough  
|                                                       | Scarborough  
| Market Towns                                          | Filey  
|                                                       | Knaresborough  
|                                                       | Malton/Norton  
|                                                       | Northallerton  
|                                                       | Richmond/Catterick  
|                                                       | Ripon  
|                                                       | Selby  
|                                                       | Skipton  
|                                                       | Thirsk  
|                                                       | Whitby  

All areas other than those defined above
Plans defining the urban areas and market towns can be found in the appropriate Local Plan. In defining the standards, it has been acknowledged that the majority of new developments in rural areas and market towns will fall below the threshold values specified in the draft Regional Transport Strategy.

A flexible approach should be taken in using the standards so that each development proposal is assessed on its merit. A lower parking provision may be appropriate, particularly in more central locations where public transport provision is greater, depending on the circumstances of each case. This should be established from early discussions with the highway authority. All parking layouts must be designed in such a way that pedestrian and cyclist safety and convenience have absolute priority. There should be no requirement for cyclists or pedestrians to cross car park or service access roads to gain access to buildings.

5.4 Powered Two Wheeled Parking

Given the increasing use of motorcycles and scooters, adequate provision should be made for parking at new developments. The following standard applies to all commercial, retail and leisure uses:

- 1 powered two wheeled space equivalent for every 1000m² GFA.

These spaces should be additional to the number of required car parking spaces.

5.5 Parking for People with Mobility Problems

The needs of people with disabilities should be properly provided for in the design of parking areas, and reduced parking levels should not apply to the provision of such spaces. Parking for the disabled should be additional to the adopted maximum parking standards.

A provision equal to 6% of spaces should be designated for people with disabilities, with a minimum of 1 space for employment developments, and 3 spaces for retail/leisure developments above 1000m².

The spaces need to be extra wide to cater for wheelchair manoeuvring and be located as close as practical to building entrances. The kerb adjoining these spaces should be dropped along the entire length of the parking spaces to facilitate ease of movement for wheelchair users.
These wider bays should be provided from the opening of the facility and not created from standard bays as an afterthought.

5.6 Developer Contributions
PPG 13 states that “Given that there should be no minimum parking requirements for development, it is inappropriate for a local authority to seek commuted payments based purely around the lack of parking on the site.”

However, the collection of contributions is still reasonable to ensure the full transport costs of new developments are covered by the developers. Where appropriate, contributions will be sought to provide for the following:

- public transport services;
- bus priority measures;
- cycling and walking facilities;
- park and ride facilities;
- traffic management and safety schemes;
- parking controls and enforcement;
- highway improvements;
- other provisions which are considered appropriate.

5.7 Access and Parking for Service Vehicles
Operational space for service vehicles is required, normally within the site, which will adequately cater for the expected servicing needs of the development. The applicant will need to demonstrate that the servicing requirements will not result in an adverse effect on the safety of pedestrians or other vehicles or cause congestion on the adjacent highway network.

Service vehicles should be able to enter and leave the development site in forward gear, and wherever possible, be segregated from all other vehicles. In certain instances, timing restrictions may be applied for deliveries.
Notes on the application of the standards

1. Plans defining the urban areas and market towns can be found in the appropriate Local Plan.

2. These are maximum parking standards, with different values dependent on accessibility to public transport proximity of differing land uses and location.

3. A flexible approach should be taken in using the standards so that each development proposal is assessed on its merit. A lower parking provision may be appropriate, particularly in more central locations where public transport provision is greater, depending on the circumstances of each case. This should be established from early discussions with the highway authority.

4. Operational parking space is defined as the space required for cars and other vehicles regularly and necessarily involved in the operation of the business of particular buildings. It includes space for commercial vehicles delivering goods to or collecting them from the buildings, space for loading and unloading and for picking up and setting down of passengers.

5. Where no operational requirement is specified, adequate provision for servicing must be provided. This should include sufficient space to allow the maximum number and size of vehicles likely to serve the development at any one time to manoeuvre with ease and stand for loading and unloading without inconvenience to other users of the site.

6. Staff requirements quoted refer to the likely maximum number of staff to be present on site at the busiest time.

7. In a number of cases, new development will incorporate more than one land use. In these circumstances, the standards applicable to each use simultaneously will be demanded.

8. All parking layouts must be designed in such a way that pedestrian and cyclist safety and convenience have absolute priority.

9. Where a specific category is not listed standards will be determined by negotiation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Cycle Parking (Minimum)</th>
<th>Operational Requirement</th>
<th>Vehicular Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Nursery Schools</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> 1 space/5 staff</td>
<td>Facility for contract buses and parents to pick up and set down as appropriate</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> 1 space/1 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Travel Plan</td>
<td><strong>Visitors</strong> 1 space/6 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Students</strong> 1 space/5 students</td>
<td>Facility for contract buses and parents to pick up and set down as appropriate</td>
<td><strong>Students</strong> 1 space/3 sixth forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Travel Plan</td>
<td><strong>Students</strong> 1 space/15 sixth forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Primary and Secondary Schools</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> 1 space/5 staff</td>
<td>Facility for contract buses and parents to pick up and set down as appropriate</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> 1 space/1 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Travel Plan</td>
<td><strong>Students</strong> 1 space/5 sixth forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Students</strong> 1 space/5 students</td>
<td>Facility for contract buses and parents to pick up and set down as appropriate</td>
<td><strong>Students</strong> 1 space/20 sixth forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Sixth Form Colleges and Colleges of FE</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> 1 space/5 staff</td>
<td>Facility for contract buses and parents to pick up and set down as appropriate</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> 1 space/1 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Travel Plan</td>
<td><strong>Students</strong> 1 space/5 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Students</strong> 1 space/5 students</td>
<td>Facility for contract buses and parents to pick up and set down as appropriate</td>
<td><strong>Students</strong> 1 space/20 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Health Centres Doctors' Surgeries Veterinary Surgeries Dentists' Surgeries</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>1 space/3 consulting rooms</td>
<td>1 space/doctor or nurse Facility for patients to pick up and set down as appropriate Disabled parking</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> 1 space/every 3 other staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 spaces/consulting room</td>
<td><strong>Patients</strong> 1 space/consulting room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Patients</strong> 1 space/2 consulting rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING STANDARDS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Cycle Parking (Minimum)</th>
<th>Operational Requirement</th>
<th>Vehicular Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non Operational Requirements (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Market Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Libraries/Museums/Art Galleries</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>1 space/300 m² GFA as appropriate.</td>
<td>space for mobile library van as appropriate.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/2 members of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/30 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Business Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/30 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Office</td>
<td>B1/</td>
<td>1 space/150 m² GFA</td>
<td>space for deliveries</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/30 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/50 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/150 m² GFA</td>
<td>1 suitably located space to accommodate security van for banks and building societies and other deliveries in a town centre location</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/50 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Manufacturing</td>
<td>B2 to B7</td>
<td>1 space/200 m² GFA</td>
<td>1 service vehicle space/500m² GFA</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/50 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/200 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/300 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Warehousing</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>1 space/400 m² GFA</td>
<td>1 service vehicle space/250 m² GFA</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/200 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/300 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plus for office areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/30m² GFA</td>
<td>1 space/300m² GFA</td>
<td>Plus for office areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plus for office areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/50m² GFA</td>
<td>1 space/300m² GFA</td>
<td>Plus for office areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/150 m² GFA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/30 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/40 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/50 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Use Class</td>
<td>Cycle Parking (Minimum)</td>
<td>Operational Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Hotels/Motels</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1 space/10 bedrooms</td>
<td>1 space/resident member of staff Coach pick up/set down Taxi/car pick up/set down Space for deliveries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guests 1 space/bedroom and 1 coach space/100 bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff 1 space/3 non-residential staff (plus requirement for public facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guests, Non-residential staff 1 space/2 bedrooms (plus requirement for public facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guests, Non-residential staff 1 space/2 bedrooms (plus requirement for public facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Guest Houses</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>space/10 bedrooms</td>
<td>1 space/resident member of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guests 1 space/bedroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guests 1 space/2 bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guests 1 space/2 bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Restaurants</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>1 space/50 m² PFA</td>
<td>Taxi/car pick up/set down space for deliveries Note: these standards may be varied for town centre sites depending on the availability of public car parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(minimum 4 spaces)</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/3 staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customers 1 space/4 seats or 1 space/5 m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customers 1 space/8 seats or 1 space/10 m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff 1 space/5 staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customers 1 space/12 seats or 1 space/20 m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Public Houses/Licensed Clubs</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>space/10 m² PFA</td>
<td>Space for deliveries Note: these standards may be varied for town centre sites depending on the availability of public car parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff 1 space/3 staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customers 1 space/2 m² public space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customers 1 space/4 m² public space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customers 1 space/8 m² public space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Use Class</td>
<td>Cycle Parking (Minimum)</td>
<td>Operational Requirement</td>
<td>Vehicular Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Public Halls/Places of Assembly/Community Centres/Places of Worship</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>1 space/25 m² GFA</td>
<td>space for deliveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Garages/Service Stations/Car Repair Workshops</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1 space/6 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paint/Body Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Motorist Centres</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1 space/6 staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Parking Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Cycle Parking (Minimum)</th>
<th>Operational Requirement</th>
<th>Non Operational Requirements (Maximum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail</strong></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 space/200 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/100 m² GFA</td>
<td>1 service vehicle space/500 m² GFA</td>
<td>Rural Areas: 1 space/30 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;Market Towns: 1 space/40 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;Urban Areas: 1 space/50 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;Shared in a public parking area and not allocated to individual units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Town Centre/ Neighbourhood shops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Customers</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 space/200 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/500 m² GFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Supermarkets (under 1000 m² GFA)</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 space/200 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/500 m² GFA</td>
<td>1 service vehicle space/500 m² GFA</td>
<td>1 space/14 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/20 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/25 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Superstores (over 1000 m² GFA)</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 space/200 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/750 m² GFA</td>
<td>1 service vehicle space/750 m² GFA</td>
<td>1 space/14 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/18 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/20 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) DIY Stores/ Retail Warehousing</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 space/200 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/750 m² GFA</td>
<td>1 service vehicle space/500 m² GFA</td>
<td>1 space/20 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/25 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/30 m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Garden Centres</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 space/200 m² GFA&lt;br&gt;1 space/750 m² GFA</td>
<td>1 service vehicle space/1000 m² GDA (Gross Display Area)&lt;br&gt;Staff 1 space/100 m² GDA&lt;br&gt;Customers 1 space/25 m² GDA</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/100 m² GDA&lt;br&gt;Customers 1 space/25 m² GDA&lt;br&gt;N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Use Class</td>
<td>Cycle Parking (Minimum)</td>
<td>Operational Requirement</td>
<td>Vehicular Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14 Entertainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Cinemas and Theatres excluding multiplexes</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>1 space/50 seats</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/3 staff</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/5 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patrons 1 space/5 seats</td>
<td>Patrons 1 space/10 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patrons none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Dance Hall/ Discotheque</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>1 space/50 m²</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/3 staff</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/5 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patrons 1 space/10 m²</td>
<td>Patrons none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public floor area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15 Sports/Leisure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Indoor/ Outdoor Stadia inc Rugby League/ Football Stadia/ Cricket Grounds</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/10 staff</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/2 staff</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/4 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Players &amp; Spectators 1 space/10 staff</td>
<td>Players/Competitors 1 space/2 players</td>
<td>Players/Competitors 1 space/2 players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spectators 1 space/5 seats 1 coach space/500 spectators</td>
<td>Spectators 1 space/15 seats 1 coach space/500 spectators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sports/ Leisure Centres</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/10 staff</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/2 staff</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/4 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Players &amp; Spectators 1 space/10 staff</td>
<td>Players 1 space/2 players 1 coach space/4 pitches plus suitable spectator provision</td>
<td>Players 1 space/2 players 1 coach space/4 pitches plus suitable spectator provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** these standards may be varied for town centre sites depending on the availability of public car parking.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Cycle Parking (Minimum)</th>
<th>Operational Requirement</th>
<th>Non Operational Requirements (Maximum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Areas</td>
<td>Market Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Swimming Pool/</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/10 staff</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/2 staff</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/3 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skating Rink</td>
<td></td>
<td>Players &amp; Spectators 1 space/10 staff</td>
<td>Patrons 1 space/10 m² pool/rink</td>
<td>Patrons 1 space/10 m² pool/rink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Golf Courses</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/10 staff</td>
<td>1 space/2 staff 3 spaces/hole</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bar and Restaurant to be assessed separately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Residential - Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Frail Elderly/</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1 space/6 staff</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/staff resident</td>
<td>1 space/5 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Homes (restricted to elderly 60/65+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/2 non-resident plus Ambulance/</td>
<td>1 space/5 residents</td>
<td>1 space/5 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>customised transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sheltered Accommodation</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1 space/10 staff</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/resident</td>
<td>1 space/4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(restricted to elderly 60/65+ and restricted to 1 bedroom units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>plus Ambulance/customised transport</td>
<td>1 space/4 units</td>
<td>1 space/4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Use Class</td>
<td>Cycle Parking (Minimum)</td>
<td>Operational Requirement</td>
<td>Vehicular Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Semi-Retirement Accommodation (where individual units are self-contained)</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1 space/5 units</td>
<td>Staff 1 space/2 non-resident Visitors 1 space/unit</td>
<td>Rural Areas: 1 space/10 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Student Accommodation</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1 space/3 students</td>
<td>Visitors 1 space/10 students</td>
<td>Rural Areas: 1 space/10 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Community Housing for the Handicapped</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff 1 space/resident member of staff</td>
<td>Rural Areas: 1 space/3 non resident members of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residents 1 space/4 residents (physically handicapped only) plus Ambulance/customised transport</td>
<td>Visitors 1 space/10 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Use Class</td>
<td>Cycle Parking</td>
<td>Rural Areas</td>
<td>Vehicle Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Market Towns</td>
<td>Inner Urban Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Residential – Non Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Dwelling 4 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>No specific provision</td>
<td>3 spaces</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Dwelling 3 bedrooms</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>No specific provision</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Dwelling 2 bedrooms</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>No specific provision</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
<td>1 space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Dwelling 1 bedroom</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>No specific provision</td>
<td>1 space</td>
<td>1 space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Houses in multiple occupation/ Bedsitters</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1 per unit</td>
<td>1 space/bedroom</td>
<td>1 space/bedroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For estates with more than 50 dwellings an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling should be provided.

1 designated casual visitor parking space per 5 dwellings for shared access roads or estate roads with a carriageway width of less than 5.5 metres. These must be contiguous with the highway and must not be conveyed to an individual dwelling.
Appendix B

Cycle Parking Facilities

Guidelines for Provision
The type of cycle parking provided should be based on the expected length of stay by the prospective user.

Short Stay
Where the length of stay by the user is expected to be less than approximately 2 to 3 hours (e.g. customers at a supermarket) short stay cycle parking facilities will normally be adequate. These should preferably be ‘Sheffield’ type stands these being a fixed hoop against which a cycle can be lent and locked. These are available commercially from a number of manufacturers. Any type of stand that supports the cycle by its wheel should be avoided as these often cause damage to the wheel.

Short stay cycle parking facilities need not necessarily be undercover but providing covered parking facilities may benefit customers.

Long Stay
Where the length of stay by the user is expected to be over approximately 3 hours (e.g. staff parking) long stay facilities should normally be provided. These may be either Sheffield type stands provided in a covered area or covered bike shed or cycle lockers. Both of these types of facility are available commercially from a number of manufacturers.

Location of Cycle Parking
The location of cycle parking is crucial to its successful use.

All types of cycle parking should be located in an area which has regular passing pedestrian traffic. This provides informal supervision, increases the security of the facilities and therefore increases its use.

Short stay cycle parking should be located as close as possible (e.g. within 30 m) to the final destination (e.g. as close to the store entrance as possible). Experience shows that where the facility is not located close to the final destination its use is decreased. This can lead to problems with informal cycle parking at the entrance to the development (e.g. cycle locked to trolley parks at supermarket entrances).

Ongoing Review of Provision
The number of cycle parking places specified in the guidelines is the recommended minimum provision. The developers should always assess whether an increased level of provision may be necessary or advantageous. Additionally, the developers should monitor usage of the cycle parking facilities following completion of the development. If the cycle parking is well utilised consideration should be given to providing additional parking.
‘Standard’ Car Size
99% of all new cars will fit within the dimensions of a rectangle 4.75m x 1.8m.

‘Standard’ Car Parking Space
A minimum space of 4.8m x 2.4m is required for the hardstandings, car ports and the internal dimensions of garages. The standard dimensions of 4.8m x 2.4m must only be used as a general minimum (16ft x 8ft).

Basic Hardstandings
For a standard car excluding working space for individual plots.

Basic
Convertible hardstandings/Convertible car port. Attached garage/Detached garage. Group hardstandings (convertible to garages later)

Notes
a. Dimensions of convertible hardstandings include allowance for wall thickness.
b. Slab dimensions are the absolute minimum for garages and larger sizes will be to provide working space.
c. Add from 0.6m in length x 1.0m in width to 1.5m in length and 1.5m in width for working space.
d. In special case of garages or car ports for the semi-ambulant, see ‘Designing for the Disabled’ by Selwyn Goldsmith RIBA.

Car Working Space
For practical purposes standard car parking spaces need to be increased to accommodate working areas e.g. for washing and storage space

A Working surface and minimum clearance
B Door opening from dwelling
C Washing and cleaning
D Washing and storage space
E As D, with space for kneeling
Manoeuvring space between walls or garages.
Min 7.3m – up to 9.0m desirable.
To allow for opening lock up doors and cars parked outside.

Manoeuvring space between garage and opposite kerb.
Manoeuvring space at end of forecourt aisles 3.0m.

Garage forecourts need to be kept as visually unobtrusive as possible.
The provision of screening by layout or by screen wings (w) may be required.

### Accessway Widths to Garage Courts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total spaces*</th>
<th>Widths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Up to 6</td>
<td>2.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 7-16</td>
<td>4.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Over 16</td>
<td>5.0m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Garages and hardstandings
For service vehicles to mews area 4.5m.

### Radius
For accessways up to 16 spaces a minimum centre line radius of 7.5m.
For accessways over 16 spaces radius to be designed for 10mph and forward visibility provided accordingly.
Washing areas should be sited clear of the vehicular access and parking area.
Appendix C3
Car Parking Dimensional Requirements

**Individual Garage**
The MINIMUM internal size is 4.8m x 2.4m.
THROUGH garages – with doors back and front are strongly recommended when this can give access for additional rear curtilage parking.

**Parking Space in Front of a Garage**
Allow a minimum of 6m space for minimum working at rear, up and over door clearance at front.
This space MUST NOT lie within future highways limits.

**Grouped Garages on Sloping Sites**
Where garages are sited across contours they may need to be wider than normal to accommodate wider piers.
The manoeuvring space in a garage forecourt will need to be wider than the minimum to accommodate a short ramp.
The length of a ramp and width of pier will depend on the slope of the forecourt.

**Parking Space Abutting Turning Areas**
Parking bays will need to be lengthened where they abut turning areas and provided with a drop kerb to act as a distance stop.
This will enable large vehicles to turn properly.
Appendix C4
Car Parking Dimensional Requirements

Alternative Parking Layouts
N.B. These arrangements are not normally acceptable adjacent to highways.
Developers are advised to use this as a prompt/checklist to assist in the preparation of a Transport Assessment for significant developments. Smaller developments may not need to address all issues. Highway Authority Officers will use this list when checking Transport Assessments. This list should save time and money by making sure the developer’s Transport Assessment covers all the required points, although by definition no list can cover all issues or eventualities. Please feel free to copy the checklist for the sole purpose of assisting you prepare a Transport Assessment.

### ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED BY DEVELOPER

#### Executive Summary
To be written so the public can understand the conclusions. Also make sure the methodology and build-up of assumptions in the main report itself are clear to read and follow.

#### Policy Framework – Please agree with the Highway Authority
Consideration should be given to relevant national and local policy, especially the LTP.

#### Existing Highway Conditions – Please agree with the Highway Authority
Consider the existing road infrastructure.

Highlight existing problems (queues, accidents, complaints etc.)

Set out the existing traffic flows. Are the surveys current and representative? What are the peak hours? What about the weekend? Holiday periods?

Have the counts included HGVs? Are PCUs conversions, or %HGVs used in capacity calculations?

Does the report highlight all the critical junctions and links, or are there more?

Does the report consider other committed developments (or vacant buildings etc.) which might have a noticeable impact on the base traffic assumptions?

#### The Proposed Development
Does the development description match that shown on the planning application?

Does the site accord to the current parking standards?

#### Generation and Assignment – Please agree with the Highway Authority
What assumptions have been made about modal split, do these relate to the area?

Is the traffic generation methodology robust?

Are comparative sites similar in composition and location?

Is the sample large enough and the sites comparable to the area?

Are the figures mean or 85th percentile?

Do the figures correlate to the proposed parking levels and modal split assumptions?

What are the peak weekday and weekend times, do these relate to the surveyed network peaks or is there a combination of different peak times? Consider tidality for new junctions.

What about HGV traffic generation, is this material?

On what basis is the traffic assigned to the road network (comparative counts, gravity model, a range of tested options, a guess?) Is this reasonable, has it been justified?

What assumptions have been made for traffic already on the network? E.g. pass-by/diverted trips

What effect will competing sites have on the above?

Without a further planning consent, what other uses could go on in the site?

Do the conclusions match those in other reports? E.g. Retail Impact Assessment

#### Future Issues – Please agree with the Highway Authority
Are there any committed or protected highway or transportation schemes which would have a direct or indirect effect on any of the above?

What traffic growth assumptions have been made, have these been substantiated?

#### Vehicular Impact – Please agree with the Highway Authority
Have the correct road junctions and links been identified?
How have the critical junctions and links been analysed, has this been done properly?
Do the calculations model existing conditions; do these reflect what actually occurs?
What is the future impact in terms of capacity, delay, queuing etc?
Consider the implications of the impact (increased accident risk, effect on other road users, pollution, noise, vibration, queuing through junctions, excessive delay, rat-running to avoid problems, impact on schools and other sensitive locations etc.)
What mitigating measures is the developer proposing, are these deliverable, have TROs been considered and what effect will these have on frontagers, how do these affect other road users etc?
What about HGVs?
Is secure powered two-wheeled parking provided?
What are the consequences on other vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists and public transport etc?

What developer funded improvements are required?

Pedestrian Impact – Please agree with the Highway Authority
What is the catchment zone?
What are the routes on foot to/from the site (access to/from residential areas, public transport connections, local facilities etc.)?
Are there any accident problems involving pedestrians?
Is there, or will there be, a need for help in crossing roads?
What about dropped crossings/tactile facilities etc?
What about footway/path widths, surfacing, lighting, safety/security?
Has the site been designed to achieve good access on foot or do you have to negotiate a sea of car parking?
Are pedestrians disadvantaged in any way by these proposals?

What developer funded improvements are required?

Bicycle Accessibility – Please agree with the Highway Authority
What is the catchment zone?
What are the routes by bicycle to/from the site (access to/from residential areas, public transport connections, local facilities etc.)?
Are there any accident problems involving cyclists?
Is there, or will there be, a need for help in crossing roads?
What about cycleway/path widths, surfacing, lighting, safety/security, junction arrangements?
Has the site been designed to achieve good access by bike without negotiating a sea of car parking?
Is the bicycle parking convenient, safe, secure, covered etc. and in accordance with the highway authority's guidelines?
Have bicycle changing, showering, locker, clothes drying facilities been provided?

What developer funded improvements are required?

Public Transport Access – Please agree with the Highway Authority
Which bus/train services pass the site, and do they stop?
How frequent, when do they start and finish, what about at the weekend?
Where can you get to on the existing services (where can’t you get)?
Are the stops close to the site (consider shelters, lighting, bicycle parking, seating, information etc.)?
How accessible are the stops on foot (directness, dropped crossings, tactile facilities, crossing facilities)?
For major sites – do the buses have sufficient capacity at peak times?
Can public transport penetrate the site? Consider cost, increased journey times for other users etc.

What developer funded improvements are required?

Conclusions & Reminders
What developer funded improvements are required? – Please list including the need for any TROs.
Is a road safety audit needed?
Are legal agreements required? T&CP Act Section 106, Highways Act Section 278 and/or Section 38?

Is a ‘Travel Plan’ Required? – Please agree with the Highway Authority
What measures are to be included?
## Checklist for a Travel Plan

Developers are advised to use this as a prompt/checklist to assist in the preparation of a Travel Plan for significant developments. This list will be used as part of the appraisal process of the Travel Plan. This list should save time and money by making sure Travel Plans cover all the required points, although by definition no list can cover all issues or eventualities. Note also that the level of input can be important and that travel plans that include only minimal coverage of the items listed below will not be sufficient, especially in areas where the Transport Assessment suggests there may be a problem. Please feel free to copy the checklist for the sole purpose of assisting you prepare a Travel Plan.

### Issues to be Considered by Developer

| **Executive Summary**          |  
|-------------------------------|---
| To be written so the public can understand the conclusions. |  

| **Policy Framework**          |  
|-------------------------------|---
| Consideration should be given to relevant national and local policy, especially the LTP. |  

| **Administrative Arrangements** |  
|-------------------------------|---
| Is there a nominated person with responsibility for the travel plan and its maintenance? |  

| **Is there a survey of staff travel choices for current staff and/or statistics that will inform the likely use of the new development?** |  
| **Have you presented a timetable for completion of the travel plan and submission of interim reports to the travel awareness officer at NYCC (at not less than two-year intervals)?** |  
| **Is there evidence that public transport operators have been consulted?** |  

| **The Proposed Development** |  
|-------------------------------|---
| Is the site permeable for walkers and cyclists so that all of the desire lines across the site are possible without detour? |  

| **Is there a car park management system that includes parking permits?** |  
| **Does the car park layout incorporate spaces for car sharers in an attractive and visible location?** |  
| **Is the approach to key locations convenient and convivial for walkers?** |  
| **Is the approach to key locations convenient and convivial for cyclists?** |  
| **Is there secure (i.e. overlooked) cycle parking in a location that encourages cycling?** |  

| E.g. near the clocking-in point in a workplace. |  
| **Are there features within suitable buildings that would encourage cycling?** |  

| E.g. changing rooms, lockers, showers. |  
| **Are there clear, safe, well-lit connections to the nearest public transport routes?** |  
| **Are there facilities for waiting for public transport on-site?** |  

| **Public Transport Promotions** |  
|-------------------------------|---
| Are timetables displayed in a visible location and telephone calls to public transport information lines made available free of charge? |  

| **Are there initiatives planned to encourage a positive attitude to public transport?** |  
| **E.g. free trial weeks, discount on ticket purchase etc?** |  

| **Car Sharing Promotion** |  
|-------------------------------|---
| Is there a car-share database or other means to encourage car sharing? |  

| **Are there any promotion measures/incentives to encourage car sharing?** |
### Walking Promotions

Are there plans to encourage walking, e.g. through promotional campaigns linked to walking and health?  
Will walkers benefit in any way from the Transport Plan?

### Cycling Promotions

Is there a mileage allowance (of 20 pence per mile) for work-related bicycle use?  
Is there a bicycle user group?  
Is there promotion of national events such as Bike to Work Week?  
Is there financial assistance towards the purchase or loan of a bicycle?

### Office Practice

Is maximum possible use made of flexible working in order to reduce the need to travel?  
Is maximum possible use made of information technology in order to reduce the need to travel?  
Is there a goods inwards/outwards delivery policy that discourages wasteful journeys?  
Is there a company car policy that discourages driving?

### General Promotions

Is there constant reminders of the need to reduce unnecessary car use?  
Are there two or more per year positive attempts to involve occupants in promotions of alternatives to the car?  
Are small efforts made to avoid all forms of travel, e.g. canteen or shop on site?

### Conclusions & Reminders

What developer funded improvements are required? – Please list  
Are legal agreements required? T&CP Act Section 106?
HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE

1. INTRODUCTION

The LTP recognises the importance of providing a safe, efficient and well maintained highway network as part of an integrated transport strategy. This principle aligns with the Environmental Management Business Unit objective of keeping the highway network safe and well maintained at all times of the year.

Government Policy is stated in "Transport 2010" which acknowledges past under-investment in the maintenance of the highway network and sets out targets as follows:

- To arrest the deterioration in the condition of local roads – target date 2004
- To eliminate the backlog in the condition of local roads – target date 2010 (end of plan period)

NYCC has responded to the need to arrest the deterioration of the highway network with increased attention to structural maintenance combined with consideration of environmental issues.

Additional funding provision for the development of the United Kingdom Pavement Management System indicates our commitment to meet the above targets.

Following these introductory remarks, this Appendix sets out:-

- The principal LTP targets relating to Highway Maintenance, together with any necessary and relevant baseline information, our performance indications and monitoring mechanisms (Section 2)
- The progress achieved towards meeting these targets during 2002/03, and any relevant details of the expenditure incurred (Section 3)
- What we aim to achieve during 2003/04 (Section 4)
- An overall review of our performance to date and whether or not we are on course to deliver the targets concerned together with the actions we intend to take (or have already taken) should we be ahead or behind schedule to meet them (Section 5)
- Details and examples of our delivery of schemes and other initiatives on the ground (Section 6)
- Our arrangements for consulting the public and relevant bodies, groups and organisations in connection with our various initiatives (Section 7)
- Our efforts to learn and improve our performance based on the improvements of other local transport authorities and, conversely, to share our own successes with others who might benefit from our experience (Section 8)
- A note regarding de-trunking (Section 9)
2. TARGETS FOR HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE

The principal targets in the LTP relating to highway maintenance are listed below, together with notes about their respective baseline (where applicable) and any necessary monitoring information.

**Target C1:** To (a) reduce to 6% the length of principal road network with negative residual life during the Plan period, and (b) reduce to 14% the length with skidding resistance below investigatory level

Although no baseline positions are necessary for monitoring progress towards meeting these targets, the LTP position for (a) is that, based on a survey of 83% of the principal road network in the County (1990 – 1999), some 21.68% had negative residual life. The situation in respect of (b), based on a survey undertaken in 1999 on 652.65km (90%) of the principal road network, was that 86.8km (13.3%) had skidding resistance below investigatory level.

The structural integrity of the road pavement can be measured by Deflectograph survey which records the flexure of the road structure and foundations to determine the residual life of the road. A failed pavement is manifested by a negative residual life. Surveys take place annually and have covered one third of the principal road network each year. Long term average values are used to measure the condition of the network. A baseline and target of 6% of the network with negative residual life has been established to represent the state of the network prior to reductions in investment. The current measurements indicate National Road Maintenance Condition Survey ten year averages of 21.6%, 19.6% and 22.9% for the previous three years. The corresponding figures for Best Value Performance Indicator No 96 are 23.7%, 20.2% and 22.4%. It is apparent that approximately 14% of the principal road network requires resurfacing or reconstruction to bring the network condition up to the Transport 2010 targets.

The safety of the road surfacing is paramount. Skidding resistance of the surfacing measured in wet conditions by Griptester during the Summer period has been utilised to ascertain the current condition. Condition monitoring of the principal road network by Griptester survey has been carried out during recent years. The LTP target of 14% set in 2000 has therefore already been achieved. A more challenging target requires to be established for future use.

**Target C3:** To ensure that 99% of reported incidents of dangerous damage to roads and pavements are repaired or made safe within 24 hours from the time that the Authority first became aware of the damage

No baseline position is necessary to monitor progress towards meeting this target. This LTP target also aligned with the previous BVPI 105 (now deleted) and is monitored on a regular basis by Divisional staff who receive and record these reports. This is supplemented by complaints/feedback by third parties and the general public.

**Target G1:** To minimise the time major roads are closed due to temporary traffic signals or local authority works. The maximum closure rate will be 0.06 days per kilometre of traffic sensitive street

This is a very challenging target and represents the performance of the best performing authority at the time the target was set. No baseline position is necessary to monitor progress towards this target. This LTP target is also BVPI 100 and is monitored on a regular basis by Divisional staff.
Consideration is underway to include future targets for the condition of non-principal roads and footways in accordance with national developments during the past few years.

3. **REVIEW OF PROGRESS AND EXPENDITURE IN 2002/03**

During 2002/03 progress was made towards meeting the above targets as follows:-

**Target C1:**

(a) The budgeted expenditure on structural maintenance on principal roads for 2002/03 was £2.739m. This expenditure should address the annual decline in condition due to traffic and environmental factors and may contribute to addressing the backlog. Outcome performance has been measured by deflectograph testing of the carriageway with recent results indicating similar performance levels. It is intended to change the monitoring process to Coarse Visual Survey/TRACS Type Surveys during successive years.

(b) The budgeted expenditure on rectification of skidding resistance on principal roads for 2002/03 was £0.296m

Targeted expenditure in improving the highest priority defective lengths of principal road by resurfacing should, as above, address the annual decline in condition due to traffic and environmental factors and may contribute to addressing the backlog. Outcome performance is monitored by Griptester testing of the carriageway and recent results indicate an improvement in overall condition.

**Target C3:**

Data for 2002/03 indicates that 99.7% of dangerous damage incidents have been rectified within the 24 hour deadline. The target was therefore achieved for this year. However, it remains our policy to continue giving priority to the important service to ensure that the target is also achieved in subsequent years.

**Target G1:**

Data for 2002/03 indicates that the major road closures due to temporary traffic signals as part of local authority roadworks was 0.53 days per km of traffic sensitive street. Whilst this is significantly short of the target figure, it should be recognised that the target set was very challenging. Improvements have been achieved in many delivery areas but the outturn data is affected by the need for essential work over one days duration in some urban locations.

4. **WORKS AND EXPENDITURE PROGRAMMED FOR 2003/04**

Our capital £4.580m expenditure on maintenance of the principal road network for 2003/04 is detailed below:

**Target C1: Principal Road Condition**

(a) The budgeted expenditure on structural maintenance on principal roads for 2003/04 is £3.185m. This represents an increase of 42% compared with 2002/03. Major resurfacing and reconstruction schemes are programmed for some 42 locations within the County.
(b) The budgeted expenditure on rectification of skidding resistance on principal roads is £0.220m for 2003/04. This represents a decrease of 21% compared with 2002/03. This level of expenditure should however still allow us to continue to reduce the percentage of the principal road network with skidding resistance below investigatory levels.

Target C3: Response to Dangerous Damage Reports

No capital budget is allocated to achieving this target. Revenue budgets will be set at an appropriate sufficient level to maintain our good response times.

Target G1: Closure Rate on Traffic Sensitive Streets

No capital budget is allocated to achieving this target.

Planned expenditure on targets C1, C3 and G1 collectively during 2003/04 is in the order of £4.580m. This represents an increase of 67% compared with actual expenditure in 2002/03.

5. CURRENT POSITION

(a) Upgrading the Principal Road Network

Since the LTP was prepared, the following key events are listed:

Increased capital funding from the Government is apparent for the past three years to assist the achievement of improvements in network condition. A substantial increase of 67% is planned in capital expenditure for 2003/04 for principal roads.

- A new contract for the delivery of highway maintenance has resulted in the externalisation of NYCC County Contracting to Raynesway Construction from April 2002. This contract embraces new principles with inclusion of partnering arrangements, sharing of profit/loss, encouragement of innovation and the development of key performance indicators.

- The organisation has been proactive in the development of national process key performance indicators via the Highway Works Best Value Club. Significant progress has been made during 2002/03 with performance compared against the other club members by external benchmarking.

- A step change in the investment in the acquisition of condition assessment data is current to ensure that the principal/non principal roads and footway network is assessed for condition.

- New technology for condition assessment has been introduced with the use of the Mk2 Griptester for the skidding resistance testing of the highway network.

- A joint innovation project by the client and contractor is currently developing proposals for new materials/methods, recycling and information technology improvements.

In conclusion step/continuous improvements have/are being made at present with a view to increased performance using modern processes and to obtain a substantial improvement in the outcome condition of the principal road network.
(b) **Repairs to Dangerous Damage to Roads and Pavements**

The situation with dangerous damage repair is considered to be under control but will be subject to continual monitoring.

(c) **Minimising Major Road Closures**

Considerable progress in the timing of highway works has been achieved to mitigate disruption of the highway at peak usage.

Benefits to the community has been balanced with increased costs from out of hours working.

6. **DELIVERY OF PROJECTS ON THE GROUND**

North Yorkshire has a large rural area with generally sparse population. The highway network provides the primary means of communication for the public and therefore the need for a reasonably well maintained and safe highway rates highly with public expectation. Similarly, town centres require to be promoted as prosperous and vibrant locations for shopping, tourism and industry.

The programme for 2003/04 includes projects that can be generally described in the following categories:-

1. **Principal Roads**

Resurfacing and reconstruction of the carriageway, together with associated kerbing, drainage and other highway works. Quiet surfacings are utilised on urban roads where environmental benefits are apparent. Skidding resistance rectification in urban areas is accomplished by the use of micro-asphalt whereas in rural areas, surface dressing is the primary treatment.

2. **Non-Principal Roads**

Resurfacing and reconstruction of the carriageway, together with associated kerbing, drainage and other highway works. Quiet surfacings are utilised on urban roads where environmental benefits are apparent.

3. **Footways**

Resurfacing and associated kerbing in both urban and rural locations. Slurry surfacing is utilised to arrest fretting and deterioration of surfacings.

4. **Drainage**

With increased risk from flooding, a programme of drainage remedial works is targeted at previous locations where flooding of residential or industrial property has occurred.

5. **Landslip Remediation**

Increased rainfall has contributed to the instability of many locations where landslip/subsidence has previously affected the highway. Several priority locations are programmed for remedial treatment.
6. **Special Projects – Flagged Footways**

A backlog of deteriorated concrete flagged footways has required a special status to target many residential areas where the safety and performance of these pavements is of concern.

7. **CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

Extensive consultation on highway maintenance is ongoing with the latest review including consultation on the subject of verge maintenance. This review was conducted by a Member/officer group resulting in recommendations for an updated policy. Consultation has been conducted recently on winter maintenance with Parish Councils and our agency authorities on the scale of the service and priorities.

Considerable consultation with other organisations and the public has taken place on flooding prevention with three recent exhibitions providing the public with the opportunity to comment on design proposals aimed at alleviating future potential flooding conditions.

Cross boundary consultation with highway local authorities is ongoing with respect to winter maintenance and de-trunking continuity.

8. **BEST PRACTICE**

The Environmental Management Business Unit has been active in the process of sharing and learning from the experiences of other local highway authorities. Current involvement is as follows:

(a) CSS Engineering Committee – National Group
(b) CSS Best Value Working Group
(c) CSS Northern Regional Best Value Group
(d) CSS Northern Regional Best Value Group/Task Group No 2 Highway Maintenance and Network Management – Regional Group
(e) Highway Works Best Value Benchmarking Club – National Group
(f) UKPMS Owners Forum – National Group
(g) UKPMS EXOR User Group – National Group
(h) UKPMS NE England User Group – Regional Group
(i) Vaisala User Group – National Group

Activities include the general sharing of experience and expertise in highway maintenance.

Key Performance Indicators have been introduced for two primary areas, ie

(1) Highway Works Best Value Benchmarking Club. Process KPIs utilising the national building and civil engineering criteria and permitting internal service improvement monitoring and external benchmarking.

(2) Local Key Performance Indicators targeting specific areas for service development and improvement.
North Yorkshire and Raynesway Construction presented papers at a seminar in Newcastle upon Tyne during November 2002 to promote current performance management experience with the Highway Works Best Value Benchmarking Club. A further seminar is planned for central Scotland during September 2003 to encourage participation from the Scottish unitary Councils and trunk road management consortium.

Comparison of Best Value Reviews/Inspections has highlighted the excellent performance of Hertfordshire County Council highway maintenance delivery. During October 2002, a team from North Yorkshire visited Hertfordshire for a one day review of highway maintenance. This appraisal has assisted future change management.

Collaborative procurement with the City of York Council of Weather Forecast/Ice Prediction provision in partnership with private sector providers will provide a cost effective/high technology specialist service during the next five years.

A joint working group (North Yorkshire/Raynesway Construction) on innovation has been established to appraise and implement new developments which should improve the overall service delivery. Recycling techniques are under review with a view to promote an improved environmental sustainability policy and reduce primary aggregate consumption.

Increased resources have been deployed for New Roads and Street Works regulations with more extensive inspection under section 74. Reduced occupancy of the highway by Utilities is the objective of this change which should reduce congestion and disruption.

The system used for routine safety inspections have been updated to include the use of data capture devices and data handling to assist the recording and actioning of defect remedial works.

9. DE-TRUNKING OF NON-CORE ROADS – 2003

From 1 July 2003, the Department for Transport via the Highways Agency has transferred some 68km of trunk road to the Council. The first batch of trunk roads to be integrated into the County/principal/primary road category are as follows:

A19 Thirsk – York
A19 York – Osgodby
A64 A1 – Leeds CC Boundary
A65 Skipton – Bradford MBC Boundary

A delay has occurred in the transfer of the following roads which are expected during 2003/04:

A59 Shipton – Lancashire CC Boundary
A65 Skipton – Lancashire CC Boundary

Special grant provision for revenue funding has been provided by the Highways Agency for routine highway maintenance purposes.

An appraisal of capital funded structural maintenance indicates that there were no planned projects for 2003/04 in the excess £100k category. Discussions are current regarding projects under £100k.
The increase in principal/primary road network with attendant funding should enable continuous investment in high quality systems to provide essential network communication between main centres of population within the County.
HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE ASSOCIATED WITH TIMBER EXTRACTION AND HAULAGE

In the 1950s and 60s, a national aim was that the country should become self-sufficient in the production of timber. In order to assist this process, there were tax allowances for the planting of new woodland. As a result, much marginal land was planted with little, if any, thought given to how the timber would be harvested and transported when it came to maturity.

There are large areas of North Yorkshire which are currently covered by woodland which has matured or is rapidly coming to maturity. Much of this land is only served by minor unclassified roads which were not designed or built to cater for modern heavy industrial traffic.

The market for timber is currently not good but nevertheless felling operations in many areas are planned as the alternative is to allow the timber to blow down and rot in situ. From the planning point of view this could be disastrous as many of the forested areas are in the two National Parks in the County. In order to retain their amenity value as well as realising whatever financial return can be achieved, the woodland has to be managed and timber harvested and abstracted.

The need to maintain these minor roads and associated bridges has been highlighted for several years in the LTP although there has been no financial recognition of the scale of the problem. We understand that a similar bids were made in Scotland several years ago in timber growing areas and the Scottish Office recognised the need both to harvest the timber and to provide a network of suitable routes for its transport. It is understood that an allocation of £5m was made to assist with minor routes maintenance and this has generally eased the backlog of works and provided haul routes which are suitable for purpose.

North Yorkshire County Council is currently working with the Forest Industries to develop a network of recognised and acceptable routes for the haulage of timber and this will be incorporated into the County Council’s Freight Strategy as and when the network is fully developed. In the meantime, working together with the major forest interests we have developed a programme for the next five years which in outline is listed below:-
Anticipated Timber Route Maintenance 2003 – 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Location of Forest</th>
<th>Cost (£k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 – Richmond</td>
<td>(1) Raydale</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Foreland Rigg</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Witton Fell</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 – Thirsk</td>
<td>Silton Forest</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 – Whitby</td>
<td>(1) Egton High Moor</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Glaisdale</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Wykeham</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 – Kirkbymoorside</td>
<td>Egton High Moor</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 – Skipton</td>
<td>(1) Greenfield, Langstrothdale</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Settle</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,990</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These locations and prices relate only to the felling proposals which have already been notified to us. They do not include areas of woodland in private ownership where felling licences have yet to be issued.

The minimum requirement therefore for the next five years, not counting the demands of private woodland about which we are currently unaware, is £1,990k. These are all schemes on minor unclassified routes where the normal highways maintenance comprises patching and surface dressing as that is suitable for the type of traffic normally using the route. The use of Section 59 of the Highways Act, recovery of expenses due to extraordinary traffic, has been attempted on several occasions in the past, generally without success. The financial margins on timber extraction currently are so low that, faced with significant bills for highways maintenance, the timber owners are likely to allow the timber to fall and rot rather than harvest it. The disadvantages of this in terms of amenity and planning considerations are significant at a time when the countryside is just beginning to recover from the economic stringencies generated by the Foot and Mouth epidemic.

This transport plan indicates elsewhere that the County Council, along with the Timber Industry, has been innovative in its approach to timber harvesting. It must be recognised that timber must be felled and transported to mills for processing on roads which are currently unsatisfactory for the purpose. These need to be maintained to a sufficiently high standard to allow the proper transport of the product or, where possible, alternative and less environmentally intrusive methods of transport may be developed.

We would like the Government Office to accept that damage caused by the haulage of timber in North Yorkshire is an unusual, although not unique, transport phenomenon and recognise that the standard highways maintenance allocation is insufficient to cover these additional needs. We would therefore invite the Government Office to address the problem by supporting the maintenance of timber extraction routes to the extent of £400k/annum over the next five years.
TABLES FOR REPORTING MAINTENANCE DATA

Latest available carriageway and footway condition data from 2002/03 surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Best Value Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Road Condition</td>
<td>BV 96</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-principal classified road condition</td>
<td>BV 97a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-principal unclassified road condition</td>
<td>BV 97b</td>
<td>Complete data not yet available for 2002/03. Increased resources have been provided for 2003/04 to carry out condition assessment surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories 1 and 2 footway condition</td>
<td>BV 187a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L - Maintenance and Strengthening of Bridges and Structures
MAINTENANCE AND STRENGTHENING OF BRIDGES AND STRUCTURES

1. INTRODUCTION

The LTP for North Yorkshire recognises the importance of providing a safe, efficient and well maintained highway network as part of an Integrated Transport Strategy. The County Council is revising its Bridge Maintenance and Management system to allow the adoption of the Bridge Condition Indicator system to be adopted and in place by the end of Autumn 2003.

The Retaining Wall survey commissioned during the year 2002/03 is 95% complete, the results of which will form an asset database which can accurately give location, dimension type, length, height and ownership information which to date has been difficult to access.

The County Council proposes to carry out 24 strengthening schemes and 18 essential maintenance schemes on bridges and retaining walls. There are no funds available in 2003/04 to contribute to Network Rail strengthening schemes. In accordance with Network Rail’s programme for strengthening and maintenance the schedule of bridges shows five structures to be funded in some part in the year 2004/05.

Following these introductory remarks, this Appendix sets out:-

- The principal LTP targets relating to the maintenance and strengthening of bridges and structures, together with any necessary and relevant baseline information, our performance indicators and monitoring mechanisms (Section 2).

- The progress achieved towards meeting these targets during 2002/03, and any relevant details of expenditure incurred (Section 3).

- What we hope to achieve during 2003/04 (Section 4).

- An overall review of our performance to date and whether or not we are on course to deliver the targets concerned, together with the actions we intend to take (or have already taken) should we be ahead or behind schedule to meet them (Section 5).

- Details and examples of our delivery of schemes and other initiatives on the ground (Section 6).

- Our arrangements for consultation with the public and relevant bodies, groups and organisations in connection with our various initiatives (Section 7).

- Our efforts to learn from and improve our performance, based on success of other local transport authorities and, conversely, to share our own successes with others who might benefit from our experiences (Section 8).
2. **TARGET G2. To ensure 90% of the bridge stock is available for 40 tonne vehicles by 2006.**

This target has technically been achieved, but it is considered that it should be elevated to reflect both anticipated changes in traffic patterns as a result of the lorry routeing strategy and the County Council's policy of maintaining access to communities so that socio-economic deprivation is prevented.

As of April 2003 the total number of bridges requiring strengthening works within the LTP was 138. Of these 138 bridges, 122 are County structures, the others are Network Rail (8) and Property Board (8).

Principal Inspections, monitoring and review of the assessment data in preparation for the introduction of the Bridge Condition Indicator system have highlighted a further 50 bridges which require a review of their assessed capacity. These structures require re-assessing either because early assessments are now judged unreliable or because past works have failed to arrest deterioration or because marginal passes have since deteriorated.

In 2002/03 40 County bridge assessments were completed, together with 49 Network Rail owned structures.

For the year 2003/04, there remain about 30 incomplete Network Rail bridge assessments – these have been the subject of a complicated and iterative procedure with Network Rail's Technical Approval Consultants.

Our monitoring of the structures is carried out through the Principal Inspection, General Inspections and Special Inspections of structures on the County database. Individual structures noted with faults or awaiting strengthening are logged for monitoring and prioritised for the required works. Every structure on the County database is given a General Inspection on a two yearly return cycle. Divisional maintenance staff monitor the general day to day condition of the structures and report anomalies which are then checked by Engineers from our Consulting Engineers partnering with the County Council.

From the lessons learnt during the Mercury Bridge failure and discussion with Engineers regarding bridge foundations in fast flowing rivers, we wish to initiate regular diving surveys of significant structures on our network, as part of the Principal Inspection works. We estimate that the extra cost of this inspection will be about £11k per year. The early warning information this may provide will allow intervention and prevent massive repair bills.

Massive traffic disruption and extensive diversions frequently arise from the imposition of weight limits: this is contrary to the County Council's policy stated above.

3. **REVIEW OF PROGRESS AND EXPENDITURE IN 2002/03**

Against a target of 75 strengthenings and 7 retaining wall maintenance schemes, the following was achieved:

- 16 schemes completed from 2001/02: these schemes were delayed by foot and mouth.
- 45 bridge schemes started and completed within 2002/03.
- Two schemes involving the temporary shoring of structures prior to repair or strengthening.
• Started 16 bridge schemes which will be completed in 2003/04.

• 11 retaining wall and bridge maintenance schemes in the year 2002/03.

In respect of expenditure, the allocation of funding available totalled £6,416, constituted as follows:-

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{£4,735k} & \text{2002/03 allocation} \\
\text{£1,681k} & \text{2001/02 underspend (foot and mouth + flooding)} \\
\text{Total} & \text{£6,416k}
\end{array}
\]

Of this total, it was intended that £1,000k be assigned for the purpose of strengthening Network Rail bridge stock, principally Victoria Avenue Bridge at Harrogate as the County Council's contribution to the strengthening by Network Rail of this structure.

This therefore meant that the allocation for works and assessments for bridges totalled £5,415k, of which £415k was allocated to Assessments and the Retaining Wall survey, leaving £5,000k available for strengthening and maintenance works.

It became apparent during the first quarter of the financial year that Network Rail would not be able to deliver their project within the financial year. At the present time there is only a tentative programme from Network Rail and there is little confidence that it will be delivered.

To try to take up the underspend caused by the problem with Network Rail strengthening, major maintenance works were brought forward in the County programme. 17 structures were brought forward from 2003/04. However, for reasons of procedural delays, problems with land or timing of diversionary routes, consulting resources and the lack of contracting resources we were unable to deliver all of these schemes on time.

These 17 schemes in addition to 25 new schemes form the 2003/04 intended workload at a cost of £3,971k as part of the £4,277k, the remainder being assigned to outstanding assessments, design and supervision fees, BCI data procurement, monitoring and retaining walls inspections.

Within the £3,971k a sum of £500k has been assigned for maintenance works spread over approximately seven schemes. Historically, this level of expenditure has proved to be considerably insufficient since it affords scope for dealing with a mere one or two emergencies per annum and seriously insufficient since it affords minimal scope for wall repairs and painting schemes. A sum of £1,000k pa would be more realistic. For example, emergency schemes and accelerated priority works to the value of about £1,100k had to be accommodated within 2002/03 at the expense of the programmed, but less urgent, schemes and (to some extent) from the unspent funding ascribed to Network Rail.

4. **WORKS AND EXPENDITURE PROGRAMMED FOR 2003/04**

Due to the lower allocation of funding and the overrun of schemes from 2002/03 no funding for Network Rail strengthenings will be assigned for 2003/04. In accordance with their programme, funding will be sought for projects in 2004/05 and 2005/06.

Re-plating of weight restricted bridges to conform with the new regulations is anticipated to cost some £30k. We are currently working with Trading Standards, Legal Services, Area Traffic Managers and the Freight Transport Officer to review the permanent weight limits throughout the County.
We have programmed 42 schemes, comprising 24 strengthenings and 18 essential maintenance schemes to prevent structures falling below their required strengths or, in the case of Listed structures, to arrest further deterioration.

5. **CURRENT POSITION**

Due to the lack of progress with regard to Network Rail and their structures and our reassessment of County Bridges, we have just about remained at status quo with regard to the bridge programme. When all the retaining wall information is available we will have a more definitive answer but it appears from our current information that the strengthening programme will be complete in 2005/06 and the maintenance programme will be on or about steady state.

The works to refurbish the mechanical, electrical and hydraulic equipment on Selby and Whitby Swing Bridges have been substantially completed.

We had hoped to introduce a five year contract for the maintenance of the swing bridges to keep these refurbished structures in good condition. Our initial costing indicates that a sum of £600k over a five year period would be required to ensure preventive maintenance was carried out. Due to the imminent handover to the County Council of the A63 new River Ouse Bridge, the Maintenance Contract was not let and is currently under review.

When the new Highway Agency A63 River Ouse Swing Bridge is commissioned we will have to carry out essential maintenance to the main steelwork carrying the timber deck of the Selby Swing Bridge on the A19. The cost of this work is in the region of £600k and is tentatively programmed for late 2005/06. The cost of the works includes for the substitution of a more durable and waterproof deck. This work will avoid weight-restricting this important urban link (which will be required to carry diverted traffic in the event of an incident on the new bypass).

6. **DELIVERY OF PROJECTS ON THE GROUND**

Of the many schemes enacted within the year, the following are noteworthy:

- **Bridge Green, Danby** – a clapper deck, demolished by a flood. An urgent scheme was implemented, including a rapidly installed temporary bridge. The replacement deck, to current standards, retains the original external appearance.

- **Cow Bridge** – following previous traffic dislocation caused by a nearby deck strengthening, a lot of attention was given to ways of strengthening this large but narrow masonry arch by means precluding the need for traffic restriction and a scheme was enacted to strengthen from beneath rather than by the simpler expedient of overlaying.

- **Bradley Canal Swing Bridge** – following many years of severe difficulty in operation, a new deck and opening system were commissioned. Of particular concern was the heated opposition of a small number of local people, resulting in extensive public meetings, consultations and exhibitions, which gained overall support locally and a much improved service for boat users, timed to be available from Easter, the start of the boating season.
• Creets Bridge – a Listed arch, largely destroyed by flood in 2001, damage limitation and support works were installed during the year, as well as maintenance of the temporary diversionary bridge, while extended debates ensued between the local community (which favoured a widened replacement) and English Heritage (which insisted on replacement as original). A decision by the Minister has enabled a start of the rebuild to take place in 2003.

7. CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS

As each strengthening or maintenance project is commissioned letters are sent to County and Parish Councillors for comments on the proposed works. During the consultation period we ask for comment and local information which will assist in the programming of the works. It should be noted that 90% of our works leave the bridge looking as though it has not been repaired, as much of the strengthening is internal and hidden from view. Very few of our structures require total replacement; when they do we consult with the Parish Councils and District Councils to ensure that the new structure will be acceptable. All practical feedback is added to the final design. Several examples of schemes designed within the year have been amended, to reflect community concerns.

We consult heavily with the Environment Agency providing advanced warning of the structures we intend to work on, so that information on precautions to protect the environment, and sites of special scientific interest, etc, can be located, thus preventing problems in gaining consent for the works. We have pro-actively instigated discussions with the EA to streamline approval procedures and to confirm programme changes.

The County Council is developing a Lorry Routeing Database and the information which it holds is being used during the review of the weight limits for the re-signing of the structures to the new Regulations. When it is necessary to introduce a change, a permanent or a temporary weight limit, consultation is carried out covering community stakeholders from the local farmers to the bus and haulage operators.

Liaison with the Timber Extraction Companies has required the strengthening of some structures to be brought forward so that the lorries carrying the timber can be routed away from populated areas.

Via the website, maintained by the County Council, we have been asked what we are doing to protect the Listed structures. The County Council has 425 Listed structures and 74 Ancient Monuments, all of which are used by large volumes of mixed traffic every day. We consider the maintenance and protection of these structures very carefully and we are trying steadily to improve methods of protection. At Cattal Bridge we have introduced traffic signals to prevent vehicular conflicts on this narrow structure. In most cases the imposition of weight restrictions proves very problematical as they prevent farmers from carrying out economic working practices. There are problems with the increased length of vehicles using the road network in the rural areas, the usual damage being demolition, by turning vehicles, of parapet walls close to bends.

8. BEST PRACTICE

As a member of the County Surveyors Society we meet regularly with other representatives of Authorities around Yorkshire and the North of England to exchange views on a wide range of subjects pertaining to bridges.
We have recently given lectures to the Midland CSS and the Bridge 2003 Conference in London on the Procurement and Repair of Mercury Bridge. We have also discussed, with others, methods of repairing damaged masonry structures and the methods of procuring contracts to repair them. We have regular contact with Bridge Engineers from other Authorities as far afield as Scotland to discuss ways that we, or they, have overcome individual problems. We were part of the team that was instrumental in the production of the Risk Assessment Model for Road over Rail Bridges.

We regularly attend seminars and bridge conferences to discuss bridge matters, contacts made and the crossover of information usually forms the stimulus for change.

**NUMBER OF BRIDGES ON THE NORTH YORKSHIRE ROAD NETWORK AND OWNERSHIP DETAILS**

The following Table is based on the information held before the Highways Agency began the DBFO process and for the basis of this Table all such structures are still in the ownership of the Highways Agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principal Road</th>
<th>Non-Principal Road</th>
<th>Unclassified Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bridges</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number to be assessed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number to be strengthened</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BRIDGE OWNERSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Principal Road</th>
<th>Non-Principal Road</th>
<th>Unclassified Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire County Council</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railtrack</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Rail Property</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Waterways</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Water</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire County Council</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Rivers Authority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Metropolitan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RETAINING WALLS IN NORTH YORKSHIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wall Type</th>
<th>Principal Roads</th>
<th>Non-Principal Roads</th>
<th>Unclassified Roads</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls Retaining Road (Burr)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls situated above Road</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Length of Walls (km)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following our involvement with the evolution of the Road/Rail risk ranking model, we have applied it across our highway network.

As part of the Bridge Maintenance and Management system and following the production of the retaining wall data, a systematic effort will be made to collect and refine the existing bridge data for incorporation into the BCI system.

The moving bridge maintenance contract compiled in 2002/03 has been deferred until arrangements for the A63 new River Ouse Bridge operating system is established and to allow revision of the delegation of contractual risk so as to lessen the cost of the contract. We view this contract as a good method of preventing breakdowns on these complex moving structures. By letting the contract over a five year period the contractor is enabled to gain an understanding of the operating characteristics of the structure. It will also provide better service when these structures do break down, hopefully repair times will be reduced and the resulting traffic disruption to river and road will be reduced.

9. **FUNDING BEYOND THE CURRENCY OF THIS SIX YEAR PLAN**

At current prices and for steady state maintenance for County structures, we estimate that the following sums are necessary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Bridge Maintenance (CBM)</td>
<td>£4,500k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail structures</td>
<td>£3,000k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CBM figure includes for the extra costs associated with BCI, Principal Inspections, Retaining Wall inspections, maintenance works, Diver Surveys.

Until the information gathered during the Retaining Wall Survey has been analysed it is difficult to be certain with regard to the adequacy of this bid. We have one other largely unknown factor which will affect funding, the de-trunked Highway Agency Structures. Due to circumstances beyond our control not all the information with regard to the structures which will become County structures is available, so our costs are indicative only and will be reassessed as the information is made available by the Highways Agency and their Agents.

**SUPPLEMENTARY BID FOR FUNDING**

In the original LTP the information given in the bridge programme was our best estimate of the works required with regard to the available information. The carry over of work from 2002/03 into 2003/04 has caused the review of the programme of work to completion, to attain Steady State Maintenance and the 95% target for 40 tonnes on the network by the end of this current LTP. Extra costs associated with the de-trunking of the Highways Agency structures have been included but not all the information is available to ensure that the works maintenance or capital is correctly valued. Information is as yet unavailable and therefore the figures given with regard to de-trunking are the best estimated costs.

The revision of years 5 and 6 of this Plan has caused an increase in requirements for funding.
The new projected costs for County owned structures are £1.26m higher in 2004/05 and £2.24m higher in 2005/06 than the previously reported estimates. The increase in the indicative costs is due to the re-assessment of structures, more detailed inspection works and the extra costs associated with the de-trunking of the Highways Agency structures. The figures quoted only relate to works for the County Council's structures and do not include for contributions to strengthening projects to be carried out by Network Rail. There are indicative costs shown for Network Rail structures which require strengthening but due to the lack of certainty with regard to their programme delivery we have placed them outside of the costs associated with achieving the County Council's programme and they will enter the main programme when their delivery and pricing has been confirmed by Network Rail.

**BRIDGE PROGRAMME OF STRENGTHENING MAINTENANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL COST (£k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (00/01)</td>
<td>4,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (01/02)</td>
<td>3,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (02/03)</td>
<td>4,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (03/04)</td>
<td>4,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (04/05)</td>
<td>8,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (05/06)</td>
<td>6,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COSTS</td>
<td>32,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following tables detail the programme of works for the years 2003 to 2006. The list is ordered by bridge number and not by priority. For brevity years 1 to 3 have not been reported and the expenditure for those years is shown in the table preceding this note.

**YEAR 4 (2003/04)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRIDGE NO</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>ASSESSED WEIGHT (t)</th>
<th>COST (£k)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>East Ayton</td>
<td>A170</td>
<td>49880</td>
<td>48480</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Masonry Repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Blackbeck</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>49327</td>
<td>49184</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Replace structure in poor condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Blue Wath</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>47455</td>
<td>50005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Replace existing deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Long Slack Culvert</td>
<td>B6451</td>
<td>42020</td>
<td>45640</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Redshaw</td>
<td>B6255</td>
<td>38060</td>
<td>48510</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Repair parapets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Thornton in Lonsdale</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>36940</td>
<td>47330</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Repair to flood arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Ingleton</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>36950</td>
<td>47320</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Strengthen arch by pointing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>C29</td>
<td>40030</td>
<td>50270</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td>C32</td>
<td>38710</td>
<td>48920</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Strengthen no alternative diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292.1</td>
<td>Hylands Retaining Wall</td>
<td>C32</td>
<td>38771</td>
<td>490456</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Rebuild 30m of wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Aysgarth (Yore Old)</td>
<td>C118</td>
<td>40110</td>
<td>4880</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Castleton</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>46850</td>
<td>50830</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Scour protection and parapet repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Redmire</td>
<td>C34</td>
<td>40410</td>
<td>49090</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strengthen structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Beck Crooks</td>
<td>C29</td>
<td>39490</td>
<td>50720</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Repair &amp; strengthen arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Eskleigh South</td>
<td>C30</td>
<td>39998</td>
<td>50350</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Strengthen structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>Hutton Rudby</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>44720</td>
<td>50660</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Strengthen precast concrete arch rings of structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Kirby Wiske</td>
<td>C168</td>
<td>43780</td>
<td>48480</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Strengthen structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>High Hamer</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>47430</td>
<td>49760</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Bridge widening &amp; parapet repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Whitby Swing Bridge</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>48990</td>
<td>51110</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Essential maintenance to structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Kirk Old</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>42539</td>
<td>49027</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Repair scour and re-point structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE NO</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ROAD EAST</td>
<td>NORTH ASSESSED WEIGHT (t)</td>
<td>COST (£k)</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Crook</td>
<td>C86</td>
<td>44530 47070</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>160 Bridge widening &amp; parapet repairs to prevent future accident damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>Wensley Low</td>
<td>Uncl 40930</td>
<td>48960 10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25 Strengthen masonry arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Arkleside</td>
<td>Uncl 10150</td>
<td>48080 25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Strengthen structure to avoid weight limit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Braithwaite</td>
<td>C176</td>
<td>47270 46230</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>45 Replace reinforced concrete deck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Birky</td>
<td>C148</td>
<td>43300 50240</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35 Repair &amp; strengthen arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Hartoft</td>
<td>C63</td>
<td>47490 49250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20 Strengthening of Deck Slab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Rosedale Abbey</td>
<td>Uncl 47247</td>
<td>49581 17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Replace rc slab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Ellerburn</td>
<td>Uncl 48450</td>
<td>48420 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Strengthen Masonry arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681</td>
<td>Stalwith</td>
<td>Uncl 41280</td>
<td>50900 7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 Repair abutments treat scour and repair spandrel of masonry structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td>Sourbeck</td>
<td>C37</td>
<td>41930 49760</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>36 Strengthen deck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Brompton Butts North</td>
<td>Uncl 49440</td>
<td>48180 17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 Strengthen Masonry arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Brompton Butts South</td>
<td>C70</td>
<td>49440 48170</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 Maintain existing weight limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Wrench Green - Hackness</td>
<td>Uncl 49680</td>
<td>48920 3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90 Re-deck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>Ayton New</td>
<td>A170</td>
<td>49880 48480</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40 85 Essential masonry repairs to walls and parapets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797</td>
<td>Worlds End</td>
<td>C168</td>
<td>44350 48070</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>190 Strengthen rc beam and slab structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>Broughton New</td>
<td>C24</td>
<td>45600 50680</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>50 Re-deck structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>Little Ayton</td>
<td>C153</td>
<td>45700 51020</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>80 Strengthen and repair Temporary weight limit in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833</td>
<td>Cam Bridge</td>
<td>C56</td>
<td>47670 50590</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>22 Repair arch to strengthen to 40t.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862</td>
<td>Bentley (Skipton)</td>
<td>A6069</td>
<td>39860 45160</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200 Strengthen parts of bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Mill Canal</td>
<td>C398</td>
<td>39900 45180</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50 Strengthen masonry arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>982</td>
<td>Peasemolm Glen</td>
<td>C237</td>
<td>50320 48900</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100 Concrete and parapet repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Eastburn</td>
<td>B6265</td>
<td>40150 44450</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>125 Strengthen bridge deck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029</td>
<td>Selby Swing</td>
<td>A19T</td>
<td>46160 43250</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>150 Repairs to wailings and pilings in river protecting structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1151</td>
<td>Cawood</td>
<td>B1222</td>
<td>45750 43780</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>80 Repairs to wailings and pilings in river protecting structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291</td>
<td>Cowside</td>
<td>C393</td>
<td>38450 46670</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>47 Strengthen structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>Austwick Mill</td>
<td>C119</td>
<td>37780 46920</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 Strengthen masonry arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382</td>
<td>Midway</td>
<td>Uncl 38920</td>
<td>45730 18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45 Strengthen structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389</td>
<td>Causeway Beck</td>
<td>C359</td>
<td>49011 47772</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20 Repair foundations and walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430</td>
<td>Bloe Beck</td>
<td>C386</td>
<td>37090 46700</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40 Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1432</td>
<td>Mewith Head Farm</td>
<td>C386</td>
<td>37020 46710</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22 Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Buck Haw Brow Ret/Wall</td>
<td>B6480</td>
<td>38000 46570</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10 Rebuilding sections of wall supporting highway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1472</td>
<td>Storth Gill Lane Cattle Creep</td>
<td>Uncl 37980</td>
<td>46280 7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 Rebuilding sections of wall supporting highway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524</td>
<td>Holme Beck</td>
<td>C249</td>
<td>40060 44450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80 Re-deck bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Beckermonds</td>
<td>Uncl 38740</td>
<td>48030 13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 Repair &amp; strengthen arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>Hen Gill</td>
<td>Uncl 39790</td>
<td>44710 40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30 Repair lateral crack in arch ring and stabilise structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Sutton in craven New</td>
<td>Uncl 39970</td>
<td>44260 17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25 Repair abutments and spandrels of masonry structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Bradley Canal Swing Bridge</td>
<td>Uncl 40000</td>
<td>46330 3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60 Completion of replacement project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Hall Beck</td>
<td>Uncl 41680</td>
<td>45530 40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 Scour protection to abutments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Nethermook</td>
<td>Uncl 41580</td>
<td>45650 40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40 Major repair to structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Careless</td>
<td>C31</td>
<td>42570 46530</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50 Strengthen by re-decking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Hampsthwaite</td>
<td>C263</td>
<td>42610 45920</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40 Strengthen &amp; repair retaining wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Cattal</td>
<td>C282</td>
<td>44477 45400</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>30 Protect listed structure with traffic signals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>Creets</td>
<td>Uncl 42410</td>
<td>47450 0</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>515 Damaged by flood currently over bridged. Structure deadlock only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>Redmire west</td>
<td>C35</td>
<td>40415 49095</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20 Strengthen clapper structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Wooden Hill</td>
<td>Uncl 43550</td>
<td>49290 7.5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154 Replace existing structure improve flow of river</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REB2.28</td>
<td>Leyburn</td>
<td>A684</td>
<td>41050 49040</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40 Protection to weak area of footway on structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3,971 Sum total for strengthening and maintenance 2003/2004
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRIDGE NO</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>ASSESSED WEIGHT (t)</th>
<th>COST (£k)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Topcliffe Great</td>
<td>A167</td>
<td>43980</td>
<td>47590</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Strengthen spandrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Bedale</td>
<td>A684</td>
<td>42680</td>
<td>48830</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Repair and waterproof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Hamby</td>
<td>A685</td>
<td>41290</td>
<td>48895</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Replace decks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Hill House</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>38250</td>
<td>49230</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>New Village</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>36940</td>
<td>47240</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Strengthen timber deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Main Stell</td>
<td>A172</td>
<td>45440</td>
<td>51230</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Overslab existing deck to strengthen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Fryup</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>47295</td>
<td>50469</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Strengthen reinforced concrete box culvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Tunstall</td>
<td>C37</td>
<td>42190</td>
<td>49610</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Strengthen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Coverham</td>
<td>C35</td>
<td>41040</td>
<td>48620</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Scotton Beck West</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>41900</td>
<td>49580</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Strengthen and repair structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Scotton Beck East</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>41910</td>
<td>49580</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rebuild spandrels and wing walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Thwaiteholme</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>39610</td>
<td>49060</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strengthen no alternative diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Widdle Foot</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>38260</td>
<td>48790</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Access for farms keep in good repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Skellgill</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>39230</td>
<td>49140</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Strengthen no alternative diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Firby</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>42680</td>
<td>48630</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>Woodhouse (or Foss)</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>46055</td>
<td>46595</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Goodwill</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>46770</td>
<td>48160</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Repair arch ring and spandrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Muscoates</td>
<td>C61</td>
<td>46860</td>
<td>47990</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Ouse Gill</td>
<td>C60</td>
<td>46399</td>
<td>49461</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Strengthen and repair foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Arklebeck</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>40440</td>
<td>48060</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Strengthen structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Riggs Road (Ryton)</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>47960</td>
<td>47540</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Replace structure and widen road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>Bosendale</td>
<td>C61</td>
<td>47200</td>
<td>46250</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Redecope and replace parapets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>Butterwick</td>
<td>C230</td>
<td>47320</td>
<td>47760</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>North End Clapper</td>
<td>C24</td>
<td>45070</td>
<td>50460</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overslab clapper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>Church Bridge</td>
<td>C24</td>
<td>45070</td>
<td>50460</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overslab clapper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>Stell Bank</td>
<td>C156</td>
<td>44320</td>
<td>49120</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Strengthen extension in wheel track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>Jacksons</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>47295</td>
<td>49035</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strengthen Masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>Gingerfield</td>
<td>C41</td>
<td>41640</td>
<td>50300</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Strengthen by redecking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693</td>
<td>Sprent</td>
<td>C41</td>
<td>41090</td>
<td>50940</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Strengthen deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
<td>Stanwick Church</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>41850</td>
<td>51190</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Arch forming hinges, only access to village, bridge being monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>Ruston North</td>
<td>C212</td>
<td>49590</td>
<td>48310</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Strengthen Masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>Hayburn</td>
<td>C77</td>
<td>49950</td>
<td>49760</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Strengthen structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Little Sessay</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>44660</td>
<td>47490</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Strengthen and repair structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835</td>
<td>New Wath</td>
<td>C82</td>
<td>48150</td>
<td>50030</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Rebuild spandrels and wing walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1062</td>
<td>Little Busby</td>
<td>C24</td>
<td>45057</td>
<td>50507</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Strengthen and repair structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064</td>
<td>Burn Beck</td>
<td>C277</td>
<td>44407</td>
<td>46344</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Strengthen and repair structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Works listed by Bridge Number not order of priority

**YEAR 5 (2004/05)**

6 Bat surveys of structures before works commence.

300 Estimated additional sum for Monitoring of substandard structures, BCI's and Assessments.

4,277 Total required for strengthening 2003/2004

appendix l/11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRIDGE NO</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROAD EAST</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>ASSESSED WEIGHT (t)</th>
<th>COST (£k)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td>Hag</td>
<td>Uncl 44512</td>
<td>45264</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Repair foundations and strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1074</td>
<td>Ryton Cut Culvert</td>
<td>Uncl 47960</td>
<td>47530</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Replace structure and widen road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>Stainderber Lane End Culvert</td>
<td>C380 36520</td>
<td>47360</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1288</td>
<td>Newfield</td>
<td>C393 39070</td>
<td>45810</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>Parkfoot</td>
<td>C385 36730</td>
<td>47170</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324</td>
<td>Wharfe Gill Beck</td>
<td>C119 37790</td>
<td>46920</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Redec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338</td>
<td>Tems</td>
<td>Uncl 38110</td>
<td>46400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340</td>
<td>Chapel-le-Dale</td>
<td>Uncl 37380</td>
<td>47720</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Replace structure no viable diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342</td>
<td>Lower West House End Culvert</td>
<td>Uncl 36710</td>
<td>47380</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>Crook Beck Low</td>
<td>Uncl 37270</td>
<td>46870</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>Park Drain</td>
<td>C303 46923</td>
<td>44369</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Replace existing structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>Gordale</td>
<td>Uncl 39130</td>
<td>46350</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Repair structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403</td>
<td>Winterburn</td>
<td>Uncl 39340</td>
<td>45850</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1413</td>
<td>Newby Moor Beck</td>
<td>Uncl 46950</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>Dale Barn</td>
<td>Uncl 37130</td>
<td>47550</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>Dale House Upper</td>
<td>Uncl 37200</td>
<td>47590</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1426</td>
<td>Twisleton</td>
<td>Uncl 37220</td>
<td>47620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>Crook Beck Middle</td>
<td>Uncl 37260</td>
<td>46920</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>Rice Side</td>
<td>C394 38830</td>
<td>47620</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Dry Beck</td>
<td>C394 39000</td>
<td>47430</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Cowsen Gill</td>
<td>C387 37260</td>
<td>46250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Foster Beck</td>
<td>C379 41480</td>
<td>46640</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>Skirse Gill</td>
<td>C404 39630</td>
<td>45910</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Bauther Gill</td>
<td>C32 39160</td>
<td>47830</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
<td>C248 39240</td>
<td>44940</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>High Greenfield</td>
<td>Uncl 38270</td>
<td>47890</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Strengthen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Uncl 39719</td>
<td>44987</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Strengthen &amp; repair Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Lanshaw Beck</td>
<td>Uncl 39950</td>
<td>44250</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Repair abutments and spandrels of masonry structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>Tithe Laithe</td>
<td>Uncl 40030</td>
<td>44890</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Menethorpe</td>
<td>Uncl 47690</td>
<td>46760</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Redec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Howl Beck (Westow)</td>
<td>Uncl 47640</td>
<td>46670</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>Glasshouses Mill Culvert</td>
<td>Uncl 41710</td>
<td>46440</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Strengthen RC Slab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Grange Hall</td>
<td>C235 40200</td>
<td>44620</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strengthen by overslabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Grantley</td>
<td>C31 42390</td>
<td>46920</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Strengthen and repair structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Rawden</td>
<td>C257 42570</td>
<td>45840</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Strengthen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>C263 43310</td>
<td>46650</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Strengthen and repair structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Uncl 43300</td>
<td>46630</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Baffie (Barrowby)</td>
<td>Uncl 43230</td>
<td>44730</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Strengthen and repair structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>C273 44625</td>
<td>45288</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Strengthen and repair structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Mill Lane Stutton</td>
<td>C305 44820</td>
<td>44160</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Strengthen and repair structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Bradley Drain Culvert</td>
<td>Uncl 45537</td>
<td>41828</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Strengthen arch and repair structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

500 Walls in various locations across the County in need of major repair
195 Retention costs for 03/04 works

3,610 Sum total for strengthening and maintenance 2004/2005
350 Maintenance of Non Core HA network Detrunked Structures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRIDGE NO</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>ASSESSED WEIGHT (t)</th>
<th>COST (£k)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEH3 43</td>
<td>Victoria Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100 Network Rail figures and programme contributions still not agreed with NYCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REB2 23</td>
<td>Leyburn Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200 Network Rail figures and programme contributions still not agreed with NYCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REB2 28</td>
<td>Leyburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950 Network Rail figures and programme contributions still not agreed with NYCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REB2 31</td>
<td>Preston Under Scar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950 Network Rail figures and programme contributions still not agreed with NYCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKS1 2A</td>
<td>New Road Carleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200 Network Rail figures and programme contributions still not agreed with NYCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Bat surveys of structures before works commence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 Monitoring of substandard structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320 Inspection of structures including detrunked Highways Agency structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 Diving surveys checking structures at risk scour in fast flowing deep rivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 Contribution to the strengthening of British Rail Property Structures on County Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,247 Total required for strengthening and maintenance 2004/2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note** Works listed by Bridge Number not order of priority

**YEAR 6 (2005/06)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRIDGE NO</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>ASSESSED WEIGHT (t)</th>
<th>COST (£k)</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Swindon Gill</td>
<td>A682</td>
<td>38580</td>
<td>45390</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 50</td>
<td>50 Carry out essential maintenance to structure and replace steel joist under road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Bedale</td>
<td>A684</td>
<td>42680</td>
<td>48830</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 50</td>
<td>50 Needs repair and waterproofing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>South Milford</td>
<td>C321</td>
<td>44968</td>
<td>43175</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 35</td>
<td>35 Needs repair and waterproofing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Housleye Shackleton</td>
<td>C56</td>
<td>47350</td>
<td>50730</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 15</td>
<td>15 Needs repairs and painting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Thorn Wash</td>
<td>C62</td>
<td>46660</td>
<td>49730</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 30</td>
<td>30 Needs repair walls moving off structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>Gammersgill</td>
<td>C103</td>
<td>40560</td>
<td>48300</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 50</td>
<td>50 Listed structure needs repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 Replace RC Slab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td>Bying Road</td>
<td>C37</td>
<td>41890</td>
<td>49800</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 50</td>
<td>50 Needs repairs in poor condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848</td>
<td>Golden Grove</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>49000</td>
<td>50880</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 42</td>
<td>42 Redeco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889</td>
<td>Hubberholme</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>39280</td>
<td>47830</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 40</td>
<td>40 Rebuild and repair sections of wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td>Low Eggbrough Canal</td>
<td>A19</td>
<td>45600</td>
<td>42260</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 50</td>
<td>50 Major maintenance of structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029</td>
<td>Selby Swing Bridge</td>
<td>A19</td>
<td>46160</td>
<td>43250</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 600</td>
<td>600 Essential maintenance to structure repairs to main support beams re-deck and paint structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068</td>
<td>Ladypits</td>
<td>A163</td>
<td>46970</td>
<td>43660</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 15</td>
<td>15 Structure is undercut and needs foundation repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Dibbles</td>
<td>B6265</td>
<td>40520</td>
<td>46300</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 30</td>
<td>30 Major maintenance of structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341</td>
<td>Treeaber</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>36580</td>
<td>47300</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 50</td>
<td>50 Strengthen and repair structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>Arncliffe Mill</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>39300</td>
<td>47200</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 50</td>
<td>50 Needs attention to regain plated weight limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404</td>
<td>Nappa</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>39310</td>
<td>45710</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 40</td>
<td>40 Needs repairs in poor condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1406</td>
<td>Chew Lane</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>39310</td>
<td>45450</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 6</td>
<td>6 Punching failure to arch needs repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417</td>
<td>Low Westhouse</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>36710</td>
<td>47370</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 30</td>
<td>30 Overslab clapper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>Coronley Beck</td>
<td>C235</td>
<td>39890</td>
<td>44700</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 60</td>
<td>60 Strengthen length of arch under road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>C131</td>
<td>39830</td>
<td>45010</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 40</td>
<td>40 Repairs and maintenance of masonry arches to retain 40t capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>Lumb Gill</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>40940</td>
<td>44950</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 30</td>
<td>30 Strengthen Clapper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>Sutton in Craven School</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>40060</td>
<td>44440</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 10</td>
<td>10 Install bollards to protect weak footpaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Lindley</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>42250</td>
<td>44830</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 60</td>
<td>60 Strengthen structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>42470</td>
<td>44810</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 50</td>
<td>50 RC arch reinforcement is exposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Scot Beck</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>41830</td>
<td>45860</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 25</td>
<td>25 Repairs to spandrel walls and arch ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Mill Beck</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>47809</td>
<td>46504</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 40</td>
<td>40 Replace structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>Morrells Wood</td>
<td>C167</td>
<td>43370</td>
<td>46990</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 20</td>
<td>20 Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Lurk Beck</td>
<td>C376</td>
<td>42280</td>
<td>46235</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 30</td>
<td>30 Strengthen Clapper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Beck House</td>
<td>C259</td>
<td>42760</td>
<td>44870</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 25</td>
<td>25 Paint structure, repairs to scour and abutments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Tutt</td>
<td>C267</td>
<td>43950</td>
<td>46640</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 25</td>
<td>25 Concrete repairs and waterproofing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Smeaton</td>
<td>C342</td>
<td>45350</td>
<td>41759</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 50</td>
<td>50 Strengthen masonry arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Burnistone</td>
<td>C278</td>
<td>44452</td>
<td>45396</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 50</td>
<td>50 Reconstruct spindrels and repair abutment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>School House (Skipton)</td>
<td>Uncl</td>
<td>39950</td>
<td>45170</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 60</td>
<td>60 Strengthen precast concrete deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE NO</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ROAD EAST</td>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>ASSESSED WEIGHT (t)</td>
<td>COST (£k)</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEH3 42</td>
<td>Royal Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Structural maintenance of retaining walls results of retaining wall survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM5 72</td>
<td>Hutton Bonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>retention costs for 04/05 works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKS1 7</td>
<td>Wildmans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3539</td>
<td>Total strengthening and maintenance costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locations to be confirmed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenditure (£k) 2003/04</th>
<th>Expenditure (£k) 2004/05</th>
<th>Expenditure (£k) 2005/06</th>
<th>Total Expenditure (£k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strengthening and maintenance of bridges</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>9,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strengthening Rebuilding Retaining Walls</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail Structures</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>5,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat Surveys</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diving Surveys</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment &amp; Monitoring Structures</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection of De-trunked HA Non Core Network</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of De-trunked HA Non Core Network</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Property Board Structures strengthening Contribution</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,277</td>
<td>8,247</td>
<td>6,585</td>
<td>19,132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Works listed by Bridge Number not order of priority

As described in Appendix L, the following items relate to issues which have expended or not previously been included in LTP submissions.

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This statement sets out the County Council's ten year programme of major and major/minor highway improvement schemes.

At the request of the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber (GOYH) the County Council has prepared a programme of Major and Major/Minor Highway Works to 2010. The following programme of schemes has therefore been developed in consultation with GOYH and in line with Government advice is felt to be “realistic and deliverable”.

The County is predominately rural in nature with numerous towns, villages and small communities scattered across the County. Many of the larger towns and villages have benefited from bypasses and/or traffic management measures that are effective in reducing the impact of traffic on the communities. There are, however, a number of communities located on main traffic routes where extraneous through traffic creates environmental and road safety problems. In many of these communities traffic calming measures have been implemented and have resulted in significant benefits to the communities and to travellers. There remains, however, a number of communities where traffic calming measures have not provided sufficient environmental and/or road safety benefits or are not feasible. In these cases where other measures are not felt to be appropriate or sufficient, the only remaining option is to remove through traffic from the community by means of a local bypass.

The general design principle for new bypasses will be to provide the maximum environmental and road safety benefits to the community whilst having a minimum impact on the wider environment. Though there may be some benefits to travellers in terms of reduced journey times as a result of these bypasses this is not the main aim of providing these new roads.

In the second Annual Progress Report published in 2002, the County Council identified five major and major/minor highway schemes for implementation during the period up to 2010, namely:

i) A165 Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme;
ii) A165 Reighton Bypass;
iii) A19 Burn Bypass;
iv) A61 Killinghall Bypass;
v) A19 Shipton by Beningbrough Bypass.

Progress on these schemes is described in more detail in Sections 2 and 5 of this Appendix.

Within this present review, the A684 Leeming Bar/Aiskew/Bedale Bypass has been added in light of the decision by HA to upgrade the A1 to motorway standard from Dishforth to Barton. It is considered appropriate to promote this scheme now in order to benefit from the A1(M) construction. Further details on this scheme are provided in Sections 2 and 5 of this Appendix.

There are a further two schemes (A56 Thornton in Craven Bypass and A65(T) Village Bypasses) which may need to be programmed due to special circumstances and these are described in detail in Section 2 of this Appendix.
2. **MAJOR AND MAJOR/MINOR SCHEMES PROGRAMME**

Taking into account the ongoing discussions with representatives from the GOYH, the County Council has decided to revise its major and major/minor highway schemes submission and to submit a “realistic and deliverable” programme of schemes for the period up to 2010. Table 1 below gives brief details of the County Council’s proposed programme.

**Table 1: Summary Programme to 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Est Cost (£m) *1</th>
<th>Anticipated date of bid for funding</th>
<th>Start of construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A165 Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>Scheme approved</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A165 Reighton Bypass</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Scheme approved</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19 Burn Bypass</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A61 Killinghall Bypass</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19 Shipton by Beningbrough Bypass</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A684 Leeming Bar/ Aiskew/Bedale Bypass</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td>Subject to consultation with HA</td>
<td>Subject to consultation with HA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 – Estimated scheme cost including inflation and risk cost as specified in Major Scheme Appraisal in LTP Part 1

In addition to the schemes included in Table 1 above, following discussions with the GOYH, it has been agreed that the County Council may need to amend the programme to include the following schemes due to special circumstances.

i) **A56 Thornton in Craven Bypass** – Currently Lancashire County Council’s joint second priority major highway improvement is for the A56 Village Bypass Schemes (Colne, Kelbrook, Earby and Foulridge). The Lancashire County Council schemes terminate at the County boundary with North Yorkshire. Should the Lancashire County Council A56 Package be provided, the only remaining community on the A56 between Colne and the A59 that would still have substantial volumes of through traffic passing through the village would be Thornton in Craven. The village currently experiences environmental and road safety problems as a result of this through traffic. The construction of a new road in Lancashire may exacerbate these problems. We have, therefore, been working closely with Lancashire County Council on cross boundary issues arising from these proposals. At this time, Lancashire CC has not received the requisite approval in their LTP settlement for the construction of their proposed improvements. However, if the Lancashire proposals are approved in the future the County Council will be seeking funding for the A56 Thornton in Craven Bypass.
ii) A684 Leeming Bar/Aiskew/Bedale Bypass – This scheme was considered as a special case in the last APR and is now included in the programme in light of the decision by HA to upgrade the A1 to motorway standard from Dishforth to Barton.

iii) A65(T) Village Bypass schemes. – These are still subject to the outcome of an ongoing study. The GOYH accept that the County Council may wish to amend their programme of schemes to take into account the results of this study. The consultants have completed their report and this will be published for consultation purposes shortly. The report concludes that bypasses should form part of a package approach to solve the problems in the community. The County Council has yet to come to a formal view on the right approach to this route but will be discussing the way forward with the Government Office and Highways Agency as part of the discussions, currently ongoing, over de-trunking of the route. In the meantime, HA have programmed substantial resurfacing works in Hellifield and Gargrave from May to July this year.

3. CONTRIBUTION TO CORPORATE PRIORITIES AND LTP KEY AIMS

The Local Transport Plan identifies the six "County Council Corporate Priorities" and the "Key Aims of the LTP". The six schemes included in the programme of Major and Major/Minor Schemes all contribute to these priorities and aims in a similar manner. Brief details are set out below.

All the schemes identified are on the primary route network for North Yorkshire.

By improving the transport network all the schemes contribute towards the corporate priority of "promoting a successful North Yorkshire economy and infrastructure".

The schemes also contribute to the priority to "promote safe, healthy and sustainable communities" by removing extraneous through traffic from the villages, hence improving road safety and the environment for these communities.

The key aims of the LTP are closely related to the Corporate Priorities. Therefore programmed schemes also make a significant contribution towards three of these aims.

Providing Economic Prosperity – As with the related corporate priority the improvements to the primary road network will assist in improving accessibility to key areas of the County. This is particularly true for the A165 schemes which will improve transport links on the East Coast, an area identified in Regional Planning Guidance as being a Second Priority Regeneration area. Similarly, the A19 Burn Bypass improves the link between the M62 and the Selby area. This area is currently identified as a First Priority Regeneration Area in the Regional Planning Guidance and with the closure of substantial parts of the Selby Coalfield promoting the economic prosperity of the area has become an even higher priority.

Improving Community Life – A major objective of all the programmed schemes is to remove extraneous through traffic from the villages. This will reduce noise, pollution and severance from these communities, hence leading to an improved living environment.

Improving Safety – The removal of through traffic from the villages will improve road safety for both residents and travellers. All the programmed schemes will result in a reduction in the number of accidents (as assessed by COBA11 – scheme summary table).
4. **OTHER MAJOR/MINOR SCHEMES**

The County Council may also wish to include bids in the roll forward of the Local Transport Plan for non-highway major/minor schemes arising from the following studies:

i) **Rail Improvement Schemes**

Crosshills Station – A £2m proposal to provide a new railway station on the Skipton to Keighley Railway serving the communities of Crosshills, Glusburn and Sutton in Craven.

Malton to Pickering railway re-instatement – Proposals for the re-instatement of the Malton to Pickering Railway Line linking, via the privately run North York Moors Railway, the Middlesborough to Whitby line with the York to Scarborough line. A passenger demand study has been completed and results are promising. Discussions with partners on possible re-opening are ongoing.

Northallerton level crossing – The County town of Northallerton is bisected on three of its main radial roads by level crossings on the Northallerton to Teesside branch line. Closures totalling around 20 minutes in the peak traffic hours result in significant traffic congestion in the town centre and substantial delays to emergency vehicles. In order to overcome congestion problems on the East Coast Main Line the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) is proposing increasing the use of the branch line by up to 50%. This will lead to even greater traffic congestion in Northallerton. We are currently working in partnership with the SRA and the Network Rail on potential solutions (including provision of a new bridge). This work is ongoing and may result in the need for new road and rail infrastructure works.

Other new rail halts – Investigations into other potential locations for new halts are ongoing and may result in bids for additional funding.

Each of the above schemes will be discussed with the Strategic Rail Authority and may be eligible for partial funding from the Rail Passenger Partnership (RPP) fund. Subject to the bids to the RPP being successful the County Council will be seeking further funding through the LTP process.

ii) **Freight Quality Partnerships**

As detailed in Appendix H the County Council is continuing its policy of working with stakeholders including road and rail-freight operators in addressing freight related problems. Although discussions are ongoing on a range of topics, good progress is being made, and the following potential major/minor schemes have been identified:

New access to Wards of Sherburn: The Sherburn Freight Quality Partnership has been established to address the impact of HGV movements arising from Ward and Atlas Building Systems, which combined are significant goods vehicle trip generators. A draft study jointly commissioned by the County Council and Highways Agency suggests that an access road direct on to the A64(T) is a feasible proposition. This option is now being actively pursued by the Partnership.

Swinden Quarry: A study commissioned by the County Council that considered the potential for improvements to the Swinden line and re-instatement of the Threshfield line is now complete. However, although it concluded that the prospects for this are limited, investigations are still ongoing and the possibility remains that funding may be required for capital improvements and re-instatement of former rail infrastructure.
Timber Extraction: The County Council commissioned Timber Transport Study to consider the feasibility of rail-borne timber; this has now reported and does not recommend significant infrastructure investment. It is anticipated that any remedial upgrades that are required can be funded through existing budgets.

5. SCHEME DETAILS AND STATE OF READINESS

Brief details of each scheme included in the programme and its state of readiness are given below.

**A165 Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme**

This scheme consists of the provision of two Park & Ride sites, with complementary bus priority measures, the provision of a new urban traffic control system in Scarborough and the diversion of the A165 between Scarborough and Lebberston. The cost of the scheme is £26.9m as shown in Table 1 and is detailed in the Finance forms accompanying this report. The 2003-2004 Local Transport Settlement provisionally accepted the scheme "subject to successful completion of the statutory procedures".

The County Council submitted a Planning Application for the A64 Park & Ride site in April 2002 but this is held in abeyance pending the outcome of negotiations with an adjacent developer. The planning consent for the A165 Park & Ride site was granted in December 2002. As the planning consent for the A165 Diversion was due to expire in October 2003, an application to renew this consent was submitted in February 2003. At present, surveys are being undertaken to confirm the presence/absence of great crested newts, a European protected species, on or adjacent to the site of the project. Should the newts be present, a mitigation plan will be prepared so that the necessary licence can be obtained from DEFRA. A Public Inquiry relating to the Statutory Orders was held in December 2002 and the Secretary of State's decision is currently awaited. Notwithstanding, the procedures necessary for the appointment of a preferred Contractor through a partnership agreement are being undertaken at this time to expedite the completion of the design and construction of the project. It is expected that a contract will be awarded to the successful tenderer by the end of this year. The development of the UTC and bus priority measures are ongoing with a view to commencement in 2005/2006.

**A165 Reighton Bypass**

The estimated cost of Reighton Bypass is £6.5m. This is a 2.6km bypass passing to the west of the village of Reighton on the A165 south of Scarborough. Removal of extraneous through traffic from the village would result in environmental improvements for residents and road safety and journey improvements for both residents and travellers. The 2003-2004 Local Transport Settlement provisionally accepted the scheme "subject to successful completion of the statutory procedures".

Planning approval and Side Road Orders are in place. However, minor amendments to these have been pursued in order to ensure the scheme complies with current design standards. These amendments to the planning consent have now been approved. Recent investigations however have uncovered the presence of badgers, a European protected species, and the possible presence of features of archaeological significance. Further studies are required before renewal of the full planning consent can be presented for consideration in September 2003. The Government Office has recently responded favourably to the draft Side Roads Order amendments and as a result they will be published in late summer 2003. The Compulsory Purchase Orders lapsed in 2000 and will also be published in late Summer 2003.
**A19 Burn Bypass** – The £2.0m estimated cost of the Burn Bypass means that the project is a major/minor scheme. Consequently the County Council is not required to submit a full Annex E assessment. The village of Burn is located on the A19 approximately 3km south of Selby. The crossroads junction of the A19 with West Lane and Brick Kiln Lane in the centre of the village has a poor road safety record. When the Selby Bypass opens in 2003 it is considered likely that the A19 through Burn will replace the A1041 as the most attractive route between the A19 and A63 north of Selby and the M62. It is anticipated that traffic flows on the A19 through Burn will increase significantly, exacerbating the current problems. The County Council will monitor the traffic flows through Burn and update the assessment at the appropriate time. There being no preferred route for the Burn Bypass at this time, the County Council has begun an assessment of different route options and will carry out public consultation in order to determine a preferred route by the summer of 2004.

**A61 Killinghall Bypass** – The preferred route of the A61 Killinghall Bypass was included in the first APR as a scheme potentially to commence before 2006. The Government's decision letter on the APR in December 2001 stated that “a bypass of the village would appear to be beneficial” but that the bid “needs reconsidering as it would seem to be very large for what it is designed to achieve”. The County Council has therefore reassessed its position on Killinghall Bypass and is currently investigating alternative shorter routes and will carry out public consultation on any suitable options. This work will take into account the results of the review of the strategy for the Harrogate and Knaresborough Northern and Western Relief Roads. It is anticipated that the outcome of the review of the route options will be fully reported in the APR to be submitted in July 2004.

**A19 Shipton by Beningbrough Bypass** – There is no preferred route for the Shipton Bypass. The Highways Agency previously had a preferred route protected but this was dropped as part of the roads review in the early nineties. The County Council will reassess this route and consider alternatives. Progress will be reported in future Annual Progress Reports.

**A684 Leeming Bar/Aiskew/Bedale Bypass** - This scheme is now included in the programme in light of the decision by HA to upgrade the A1 to motorway standard from Dishforth to Barton. The purpose of the bypass is to relieve environmental and road safety problems in and on the approaches to the villages of Leeming Bar, Aiskew and Bedale. The preferred route for this scheme is aligned to the north of these three villages incorporating a roundabout at either end and a grade separated junction over the proposed M1. Discussions will be held with the HA in regard to their proposed junction arrangements in the Leeming Bar area and how these may impact on the need for and the alignment of the A684 Bypass. Also to be discussed will be the timing and methods of construction of both projects to ensure as far as reasonably possible that disruption to the three communities is kept to a minimum.

Details of the preliminary assessment of these schemes (excluding the Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme and the Reighton Bypass which have already been approved by the Government) are included in Table 2 below.
## Major Schemes Review

### Table 2: Assessment Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Cost (£m)</th>
<th>Net Present Value (£m)</th>
<th>No of Accidents 1996–00</th>
<th>No of Accidents saved over 30 year period</th>
<th>Popn</th>
<th>Traffic Flow on Main Route (AADT)</th>
<th>Environmental Benefits</th>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A19 Burn Bypass</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>Noise and pollution benefits to residents within the village.</td>
<td>Neutral/slight adverse.</td>
<td>Scheme less than £5m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A61 Killinghall (Scheme subject to review)</td>
<td>12.2 Under review</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>75 *1</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>19,000 (A61)</td>
<td>Significant benefits to large number of residents in village. Large beneficial improvement to setting of Listed Buildings.</td>
<td>Slight to moderate adverse impact on Special Landscape Area.</td>
<td>Based on current preferred route. Scheme subject to review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19 Shipton by Beningbrough Bypass (Scheme subject to review)</td>
<td>6.9 Under review</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>Significant benefit to residents adjacent to existing road.</td>
<td>Slight adverse impact on landscape and biodiversity.</td>
<td>Based on deleted Highways Agency route. Scheme subject to review. Non-core trunk road subject to de-trunking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A684 Leeming Bar/Aiskew/Bedale Bypass</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>Significant benefits to properties and commercial centre of Bedale</td>
<td>Moderate to large adverse. Impact on landscape and biodiversity.</td>
<td>This project should be carried out in conjunction with the upgrading of A1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Accidents 1994 - 1998
SINC Site of Importance for Nature Conservation
SUPPLEMENTARY BIDS

1. INTRODUCTION

As stated in the LTP Spending Programme section of the APR a number of significant new issues have arisen since the submission of the Local Transport Plan in July 2000. Following consultation with the Government office for Yorkshire and the Humber (GOYH) the County Council has therefore submitted four Supplementary Bids for funding to address these issues. Brief details are included in the APR with full details of the bids included in this Appendix.

NATIONAL CYCLE NETWORK – NORTH YORKSHIRE

1. Introduction

North Yorkshire County Council, in partnership with District Councils and Sustrans, have provided substantial sections of the National Cycle Network in North Yorkshire and is investigating and approving additional sections of the National Cycle Network (NCN) in the County.

The National Cycle Network is a high profile national project supported by central government. Sustrans, the charity charged by the Government with co-ordinating this project hope to have 10,000 miles of route open by 2005. This includes substantial sections within North Yorkshire.

Given the current levels of funding available from the North Yorkshire Local Transport Plan settlement it will not be possible to implement any further substantial sections of the network during the current LTP period without prejudicing the development of local cycling plans. The County Council is therefore seeking additional funding to complete the implementation of the National Cycle Network in North Yorkshire.

2. Background

The Council has worked closely with Sustrans and the District Councils in funding and implementing sections of Route 65/66 The White Rose Route and Route 62 The Trans Pennine Trail. Additionally reports into Route 1 (The East Coast Route), Route 68 (The Pennine Cycleway) and Route 67 (York to Penrith) have been commissioned from Sustrans.

It is inevitable in a rural County of the size and nature of North Yorkshire that most of the NCN routes approved are likely to be used mainly for recreational trips. The Council does not therefore wish to transfer existing LTP funding to the National Cycle Network and away from providing urban networks where there is a greater opportunity to affect modal transfer and address social exclusion issues.
Whilst the County Council, as the Highway Authority, has approved these routes sufficient funding is not currently available to allow the Council to implement all of them. The Council has informed Sustrans that whilst it is willing to make a significant contribution towards implementing these routes it expects Sustrans to secure a proportion of the funding from other sources. Sustrans has not however been able to secure any other contributions towards the cost of the routes and has informed the County Council that it expects the Council, as the Highway Authority, to fund the routes.

3. Supplementary Bid

The following sections of the National Cycle Network have been approved by the County Council following public consultation and are currently awaiting implementation. See Figure 1.

All the sections of route approved, but not yet implemented, in North Yorkshire form parts of longer routes running between and through other transport authority areas. These routes are at differing stages of development in different authorities areas.

**Route 68 – The Pennine Cycleway**
Approximately 60km of route mainly on quiet roads between east of Barnoldswick and Kingsdale. This forms the North Yorkshire section of a route from Derbyshire to Northumberland and links to Lancashire and Cumbria. Estimated Cost £45k. This route is programmed for implementation during 2003/2004.

**Route 67 – York to Penrith**
Approximately 110km of route between Northallerton and Tan Hill. Mainly on quiet roads. This section links into Route 67 in Cumbria. Estimated cost £180k.

Further work is required to complete the following routes.

**Route 1 – The East Coast Route**

a) East Riding of Yorkshire County Boundary to Scarborough.
b) Improve the surface of the former Scarborough to Whitby railway.
c) Complete the study of and implement the Whitby to Staithes (Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council Boundary) section of the route.
Estimated Cost £100k

**Route 65/66 – The White Rose Route**

a) Off road track adjacent to the A170 near Sutton Bank.
b) On road link between Northallerton and the White Rose Route at Hutton Rudby.
c) A166 Scoreby Lane to Stamford Bridge – 625m of cycle track in the verge linking off road route in East Riding of Yorkshire and on road link City of York (Estimated Cost £75k). Programmed for completion in 2003/04.

In addition to the above there are sections of cycle route within urban areas which would serve a dual purpose by making a significant contribution towards modal shift of utility trips and providing links through the towns for the National Cycle Network. Examples of this are the Spofforth to Harrogate Route, links through Northallerton, Thirsk, Whitby and Scarborough. Funding for these sections of route has already been identified in the current Local Transport Plan.
Details of the estimated cost for each of routes identified above (excluding sections already funded from LTP money) together with an expected expenditure profile are included in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Expenditure (€k) 2003/04 (Approved)</th>
<th>Expenditure (€k) 2004/05</th>
<th>Total Expenditure (€k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 69 – The Pennine Cycleway</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 67 – York to Penrith</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 1 – The East Coast Route</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 65/66 – The White Rose Route</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – National Cycle Network Supplementary Bid – Expenditure Profile

The total supplementary bid for additional funding is therefore £280k in 2004/05 which combined with this year’s approved allocation makes a total of £400k over two financial years.

As stated above this is a bid for additional funding. It would not be possible to implement these routes from the existing Local Transport Plan cycling funding without significantly compromising the Council ability to meet its objectives for urban cycle networks. Should additional funding not be forthcoming the majority of the remaining sections of the National Cycle Network in North Yorkshire will not be completed during this Local Transport Plan period and this would therefore leave significant gaps in the National Cycle Network.

4.0 Justification

Whilst it is acknowledged that provision of urban cycle networks is a priority and will make a greater contribution to the County Council’s LTP Objectives nevertheless the National Cycle Network routes are consistent with and contribute towards these objectives. Brief details of the relevant objectives and the National Cycle Networks contribution are given below.

Objective 1 – To promote social equality by providing choices of travel mode. The NCN in North Yorkshire is a network of both on and off road routes available to cyclists. Substantial funding is invested in the network to provide routes that are as safe and convenient as is feasible. These routes link many of the Towns in the County and can therefore provide commuter routes for more experienced cyclists. More importantly however these routes provide a safe means of access into the countryside for non-car owners. The standard of the routes is such that most are suitable for unaccompanied older children hence providing an opportunity for informal physical recreation.
Objective 2 – To limit traffic growth by developing alternative non-car modes. North Yorkshire has a strong tourist industry. A significant proportion of trips in rural areas are therefore tourist related. The provision of a high quality, well promoted network of recreational routes, such as many of the NCN routes in North Yorkshire, therefore provides an alternative means of tourism not dependant on the private car. It is therefore anticipated that the NCN could contribute towards this objective in many rural areas of the County.

Objective 7 – To facilitate opportunities for economic regeneration and growth. The tourist industry is an important element of the North Yorkshire economy. High profile recreational cycle routes such as those provided by the NCN in North Yorkshire will encourage greater cycle tourism in the County. For example, the County Council is currently in discussions with both Hambleton District Council and Scarborough Borough Council about the tourist potential of promoting a circular route from the ferry terminal in Hull involving the East Coast Route and the White Rose Route. These discussions will be extended in the near future to include the other authorities on the route.
INTEGRATED TRANSPORT WORKS ON DE TRUNKED ROADS

The following sections of trunk road in North Yorkshire were de-trunked on 1 July 2003 and handed to the County Council:

A19 Thirsk to York
A19 York to North of Selby
A64 West of the A1 to the County Boundary
A65 Thorlby to Chelker
A629 West and South of Skipton
A1041 South of Selby

The arrangements with the Highways Agency for the de trunking of these roads do not include any provision for funding for integrated transport schemes. The procedure for funding of Capital Maintenance on these roads is set out in Para. 65 of the APR Guidance Notes however there is no advice given on the procedure for funding of integrated transport schemes. Whilst bids for funding these schemes will be included in the next Local Transport Plan there remains a funding gap for 2004/05 and 2005/2006 for these works. The County Council has therefore prepared this supplementary bid for funds to allow the implementation of both safety and non-safety related integrated transport schemes on these sections of road.

Non Safety Integrated Transport Schemes

As part of the preparation of the Local Transport Plan the County Council were required to bid for funding for 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 for “Non-Safety Improvements on Non-Core Trunk Roads”. The County Council identified £1.82m of required schemes.

The Highways Agency completed a number of these schemes. However there are a number of these original schemes outstanding and since July 2000 other non-safety issues on non-core trunk roads have arisen. The County Council has therefore maintained a list of outstanding non-safety issues on non-core trunk roads. An extract from this list for the roads listed above is included as Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate (£k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>Husthwaite Junction near Cold Harbour</td>
<td>Deceleration lane and right turn facility</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>Shires Lane Junction near Alne</td>
<td>Acceleration and deceleration lanes</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>New Parks to Warehills Lane</td>
<td>Improve road alignment and widening</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>Tollerton crossroads</td>
<td>Drainage works</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>North of Thormanby</td>
<td>Drainage works</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>South of Thormanby</td>
<td>Drainage works</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1041</td>
<td>Brayton Lane / Barlow Common Lane</td>
<td>Cycle/Pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - List of Outstanding Non-Safety Related Schemes
The total cost of the outstanding non-safety schemes is £470k to be implemented over a two-year period. The Council is therefore bidding for an extra £235k per annum for 2004/05 and 2005/06 for non-safety related schemes.

**Safety Related Integrated Transport Works**

In addition to this, there are a number of safety related issues which will require the attention of the County Council. Details of the numbers of casualties involved in road accidents on these sections of road for the three-year period 2000 to 2002 are given below.

### Casualties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Casualties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A19 Thirsk to York</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19 York to North of Selby</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A64 West of the A1 to the County Boundary</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A65 Thorby to Chelker</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A629 West and South of Skipton</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1041 South of Selby</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>496</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This represents 5.5% additional casualties to the total number of casualties on county roads over the previous 3 years.

The accidents identified above include five locations that are in the top 100 high-risk accident sites in North Yorkshire and therefore require extra safety measures to be provided.

The uncertainty about the programme for de-trunking of these roads has meant that the County Council has not yet been able to prepare a programme of safety related schemes. However, based on the existing rates of safety related spending per accident on the road network currently managed by the Council, and the extra costs necessary to address the high risk accident sites, we have prepared a bid for safety related works on the sections of road to be de-trunked. The Council is therefore bidding for an extra £230k in 2004/05 and £260k in 2005/06 for safety related schemes.

A summary of the total bid is included in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004/05 (£000)</th>
<th>2005/06 (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Safety</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>465</strong></td>
<td><strong>495</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 – Supplementary Bid for Funding of Integrated Transport Measures on De Trunked Roads**

Should significant funding for these de-trunked roads not be forthcoming the County Council would be unable to carry out any non-essential works on these lengths of road until 2006/07. Essential safety works would be carried out funded by the redistributing of current LTP allocations. This would however have a detrimental effect on the ability of the Council to meet its LTP targets.
MANAGING THE ACCIDENTAL OBSTRUCTION OF THE RAILWAY
BY ROAD VEHICLES

1. INTRODUCTION

In February 2001 an accident between a road vehicle and a train set in motion a requirement for a method of assessing the risk of a road vehicle accessing rail tracks and causing great loss of life. It should be remembered that these events are rare and usually result in injury only to the vehicle occupants.

The Department for Transport issued guidance regarding the management of Road over Rail and Roads parallel to rail tracks. The document also sets out the protocol ratified by the Local Government Association and Network Rail apportioning costs and responsibilities for the cost of improvements made at locations where roads meet, cross or run close to railways.

2. NUMBER OF STRUCTURES ROAD CROSSING RAIL

Within the County there is 134 structures over rail tracks. 33 over the East Coast Main Line, the high speed track through the County. The rest on other routes which are heavily trafficked by goods and passenger services.

3. PROGRESS TO DATE

The Risk Assessment Programme has been completed and all 134 structures have been assessed.

11 of the East Coast Main Line structures have been protected and a bid for funding to complete the four other structures. Temporary barriers are to be positioned at Colton Lane, a high scoring site, until a permanent solution can be funded. 91 structures have scored higher than 55 and lower than 95 which indicates that they should be assessed for traffic management methods, sign, etc, but they do not require the installation of barriers.

There remain 10 structures which require barrier treatment. Contract 2 is in preparation (4 structures) at an estimated cost of £230k in 2003/04 depending on funding. 4 structures in Contract 3 (2004/05) estimated cost £200k and 2 structures 2005/06 at £120k.

It would be prudent to carry out traffic management inspections at the 91 structures and a cost of £50k should be applied in each year to allow for investigation and signing and lining improvements were required.

4. ROADS PARALLEL OR CLOSE TO RAILWAY

The new advice from the Department of Transport indicates that all conflicts between road and rail should be access for risk. To allow for the cost of this investigation works £50k per year for 2003/04 and 2004/05 has been allowed. Extra costs for measures to prevent conflicts will follow from the Risk Assessments.
**SUPPLEMENTARY BID FOR FUNDING**

As described in Appendix L the following items relate to issues not previously included in the LTP submissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenditure (£k) 2003/04</th>
<th>Expenditure (£k) 2004/05</th>
<th>Expenditure (£k) 2005/06</th>
<th>Total Expenditure (£k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment of Structures</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Barrier Installation</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads parallel or close to railways</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previously 2002/03 £558k Works 18k Design & Assessment  

£576k
TOWN CENTRE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the 2001/02 financial year, the County Council has been engaged in the development of integrated traffic management strategies for its market towns and coastal resorts. Progress on these is reported in this year’s APR, and it has now become evident that progress on implementation of schemes included in the adopted strategies is being limited due to the levels of funding available.

2. BACKGROUND

When the programme of town centre studies was being considered in early 2001, it was envisaged that strategies for all of the market towns and coastal resorts would be developed over a period of 5 to 6 years. We progressed six studies to the point where, by March this year, six strategies had been adopted by the County Council. It has already become apparent that, in order to deliver all of the schemes included in each of the strategies, implementation will extend over a four year period, in most cases.

As a consequence of the rapidly expanding programme of works arising from the adoption of the town centre strategies, we have already reduced the number of studies to be commenced in each financial year to two. Because of the success of the strategy process, we acknowledge that this decision will inevitably lead to demands from those communities where study work is unlikely to commence for some years yet.

Of more immediate concern however, is the fact that, for those towns for which strategies have already been, or will shortly be adopted, the programme for implementing the schemes is likely to extend for up to four years, in some cases longer, given the current levels of funding available. It is evident from the extensive public consultation exercises we have undertaken for each town that, not only has each community responded very positively, there is also a high level of expectation that the County Council will deliver the schemes included in each strategy as expeditiously as possible. We are in no doubt that any unnecessary delays in scheme delivery, many of which are interdependent, will lead to frustration and disillusionment with the process the County Council has firmly committed itself to.

Furthermore, the County Council has already demonstrated that it can deliver a substantially increased LTP allocation, as evidenced by our achievement in 2002/03.

It is for these reasons that this supplementary bid is now being submitted.

3. SUPPLEMENTARY BID

The Annexes attached to the Traffic Management Appendix (Appendix C) indicate the funding profile which it is presently anticipated can be sustained over the next three years, at present levels of LTP allocation. It will be seen that, particularly for some of the larger towns such as Skipton and Whitby, the funding still required after 2006 amounts to in excess of £2.2 million. By 2004, five more strategies will have been adopted; for Northallerton, Easingwold, Malton/Norton, Leyburn and Selby.
These new strategies will substantially increase the requirement for additional funding for this area of work.

The bid for supplementary funding is therefore:

2004/05    2005/06
£900k       £1200k

These levels of additional funding would enable the programme of implementation to be reduced in length, thereby ensuring that the County Council is more able to respond to the level of community expectation now being generated.
Appendix P - Consultation and Best Practice.
CONSULTATION AND BEST PRACTICE

CONSULTATION

Introduction

Consultation is the cornerstone of the development and implementation of all our LTP initiatives. Annex 1 to this Appendix is a copy of the summary included in our 2002 APR regarding consultation carried out on

- The formulation and review of transport policies, leading to the adoption of relevant and appropriate objectives, strategies and targets;

- The determination of priorities for implementation, leading to the preparation of detailed work programmes reflecting those priorities relative to financial resources available; and

- The development and implementation of individual schemes and projects.

A comprehensive review of our consultation procedures is being carried out, taking into account good practice in other Authorities and to ensure consistency in approach across all aspects of the LTP. A report on the outcome of the review will be made in our next APR. Consultation carried out as part of the implementation of schemes is included in the respective APR Appendices. Notwithstanding this review we have continually sought to improve our consultation practices.

In summary consultation on the development of the traffic management strategies has continued and as a result of feedback, an additional stage has been introduced to broaden the initial consultation on transport issues beyond the stakeholders group. Questionnaires are now distributed to 10% of all properties in the study area to ensure that the issues to be addressed are agreed by a wider representative group. Improvements have also been made to the process by providing feedback on decisions taken following consultation. Additionally, we have introduced the concept of post-implementation surveys to establish the public's views on schemes delivered. The information provided through this feedback is used to improve the design and consultation process.

Consulting the Public

At a more strategic level, consultation for the current year has consisted of three main strands:

1. A questionnaire on transport, which was included in the County Council's Newsletter 'The North Yorkshire Reporter' which is sent to all homes and business premises in the County.
2. A Forum for all LTP stakeholders designed to assess the County's performance on the provision of transport services, to stimulate new ideas and obtain direction for future work programmes, targets and the roll forward of the LTP.

3. Consultation on transport issues with all external contiguous Highway Authorities, the seven District Councils and two National Parks within the County.

A summary of the outcome from the above three strands is given below.

1. NORTH YORKSHIRE REPORTER TRANSPORT QUESTIONNAIRE

The North Yorkshire County Council Reporter is delivered in Autumn and Spring each year to all homes and businesses in the County. The Autumn 2003 edition contained an article entitled 'TRANSPORT Are we getting it right?'. A copy of the article is included as Annex 2. This two page illustrated article was designed to give an interesting and concise overview of the Authority's main objectives in providing and maintaining transport services. This was followed by the questionnaire 'Transport Survey' which aimed to measure the strength of support for the County's six main transport objectives. Question 7 on the survey form allowed for additional comments. A prize worth £250 was offered to stimulate the level of feedback.

Part A Support for the Council's Transport Objectives

The results of the first six questions contained in the North Yorkshire Reporter Transport Survey are provided below in Table 1. The figures shown are %age responses received to each of the questions.

'Are we getting it Right?' Prize Winners
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No View</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q.1</td>
<td>Preparing comprehensive transport plans is the best way of identifying the opportunities and priorities for improvement in the County’s towns.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.2</td>
<td>Road safety should continue to be a high priority and more challenging targets should be set.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.3</td>
<td>Improving the quality and frequency of public transport, enhancing passenger waiting facilities and providing better information on services is the right approach to encourage greater use of public transport.</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.4</td>
<td>The provision of a comprehensive network of safe and convenient routes for cyclists should form part of the overall plan to improve transport.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.5</td>
<td>Improved facilities for pedestrians should remain a priority.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.6</td>
<td>The council should continue to promote transport initiatives such as reducing the impact of freight movements and the development of school and workplace travel plans.</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part B General Comments arising from Question 7

A total of 2,065 comments were received in response to question 7 and a summary of the analysis of these is given below.

The comments have been categorised into the following 11 topic areas:

1. Public transportation – 940 comments
   Includes issues regarding the cost of public transportation, frequency, reliability, convenience, ticketing, integrated services, authority liaison, information provision and publicity, transport services in rural areas, general public transport comments, cross-cutting issues, bus waiting facilities, bus stations, bus routes and services, and rail services.

2. Road Safety and Speeding – 103 comments
   Includes issues regarding enforcement, speed limit reduction, improved school safety, and issues in localities prone to excessive vehicle speeds.

3. Traffic Calming – 44 comments
   Includes requests for the introduction of traffic calming measures, concerns relating to the physical dimensions of these calming measures, and opposition towards the implementation of them.

4. School Travel – 94 comments
Includes cycling to school, car school run, walking to school initiatives, school bus, and school related pedestrian road safety issues.

5. **Freight, HGV and commercial vehicles – 79 comments**
Includes requests for restricting commercial freight movement and support for transferring freight from the road network onto the rail network.

6. **Provision of Cycling Facilities – 304 comments**
Includes issues regarding cycle routes and parking provision, cyclist safety, cyclist responsibilities, opposition towards cycling facilities, and the provision of facilities at specific locations.

7. **Pedestrian Facilities – 101 comments**
Includes issues regarding the provision of pedestrian facilities and access problems experienced at specific localities.

8. **Park and Ride Facilities – 40 comments**
Includes requests for the implementation of additional schemes and suggestions to improve existing facilities.

9. **Parking Facilities – 14 comments**
Includes issues regarding parking provision and practice at specific locations.

10. **Road Infrastructure – 106 comments**
Includes issues regarding upgrading, maintaining and investing in road infrastructure, junction design, road signing and lighting provision, general comments, and concerns and requests for infrastructure at specific localities.

11. **Transport Plans and Policy – 240 comments**
Includes issues regarding the development of transport plans and consultation, safety targets, land-use application and development, allocation of financial resources, car dependence and usage, general comments relating to transport plans, and to the survey.

**Conclusions and Actions resulting from the Transport Survey**

The questions designed to assess the strength of support for the Council's current transportation policies and programmes indicate that the people are very much in favour of the direction and actions which the County Council has taken.

The response to the final question dealing with other comments resulted in a substantial volume of useful and practical suggestions. The fact that the general public is willing and able to respond in this manner is most encouraging, firstly in that it indicates a confidence that comments are taken into account and secondly it proves invaluable formulating future policies and programmes. The level of detail in these responses is not appropriate for this report but it is available from the Environmental Services Directorate. The document is entitled "Local Transport Plan APR Comments".

**2. FORUM FOR ALL LTP STAKEHOLDERS**

The stakeholders consisted of those organisations thought to have a keen interest in transportation and was based mainly on those who had already actively participated in the preparation of the LTP. The list included Members and/or Officers of all the County's District Councils and National Park Authorities, representatives of both urban and rural Town and
Parish Councils, the emergency services, other public-sector bodies, transport service providers, transport service user groups, environmental groups and the business world.

Invitations briefly describing the purpose and nature of the event were sent to just over 100 groups, organisations and companies.

The stakeholder consultation meeting was held at County Hall, Northallerton on Friday 6 December 2002. Following a presentation outlining the works completed and initiatives being pursued by the Council through the LTP process, the 87 delegates with officer support were subdivided into themed workshops to discuss different aspects of the County's transport functions as follows:

**Workshop 1 – Highway and bridge maintenance (including the movement of freight and bridge strengthening)**

**Workshop 2 – Public transport (covering both bus and rail services, publicity promotion and timetable information, community transport initiatives, and access for disabled people.**

**Workshop 3 – Traffic management and road safety (including cycling, walking, access for disabled people, travel awareness and major highway schemes).**

Each of the Workshops were structured to address the following areas:

- Implementation to date
- Targets
- The Way Forward

In addition to the above, the delegates were requested to complete the same questionnaire included in the North Yorkshire Reporter article mentioned above.

**The Results of the LTP Stakeholders Forum**

The issues raised in the Workshop by the delegates, along with the Council's response and/or proposed action is included as Annex 3 to this Appendix.

The comments and suggestions from the Forum like the results of the Transport Survey are most encouraging and useful. The great majority of the suggestions are wise and practicable. The information collected will be used to inform and guide the roll forward of the County's Local Transport Plan, and where practical issues addressed at the earliest opportunity where considered appropriate.
The results of the stakeholders response to the Transport for "Are We Getting It Right" survey are shown below. It is interesting to note that the level of support from each of the work categories from the stakeholders was very similar to that received from the general public, indicating a high degree of support to the Council's approach to delivery of the LTP.

### To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No View</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q.1 Preparing comprehensive transport plans is the best way of identifying the opportunities and priorities for improvement in the County’s towns.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.2 Road safety should continue to be a high priority and more challenging targets should be set.</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.3 Improving the quality and frequency of public transport, enhancing passenger waiting facilities and providing better information on services is the right approach to encourage greater use of public transport.</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.4 The provision of a comprehensive network of safe and convenient routes for cyclists should form part of the overall plan to improve transport.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.5 Improved facilities for pedestrians should remain a priority.</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.6 The council should continue to promote transport initiatives such as reducing the impact of freight movements and the development of school and workplace travel plans.</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. CONSULTATION WITH INTERNAL LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND ADJOINING HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES

During the past year we have been proactive in consulting with local authorities within and adjoining the County.

#### 3.1 Internal Consultation

The seven internal local authorities were:

- Craven District Council
- Hambleton District Council
- Harrogate District Council
- Richmondshire District Council
- Ryedale District Council
- Scarborough Borough Council
- Selby District Council
A separate meeting was held with each and the main issues under discussion were:

- Planning Issues
- Passenger Transport
- Integrated Transport Issues
- Town Centre Traffic Management Studies
- LTP Statement
- Ongoing liaison and the future LTP programme

The two National Park Authorities consulted were:

- North York Moors National Park Authority
- Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority

They attended one meeting at County Hall and the main items for discussion were as follows:

- Planning Issues
- Passenger Transport
- Integrated Transport Issues
- Town Centre Traffic Management Studies
- LTP Statement
- Ongoing liaison and the future LTP programme
- Relationship to NYM Traffic and Transport Strategy
- Good Practice Guide for the Implementation of schemes in National Parks
- Design Guide for protected areas highway works
- Signing strategy relating to rural road hierarchy and urbanisation

3.2 External Consultation

The following external and continuous highway authorities were consulted and in some cases a number of authorities chose one of their number to represent them as indicated below:

- East Riding County Council
- South Yorks PTE (representing Doncaster)
- West Yorks PTE (representing Bradford, Leeds & Wakefield)
- City of York Council
- Lancashire County Council
- Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit (representing Darlington, Stockton on Tees, Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland)
- Durham County Council

The main items under discussion were as follows:

- Strategic Planning Issues
- Major Highway Schemes
- De-trunking
- Demand Management
- Public Transport
- Community Transport
- Road Safety Issues
• Pedestrian and cycling issues
• Freight management
• Airports (as appropriate)
• Sharing good practice
• Ongoing liaison and the future LTP programme

3.3 Conclusions and Actions resulting from Consultation with Local Authorities

These can be summarised as follows:

• There was a high degree of commonality in the way each Authority was moving forward in the development of their transportation policies and dealing with sensitive issues.

• A number of appropriate new ideas were received by the County Council and it is believed that the other participants obtained similar benefits.

• The assembly of a number of specialists in the field of transportation and planning resulted in a well-balanced debate and discussion. The meetings with the adjacent highway authorities afforded the opportunity to discuss cross boundary issues and to identify where ongoing discussions on issues should be broadened to other disciplines. In the meetings with the internal local authorities the opportunity was afforded to discuss the implementation of the Council's Transport Issues and Development Guide and the future planning frameworks which will guide land allocations in the roll forward of Local Plans and associated issues.

The consensus of opinion was that these meetings were beneficial and should be continued in future years.

BEST PRACTICE

Learning from Others

APR preparation

Prior to the preparation of this year's APR we have studied the above average APRs for last year. In particular we have examined those from authorities which were recommended as excelling in particular topic areas. We have picked up some very useful ideas which we are applying in this years APR and in the development and implementation of our LTP activities.

We have also attended seminars organised by the Government Office on APR preparation and discussed related issues with other authorities.

Bus Services and Infrastructure

We have jointly funded research undertaken by Harrogate and District Bus Company to find out from passengers what they feel would increase the attraction of bus services. The information will be shared with other bus operators in the County and will also be used to develop our future strategies for encouraging increased use of public transport.

Rail

Through our joint work with Metro and City of York on the Harrogate Line Route Strategy we have been able to learn from the experience of others (particularly Metro) in the commissioning and management of a major rail study.
Public Transport Information

We are a member of the Yorkshire Local Information Partnership which includes the two PTEs and City of York Council. We share good practice in promoting public transport. The Partnership has also jointly developed a new journey planner which includes both internet access and a telephone enquiry service which is available throughout North Yorkshire.

Disability

We have introduced the “fast track” method of providing disabled parking places on street on an advisory basis outside the homes of disabled people rather than through a formal traffic order.

Highway Maintenance

We have undertaken an appraisal of Highway Maintenance Best Value inspections. This identified excellent performance by Hertfordshire County Council and a one day visit was organised for relevant staff. This identified a number of areas of where improvements could be implemented in our authority.

We have introduced a "champion" management role within the highway maintenance service with specific responsibilities allocated to individuals for key elements of the service. Ideas from other authorities are regularly considered as part of this process.

An "Innovation" group has been formed with our term maintenance contractor (Raynesway Construction Southern). The initial priority is focussed on sustainability with recycling initiatives already planned.

We have introduced key performance indicators for our term contractor based on a scheme in use by other highway authorities. This is enabling trends in performance levels to be monitored and areas for service improvements to be identified.

Membership of the Highway Works Best Value Benchmarking Club has enabled comparisons to be made with other members and areas for improvement identified.

The appointment of Raynesway Southern Construction as our term maintenance contractor has enabled experience from other parts of their organisation to be considered for service improvements.

The planned procurement of UKPMS facilities from the private sector with experience of this specialist function will be invaluable in introducing the system in North Yorkshire.

Cycling

We have introduced discretionary cycle lanes on roads of 7.3m width following discussions with City of York Council on potential conflict between cycles and wider vehicles encroaching into the cycle lane.

We sought advice from East Riding of Yorkshire Council on the design of cycle direction signs as part of a more general liaison on signing strategies for the National Cycle Network Route 1, The East Coast Route.
We have revised our approach to consultation on provision of cycling routes by using a leaflet and post paid questionnaire to improve response rates. It is based on the system used by the City of York Council.

**Road Casualty Reduction**

In partnership with North Yorkshire Police we have visited Cleveland and Lincolnshire Police Authorities to learn from their experience of implementing a Safety Camera partnership. We have also attended regional meetings for Safety Camera Project Managers where we have benefited from the experience of authorities where Safety Camera schemes are already in place. We are planning to introduce a Safety Camera scheme in North Yorkshire in April 2004.

We have introduced variable message signing at Foxholes, Burn and Saxton as part of traffic calming schemes. We contacted Kent County Council and visited Durham County Council to learn from their experience of the use of these signs. This proved to be very helpful in assessing the effectiveness of the signs, their maintenance and the specification for their acquisition.

We have used the guide produced by Kent County Council on traffic calming techniques for application in projects within the County.

**Traffic Signals**

We are an active participant in the national CSS Traffic Signal Users Group which is an important forum for the exchange of good practice.

We have consulted during the last year with Doncaster and West Sussex Councils on positioning of kerbside detectors for Puffin crossings and used this information in the design and implementation of a number of schemes.

During the recent re-tendering of our traffic signal maintenance contract we consulted with Leeds, Kirklees and Doncaster Councils on the form of their tender documents for this area of work and was supplied with a copy of them. We visited Leeds City Council and discussed in some detail the way their contract was organised. This proved useful in the specification of our contract and tendering documentation.

**Travel Awareness including School and Workplace Travel Plans**

As an active member of groups meeting regionally and national virtual groups we have benefited from good practice in school travel. We have, for example, used classroom materials prepared by Lincolnshire County Council and have followed an example of an approach to special schools pioneered by Northamptonshire and further developed by Hartlepool Borough Council. The Bromley Council “East Steps” CD has also been used in North Yorkshire classrooms.

Following a visit to beacon council Hampshire County Council we have trialled their approach to workplace travel plans. Working with Scarborough and Harrogate Borough Councils we held Workplace Transport Forums, similar to those held in Romsey and Petersfield.

In developing our travel awareness marketing campaign, we test-marketed several possible campaign materials. Rather than developing all of our own, we used materials previously used by the City of York & Cheshire County Councils. Work by Gloucestershire County Council also influenced our individualised marketing campaign. Successful practice from
even further afield has also guided our approach. Prior to our use of individualised marketing of travel choices in Ripon, the main application of this innovative technique had been in Australia.

New Development

We have launched a new document ‘Transport Issues and Development – A Guide’ at a recent seminar at County Hall. It includes revised standards on parking provision based on maximum parking standards in line with PPG13. It also includes the requirements and guidance for undertaking transport assessments of new developments and on preparing Travel Plans. The advice on preparation of Transport Assessments was based on a similar approach undertaken by Sheffield City Council suitably adapted to take account of local circumstances in North Yorkshire.

Freight

We have set up a Timber Freight Quality Partnership and it includes the Forestry Commission/Forest Enterprise and private sector interests and importantly, Anne Angus the Timber Transport Project Manager for the Timber Transport Forum (managed by the Forest Industries Development Council). The TTF is comprised of organisations across the UK and its objectives include disseminating information, and identifying national and international best practice. The TTF are keen to be involved in our FQP and we will gain a substantial benefit from their input.

National Parks

We have been represented on the national steering group which developed the Accord drawn up between the National Park Authorities and their constituent transport authorities. This sets out policies and standards for working on highway and transport schemes in the National Parks and gives examples of good practice.

SHARING OUR GOOD PRACTICE WITH OTHERS

APR preparation

We have provided copied of last year’s APR to other authorities on request. The Government Office in Leeds advised us that it was the best in the Region. It has also been made available on the Council’s website.

Bus Services and Infrastructure

We have developed a premier specification for bus service contracts on our quality corridors. This includes for new buses, driver training and a publicity package. We have provided information on this to Durham and Darlington Councils.

We have also developed a contract specification for tendered bus services which is based on the County Council providing the buses with the operator responsible for running and maintaining the vehicles. This is to test whether this is a more cost-effective way of providing supported services. We have advised Darlington Council on this and supplied them with the relevant documentation.

We are working closely with the five Rural Transport Partnership officers and the Countryside Agency in improving accessibility to rural areas. In support of this we have been asked by the Countryside Agency to co-ordinate the development of a Community Transport Strategy for the County. A brief for the work has been submitted to the
Countryside Agency and we will manage and co-ordinate the work which is planned for the current year.

**Rail**

The extensive feasibility work we have undertaken into the reopening of the Malton to Pickering railway line is the leading example of this type of work in the Region. Copies of the various study reports have been sent to a number of other authorities and interest groups. They have also been widely accessed through the County Council’s website. A presentation on the work to date and lessons learnt was given by the County Council’s project manager at the regional launch in Leeds of the Countryside Agency’s study into the potential for reopening rural railway lines throughout the Region. This was attended by 130 representatives of other local authorities, Government agencies and interest groups. We have subsequently been asked to support and provide advice on feasibility work to be undertaken by East Riding of Yorkshire Council into the potential reinstatement of the York to Beverley line.

We are involved in a wide range of local rail partnerships which enables us to let others know of initiatives already underway elsewhere in the county. For example, Esk Valley Railway Development Company are hoping to operate on-train catering trolleys and we were able to supply a copy of the agreement that the Settle-Carlisle Development Company has with Arriva Trains Northern relating to on-train catering between Settle and Carlisle.

**Highway Maintenance**

Advice given to Durham County Council regarding the Highway Works Best Value Benchmarking Club.

Presentation on Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for highway Maintenance given at a conference in Newcastle during October 2002 for the Highway Works Best Value Benchmarking Club. This has subsequently resulted in an extension of the use of these KPIs by other authorities in the Northern Region thereby enhancing the benchmarking opportunities.

We are also working in Partnership with City of York Council to introduce a joint procurement of weather forecast/ice prediction service for 2003 through to 2008.

**Cycling**

We have recently published the “Transport Issues and Development – A Guide” which includes details of the requirements for cycling infrastructure to and within new developments.

We have also produced “Design Guidelines for Cycle Facilities” for distribution to potential developers in North Yorkshire to ensure the provision of an appropriate design of cycle facilities by developers.

**Pedestrians**

The publication “Transport Issues and Development – A Guide” also gives details of the requirements for pedestrian facilities both to and within new developments.

**Traffic Signals**
We have advised a number of other local authorities on our approach to locating the secondary signals at traffic signal junctions.

Road Safety Education

The Road Safety Team has developed, in conjunction with a commercial company, a classroom resource to demonstrate the importance of wearing seat belts. Consisting of a model car, containing four occupants, the resource demonstrates clearly what happens to unrestrained car occupants in a crash. This resource, which has been demonstrated to other authorities in the region and promoted on the LARSOA website, has already been purchased by other authorities. A web based set of teachers notes to back up the demonstration is to be revised and updated. Work is also underway to update a Theatre In Education production on the same subject entitled “Are we there yet?” aimed at Key Stage 2 pupils. Using LPSA funding we propose to offer this production to all primary schools in the County over the next two years as a contribution towards meeting the targets to increase seat belt use by children.

County Council staff are actively involved in Regional Working Groups, including those developing Publicity campaigns, classroom resources and Walk to School materials. The development by one of these groups of an entirely new Key Stage 2 classroom resource has been a major undertaking. The resource, which provides the opportunity for hands on activities with the minimum of teacher supervision has been subjected to extensive testing in the classroom, and is now available for introduction to schools across the County. It is anticipated that there will be considerable commercial potential for this resource and if this occurs then the Region will benefit financially.

Travel Awareness including School and Workplace Travel Plans

Our approach to travel awareness has been recognised as particularly innovative and it has attracted interest from throughout the UK, from Devon to Aberdeenshire. To cover distribution costs we have made a nominal charge for the information pack and to date twenty-two authorities have purchased this, enabling a network of users to be established, and also some further development.

Our approach to schools work via the curriculum has attracted considerable attention. High level approaches have been received from senior civil servants at the Dept for Education and Skills and presentations made to them of our work.

Our guide to Ofsted inspections, in particular, has been widely distributed. Bath and NE Somerset Council have adopted this approach and helped us re-write the guidance.

Our work on how to accommodate Walk to School week into rural schools was featured in the Sustrans video to support school travel plans. Our promotion of Park & Stride to schools has also featured in their widely-distributed newsletters this year.

As a founder member of the regional travel awareness training group, we were responsible for delivering training to 18 authorities in the Y&H and the GONE region. Evaluation scores for the training sessions were very high and it has been put forward by the National TravelWise association as a model of best practice.

Our influence has even extended outside of the UK in that the Travel Awareness Officer is representing the region at a European ‘Target’ seminar on travel behaviour in June 2003 on our work with measuring and influencing attitudes to car use.
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**Freight**

We have a seat on the Board of Freight Business Yorkshire and Humber. It is a body established as part of the Regional Development Agency for Yorkshire and the Humber (Yorkshire Forward’s Cluster Network Strategy). It includes public, private, academic and industry bodies, whose objectives include efficiency and sustainability in goods distribution and acts as a forum for addressing freight issues which affect the region.

There are also plans to establish a steering Group to establish a Regional Freight Strategy through the Regional Assembly. We have been invited to be a member in view of our work on freight initiatives in the County.

We meet regularly with the West Yorkshire Freight Group. It acts as a useful forum in which to discuss cross boundary issues and other topics of mutual interest with neighbouring authorities including City of York Council and the Metropolitan District Councils.

We have been working the City of York Council on the development of their Freight Strategy.

We are a member of the Transport Visions Network. This is co-ordinated by Southampton University and funded by a number of organisations including the DfT and Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council. We had a seat on the Editorial Board which evaluated its ‘Freight and Logistics’ Report. This is due out in the next few months and will be sent out to interested parties such as local authorities and academic institutions.

We have been invited by the DfT to give a presentation at a forthcoming freight workshop (hosted by GOYH) on our experience of establishing Freight Quality Partnerships for the benefit of other local authorities and interested parties who will be attending.

Separately, we have also been asked by other neighbouring authorities to give them guidance on setting up FQP’s, in terms of our experience and potential pitfalls.

**Best Practice Groups**

We are a member of the following Best Practice groups:

CSS Best Value Working Group – National Group
CSS Northern Regional Best Value Group – Regional Group
CSS Northern Regional Best Value Group –Task Group No 2 Highway Maintenance and Network Management
Highway Works Best Value Benchmarking Club

**Other Groups**

Our membership of the following groups listed below (some of which have already been mentioned) provide invaluable opportunities for sharing and learning best practice:-

Regional Transport Officers Group
Membership of the Local Authority Cycle Planning Group (LACPG)
Corporate Membership of the Cyclist’s Touring Club (CTC)
CSS Engineering Committee – National Group
UKPMS Owners Forum
UKPMS Exor User Group
UKPMS NE England User Group
Vaisala Ice Prediction System User Group
Ordnance Survey Liaison Officer Regional Group
National Land and Property Gazetteer Group
Regional Local Authorities Road Safety Officers Association
Regional Institute of Road Safety Officers
Regional Casualty Reduction Steering Group
National Travelwise Association
CSS Traffic Signals User Group
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### SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION POINTS AND NYCC RESPONSE/ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Range of Discussion</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous Highways</td>
<td>Involving the public: Call Centre under consideration with freephone. Out of Hours service (problems in ascertaining the extent of highway defect).</td>
<td>Options have been considered, progress now awaiting funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verge Maintenance</td>
<td>Grass not cut enough. Warning signs may be obstructed.</td>
<td>A comprehensive verge maintenance review is currently underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside Ditches</td>
<td>Some not cleaned often enough. Some owned by private landowners. The law is complex. NYCC has a number of options available for achieving cleaning of private ditches. No clear way forward identified.</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud on Roads</td>
<td>A matter of concern. NYCC, District Council, Police and perpetrators involved in resolving any clean up. Police do not normally prosecute. No change proposed.</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Transport</td>
<td>Bridges are being brought up to the 40 tonnes standard even though there are environmental weight restrictions. The Timber Freight Quality Partnership (FQP) and NYCC should develop a forward programme for harvesting so that this can be taken into account when planning the maintenance and improvement of highways.</td>
<td>Bridge Strengthening Programme being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Undertakings</td>
<td>The legal limit for a change in level of 10mm is unacceptable, bouncing HCVs wake residents. What can be done?</td>
<td>NYCC have appointed seven Utility inspectors to improve enforcement of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry Traffic</td>
<td>Quarry traffic through Settle is a problem. A Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting traffic through the town centre is not seen as a solution. Recommendations resulting from a Partnership approach to address the quarry traffic.</td>
<td>Settle FWP established and is addressing such problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Range of Discussion</td>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV traffic problem</td>
<td>HCV traffic problem may be able to reduce overall traffic flows through the town.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees in Verges</td>
<td>Query about the legal position. Can District Councils act on behalf of the County Council in management of trees in verges?</td>
<td>District Councils can plant and maintain trees in the highway with Highway Authority approval. The District must indemnify the Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Bridges</td>
<td>Concern to ensure protection of these of which 75% are over 100 years old.</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP Targets</td>
<td>The following targets are to be re-visited: C1(a) and (b) G1 G2</td>
<td>Targets re-assessed and funding allocated accordingly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTATION FORUM - 6 DECEMBER 2002

### WORKSHOP 2: PUBLIC TRANSPORT (Formed into Two Working Groups)

### SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION POINTS AND NYCC RESPONSE/ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Range of Discussion</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Terminals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Skipton</strong>&lt;br&gt;A number of concerns expressed:&lt;br&gt;Need for additional stands.&lt;br&gt;Poor facilities for disabled.&lt;br&gt;Lack of community transport.&lt;br&gt;Poor ease of interchange between modes.&lt;br&gt;Lack of consultation by NYCC and failure to act on suggestions.&lt;br&gt;Fear that it compares unfavourably with Keighley.</td>
<td>Consultation procedures are in place to consider detailed design issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harrogate</strong></td>
<td>A number of concerns expressed:&lt;br&gt;Need for weather protection.&lt;br&gt;Poor facilities for disabled.&lt;br&gt;Lack of consultation on design, particularly with community transport providers.</td>
<td>Now addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northallerton</strong></td>
<td>No bus terminus hence difficulties for long distance and day trip coaches.</td>
<td>Will be considered as part of the TM strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stokesley</strong></td>
<td>A number of concerns expressed:&lt;br&gt;Consequences of the imminent closure of bus station.&lt;br&gt;Poorer services may follow re-tendering of services.</td>
<td>We have addressed these issues through consultation with local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future development</strong></td>
<td>What are the future plans for new and improved bus terminals?&lt;br&gt;There is no suitable location for a terminus in Scarborough.</td>
<td>On-street facilities will be improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Range of Discussion</td>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Quality Corridors</td>
<td>Support for policy of concentration of key corridors and provision of infrastructure, however:- Why had Cross Hills to Cowling not been included in the Skipton Corridor? The implementation of the infrastructure has taken too long owing to a poorly managed consultation process. There are few buses in Swaledale, when will things be improved? The process must be continued to eventually cover all services. The Government must recognise the need for revenue funding to maintain new infrastructure. They do not fall on the Skipton-Keighley Corridor. Some of CHS was done and the other parts are being done under misc this year. Cowling will be done later Not sure which scheme this relates to but on the whole it has been much to the contrary New services introduced in January 2003 Noted Agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stops</td>
<td>Why does NYCC not sell advertising on bus shelters?</td>
<td>We decided not to use Adshel shelters. The company tendered for our contract but were unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Information</td>
<td>Realtime Passenger Information Systems (RTPI) are being considered for Harrogate and Scarborough. There are issues regarding RTPI: Is it reliable? Is it a high priority for operators? Providing the wrong information is worse that no information. Would a variety of suppliers result in different authorities developing incompatible systems? Need to improve quality and range of information provided. Traveline: This service has been promoted beyond its current capabilities. It does not provide real time information. The use of mobile phones is not possible in sparsely populated areas of the County. Pressure Government to make Traveline a low-cost service. System will be monitored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Range of Discussion</td>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Information</td>
<td><strong>Publicity:</strong></td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td>Room for improvement as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stronger efforts needed. Move away from traditional methods to door to door distribution and mail drops which needs to be repeated frequently. Newspapers can be unreliable. Publish information in Parish magazines and community newspapers. More advertising on the vehicles themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Timetables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These should:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be made available on buses and close to stops.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be adequate for the elderly who have eyesight problems. Take account of the needs of the blind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>The well-known barriers to the successful implementation of these schemes debated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scarborough has the only Park and Ride scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schemes need to run for a long time to attract motorists to them and bus priority measures may also be needed.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park and Ride services are expensive to operate. Can they be funded through the Urban Bus Challenge?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality vehicles and frequent services must be provided for these schemes.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park and Ride schemes based on rail should be considered.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car parking should be reviewed to avoid distortions between parking charges, Park and Ride fares and bus fares.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kiss and Ride as part of Park and Ride should be considered.</strong></td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Range of Discussion</td>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Railway Stations</td>
<td>Safe walking routes to stations are required.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buses should have priority over cars at railway stations.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storage facilities for bicycles are needed at stations.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The facilities for carrying bicycles on trains are well used.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities and pricing of parking facilities at stations should be structured to discourage making the whole journey by car.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The audit of facilities for disabled people at railway stations could be made available to the public.</td>
<td>This is available on request at a charge to cover photocopying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of LTP targets</td>
<td>Comments and suggestions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1 – Meaning less in its present form.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 – Will developments with Railtrack hold up its achievement.</td>
<td>Targets will be reviewed with roll forward of LTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B6 – The reduction in subsidy is contrary to the policy and will lead to increased cost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B7 – This has more meaning than target A1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A new target is needed for accessibility for disabled people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are no targets relating to rail services (only rail infrastructure).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus terminals</td>
<td>What are the future plans for new and improved bus terminals?</td>
<td>There is an LTP implementation programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>The need to improve rail services, access and facilities is a matter of concern.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External sources of funding</td>
<td>The LTP should contain the exploration of external funding. The LTP money is short term and there is concern regarding money for continuing the services and maintaining the infrastructure.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Range of Discussion</td>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging modal shift</td>
<td>The LTP should mention the need to encourage young people to use public transport. There is a wide range of possibilities which should be pursued. The school run by car should be discouraged. The subsidised Night Out Buses is popular, what will happen when the subsidy tapers off?</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Transport</td>
<td>NYCC should subsidise alternative modes such as Community Transport. Social Services Transport should be integrated with mainstream transport. Community Transport providers should pick up ordinary passengers. There are legal issues to take into account but the rules should be changed. A positive approach is needed.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Priorities</td>
<td>Bus service reliability is: Essential to increase ridership and to achieve this bus priority measures are needed. Is a matter for priority and is the single most important target in rail travel.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Facilities</td>
<td>LTP should place a greater emphasis on coach facilities so as to promote tourism and meet current transport objectives. There are several measures which should be acted upon: Improved location many coach parks are badly located and remote from the destination of passengers. The facilities especially for the elderly who are major users have such inferior attributes that operators avoid a visit. Councils should encourage coaches by preferential charges. Local businesses should make coach parties welcome.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Range of Discussion</td>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td>Request that the organisation Better Government for Older People in North Yorkshire to be consulted in future. DCs will be involved in the formulation of the LTP at an early stage.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access by public transport to Leeds Bradford Airport</td>
<td>A better service is required which should be a frequent dedicated express service at periods which take account of flight check in times.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easingwold to York railway station</td>
<td>Can links from Thirsk and Northallerton to York Railway Station be improved? Existing facilities are inconvenient.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silsden Station Link</td>
<td>Ensure that service bus awaits arrival of trains.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC travel concessions</td>
<td>The variations between the various Council's schemes is causing confusion and conflicts. Action required to make the schemes function satisfactorily.</td>
<td>To be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport</td>
<td>A greater emphasis should be placed on transport in rural areas which in some cases are in need of feeder services like dial a ride to supplement public transport.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth in West Yorkshire</td>
<td>A need to take into account the future effects on transportation from North Yorkshire.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PUBLIC CONSULTATION FORUM - 6 DECEMBER 2002**

**WORKSHOP 3 : TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT, ROAD SAFETY, CYCLING, WALKING AND TRAVEL AWARENESS (Formed into Two Working Groups)**

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION POINTS AND NYCC RESPONSE/ACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Range of Discussion</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>Fast moving lorries present a danger to pedestrians on narrow roads without footways. The quiet roads initiative in the Yorkshire Dales National Park should be pursued.</td>
<td>Action will be taken on this useful suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street furniture is a problem for many disabled, and there is concern regarding facilities in Whitby.</td>
<td>Individual problems will be considered and appropriate action taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrians should be considered at the design stage for schemes. Care must be taken to allocate sufficient space for pedestrians.</td>
<td>This is already County policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>Provision for horses should be included in the LTP.</td>
<td>This needs further discussion with the User Groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New cycle tracks could be designed to accommodate horses as well.</td>
<td>This needs further discussion with the User Groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grass verges to be cut regularly to avoid damage to horses through dangerous debris.</td>
<td>The County Council already has an agreed policy on grass cutting but this suggestion will be considered when the policy is next reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>Concern that pedestrians may be afforded a lesser priority than cyclists. Mixing cycling and walking creates problems. Separate facilities should be provided.</td>
<td>It is already a County Council policy to segregate such facilities wherever possible, but there are occasions when shared facilities need to be provided rather than not cater for cyclists at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There should be greater integration between the travel modes particularly public transport and cycling.</td>
<td>Action will be taken on this useful suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>NYCC consultation process has pleased Richmond Town Council.</td>
<td>Comment noted and welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schemes</td>
<td>Traffic calming works are well received.</td>
<td>Comment noted and welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Range of Discussion</td>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management schemes (continued)</td>
<td>The Police favour a standardised approach to the design of these schemes. Speed limits continue to be exceeded on some calming schemes.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient public consultation for Helmsley and Whitby.</td>
<td>Extensive consultation has been carried out and there is good evidence from the communities responses that the consultation process was appropriate and sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of LTP Targets</td>
<td>B2 – A higher target to reduce traffic in the Yorkshire Dales National Park is desirable.</td>
<td>Target of 2% below national average is challenging but consideration will be given to review of target at roll forward of LTP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B15 – Target B15(a) should be reviewed annually and Target B15(c) should be more ambitious.</td>
<td>Target B15(a). All schools contacted annually to ensure awareness raised each year. Target B15(c). Comments noted, to be reviewed before roll forward of LTP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There should be a new target on accessibility for disabled people.</td>
<td>New outcome target has been set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There should be a new target aimed at increasing cycling which would include cycle parking facilities.</td>
<td>Targets now set within local cycling plans to increase cycling. The provision of cycle parking is an output only measure, and contributes to encouraging the increase in cycling target. Cycle parking is identified in cycle plans and installed in order of priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety targets should tie in with Community Plans safety targets.</td>
<td>Community plan targets should complement National and LTP targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examine the principal of a new target for motor cycle safety.</td>
<td>This will be reviewed for the roll forward of the LTP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should traffic growth rates for specific areas be replaced by a single County wide target.</td>
<td>Traffic growth rates have been set for areas where delays are considered an issue and in sensitive locations, eg National Parks. This allows the impact of measures in these locations to be monitored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Range of Discussion</td>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Awareness and Modal Shift</td>
<td>Travel awareness education in schools to be continued.</td>
<td>This is already County policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taxis can compete favourably on price with service buses.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service bus fleets are being modernised whilst school buses remain of poor quality.</td>
<td>Passenger Transport Group has been strengthened to evaluate the operating procedures used by our contractors to ensure vehicles are safe and of appropriate quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership approach should be adopted between District Councils and National Parks to achieve results by the various measures available, particularly workplace travel plans.</td>
<td>The County Council will seek to work closer with other authorities to establish workplace travel plans. Mechanism for dealing with opportunities afforded by new planning applications already in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement</td>
<td>NYCC should develop schemes based on successful past experience.</td>
<td>This is already County policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People should be kept informed of decisions made and how schemes will be delivered.</td>
<td>Action will be taken on this useful suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schemes should be monitored and the results published.</td>
<td>This is already County policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attention to detail at the design stage is important.</td>
<td>This is already County policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater use to be made of existing assets such as disused railway lines for cycleways.</td>
<td>This is already County policy wherever it proves possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIDER ISSUES

1. INTRODUCTION

The Local Transport Plan (LTP) is not being implemented in isolation. It is inextricably linked with a range of other strategies, plans and initiatives developed not only by the County Council but also by a variety of public, private and voluntary organisations and bodies. The goal is to ensure that each is striving to achieve the same or similar aims and objectives and is seen as part of an integrated and sustainable approach to transport issues across and, where relevant, beyond North Yorkshire.

Transport is not of course an end in itself but an important factor affecting other policy areas. Transport and travel do not exist in isolation from peoples’ day to day lives. They impact on many aspects including social inclusiveness and well being, public health, access to services and facilities and the broad community environment.

The APR Guidance issued by the Department for Transport requires that the linkages between transport and other policy areas such as social inclusion, neighbourhood renewal, accessibility and mobility, rural communities, community strategies and environmental policy are demonstrated. The County Council has been working to achieve greater co-ordination of effort between its own departments and with external organisations to ensure the most effective and inclusive development and delivery of policies and programmes.

The following paragraphs provide a brief overview of how the LTP links into and supports the wider objectives

2. NATIONAL AND REGIONAL GUIDANCE

The LTP takes fully on board Government guidance for transport and its aims for the economy, environment, safety, integration and accessibility. It is fully consistent with national policy, Regional Planning Guidance for Yorkshire and the Humber (RPG12) and with, the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS). Other relevant regional strategies include the Regional Economic Strategy (RES), the Regional Cultural Strategy (RCS) and the Regional Sustainability Strategy (RSS).

The RTS is an integral part of RPG12 and addresses the contribution of transport to the achievement of the Region’s aspirations for the economy, social cohesion and equity, a healthy and pleasant environment and, above all, sustainability.
3. COUNTY COUNCIL CORPORATE STRATEGY

North Yorkshire's transport policies have evolved over the years in response to changing social and economic circumstances and changes in national policy. The biggest single change occurred in 2000 when the County Council adopted the current LTP following widespread consultation. This promoted the concept of integrated transport and set out for the first time an overall strategy and programme for the following five years. The strategy and objectives are fully reflected in the County Council's Corporate Plan which has recently been reassessed. The LTP is therefore entirely consistent with the Corporate Plan and helps to achieve its objectives. This is demonstrated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Council Objectives</th>
<th>Supporting LTP schemes/initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Security for all – by promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities (LTP Objectives A, B, C, D, E, F, G) | • Road safety schemes  
• Travel awareness initiatives  
• Improving and promoting environmentally friendly forms of transport  
• Improved access for disabled people  
• Promoting sustainable movement of goods  
• Increasing the use of low noise surfacing in urban areas |
| Growing up prepared for the future through good education and care and protection when it is needed (LTP Objectives A, B, E) | • Travel awareness initiatives  
• School travel plans  
• Road safety education  
• Transport to educational facilities |
| Independence – through employment, opportunity and appropriate support (LTP Objectives A, B, E, G) | • Improved access to work  
• Green travel plans for businesses |
| Keeping us on the move – with a safe and reliable transport system and powerful telecommunications (LTP Objectives A, B, C, E, F) | • Maintenance of roads and bridges  
• Road safety schemes  
• Traffic management schemes  
• Promotion and support for local bus services  
• Improving pedestrian and cycling facilities  
• Minimising delays through maintenance works programming |
| Strengthening our economy – by supporting business, developing our infrastructure and helping people improve their skills (LTP Objectives B, C, E, G) | • Highway and transport improvements  
• Improving accessibility by all modes to workplaces  
• Implementing Traffic Management Strategies for market towns |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Council Objectives</th>
<th>Supporting LTP schemes/initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Looking after our heritage – in our countryside and in our towns and villages (LTP Objectives B, D) | • Environmental improvements linked to transport schemes  
• Maintenance and improvement of the rights of way network  
• Transport strategies for two National Parks  
• Use of appropriate materials in sensitive areas  
• Reviewing verge maintenance policy  
• Increasing use of recycling materials within the network |
| Keeping in touch – by listening to your views, by planning to meet your needs and by telling you what we are doing. | • Extensive consultation on LTP objectives, strategies, Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies and individual schemes. |

In turn the County Council's objectives listed above are consistent with and support the Government and the Local Government Association agreed set of seven shared priorities as set out below.

- Raising standards across our schools

Growing up prepared for the future – through good education and care and protection when it is needed – the link is clear.

- Improving the quality of life for children, young people, families at risk and older people

Growing up prepared for the future – through good education and care and protection when it is needed – this shows our commitment to the needs of young people and children to be protected from risk.

Independence – through employment, opportunity and appropriate support – here we state our commitment to provide people with the means to maintain an independent life, especially in supporting vulnerable adults and elderly people.

- Promoting healthier communities by targeting key local services, such as health and housing

Security for all – by promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities – this is our commitment to supporting people's health and also to supporting the health and vitality of our communities. We are working especially to counter the problems of small and remote communities by developing flexible transport solutions and investing in broadband telecommunications for our services but also available to other public and private organisations.

- Creating safer and stronger communities

Security for all – by promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities – as above, these two issues are linked.
• Transforming the local environment

Looking after our heritage – in our countryside and in our towns and villages – our heritage is an economic resource as well as a value in itself.

• Meeting transport needs more effectively

Keeping us on the move – with a safe and reliable transport system and powerful telecommunications – the link is clear.

• Promoting the economic vitality of localities

Strengthening our economy – by supporting business, developing our infrastructure and helping people to improve their skills.

The linkages between our transport policies and a wide range of other policy areas such as social inclusion, land use planning, economic development, health, education, air quality and neighbourhood renewal are explained more fully below.

4. **SOCIAL INCLUSION**

In an extensive and sparsely populated rural county like North Yorkshire, social exclusion is particularly acute in many small and isolated communities. For some people, access to jobs, training opportunities, shops, recreation, health services or just family and friends can be difficult if not impossible. For other people, such as those with disabilities, access to services and facilities can be denied through physical obstacles to movement eg kerbs, steps, lack of tactile paving and difficult to access buses.

Examples of LTP schemes and initiatives delivered in 2002/03 which address these key issues of social exclusion are:

• Low floor buses, improved infrastructure and enhanced bus service in Wensleydale
• Refurbished bus stations in Whitby, Tadcaster and Harrogate
• Wheelchair accessible bus services between Skipton and Harrogate and Pateley Bridge and Otley
• South Selby Taxibus service
• Extensive provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at key crossing points in six market towns
• Expansion of cycle networks in Harrogate, Scarborough and Northallerton
• “Village bus service” linking surrounding villages into Sherburn in Elmet

5. **ENCOURAGING NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL**

Local Strategic Partnerships have been set up across North Yorkshire, designed to build on community planning initiatives and existing partnerships. Their purpose is to address issues such as unemployment, crime, ill health, poor housing and low educational attainment. The County Council is directly involved in all the North Yorkshire LSPs at Member and Officer levels. More information on community strategies is given below.
6. LINKS TO COMMUNITY STRATEGIES

The preparation of community strategies has provided the opportunity to broaden consultation on the Local Transport Plan. Community strategies are being prepared for each of the District Council areas in the County and Local Strategic Partnerships (LSP) have been established to oversee the development of each. The strategies for Selby, Craven and Scarborough have been published and those for the other four District areas are at various stages of development but will all be in place before the end of this financial year.

The County Council is working with the District LSPs to establish a North Yorkshire Strategic Partnership (NYSP) which will oversee the preparation of a community strategy for the County as a whole. This will provide a context in which policies and programmes best dealt with at a wide area level can be developed through partnership. The LTP will be an important instrument by which the county wide strategy is delivered and will be included in future consultations on it.

The District level community strategies are being or have been put together by the partners to the LSPs. The importance the County Council attaches to the development of these strategies is reflected in the fact that a County Council Member elected by the relevant Area Committee, along with a senior officer represent the Council at the Local Strategic Partnership meetings.

As one of these partners, the County Council has sought to ensure that its programmes match the needs of the developing Community Strategy and that the County Council's programmes to deliver these needs have been embodied in those strategies. Draft plans prepared in this way have been published for consultation by the LSPs and, in two cases, ultimately adopted. In this way, we make sure that the policies and programmes of the LTP and of the community strategies are in line with each other and that the implementation of the LTP policies and programmes at the local level are adapted to the requirements of the local community strategy.

A typical example is the implementation of the Northallerton Cycle Plan. The need to 'encourage the provision of cycle paths in, through and to Northallerton' is identified in the Hambleton Community Plan (Draft). The Northallerton Cycle Plan is consistent with the public's aspiration and implementation of the Cycle Plan and has been given a high priority in the LTP programme. Route 1 of the Cycle Plan is complete and the implementation of further routes are planned for 2003/04.

7. VIBRANT AND PROSPEROUS TOWN CENTRES

Many of the initiatives and investment programmes being progressed through the LTP have a direct and positive benefit on the creation and maintenance of vibrant and prosperous town centres and help to deliver the Government’s Urban White Paper proposals. In 2002/03 there has been significant transport related investment in town centres. Measures implemented include:

- Bus station improvements in Harrogate, Tadcaster and Whitby
- Enhanced urban traffic control system in Harrogate
- New cycleway into Scarborough town centre from the north
- Park and ride improvements at the Scarborough Weaponness site
8. **ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF DISABLED PEOPLE**

The needs of disabled people are taken fully into account in the design and implementation of all transport schemes, the objective being to provide for journeys on a “door to door” basis. The introduction of fully accessible low floor buses and disabled-friendly bus stops/transport interchanges is being encouraged through the development of Bus Quality Partnership agreements with operators. Examples of this are the new services in Wensleydale and between Stokesley and Northallerton.

Development of the road safety programme has focused on the needs of the disabled through the provision/upgrading of signal controlled crossings, dropped kerb crossings and accessibility improvements at bus stations. At the end of 2002/03 we had completed the upgrade of 93% of our signalised crossings. By the end of the current financial year 100% of the signalised crossings will have facilities for disabled people.

9. **IMPROVING ACCESS TO SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS**

The Council’s transport strategy is helping to deliver the vision for the countryside set out in the Government’s Rural White Paper. Provision of public transport to cater for the needs of rural residents is crucial to improving accessibility to services in rural areas. To this end the County Council invests £4m per year on socially necessary bus services, many of which are in rural areas. In addition the County Council has been very successful in winning Rural Bus Challenge funding during the last three years. The extra funding is delivering innovative bus services targeted at the rural community. More information is available on this in Appendix D.

10. **LAND USE PLANNING**

The application of transport policies through land use planning is an ongoing process. An integrated approach to land use and transport planning aims to promote social inclusion and flexible access to services. Work is ongoing to prepare a comprehensive review of the County Structure Plan in partnership with the City of York Council and the North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales National Park Authorities. The Review is being undertaken in the context provided by RPG12. This establishes that some 45,000 new homes should be built in North Yorkshire between 1998 and 2016.

It is important that these new dwellings are located such that the need to travel, especially by car, is minimised and that there is a close relationship between them and places offering employment, opportunities, shopping, leisure and community services. The strategy therefore directs most new development to the main urban areas of York, Harrogate and Scarborough and the larger market towns, with development elsewhere largely constrained to meeting local needs.

This strategy enables maximum advantage to be taken of opportunities for developing cycling, walking and public transport and to maximise the sustainability of the land allocations. It also enables maximum use to be made of previously developed sites within urban areas in line with national policy.

Local Plans prepared by the County’s seven District Councils and two National Park Authorities have been/are being developed within the framework of policy imperatives set down in RPG12, the adopted County Structure Plan (1995) and the emerging review structure plan. These plans influence and are themselves influenced by the policies and proposals in the LTP.
In recognition of the change in emphasis in transport thinking and the associated changes in national and regional planning guidance, the County Council has produced and published a document titled 'Transport Issues & Development – A Guide'.

This new guidance provides advice to developers and planning authorities on the preparation of Transport Assessments and the preparation of 'Green' Travel Plans. It also includes the new principle of maximum parking standards as advocated in PPG13 and the Regional Transport Strategy. It has been produced in partnership with the consultants Faber Maunsell who have extensive experience of such issues in a wide range of highway authorities. Consultation on the document was carried out with the local planning authorities (County Planning, District Councils and the two National Parks). The County Council adopted the document in Spring 2003 and it is anticipated that the other local planning authorities will shortly adopt it for development control purposes.

This document differs significantly from the previous guidance. It replaces the Parking Design Guide which simply detailed minimum parking standards and traffic generation figures for junction capacity assessment. The new guidance now advocates that developers and planners assess the transport needs of a development from first principles and consider all modes of transport.

Because of the significant changes brought about by the new guidance, the County Council is providing training for users of the document. These users include Government Office, local planning authorities, developers and Consulting Engineers. Following on from this, training has been given to Planning Committee Members at Craven District Council. Further training sessions are planned for other Local Planning Authority Members and officers.

11. INTEGRATION WITH EDUCATION

Educational institutions - schools and colleges - generate substantial traffic flows. The LTP strategy aims to encourage children to walk or cycle to school wherever appropriate. This not only promotes exercise and better health for children but also helps to reduce the number of journeys to school by car. To this end the Council is identifying safe routes to school as part of promoting walking and cycling. In 2002/03 16 safe route to school projects were completed. We also now have 48 schools which have prepared and adopted School Travel Plans.

The Council takes road safety very seriously and works very closely with schools to ensure that children are aware of and know how to respond to the dangers posed by road traffic. The high casualty rate among young drivers and their passengers has led to the development of 'Drive Time', a whole day event held in secondary schools. Involving agencies including the Driving Standards Agency, St John's Ambulance as well as Road Safety staff, the day focuses on the responsibilities of car ownership and use. An integral part of the event is the inclusion of a presentation by the parents of a young man killed in a crash, who recount the circumstances of the incident and the long term effect on family and friends.

Equally successful has been the further development of the Lottery Roadshow event, in which the concepts of risk are explored in a fun way with students. Both Drive Time and the Roadshow have proved an extremely popular method of promoting road safety issues of direct relevance to this target audience.
As part of our work with Leeds and Sheffield Universities, in-depth interviews and focus group work is taking place with residents in locations with different levels of actual rural accessibility to compare this with perceived accessibility. The marketing strategy has also involved focus groups and proposals are now being drawn up to test the effectiveness of the strategy.

12. **INTEGRATION WITH HEALTH**

Transport impacts on health in three major ways. Walking and cycling can have positive effects in reducing the risk and incidence of heart disease, obesity, diabetes and osteoporosis. Conversely, air pollution from vehicles can have a considerably adverse effect on health by causing respiratory illnesses such as asthma, bronchitis and cancer. Vehicles themselves can kill and injure.

The Council is actively promoting modal shift from cars to public transport, cycling and walking by increasing the number and length of cycle-ways and walkways linking home, workplace, school and community facilities and keeping them separate from roads wherever possible. Through its positive support for public transport the Council is providing ever more attractive alternatives to using the private car for a wide variety of trip purposes.

Closer links have been established this year with the 'Healthy Schools' initiative. All schools completing a school travel plan and at least two activities are being sent a ‘Healthy School Travel’ certificate.

We are working closely with the Friarage Hospital in Northallerton following a successful bid for Rural Bus Challenge funding. Access arrangements for bus services within the grounds of the hospital are to be improved and additional services introduced for both staff and visitors.

Our extensive road safety programme has been successful at reducing casualties on the County’s roads. This in turn helps to reduce the burden on health services. The Health Authority is also a member of the North Yorkshire Safety Camera partnership which aims to have the new safety camera system up and running by April 2004.

13. **AIR QUALITY, NOISE AND CLIMATE CHANGE**

The Council is keen to promote the use of alternative fuels as an action that will help to limit climate change and improve air quality. Other initiatives such as car sharing schemes, promotion of public transport, cycling and walking as alternative modes to the private car all assist in reducing the amount of transport related air pollution.

The Council is a member of the North Yorkshire Air Quality Liaison Group which includes the seven District Councils within the County. The District Councils are in the process of completing, or have completed their ‘Second Round of Air Quality Review and Assessment – Updating and Screening’. No air quality management areas have been declared to date. Sites have been identified for further detailed assessment in the following towns:

- Knaresborough
- Harrogate
- Malton
- Ripon City
The Town Centre Traffic Management Studies in Malton, and the strategy review of Harrogate and Knaresborough will seek to address the locations identified by the District Councils. Consideration is also being given to proposals to address the location in Ripon. No local targets have been set for air quality, but consideration will be given to the need to set targets following completion of the more detailed air quality assessments.

The County Council is participating in the DEFRA 'Noise Mapping England' project and is included on the Project Board for the area. An inaugural meeting has taken place with DEFRA consultants Schal and progress is expected to be made during the current year. On a more local level an example of efforts being made to reduce nuisance from noise is increasing the use of low noise surfacing in urban areas, and the proposals to introduce 'sleep zones' in Settle to stop HCVs travelling through sensitive areas at night.

The Council is also seeking to reduce the impact construction has on the environment by increasing recycling of materials for reuse in carriageway maintenance and construction.

14. **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Transport plays a key role in economic development within the County. The two are integrated on several different levels.

The LTP is fully supportive of Government and Regional objectives for the economy. It also helps to deliver the County Council’s own corporate objective of “Strengthening our economy by supporting business, developing our infrastructure and helping people to improve their skills”.

Officers involved in transport play an important part in the development of both Regional, County and District Local Plans with a view to ensuring that new development is located in a manner which is consistent with sustainable transport provision.

Our new guide on transport assessments for new development launched earlier this year is also an important part of this process.

During 2002/03 our Development Control Officers considered and advised on 5,500 new development proposals in the County through the planning application process. This is a very important aspect of delivering our LTP objectives in terms of improving safety and accessibility of all new developments in the County. Linked to these developments we have secured over £4.5 million of investment in our highway and transport infrastructure during 2002/03.

We continue to be active in encouraging businesses to develop Green Travel Plans. This is fully described in Appendix B.

In developing our Traffic Management Strategies for the market towns we have ensured that local organisations representing the business community are fully engaged in the process.
The poor transport links to Ryedale, Scarborough and the East Coast have been a cause of major concern over many years. It has long been considered that these have significantly affected the prospects for economic development in this part of the County. During the course of last year a Partnership was set up involving the County Council, Scarborough and Ryedale District Councils, Yorkshire Forward, the Highways Agency, Regional Assembly and the Government Office to address the issue. The County Council has taken the lead by chairing the Steering Group and commissioning the consultants Steer, Davies and Glieve to undertake an innovative study of the A64 corridor. In addition to assessing both road and rail improvement options in a traditional manner, the study assessed their economic impact including estimates of job creation and retention. The final report of the work has now been received and this is supportive of the need, already recognised in draft Regional Transport priorities, to develop and assess options for major improvements to the A64. The study work is also being used as a pilot for the guidance being prepared for the DfT on Economic Impact Reports for major transport projects.
# LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN - CAPITAL PROGRAMME EXPENDITURE 2001-02 TO 2006-07

## LTP-F1: Summary of actual, estimated outturn and projected local transport capital expenditure

| Authority Name: North Yorkshire | Authority No: 216 |
| Contact Name: Patrick Looker | Version No: 1 |
| Telephone Number (with extension): 01609 532355 | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,190</td>
<td>9,125</td>
<td>14,655</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>17,150</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>4,209</td>
<td>4,984</td>
<td>8,247</td>
<td>6,585</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(LTP - F2) Individual schemes costing £5 million or more</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>8,140</td>
<td>21,412</td>
<td>2,924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(LTP - F3) Other Individual schemes costing less than £5 million or groups of related schemes (Block)</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,637</td>
<td>10,577</td>
<td>9,534</td>
<td>13,686</td>
<td>13,415</td>
<td>12,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19,218</td>
<td>23,982</td>
<td>29,884</td>
<td>49,322</td>
<td>61,062</td>
<td>43,954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes:

**LTPF1**

1. Expenditure on schemes with Gross Costs of £5 million or more (including major maintenance schemes) is included in the major schemes row (row 4) of this table.

2. Expenditure on schemes with Gross Costs of less than £5 million is recorded in rows 1, 2 and 3 for maintenance schemes and in row 5 for all other schemes.

**LTPF2 and LTPF3**

3. Where available, audited cash information should be used.
4. For years before the current financial year, actual or estimated outturn expenditure should be given.

5. Give estimated outturn expenditure for the current financial year.

6. Give projected expenditure for years after the current financial year. You should not make any adjustments for this to reflect resources held from previous years or resources which are sought for expenditure which will occur, or have occurred, in other financial years.

7. Enter all financial data in multiples of £1000, e.g. 500 = £500,000. DO NOT use commas or decimal places. Do not insert asterisks, or insert text in any number cells.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTPF2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Use LTPF2 for existing and new major schemes with gross costs of £5 million or more. This includes new road schemes, public transport schemes and major highway maintenance schemes.

9. For new schemes, the local authority priority (DfT Ref/Pry 1, 2, 3 ... etc) must not have equal rankings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTPF3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Use LTPF3 for all schemes not included in LTPF2.

| LTP-F4 |

Refer to the LTP Technical Guidance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DfT Ref/Pry</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>Start of Main Works</th>
<th>End of Main Works</th>
<th>Gross Total</th>
<th>Net Total</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LTPF2 - ALL PAGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,445</td>
<td>33,445</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>8,410</td>
<td>21,412</td>
<td>2,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme</td>
<td>PR1</td>
<td>7617</td>
<td></td>
<td>01-Apr-04</td>
<td>31-Mar-06</td>
<td>26,895</td>
<td>26,895</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>17,212</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reighton Bypass</td>
<td>RD1</td>
<td>10024</td>
<td></td>
<td>01-Apr-05</td>
<td>31-Mar-06</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Gross Total</td>
<td>Net Total</td>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LTPF2 - ALL PAGES</td>
<td></td>
<td>198,758</td>
<td>193,977</td>
<td>19,218</td>
<td>23,982</td>
<td>29,185</td>
<td>40,912</td>
<td>39,650</td>
<td>41,030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Bus Corridors</td>
<td>BL1</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stops with Travel Information Displays</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to Existing Bus Stops</td>
<td>B13</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Bus Infrastructure Schemes</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Single Mode Interchanges</td>
<td>IN1</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to Single Mode Interchanges</td>
<td>IN2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Park &amp; Ride (Bus/Road Related) Schemes</td>
<td>PR1</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride (Bus/Road Related) Improvements</td>
<td>PR2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Tracks</td>
<td>CY1</td>
<td>6,091</td>
<td>6,027</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Parking Facilities</td>
<td>CY6</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or Improved Footways</td>
<td>WA3</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrianisation</td>
<td>WA3</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or Improved Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge</td>
<td>WA5</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School Schemes</td>
<td>LS1</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Schemes which include New Street Lighting</td>
<td>LS4</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>LS5</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Safety Schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toucan or Puffin Crossings</td>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Signalled Crossing Schemes</td>
<td>RC2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unsignalled Crossings</td>
<td>RC3</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalling / Signal Upgrading</td>
<td>TM2</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed Traffic Management Schemes</td>
<td>TM3</td>
<td>6,968</td>
<td>6,933</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 20 mph zones</td>
<td>TM7</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Traffic Calming Schemes</td>
<td>TM9</td>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>7,406</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Traffic Calming Schemes</td>
<td>TM10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Rural Bypass</td>
<td>RD1</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Relief Road</td>
<td>RD3</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Dualling or Widening</td>
<td>RD7</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Junction / Junction Improvement Schemes</td>
<td>RD11</td>
<td>4,651</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Studies</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management Studies</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Studies</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Studies</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Studies</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Access Studies</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road over Rail Schemes</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Strategy</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Awareness</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon City Centre Environmental Enhancements</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Lebberston Advance Works</td>
<td>PR1</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal LTP Funded Footway Schemes</td>
<td>MM1</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Principal LTP Funded Footway Schemes</td>
<td>MM1</td>
<td>7,569</td>
<td>7,569</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Road LTP Funded Carriageway Schemes</td>
<td>MM3</td>
<td>27,214</td>
<td>26,714</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>5,790</td>
<td>6,040</td>
<td>7,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Principal LTP Funded Carriageway Schemes</td>
<td>MM3</td>
<td>29,955</td>
<td>29,955</td>
<td>4,375</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>6,017</td>
<td>4,970</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>MM5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Road LTP Funded Surface Dressing Schemes</td>
<td>4,393</td>
<td>4,393</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Principal LTP Funded Surface Dressing Schemes</td>
<td>13,649</td>
<td>13,649</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Strengthening Schemes (40 tonne vehicles)</td>
<td>20,545</td>
<td>20,545</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>6,866</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Maintenance and Enhancement Schemes</td>
<td>14,940</td>
<td>14,725</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>3,626</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Assessment Programme</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Street Lighting Equipment</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Bids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Cycle Network</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Transport Works (De-trunked Roads)</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Over Rail</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Traffic Management Strategies</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN - CAPITAL PROGRAMME EXPENDITURE 2001-02 TO 2006-07**

**LTP-F4: Actual and proposed use of LTP Integrated Transport block and maintenance funding (for actual and indicative allocations respectively)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority Name</th>
<th>North Yorkshire</th>
<th>Authority No</th>
<th>216</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**General points:**

1. Unless indicated otherwise, codes include new schemes and improvements or extensions to existing schemes;
2. Use whole numbers only - round up to the nearest kilometre or metre.
3. Authorities should give complete data for 2001/2 onwards in accordance with the Technical Guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Unit of Data</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
<th>2004-5</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus priority schemes (excluding signalling)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality bus corridor / showcase route schemes</td>
<td>BL1</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BL2</td>
<td>km</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>busways / bus lanes</td>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BL4</td>
<td>km</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes</td>
<td>BL5</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BL6</td>
<td>km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other bus priority schemes</td>
<td>BL7</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guided Bus Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new guided bus scheme</td>
<td>BG1</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BG2</td>
<td>km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Infrastructure Schemes (excluding interchanges)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new bus stop</td>
<td>BI1</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bus stops with travel information displays</td>
<td>BI2</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>km</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to existing bus stops</td>
<td>BI3</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bus infrastructure scheme</td>
<td>BI4</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Light Rail (including tram and other rapid transit systems; excluding interchanges)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New light rail line (excluding line extensions)</td>
<td>LR1</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical light rail line improvements (including track dualling and line extensions)</td>
<td>LR2</td>
<td>km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional capacity (vehicles)</td>
<td>LR3</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other light rail schemes</td>
<td>LR4</td>
<td>km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Transport Interchanges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single mode interchanges (new)</td>
<td>IN1</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single mode interchanges (improvement)</td>
<td>IN2</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport interchanges at airports (new)</td>
<td>IN3</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport interchanges at airports (improvement)</td>
<td>IN4</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal interchanges (new)</td>
<td>IN5</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal interchanges (improvement)</td>
<td>IN6</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New dynamic information systems at interchanges</td>
<td>IN7</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park and Ride</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and ride (bus/road related) : new schemes</td>
<td>PR1</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions to existing schemes</td>
<td>PR2</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and ride (rail-related) : new schemes</td>
<td>PR3</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions to existing schemes</td>
<td>PR4</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle tracks</td>
<td>Cycle lanes</td>
<td>New advanced stop lines</td>
<td>New cycle parking facilities</td>
<td>Other cycling schemes</td>
<td>Walking schemes</td>
<td>New or improved footways</td>
<td>Metres</td>
<td>Pedestrianisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY1 number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>CY2 km number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY4 number</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>CY5 number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY7 number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CY8 number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking schemes</th>
<th>New or improved footways</th>
<th>Metres</th>
<th>Pedestrianisation</th>
<th>New or improved pedestrian cycle bridge</th>
<th>Safer cycling schemes</th>
<th>New or improved pedestrian facilities</th>
<th>Walking schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA1 number</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>WA2 metres</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>4700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA4 metres</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>WA5 number</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA7 number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WA8 number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safer cycling schemes</th>
<th>New or improved pedestrian cycle bridge</th>
<th>Safer cycling schemes</th>
<th>New or improved pedestrian facilities</th>
<th>Walking schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP1 number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP2 number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP3 number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP4 number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP5 number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP6 number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Safety Schemes</th>
<th>Schools implementing first safe routes scheme</th>
<th>Other sites implementing first Safe routes scheme</th>
<th>Other safety schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS1 number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS2 number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS3 number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS4 number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS5 number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other walking schemes</th>
<th>Other cycling schemes</th>
<th>Walking schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local travel plans</th>
<th>Local highway authority site travel plans</th>
<th>Local shire district travel plans</th>
<th>Local school travel plans</th>
<th>Local further/higer education establishment travel plans</th>
<th>Local employer travel plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP1 number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP2 number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP3 number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP4 number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP5 number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP6 number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local travel plans</th>
<th>Local highway authority site travel plans</th>
<th>Local shire district travel plans</th>
<th>Local school travel plans</th>
<th>Local further/higer education establishment travel plans</th>
<th>Local employer travel plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local travel plans</th>
<th>Local highway authority site travel plans</th>
<th>Local shire district travel plans</th>
<th>Local school travel plans</th>
<th>Local further/higer education establishment travel plans</th>
<th>Local employer travel plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road crossings</td>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>RC2</td>
<td>RC3</td>
<td>RC4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toucan or puffin crossings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other signalled crossings</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other unsignalled crossings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underpass replacement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Management and Traffic Calming (excluding CCTV cameras)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Traffic Control (instations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signalling/signal upgrading (outstations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other traffic management schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear zones / low-emission zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 20mph zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 20mph zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other urban traffic calming schemes (excluding home zones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other rural traffic calming schemes (excluding quiet lanes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Road Schemes (excluding trunk roads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new rural bypasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new relief road or urban ring road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new or improved access roads with specific regeneration or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social inclusion benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road dualling and widening schemes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RD1</th>
<th>RD2</th>
<th>RD3</th>
<th>RD4</th>
<th>RD5</th>
<th>RD6</th>
<th>RD7</th>
<th>RD8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Realignment Schemes</td>
<td>RD9</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RD10</td>
<td>metres</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Junction or Junction Improvement Schemes</td>
<td>RD11</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>7 6 4 5 5 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Road Schemes</td>
<td>RD12</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Schemes (using LTP Integrated Transport Block funding)</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>10 20 15 15 15 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway Maintenance Schemes</td>
<td>MM1</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>56 32 40 49 52 57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MM2</td>
<td>metres</td>
<td>24000 9806 12258 14882 15658 17181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriageway Maintenance Scheme</td>
<td>MM3</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>87 100 129 157 165 181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MM4</td>
<td>km</td>
<td>44 45 58 71 75 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Reducing Road Surfaces</td>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>56 39 63 76 80 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MM6</td>
<td>km</td>
<td>29 19 31 38 40 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening to carry 40 tonne vehicular loading</td>
<td>MM7</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>63 77 43 71 24 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Maintenance and Enhancement of Existing Highway Structures</td>
<td>MM8</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>56 47 23 12 19 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Schemes (using LTP Capital Maintenance Funding)</td>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>102 456 456 456 456 456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Local Authority I.D. Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Auth ID</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire (sole)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton (Dunstable part of joint bid)</td>
<td>145A</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td>145J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton (sole - part of joint)</td>
<td>145B</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td>145J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton Dunstable (joint)</td>
<td>145J</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>GO-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby City</td>
<td>205A</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td>205J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire (City &amp; County joint)</td>
<td>205J</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire (County part of joint)</td>
<td>205B</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td>205J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire (sole)</td>
<td>205C</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>215A</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td>215J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire (Central)</td>
<td>215B</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td>215J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire (City &amp; Central joint)</td>
<td>215J</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire (County)</td>
<td>215C</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham City (part of joint)</td>
<td>217A</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td>217J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire (City &amp; County joint)</td>
<td>217J</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire (Greater Notts part of joint)</td>
<td>217B</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td>217J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire (North Notts)</td>
<td>217C</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>GO-EM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>124A</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>124B</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
<td>124C</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar &amp; Cleveland</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>124D</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>124E</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne &amp; Wear PTE (joint)</td>
<td>124J</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne &amp; Wear PTE (Nexus)</td>
<td>124F</td>
<td>GO-NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn with Darwen</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>43A</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>43B</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester (joint)</td>
<td>43J</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester PTA</td>
<td>43C</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>48A</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>48B</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester (Millennium Ltd)</td>
<td>43D</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester (SEMMS)</td>
<td>43N</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester CC</td>
<td>43E</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside (joint)</td>
<td>48J</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside PTE</td>
<td>48C</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>43F</td>
<td>GO-NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rochdale 43G GO-NW 43J
Salford 43H GO-NW 43J
Sefton 48D GO-NW 48J
St Helens 48E GO-NW 48J
Stockport 43I GO-NW 43J
Tameside 43K GO-NW 43J
Trafford 43L GO-NW 43J
Warrington 170 GO-NW
Wigan 43M GO-NW 43J
Wirral 48F GO-NW 48J
Bracknell 158 GO-SE
Brighton & Hove 151 GO-SE
Buckinghamshire 202 GO-SE
East Sussex 209 GO-SE
Hampshire 211 GO-SE
Isle of Wight 130 GO-SE
Kent test 213 GO-SE
Medway 164 GO-SE
Milton Keynes 146 GO-SE
Oxfordshire 100 GO-SE
Portsmouth 152 GO-SE
Reading (total package for all districts) 160 GO-SE
Slough 161 GO-SE
Southampton 153 GO-SE
Surrey 105 GO-SE
West Berkshire 159 GO-SE
West Sussex 107 GO-SE
Windsor & Maidenhead 162 GO-SE
Wokingham 163 GO-SE
Bath & North East Somerset 131 GO-SW
Bournemouth 149A GO-SW 149J
Bournemouth, Poole Christchurch (joint) 149J GO-SW
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset (Christchurch)</td>
<td>149C</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset (Rural plan exc Christchurch)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Somerset</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>149B</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gloucestershire</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swindon</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torbay</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>GO-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>110A</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>110B</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>110C</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell</td>
<td>110D</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solihull</td>
<td>110E</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke-on-Trent</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telford &amp; Wrekin</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>110F</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands Joint Committee</td>
<td>110J</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands PTE (Centro)</td>
<td>110G</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>110H</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>GO-WM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>123A</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>126A</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code1</td>
<td>Code2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calderdale</td>
<td>126B</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>123B</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Riding of Yorkshire</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Hull</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees</td>
<td>126C</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>126D</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Lincolnshire</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lincolnshire</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>123C</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>123D</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yorkshire (joint)</td>
<td>123J</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yorkshire PTE</td>
<td>123E</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>126E</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire (joint)</td>
<td>126J</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire PTE</td>
<td>126F</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>GO-YH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Authority not in list</td>
<td>ZZZ</td>
<td>ZZZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Authority not in list</td>
<td>ZZZJ</td>
<td>ZZZJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATEMENTS OF THE DISTRICT COUNCILS AND NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITIES

This Appendix contains the updated statements of the District Councils and National Park Authorities on the Local Transport Plan and Annual Progress Reports.

These are set out in the following sections:

1. Craven District Council
2. Hambleton District Council
3. Harrogate Borough Council
4. Richmondshire District Council
5. Ryedale District Council
6. Scarborough Borough Council
7. Selby District Council
8. North York Moors National Park Authority
9. Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority
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STATEMENT BY CRAVEN DISTRICT COUNCIL
The District Council’s three year Strategic Plan aims to ensure that it protects and enhances the social, economic and environmental well being of the district and will influence others to do the same for the benefit of our residents, visitors and businesses.

The Council’s objectives for achieving this include:-
1. Encouraging a thriving local economy with good quality employment by working with North Yorkshire County Council, the Regional Development Agency and others
2. Protecting the special character of Craven’s town’s villages and countryside in liaison with the Regional Development Agency, the Countryside Agency, North Yorkshire County Council and others
3. To adopt the sustainability principles of Local Agenda 21, reduce waste and maximise energy efficiency and recycling
4. To maintain high environmental standards across the district and where appropriate work closely and constructively with the Environment Agency and others
5. To improve the transport infrastructure of the district
6. To encourage access to leisure opportunities across the district
7. To promote the improved health of the residents of Craven District Council
8. To support a safe community

The District Council recognises the strategic importance of the Local Transport Plan to deliver many of the objectives within the District Council’s Strategic Plan. The District Council’s objectives in turn underpin and support the aims of the Local Transport Plan to improve community life, improve safety, to protect and enhance environmental quality, to promote social equality and to promote economic prosperity.

A specific commitment within the Council’s Strategic Plan is for the District Council to work with North Yorkshire County Council to implement the Local Transport Plan.

Land Use Planning and Transport
The strong links between land use planning and transport is recognised by the District Council. The Craven Local Plan, which was adopted in July 1999, promotes a land use strategy for sustainable development which expects that the vast majority of new development will be carefully located to reduce the need for additional car journeys. The Local Plan also encourages new developments to be easily accessible and served or capable of being served by public transport, allowing for a reduction in car journeys.

Parking standards will, where appropriate, be applied flexibly. Local plan policies also encourage the provision of effective bus and rail services and the Council will support proposals for improved public transport facilities in the area. For example, the Council has safeguarded land at Crosshills from other forms of development to facilitate the re-opening of Crosshills Railway Station.

The Local Plan also has policies to protect disused trackbeds and existing infrastructure of disused railway lines in the area from developments which prejudice their future use for transport and/or recreation purposes, namely the former Skipton to Colne line and the former line linking Clapham – Ingleton – Sedbergh.

Local plan policies also seek to promote and encourage cycle usage within new developments through the provision of cycle parking facilities and safe and convenient access for cyclists.

As a result of the new Planning Bill, which, at the time of writing, is before Parliament, the Council abandoned the review of the Local Plan in January 2003. In its place, background
work associated with the preparation of a new Local Development Framework is currently underway.

**Rail Services**
The Council contributed towards an engineering feasibility study for the re-opening of Crosshills railway station. The study has been completed, and options contained within the study were the subject of public consultation in September 2001. Work is ongoing in respect of the development of one option. In addition, the Council, in conjunction with North Yorkshire County Council, has been exploring the possibilities of relieving congestion caused by the frequent closure of the Kildwick Level Crossing. In response to consultation from North Yorkshire County Council on three options, the Council presented a fourth option for consideration after objecting to those put forward by North Yorkshire County Council. The feasibility of this fourth option is currently being explored and may be given further consideration via the preparation of a Local Development Framework.

The Council is an active participant in the promotion of and extension of railway services in Craven through its membership of the Leeds-Morecambe Railway Promotions Working Group and the Settle – Carlisle Railway Promotions Working Group. One of the key achievements of this partnership working has been the introduction of the Dales Railcard which is available to local residents and affords them one third off rail travel on these lines providing they are not commuters to Leeds. The Council also supports the Settle-Carlisle Development Company.

The Council supports efforts by the County Council to harmonise the present fare differential between West Yorkshire and North Yorkshire on the Skipton to Leeds rail service.

The Council has supported the aims of the Yorkshire Dales Railway Museum Trust by protecting the trackbed of the former Skipton to Ilkley railway between Embsay and Bolton Abbey in the Local Plan and will continue to encourage the extension of its services to Skipton. The Council has grant aided various projects over the years to assist the Railway Trust in achieving its objectives. The Railway Trust through partnership with the private sector and Council support gained European funding to finally achieve its objective of reopening Bolton Abbey Station in May 1998.

**Cycling**
The Council supports the North Yorkshire County Council’s Cycling Strategy and will work in partnership with relevant bodies through a Local Cycling Group to undertake a cycling study of Skipton.

The Council in 1997 commissioned SUSTRANS to undertake a study into the potential for converting the disused railway line from Skipton to Earby into a cycleway.

SUSTRANS in their report concluded that 35% of people in Skipton do not own a car and that the cycle route will be of benefit to both recreational cyclists and residents travelling to work. Over 7000 people live in the parishes that the cycleway will run through and the route would link in with other cycleways and footpaths including the Pendle Cycle way, the Yorkshire Dales Cycleway, the Pennine Way, the Pennine Bridleway and the Pennine Walkway. The scheme should also link in with traffic calming measures along Broughton Road and the North Yorkshire Cycling Strategy. The Council in January 1999, agreed to pursue the possibility of converting the disused line to a shared use footpath/cycleway and if possible a permissive bridleway. The Council have named the project the West Craven Cycleway and is currently seeking funding from external grant sources towards the capital costs of the scheme.

**Off Street/On Street Parking.**
The District Council owns and manages many car parks within the District, some of which are pay and display. The Council has undertaken a programme of car park refurbishment to
improve the overall condition of the car park stock. Consequently a Car Parking Policy Statement was adopted by the Council in December 2000. The Council in its Strategic Plan is committed to undertaking a fundamental review of its parking policy, including residential parking. The Council is also a partner in the Skipton Traffic Management Working Group.

A Traffic Management Strategy for Skipton is currently being developed in partnership with North Yorkshire County Council. A public consultation exercise to present options for comment was undertaken during September 2002. North Yorkshire County Council considered and responded to issues raised as a result of public consultation early in 2003. It is recognised that the management of both on and off street parking will be a crucial element of the strategy which the Council will need to consider in relation to its own car parking policy.

**Air Quality**
The Council has completed the first stage of its review of Air Quality in the District. The Air Quality Regulations 1997 set Air Quality Objective levels for seven air pollutants. Whilst the risk of exceeding air quality objective levels for most of the pollutants was considered to be very unlikely in Craven, it was concluded that further monitoring work will need to be carried out for Nitrogen Dioxide at the following roadside locations to determine whether the levels of Nitrogen Dioxide are above air quality standards:-

- A59 West of Skipton
- A6131, High Street, Skipton
- A6131, Keighley Road, Skipton
- B6172 Station Road, Crosshills
- A6068 Main Street Glusburn
- Newmarket Street, Skipton
- A65 Long Preston
- Duke Street, Settle

The review of PM 10 pollutants (fine particulates), indicates a number of potentially significant sources of this pollution from industry (including sources outside the Craven area). These sources individually and in combination present the potential for exceeding the relevant air quality objective for PM 10. A second stage review and assessment will be carried out for PM 10 in the following locations:

- West Marton and Halton West – Source – Part A processes in Ribble Valley
- Residential properties close to the quarries in the following locations:
  - Helwith Bridge
  - Threshfield
  - Halton East
  - Horton in Ribblesdale
  - Kilnsey
  - Giggleswick
  - Swinden
  - Skipton Rock Quarry
  - Ingleton

First and second stage assessments have been carried out for Nitrogen Dioxide and PM10. Updating and screening assessments for PM10 and Nitrogen Dioxide have been completed. At this stage, further review and assessment is not considered necessary.

**Bus Services/Concessionary Fares Scheme**
The Council operates a concessionary fares scheme to facilitate access to bus services for elderly and disabled residents within Craven District. At present, eligible persons can purchase a bus pass which provides half price fares on bus services operating in and out of the District. The Concessionary Fares Scheme is reviewed on an annual basis and has achieved harmonisation of schemes across the County.

The Council is a partner in the Craven Transport Forum which seeks to consider,
recommend or act upon schemes aimed at improving the quality and quantity of accessible and affordable passenger transport services in the District. The Forum as a Rural Transport Partnership has been successful in attracting funding from the Rural Development Commission for a project officer to support the partnership. The Council provided direct support for the partnership’s bid by providing office accommodation for the Rural Transport Officer.

The Council will as a partner in the Craven Transport Forum seek to improve rural bus services. The Council also recognises that information on rural bus services is vital to encourage greater usage of bus services and supports the publication of “Dales Connections” which provides comprehensive timetable information on both bus and rail services in the District.
APPENDIX S2

STATEMENT BY HAMBLETON DISTRICT COUNCIL
INTRODUCTION

Hambleton District Council supports the general principles of the Local Transport Plan 2001-2006.

During the past year much progress has been made towards implementing planning and transport policies and proposals in Hambleton. This report provides an update on recent developments and considers the need to revise policies and re-appraise the operation and effectiveness of transport initiatives in order to ensure that the transport system in the District provides accessibility to everyone.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND TRANSPORT

One of the objectives of the Rural White Paper was to enable and encourage rural communities to play a stronger role in the planning of their area, including playing a role in identifying local transport needs.

Within Hambleton significant advancement has been made towards realising this objective. For example a draft Community Plan has been produced and widely consulted upon and a final document will be published in the summer of 2003.

In the District’s market towns local partnerships have produced a series of Community Investment Prospectuses. These local community plans identify local needs, priorities and actions.

The Community Plan and the Community Investment Prospectuses cover a wide range of issues, but all contain a range of transport issues that the local communities have identified as priorities for action.

In some cases work is already underway on addressing the issues identified. For example the Bedale group want to see progress made on the provision of a relief road for Bedale, Aiskew and Leeming Bar. This project is now being taken forward by North Yorkshire County Council who are adding it to their works programme with a view to implementing it in tandem with the A1(M) motorway upgrading scheme. Similarly, the Northallerton group highlighted a need for cycle paths in the area, and a number of routes have now been implemented by the District and County Councils.

Many of the transport issues identified by the groups are however not being addressed by current initiatives. For example, the Stokesley group has identified a gap in the provision of public transport from Stokesley and Great Ayton to the leisure and retail facilities at Teesside Park. This is something that could be resolved through Local Transport Plan funding, either through the provision of subsidised bus services or through financial support to community transport providers.

HAMBLETON TRANSPORT STRATEGY
A draft Transport Strategy for Hambleton was produced during 2002/2003 and was approved by Cabinet for consultation purposes on 20 March 2003. The Strategy sets out the Council’s position on key transport issues likely to have an effect on Hambleton over the next 5 years.

Prior to the preparation of the draft Strategy a policy context review was undertaken. This highlighted several common themes that have subsequently been used in the preparation of the Strategy and which are reflected in its component action points. These themes are:

- Achieving a better, more integrated, safe and sustainable transport system which reflects land use requirements and is efficient and capable of meeting the needs of local residents, workers, businesses and visitors;
- Integrating planning and transport policies and maintaining consistency between development plans and local transport plans;
- Improving public transport and facilities for cyclists and pedestrians in order to promote healthier and more environmentally sustainable travel;
- Promoting locational, design and parking policies to steer new development to locations served by a variety of travel modes, and encourage imaginative thinking about the siting, design and layout of new developments;
- Ensuring the existing highway network is safe, efficient and well maintained;
- Promoting social equality by reducing the transport barriers faced by young, elderly and mobility impaired people, and the socially and economically disadvantaged;
- Facilitating opportunities for economic regeneration and growth, and improving and promoting sustainable, non-road travel choices for freight; and
- Implementing demand management measures aimed at discouraging commuting by private car.

Consultation is currently taking place with the County Council, Town and Parish Councils, Train and Bus operators and special interest groups such as the Ramblers, the Cyclists Touring Club and the British Horse Society. Road transport organisations such as the Highways Agency and the Freight Transport Association are also being consulted.

**HAMBLETON DISTRICT WIDE LOCAL PLAN**

The Hambleton District Wide Local Plan (DWLP) was adopted in January 1999 and covers the period to 2006. The plan includes a number of transport specific policies and proposals, for example there are policies supporting the by-passes proposed by the County Council, promoting the greater use of public transport, cycling and walking and lessening the environmental impact of traffic.

Alteration No. 1 of the Plan strengthens its transport policies with respect to the changing requirements of PPG13. It requires developers of major new developments to provide for the needs of cyclists, including the provision of cycle parking and links to the cycle network.

The District Council has now embarked upon a full review of the District Wide Local Plan to roll it forward to 2016. A significant part of this review will involve the allocation of sites for new development required during this period. This could affect the future availability of land for bypass routes.

The Local Transport Plan includes a Major Capital Highway Schemes review, but this only includes schemes that are to be programmed up to 2010. It is considered that the proposed schemes need to be re-appraised to identify those that are likely to come forward during the period up to 2016 to coincide with the forthcoming Local Plan review.
Hambleton welcomes the Highways Agency’s announcement that the section of the A1(M) between Bramham and Barton via Leeming is to be upgraded to motorway standards, and the subsequent news that the A684 Leeming Bar / Aiskew / Bedale By-pass is to be included in the County Council’s programme of Major and Major / Minor works to 2010. There is continued anxiety over the adequacy of access to the Leeming Bar Industrial Estate, and a developer funded roundabout option at the junction of Leases Lane and the A684 is seen as a possible means of addressing this problem. However if the bypass scheme is to be implemented in the next few years this option may not prove necessary. A preferred route and proposed implementation schedule will be needed soon.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STUDIES

The Northallerton Traffic Management Study being led by the County Council and Mouchel is still in progress. Options for consultation have now been identified through a series of stakeholder workshops, and full public consultation is programmed for May 2003. One of the key challenges to be addressed in Northallerton is the alleviation of the problems caused by the frequent closure of the town’s level crossings. Any proposals arising from the Strategy should be included in the Local Transport Plan and implemented as soon as possible.

The Council is also pleased that work has commenced on the production of a Traffic Management Study for Easingwold, but feels that when considering which of the District’s remaining market towns should be the subject of a Traffic Management Study, Thirsk should be the next priority.

GREEN TRAVEL PLAN AND CAR SHARE SCHEME

A Green Travel Plan for the District Council has been developed and was approved by Cabinet in June 2002.

A potential initiative emerging from this is the re-launch of the Car Sharing Scheme which is a partnership project between Hambleton, North Yorkshire County Council, DEFRA, the Friarage Hospital and the North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service.

Data relating to the scheme is currently held and controlled by the County Council. This is a factor that could have contributed to HDC’s relatively low level of participation so far. An HDC staff survey shows that there is potential for increasing involvement if the system is made more user friendly.

WENSLEYDALE RAILWAY

Progress has continued on the restoration of the Wensleydale Railway to provide passenger services between Northallerton and the Dales.

The Wensleydale Railway Company has taken over the station and goods yard at Leeming Bar to develop as a railhead for future operations. A 99-year lease has been negotiated with Network Rail, transferring control of the railway’s land and assets to the Wensleydale Railway Company. The rail regulators have also now awarded operating licenses and the company will be running passenger services between Leeming Bar and Leyburn from 4th July 2003 until October.

The route of the Wensleydale Railway has been safeguarded in the Local Plan.

PUBLIC & COMMUNITY TRANSPORT
**Public Transport Infrastructure**

Following the improvements made last year through the provision of bus shelters, raised bus boarding facilities and information boards in Northallerton and along the Northallerton to Bedale Corridor, the County Council has continued to make improvements to bus passenger infrastructure in Hambleton. New facilities are due to be provided in Stokesley town centre and improvements have already been made along the Stokesley to Northallerton Corridor. A further improvement has been the provision of low floor buses on the Northallerton – Bedale – Masham – Leyburn route.

**Concessionary Fares**

In response to concerns over whether bus services are meeting the travel needs of people who have difficulty using public transport, Hambleton District Council has recently extended its existing Concessionary Fares Scheme to provide half price taxi vouchers worth up to £60 for people with disabilities. This new initiative came into use in April 2003 and its effectiveness will be closely monitored.

**Rural Transport Partnership**

The Hambleton and Richmondshire Rural Transport Partnership continues to tackle transport related social exclusion especially for the young, elderly and people with disabilities. Its action plan has been updated and innovative schemes such as “Wheels 2 Work”, “Wheels 4 All” continue to grow and gain recognition. The partnership is very supportive of social car schemes run by the voluntary sector in the District’s market towns, and has for example provided funding to the Thirsk scheme to enable more journeys to be provided. The Partnership also manages a “Get up & Go” fund that provides transport grants to local community groups.

“Wheels 2 Work” is one of the Partnership’s most successful schemes. It leases mopeds to young people who wish to take up training, education and employment, which would otherwise be inaccessible. The scheme was launched in May 2001 and by March 2003 had received 268 referrals (160 in Hambleton), allocated 66 mopeds (39 in Hambleton) and 3 push-bikes, and funded driving lessons for 1 person. The District Council is amongst several organisations that have supported the expansion of the scheme to a fleet of 30 mopeds and 12 bicycles. In the long term it is planned to expand the scheme further to include grants for driving lessons and vehicle repair grants. The Partnership is looking at the long-term sustainability of the scheme by seeking funding from various sources including the County Council and the Department for Work and Pension.

**INTEGRATION OF PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY TRANSPORT**

It is considered from the performance of the Concessionary Fares scheme and low passenger levels on a number of the County’s subsidised bus routes that public transport may not be responding adequately to the needs of the elderly or people with disabilities in the District. The high demand for mopeds from the “Wheels 2 Work” scheme demonstrates that the transport needs of young people also need to be given priority. These groups need more demand responsive transport to enable them to gain access to education, training, jobs, healthcare, leisure and evening activities. Schemes such as “Wheels 2 Work”, social car schemes and taxi-based schemes are more responsive to these demands and have made some progress at addressing this issue.

The County Council has demonstrated its recognition of the important role played by community transport through its contribution to the Rural Transport Partnerships. However, the funding it provides towards these activities is limited in comparison to the amount of funding spent on providing subsidised bus routes which, despite the efforts of the County Council, do not always provide people with the transport they need at the times when they
need it. This is demonstrated by the recent decision to withdraw or reduce a number of the subsidised bus routes. There is a strong case to switching more LTP money away from subsidisation and towards providing demand responsive community transport.

**CYCLING**

*The National Cycle Network*

Following the successful partnership working on the development of the part of the National Cycle Network’s White Rose Route, which runs north of York through Hambleton to Middlesbrough, the District Council looks forward to working with the County Council on the implementation of the route westward from Northallerton through Bedale to Penrith. To this end the Wensleydale Railway Association has been commissioned to undertake a preliminary feasibility study into the potential shared use of the track bed on the Northallerton - Bedale section of the Northallerton to Redmire railway line. If this initial study is successful any financial support provided through the Local Transport Plan towards further feasibility work or implementation would be gratefully received. There is potential for this route to replace the currently approved section of NCN between Northallerton and Bedale if implementation proves feasible.

Another feasibility study commissioned by the District Council this year is investigating the feasibility of providing a cycle link between Great Ayton and Stokesley. The County Council is undertaking this study.

*Local Cycle Routes*

The District has also continued to work with the County Council on the production and implementation of Cycle Plans for the District’s market towns. Cycle Plans for Northallerton and Thirsk have been produced and implementation of them is underway.

Following last year’s completion of the Brompton to Northallerton Cycle Route and a cycle link between Northallerton Business Park and the North End of the High Street, work now commenced on Phase 2 of the Northallerton Cycle Plan. This will link the St James Drive Estate off Thirsk Road to the existing cycleway past the Civic Centre to Brompton and via Stone Cross to the North End of the High Street. The new route will pass through residential streets around the east of Northallerton past Northallerton College, into the Hambleton Forum car park, through the Bullamoor Memorial Park and down Turker Lane, crossing the road between the Allertonshire east and west wings via a Toucan crossing.

**AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT**

The Council is responsible for undertaking an assessment of air quality in the District. Reviews of air quality so far have not called for the declaration of any Air Quality Management Areas.

**COMMUNITY SAFETY**

The Hambleton Community Safety Partnership brings together representatives of public organisations, voluntary groups, businesses and local residents, with the aim of reducing crime and disorder and promoting community safety in Hambleton in a cost effective and socially equitable way. Road Safety is featured as a priority within the strategy; objectives include identifying speeding ‘hotspots’, implementing road safety campaigns to educate...
motorists of specific issues. The largest campaign is the ‘Handle It or Lose It’ campaign, which is aimed at motorcyclists riding in North Yorkshire. The creative campaign adopts a bright design to engage the target audience, whilst the message is delivered in a ‘light hearted and provocative manner to encourage traffic on to the website. The website delivers safety and training messages.

**CAR PARKING**

An August 2002 survey of car parking in the District showed that the towns most in need of improvements to town centre parking are Northallerton, Thirsk and Stokesley. Great Ayton is also identified as being in need of additional parking for visitors. A draft strategy for the future provision and control of the Council controlled parking spaces across the District has subsequently been prepared and consulted upon.

Consultation on the draft strategy looked at a number of options:

- Improvements to the management and signage of car parks, including re-designating long stay spaces for short term parking
- Reducing the maximum stay in certain areas to one hour to increase turnover
- Developing new car parks
- Exploring the possibility of shared use of private car park
- Improvements to the location and number of disabled parking bays.

In parallel with the consultation, additional survey work was undertaken to validate the original survey results and to examine the potential for shared use of private car parks in Northallerton and Thirsk.

Consultants were commissioned to undertake the following surveys of:

- off-street car parking in Northallerton and Thirsk, to allow comparison with 2000 data;
- on-street parking in Northallerton, to provide a broad picture of parking in the town;
- private non-residential car parking spaces available within Thirsk and Northallerton that could realistically be used to cater for future parking demands.

The results of draft strategy consultation and the survey work will be reported to Cabinet in June 2003.

Hambleton District Council acknowledges the potential conflict between increasing car parking provision in the market towns and the aim of promoting public transport, cycling and walking as alternatives to the car. The car parking studies have been closely linked to the development of the wider Traffic Management Study for Northallerton and any measures to increase car parking will be related to other traffic and demand management initiatives.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

By assessing the progress of transport initiatives in Hambleton, the following issues have been raised:

- The District Council will look to adopt and use the maximum parking standards that have now been published by the County Council in accordance with PPG13.

- The County Council is urged to ensure that implementation of the A684 Bedale / Aiskew / Leeming Bar bypass scheme is timed to coincide with the A1(M) upgrading scheme. A preferred route and proposed implementation schedule should be prepared as soon as possible in order to assist in the review of Hambleton’s District Wide Local Plan.
The District Council wishes to see progress on proposals to address the problems associated with the frequent closure of level crossings in Northallerton.

Any proposals in the Northallerton and Easingwold Traffic Management Studies should be implemented as soon as possible.

Community transport proposals should be fully integrated into the Local Transport Plan in order for stakeholders to effectively deliver a rural transport system that provides a balanced integrated network of bus routes and community transport initiatives that improve good access to everyone, are responsive to the demands of rural transport users and give value for money. Consideration should be given to transferring some of the money currently used to subsidise bus services into the provision of more demand responsive community transport initiatives.
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STATEMENT BY HARROGATE BOROUGH COUNCIL

The Borough Council continues to support and be actively involved in the delivery and implementation of the Local Transport Plan’s strategies and their integration with wider issues in Harrogate District, in partnership with the County Council and other interested groups and organisations. This is being achieved in the following ways:

**Transport Working Group**

The Harrogate District Local Plan, which covers the period up to 2006, will over the next few years be replaced by the new Local Development Framework system. At the current time detailed guidance on requirements for their production is awaited from the government, however work to review planning policies has already begun. A Transport Working Group has been established in order to enable a better integration of transport and land use strategies, policies and proposals. This group includes officers involved in the preparation of the Local Transport Plan, the future Local Development Framework, the operation of the highways agency in Harrogate and Knaresborough, development control at both County and District level, and air quality management. The officer group was established in 2002 and has already provided a useful forum for discussion, coordination and consultation on a number of emerging and fundamental issues relevant to the review of policy and the integration of longer term land use and transportation planning. The intention is that this working group will inform a wider stakeholders group (which will include District and County Members) and that this will inform public consultation and lead to the identification of key issues.

A number of significant studies that will provide background information for the review of planning and transportation policy have also been undertaken. An Urban Housing Capacity Study for the District has now been published and will assist in the review of local plan policies and proposals which will seek to use location, scale, density, design and mix of land uses to help reduce the need to travel and therefore promote sustainable travel choices and help to reduce traffic congestion. A Retail Capacity Study is also currently being undertaken which looks at the need for additional retail space in the District and will advise on a suitable strategy for its provision.

Key areas already identified by the group which need to be addressed in preparation for the review of the Local Transport Plan and the District Local Plan include: developing a data base for existing and planned public transport services, which can be easily updated and is accessible; the application of accessibility criteria defined in Regional Planning Guidance; and cross-border issues, in particular the significant relationship between Harrogate and Leeds.

The County Council are currently undertaking a comprehensive transportation study for Harrogate and Knaresborough which will inform the review of the Local Transport Plan and the Local Plan. More specific studies aimed at relieving traffic congestion in the short term
Improvements in Bus Infrastructure/Provision

One of the most significant areas where improvements have been made over the last 2 years is in relation to bus infrastructure. The Harrogate District Local Plan allocates sites for improved bus stations at Harrogate, Knaresborough and Ripon and provision for contributions towards these schemes has been made through the Local Transport Plan. The bus station in Ripon was completed last year as part of a larger development including a new library and additional retail units. This scheme is now complete and has recently attracted a small Marks and Spencer food store.

The Borough Council has worked with the bus company in Harrogate and the County Council for some time to provide a proper bus station in the town. The scheme is now complete and includes an information kiosk, raised kerbs to match the level of low floor buses in order to improve accessibility, and a pedestrian priority scheme to improve access between the town centre and the bus station. The provision of a Real Time Information system in the bus station is underway and whilst a number of technical issues have still to be resolved it is anticipated that the system will be live by the end of June 2003. Expansion of real time information into the main bus stops, key sites such as places of employment, and premises visited frequently by the public are also planned. The fact that Harrogate Bus Station is located adjacent to the railway station presents an opportunity to provide significant improvements to enable the better integration of bus and rail services, better access for community transport and taxis and also to provide improved services and facilities for passengers and staff operating these services.

In Knaresborough a bus station is being provided as part of a wider development scheme and the work should be completed in June 2003. These new facilities in three of the main towns in the District will themselves go some way towards increasing passenger usage and confidence. Improvements to the service and facilities between the new bus stations in Harrogate and Knaresborough include the provision of Real Time Passenger Information, bus priority at traffic lights through the SCOOT system, and improvements to bus stops and shelters are currently being implemented. The bus company is also contributing significantly by providing new buses. This will provide a substantial improvement to the bus service between Harrogate and Knaresborough the aim of which is to reduce traffic congestion.

Ripon bus station is within the A61 Bus Corridor identified for improvement in the Local Transport Plan and its redevelopment therefore contributes to the overall improvement of the service. Whilst this is a fast and efficient service between Ripon and Leeds there are a number of issues still to be addressed in the future in addition to bus shelter/ timetable and access improvements currently being undertaken by the County Council. The bus route follows the A61 for most of its route by-passing many smaller settlements, and some larger settlements such as Pannal, where the bus service is poor or non-existent and car ownership levels are high, yet these settlements are within a relatively short distance of the A61. The provision of feeder services into this route therefore needs to be investigated further. In the urban sections of the A61 through Harrogate, it is proposed to carry out improvements to the infrastructure in 2003/4, similar to those implemented on the Harrogate/Knaresborough route, including the provision of Real Time information facilities. However, traffic congestion at peak times in Harrogate and Leeds does cause delays to the service. Consideration therefore
needs to be given to the use of bus priority measures such as bus lanes and links to GPS technology. This is a cross boundary issue to be discussed with Leeds City Council.

A significant gap in the bus service in south Harrogate has now been filled by a new service in the Hookstone Road area which will serve the College of Further Education which now forms part of Leeds Metropolitan University, new and existing employment sites and Hornbeam Park Station. The Council is part of a local Community Safety Partnership and the Night Time Environment Group has identified the need to improve the ways in which people are able to leave the towns safely at night. As a result bus services now operate later at night, but this is an area where further work is required.

**Rural Bus Services**

Progress is being made to improve bus access and reduce social exclusion for a range of users over a large part of the rural area. The Borough Council is lead partner in the Rural Transport Partnership, which works with Community Transport, NYCC and other transport providers and users. Funding has been obtained through the Rural Bus Challenge and the Countryside Agency’s Vital Villages scheme to enable the Lower Nidd Mini Bus to operate in the area between Cattal and Boroughbridge, to the east and south east of the District. This project has seen significant community involvement and has reduced social isolation for a range of groups including young people, the elderly and disabled. A spin off from this service has been the establishment of an improved public transport service in the south east of the District linking a number of villages to Weeton Station and Wetherby.

A service linking Harrogate and Skipton has also been developed which includes feeder services from the Washburn Valley and Nidd Valley areas. These latter services are provided through community transport, shared taxi, and school bus operations which are coordinated through a central facility. A new Sunday service for local people and tourists has also been established between Harrogate and Pateley Bridge. Other possible improvements include modification of the Concessionary Fares Scheme, which is operated on a County wide basis by the District authorities, and led by Harrogate Borough Council, to introduce a more flexible system of passes and tokens enabling eligible residents to access different types of transport facility depending upon what services are available where they live. The North Yorkshire Concessionary Fares Partnership has currently appointed consultants to look at the enhancement of the existing system.

The Rural Transport Partnership have also set up the ‘Ripon Wheels to Work Scheme’ covering villages to the north-west of Ripon in the Masham area. This project started in April 2003 and is being run by the Hambleton Wheels to Work project, thus making savings on administration costs. The Yorkshire Dales Passenger Transport Group has recently published a Guide to Public Transport Services in the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty with assistance from the AONB Office. This provides a comprehensive guide to all transport services in the area. In order to coordinate the growing number of community transport initiatives underway the Countryside Agency are currently preparing a Community Transport Strategy for the whole of North Yorkshire and this is welcomed by the Borough Council.

**Improvements to the Rail Service/Better integration between Bus and Rail Services**

Progress on improvements to rail infrastructure and services has been progressed through a joint working group which includes the Borough Council, County Council, York City Council, Metro, Network Rail and Arriva. Whilst progress over the last few years has been
slow, partly due to the problems in the rail industry generally, but also due to delays caused by the refurbishment and expansion of Leeds station, a significant study which looks at the whole line, Leeds-Harrogate-York, in a comprehensive way is currently being undertaken. The Harrogate Line Study will set out a ‘vision’ for this line setting out ways in which it could be transformed into a successful commuter line and the problems which need to be overcome in order to achieve this. Previous work undertaken in relation to the provision of rail halts at Bilton and Knaresborough East, as allocated in the

Harrogate District Local Plan, improvements to services, provision of a major transport interchange at York and other relevant studies will be taken into account in the study. This work will also form an important input to the Harrogate Transportation Study due to be carried out in 2003/4.

The Countryside Agency’s recent audit of former railway lines in Yorkshire and Humberside ‘Railway Re-Openings’ provides a useful, sustainable input to the transportation debate. The Harrogate District Local Plan protects the routes of former railway lines identified in the study.

The future role of Harrogate station and the surrounding area is also currently under consideration. The Harrogate District Local Plan provides the planning policy context for comprehensive and substantial environmental, economic and transportation improvements in the area around Harrogate Station and the newly constructed bus station, including better integration between the two services and the facilities provided. Currently, meetings have been held with key landowners and service providers and a statement outlining the development potential of this area has been prepared. Expressions of Interest are currently being sought with a view to appointing consultants to prepare a comprehensive design/development brief for the site.

Cycle and Pedestrian Developments

Adjacent to the site allocated for a rail halt at Bilton is the proposed replacement Dragon Junction footbridge over the railway line. This is an important link in the implementation of the Harrogate Urban Cycle Network and in the proposed National Cycle Network route from Harrogate to Ripley. A bridge in this location will also form an important part of any rail halt proposal. The bridge requires replacement and financial provision for this has been made in the Local Transport Plan with a contribution from Network Rail. Consultants have now completed the design of the footbridge and an outline rail halt feasibility study has also been undertaken as part of the work for the planning application to ensure that the construction of the bridge does not prejudice the later construction of the rail halt. A planning application is to be submitted with a view to starting work early in 2004.

The Local Plan includes a policy that safeguards former railway lines for cycle paths, including the Harrogate to Ripley route referred to above. This policy has recently been put to the test when the Council took enforcement action against a landowner who had removed part of the railway embankment near Ripley without planning permission, creating an obstacle to the implementation of this section of the cycle route. In his report the Inspector considered the local plan policy as being “central to consideration of the appeal.” The appeal was dismissed and the embankment is currently being reinstated.

Elsewhere work continues to implement the cycle network identified in the Harrogate and Knaresborough Cycling Implementation Plan. The network of routes identified in the strategy continues to provide a useful planning tool in negotiations with developers regarding proposals for access to sites by cycle and the provision of additional cycle parking spaces.
Environmental improvements continue to be implemented on shopping streets in Harrogate and Knaresborough that seek to reduce pedestrian/vehicle conflict and encourage pedestrian activity. The Council continues to improve facilities for the disabled. Individual improvement schemes to assist pedestrian movement are also being introduced at key locations on the district and local distributor road network and Pedestrian Strategies for Harrogate and Knaresborough are currently being prepared. The Borough Council also seeks to ensure that cycle and pedestrian facilities are provided or improved through developer contributions where appropriate in relation to development proposals. A number of schemes of this type have been completed in 2002/3 and funding secured for a number of schemes yet to be implemented.

Regeneration in Ripon

The Borough Council and County Council, together with other organisations and groups in the City, are members of the Ripon City Partnership established to oversee projects seeking to regenerate the City. A package of improvements has been undertaken funded through the Local Transport Plan, Heritage Lottery Funding and the Single Regeneration Budget. These include significant pedestrian priority and repaving schemes in the Market Place and Cathedral areas and restoration of the canal basin.

A significant brownfield development site, which is in the City centre and located to the West of the Market Place, has been under consideration by both the Borough and County Councils for a number of years. The site is complicated by the fact that there are many landowners involved and site assembly has not been straightforward. The site is seen as the ‘last major piece in the jigsaw’ in terms of regeneration in the City. The Borough Council and County Council are in discussion with a developer who has now assembled the necessary land for development.

A Development Brief has been prepared for the site and comprehensive redevelopment proposals are included in the adopted Local Plan. Proposals for the site include the provision of a link road through the site between Coltsgate Hill and Blossomgate which would enable access to the site and additional traffic relief in the City centre, enabling further pedestrian priority work. This link is to be funded jointly by the developer and the County Council through the Local Transport Plan where it is included as the West of Market Place Traffic Management Scheme. The Borough Council is also likely to contribute land to the scheme. The allocation of funds towards such a scheme, where the complicated nature of the overall project means that it may be subject to delays, needs to be flexible to ensure that finance can be made available at the right time.

The scheme to improve the Coltsgate Hill junction, included in the 2002/03 list of schemes forms the first phase to improve access to the site. Grant aid from the Single Regeneration Budget and English Heritage is also available to improve historic buildings which form part of the overall site and also to open up, repave and light existing passageways which will provide pedestrian and cycle links through the site to the Market Place and city centre. Grant aid for improving/creating residential accommodation on upper floors above shops and businesses is also available. The scheme for a link road to the west of Market Place, when combined with other proposed improvements, grant aid from a number of sources and private investment forms an important part of a funding package which will result in the significant improvement of a major brownfield site in Ripon.
Car Parking

A District Parking Policy, which reflects the policies and proposals included in the Local Transport Plan and the Harrogate District Local Plan, is being developed at the present time. Several significant developments in terms of parking provision and enforcement took place last year. The redevelopment of the former Oxford Street multi storey car park, important for the town’s commercial vitality and viability, is now complete and provides short stay parking in Harrogate Town Centre. The renamed Jubilee Car Park won best new car park in the British Parking Awards 2003. All multi storey car parks in Harrogate town centre now have Secure Car Park Awards. A review of parking needs and provision in Harrogate, including the provision of park and ride is now necessary and will form part of the Harrogate Transportation Study. In July 2002 the Council took on its new powers in relation to decriminalised parking control, as agents for North Yorkshire County Council, and now has responsibility for most on and off street parking in the District. This will enable consistency of approach and better enforcement. The possibility of developing a Street Scene Initiative where parking attendants have additional enforcement powers in relation to environmental matters is also to be considered.

The provision of park and ride in Harrogate forms an important element in the Local Transport Plan but the implementation of schemes has been complicated by landowner objections and site constraints, the difficulties associated with providing suitable priority access to the town centre because of land protected under The Stray Act, and landscape/green belt constraints. Park and Ride continues to be part of the longer term package of measures identified to reduce traffic congestion, and is an issue to be addressed in the Harrogate Transportation Study. The Council has set aside funds to acquire potential sites should the opportunity arise.

The surplus funds from on street parking income have been used to fund a variety of projects, including construction and improvement of car parks, Traffic Calming Schemes and Safe Routes to School Schemes, public transport services and concessions, parking studies and environmental improvement schemes. In addition, some of this income is also used for Rural Safety Schemes, outside the Agency Area. Car parking studies are being undertaken in Ripon and Knaresborough to identify any shortfalls in provision and recommend remedial measures.

Parking Standards

As an Interim measure, and until North Yorkshire County Council undertook the review of its parking standards, the Borough Council adopted its own guidelines on parking requirements in order to bring the Council’s parking policies into line with government advice as outlined in PPG 13 Transport. The revised County Council policy advice on parking as set out in Transport Issues and Development – a Guide, is currently being considered by the Borough Council. The intention is to interpret this advice in more detail and to prepare Supplementary Planning Guidance over the coming months. The Guide includes advice in relation to the preparation of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans and the Borough Council is considering including such information within the ‘planning application package’ so that potential applicants for planning permission are aware from the outset, of the type of information required as part of their planning application.

Whilst the Borough Council has already introduced measures to encourage staff to cycle to work, including the provision of showers, secure cycle parking and an office fold-up bike, it is recognised that further work on green travel measures is necessary, and this is a matter which the Department of Technical Services will be addressing over the coming year. The
Council’s Steering Group for Local

Agenda 21 Issues in the District has recently obtained funding as part of the Rural Bus Fund Challenge allocation to establish a District Car Sharing Scheme and this proposal is currently being developed.

**Air Quality Monitoring**

The Council’s work on air quality identifies the significant environmental effects of traffic and industrial process emissions. The Council’s Stage 3 Review and Assessment, published in February 2001 concluded that it would not be necessary to designate any Air Quality Management Areas within the District. However, the report indicated that there were potentially high levels of nitrogen dioxide, which comes mostly from road traffic exhausts, at Low Skellgate Ripon, but insufficient traffic and monitoring data was available at the time to make a prediction. Additional traffic data from North Yorkshire County Council has been obtained and monitoring continues to be undertaken all of which, following the publication of new guidance, is to be incorporated into the current District’s air quality review and assessment.

Continuous monitoring of nitrogen dioxide at Skipton Road Harrogate, is being carried out as recommended by the Stage 3 Survey and via the referral from Planning Services of any potentially significant development proposals including traffic management schemes which are subject to an air quality impact assessment. The development of air quality conditions in relation to planning applications is also a matter currently under discussion.

The Council is continuing to conduct air quality monitoring across the District in order to improve the air quality database and continually reviews current monitoring sites. The latest review of air quality in the District commenced in Feb 2003 and has to be concluded by April 2004, should a detailed assessment be found necessary. The results of this work will be fed into future Local Transport Plan progress reports and the review of the Local Plan, and consideration may need to be given to the type of situation where an application is refused where the adverse impact of the development on air quality is significant e.g. developments that generate significant extra traffic. A key issue is the relationship between air quality, accessible development sites and road/junction capacity. Improvements in air quality across the Harrogate District are likely to be brought about through the policies and actions of both the Borough Council’s and County Council’s Planning and Highways sections.

**Consultation**

As has been shown in the above statement the Borough Council, both in its role as Highway Agent, and through other groups and projects, has a close working partnership with the County Council and other organisations and groups which enables integration between projects and also the opportunity to discuss, influence and develop strategies together. The County Council also held a useful Local Transport Plan Consultation Forum in December 2002 involving a wide range of transport and other related groups. This Forum was attended by representatives from both the planning and highways and transportation sections of the Council. Therefore, through these channels the Borough Council has had some involvement in the preparation of the Annual Progress Report, accepts the approach to consultation being adopted by the County Council, and looks forward to the opportunity to be involved from the outset in the forthcoming roll forward of the Local Transport Plan.

The Borough Council has set up a Local Strategic Partnership (LSP). The LSP includes the County Council and other stakeholders such as the Health Care Trust, the Police and the voluntary sector and is steering the preparation of the first Community Plan for Harrogate District. The launch of the Plan is programmed for October 2003. This will then feed into the
planning processes of a number of bodies and organisations and will be closely linked with the review of the Harrogate District Local Plan and the Local Transport Plan.
APPENDIX S4

STATEMENT BY RICHMONDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN:
Transport is a common thread linking major issues for Richmondshire - the five themes identified by the Local Strategic Partnership. The draft Community Strategy reflects the LTP's emphasis on key public transport corridors, supplemented by outreach from the market towns of Leyburn, Hawes and Reeth to the deeply rural communities they serve. The same thinking is embodied in the Council Plan 2003-8.

At the grass roots level Community Investment Prospectuses are bringing forward their own transport initiatives, or supporting others. Examples include a pilot community car club at Catterick Village, a survey-based transport plan for parishes in the A1 Corridor, and a rural IT bus taking computer training out to isolated villages. Others are mentioned elsewhere in this text.

Richmondshire District Council supports the Local Transport Plan in the following ways:

**Current Practice**

**Public and Community Transport** - The Council has a long record of helping older people and disabled residents to access public transport. Currently, through the North Yorkshire Concessionary Fares Partnership, this entitles users to a free concessionary half fare bus pass. The new Scheme allows subsidised travel throughout the whole of North Yorkshire on regulated bus routes, together with travel beyond the County boundaries. It immediately resulted in an 84% increase in the number of bus passes issued, and there are now 2,600 in circulation compared to 953 for the year 2000. We have no record of actual usage.

A discretionary concessionary taxi voucher worth £40 is also available as an alternative to a bus pass for persons with disabilities. 360 have been issued to date in 2003.

The Council contributes to the Hambleton and Richmondshire Rural Transport Partnership, with a remit to support LTP policy by widening public access to bus and community transport services. We have strongly supported the Partnership's brokerage arrangements for community vehicles, and its "Wheels 2 Work" initiative, a valuable example of 'outreach'. This scheme has benefited from SRB funding, supported through the CIP process. The Partnership has campaigned successfully for a quality bus service in Wensleydale, provided through NYCC, helped to finance the Two Dales CIP’s community minibus, supported a special Dales to Darlington service for students and workers, and many small initiatives to increase accessibility. It is currently focusing on access to health care through better co-ordination and a ‘one stop shop’ arrangement.

The Council participates in the Dales Tourism Forum, which helps to integrate visitor and resident needs along local bus routes. A jointly funded Holiday Guide uses the message "Give your car a holiday", to encourage visitors to use public transport as part of their holiday experience, and to make this easier, a direct link has been created from the Yorkshire Dales Web site to Yorkshire Dales Journey Planner.

A new green tourism initiative with huge potential is the impending reopening of a section of the Wensleydale Railway. The Council has stressed the importance of transport links from Leyburn Station to the rest of Wensleydale and is actively promoting a package deal with attractions and places of interest, including cycle hire. Improvements to the Station itself were essential, and were endorsed by the local CIP. These initiatives should support the LTP traffic reduction targets.
Taxis provide very well used services, especially between Richmond and Catterick Garrison, where the number of Hackney Carriage plates is much higher than in comparable areas. Licensing enables both numbers and costs to be geared to the viability of these services, and their value to people with individual needs, especially 'out of hours'.

**Car Parking** - The Council manages 21 off-street car parks, 4 of which were created to reduce the environmental effects of on-street parking in the centre of attractive villages/towns in the Yorkshire Dales. Another 4 are designed for visitors to 'off the beaten track' locations. One of these was recently created through local planning policy. Most are urban car parks, meeting a variety of needs in Richmond, Leyburn, Catterick Garrison, and Colburn (including lorry parking). Management is sensitive to the priority to be given to short stay needs, but seeks a balance of types of use which will ensure that space is not wasted. Responding to local representations, the Police have found more resources for enforcement of Disc Zone controls, and this seems to be producing improvements in Richmond town centre. Nuns Close car park now provides stopover space for tourist buses.

**Cycling and Walking** - The Millennium Cycle-way, a major MoD initiative, supported by the Council, links almost the whole of Catterick Garrison off-road, including the new town centre supermarket. NYCC and the Council have provided an easterly link to Colburn. A future phase will create new footpath and bridle way facilities. Elsewhere in the District the local topography limits the scope for cycle use. There has been no overall increase in travel to work by bike since 1991.

Cycle storage has been provided in Richmond, with more planned when funding is available. When introduced, Sustrans route 67, through Richmond, Swaledale and Arkengarthdale (using a section of Council owned land), should have an impact on cyclo-tourism in Richmondshire.

The 2001 Census revealed that 18% of Richmondshire residents travelled to work on foot - close to double the national average. In Richmond, pedestrians have priority in historic Finkle Street, and an attractive pathway links the Co-op Superstore to the Market Place. As a result of the work of the Town Centre Forum, and more recently NYCC, further improvements are planned. A similar concept, linking established and new facilities, underpins planned town centre redevelopment at Catterick Garrison.

**New Development** - Large new housing developments now routinely accommodate bus access. Residents at Walkerville can reach the rest of Catterick Garrison via off-road links, and if Gatherley Road Phase 2 is developed with its school, safe walking and cycling for children will be integral to that scheme. The estate already has four bus services a day to and from Richmond. The other major prospective development at Arras Lines, Catterick Garrison will be served directly by the Millennium cycle way network and an established bus service.

The Council limits parking for new developments to the recently updated maximum County Parking Standards.

A Green Travel Plan was required prior to approval of the National Army Museum project at Catterick. No other comparable developments have come forward in recent years.

**Air Quality** - An update of the first air quality review is expected late in July. Preliminary results indicate that, despite the impact of the A1 Trunk Road as it passes through Richmondshire, pollutants remain well within government guidelines.

**Planning Policy**
Location of Development - The Richmondshire Local Plan reflects the draft Community Strategy's objective of strengthening the District's community infrastructure through sustainable growth. The quality of the main centres in Richmond and Catterick Garrison (including quality bus links between the two centres), should improve with a growing local 'customer base'. The Council sees this as a virtuous circle which is wholly consistent with the strategic aims of the LTP.

The Local Plan prioritises urban development at Richmond, Catterick Garrison, Colburn, Catterick Village, and Gatherley Road (together with a satellite at Leyburn), within which access to facilities is easier than elsewhere, journeys are shorter, and the public transport network is stronger. Most urban residents have transport options other than the private car, and survey results have shown that a high proportion of shoppers in Leyburn and Richmond choose to travel by foot. By steering new housing and employment towards these areas, the planning process can help them to reach their full potential, maintain a positive climate for the development of local facilities, encourage people to walk or choose the bus, and, where cars are used, reduce the distances involved. According to the 2001 Census Richmondshire has one of the lowest rates of travel to work by car both nationally and in the region.

Outside main growth areas villages have much less capacity for growth. Hence the importance of 'outreach', supported by compatible transport services.

Detailed Policies - Current policy is to manage rather than increase public parking space in Richmond and Leyburn, coupled with sensitive town centre servicing arrangements. Where car parking is damaging village environments, the Council is committed to looking for solutions. Maximum standards open up the possibility of car-free development on selected sites in town centres.

Following the Town Centre Forum's lead, and the Local Plan, NYCC has conducted a traffic study in Richmond, looking at better facilities for bus passengers, more pedestrian-friendly arrangements in the Market Place, and better public signage, all of which link to the LTP. A similar study was carried out in Hawes. The independent Swale Valley Initiative mounts the case for a sustainable and co-ordinated transport network for the area.

The setting of the Coast to Coast Walk is recognised and safeguarded through the Local Plan. Outside the National Park the track bed of the Wensleydale Railway is treated as a potential asset, and protected from development. Permission has been granted for improvements to Leyburn Station, required for the restored train service referred to earlier.

Richmondshire's Crime and Disorder Strategy links with the LTP through its targets for reducing traffic accidents and improving road safety. A hand-held speed camera and mobile matrix board will be introduced shortly in partnership with NY Fire & Rescue Service and Richmond Police. For the Health Improvement and Modernisation Programme, increased participation in physical activity will be a priority, including cycling and walking by all sections of the community.

Monitoring

The future effectiveness of the LTP and its implementation locally will depend on information on local needs, public attitudes, levels of use, and economic viability. The Council's perception surveys reveal a decline in public concern about public transport (mainly in the A1 Corridor area), together with an underlying reluctance to reduce car use. A ward database is being set up, which will be used to hold a cross-section of essential local information. This should enable a more finely-tuned understanding of local transport issues, which in turn would feed into the LTP process. Sharing information on transportation will increase its value.
The Council prepared an Interim Strategy in 2001, to evaluate and co-ordinate its own transport functions.
The District Council supports the Transport Strategy set out in the North Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2001-2006. The Council played an active role in development of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) and is engaged in delivery of the strategy in the following ways:

The Local Plan and Development Control

The Ryedale Local Plan was adopted on the 22 March 2002 and includes land use policies and proposals that reflect the transport strategy set out in the Local Transport Plan. A central element of the Local Plan’s development strategy is to reduce the need to travel by focusing most new development in the market towns where jobs, shops and services are accessible by modes of transport other than the car. Consequently, all of the business and employment allocations and the major housing allocations are located in Ryedale’s market towns.

Policies in the Plan also require that significant housing development (sites of 0.3ha or above or for 10 dwellings or more) only take place in locations with accessibility to local jobs, shops and services by modes of transport other than the car. Policies also implement other aspects of Government housing policy including requirements for higher densities, reduced priorities for car movement and a requirement for measures to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use. Development in the open countryside is strictly controlled and limited to that required to meet local needs and support the rural economy.

Furthermore, the primary objectives of the transport policies within the Local Plan are to reduce the amount of CO2 and other harmful emissions from motor vehicles in Ryedale, and to encourage the use of more energy efficient and less polluting forms of transport. The Local Plan policies also aim to reduce the adverse impacts of motor traffic on public safety, amenity and the environment and to specifically improve and extend facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Moves to protect and improve safety levels for all transport uses are also a key objective.

Specific policies within the Ryedale Local Plan encourage the implementation of appropriate traffic management measures (particularly in residential and public areas and near to
schools) and support the improvement of public transport and rail services in the area, including the provision of freight transfer facilities. Policies also protect public transport and rail infrastructure. The District Council is working in partnership with the County Council and other stakeholders to develop and implement the following proposals:-

**Freight**

The District Council contributed to the development of the North Yorkshire Freight Strategy and is a member of the Sherburn Freight Quality Partnership, established by the County Council’s Freight Officer. The Partnership involves officers and members from the County Council and Ryedale District Council, Parish Councillors, the Highways Agency and representatives of Wards/Atlas Building Systems. The Partnership particularly aims to resolve the problems caused by HCVs using St Hilda’s Street in Sherburn.

**Rail**

The Ryedale Local Plan specifically safeguards disused railway lines from development to allow for possible future re-use or the creation of cycle routes/footpaths. The District Council has been working in partnership with the County Council, the National Park, York City Council, the North York Moors Railway and Railtrack to investigate the feasibility of reopening the disused Malton to Pickering railway (which was identified in the LTP). A Passenger Demand Study has been completed, following which the County Council gave a useful presentation on progress to date to District Councillors and representatives of Pickering Town Council and Pickering in Business. Work has progressed to gather information for a possible Rail Passenger Partnership prequalification bid, although changes in the funding situation have meant that a bid has not yet been submitted. Cost estimates for the project are currently being reviewed to ensure that up-to-date figures are available.

**Cycling and Pedestrians**

In addition, the Local Plan seeks the improvement of existing, and the creation of new facilities, for pedestrians and cyclists. The Plan specifically supports the preparation of cycle plans within the District and the establishment of links to the National Cycle Network. Work on cycle and pedestrian action plans for Malton and Norton is timetabled for 2003/4, and various transport issues, including pedestrian and cyclist concerns, have been raised through the initial workshop for the Malton and Norton Transportation Strategy. The District Council has achieved some progress on cycle ways linked to erection of flood defences in Malton and Norton and is keen to see links to wider (both cycle and train/bus) networks as part of production of the Cycle Plan. Provision of cycle facilities is also an element of proposals for the development of a more effective Malton/Norton Transport Interchange. Based on the train station / bus station area of Malton and Norton, measures are being progressed (see below) to improve the area and to encourage greater integration of train and bus services.

Pedestrian and cycling issues within Helmsley are integrated into development of the Helmsley Traffic Management Plan, and this is an approach that the District Council supports. This Authority has also been working in partnership with officers from the County Council, North York Moors National Park and the Forestry Commission to develop a Cycle Plan for the North York Moors Sub-Area and has had particular input to the location of routes, linkages with routes outside the area, provision of cycle facilities and links with objectives in the Ryedale Local Plan. The District Council looks forward to progress on the Pedestrian and Cycling Action Plans for Kirkbymoorside and Pickering, with early consultations having recently taken place for the Kirkbymoorside Plan.
Traffic Management Plans

The District Council strongly supports proposals in the LTP to produce and implement traffic management and improvement schemes for individual market towns.

The Authority has been involved in the Helmsley Traffic Management Plan, along with a whole range of other stakeholders, and this Plan deals with a whole range of transport and land use issues. This Authority was involved in workshops organised by NYCC to take a partnership approach to the development of the Helmsley Traffic Management Plan. The Plan addresses issues to improve safety, in addition to a whole realm of other measures to encourage cycling and walking, enhance public transport provision in the town and other transport related improvements. The Plan was adopted in October 2002 and includes a residents parking scheme, a new puffin crossing, improved pedestrian and cycle facilities, junction enhancements, 20mph zones, and signage improvements.

Recent reports produced for the Malton/Norton Partnership (through the Market Town Initiative) have shown a town centre disadvantaged by heavy traffic and congestion, with a lack of pedestrian friendly areas. There is poor access to Norton due to a lack of access from the eastbound A64 and no direct access from the A64 to the B1257. This is leading to a proliferation of traffic, in particular HCVs, in the central areas of the twin towns with a detrimental effect on the environment, the social and economic development of the towns and community safety. The District Council is therefore very anxious to play a full role in the development of a comprehensive traffic study of Malton and Norton, and raised many important issues at the workshop that marked the start of the Malton/Norton Transportation Strategy in November 2002. Since that time the District Council has worked very closely with the County Council and their agents Mouchel, to progress the Transportation Study. This Authority has fed detailed local information into the Study regarding congestion, danger points, potential development sites and required infrastructure improvements. Ryedale has also participated in the development of the traffic origin and destination survey that was undertaken in early 2003 to inform the Transportation Study.

The District Council, in partnership with Yorkshire Forward, is commissioning a study of potential redevelopment and enhancement sites in the river-rail corridor that links Malton and Norton, to be completed before the end of 2003. The appointed consultants are being instructed to work closely with Mouchel and the County Council regarding the Transportation Study as traffic issues (in particular overcoming the congestion that occurs in central Malton/Norton) are a major consideration in assessing the potential for redeveloping and improving these key areas.

Ryedale Community Plan

The District Council and the County Council are working in partnership to implement and develop projects that further the key themes identified in the Ryedale Community Plan, in particular under the Access and Communication Theme. Relevant schemes and activities are currently being developed and coordinated for Years 1, 2 and 3 of the Community Plan in relation to improving public transport, increasing the diversity of transport options available and developing a more efficient road system with reduced congestion and increased safety and choice. A detailed Action Plan for Access and Communication will be published in Autumn 2003.

Green Travel Plans

Green Travel Plans will be requested where appropriate as part of planning applications in Ryedale, in accordance with the relevant policy in the Adopted Ryedale Local Plan.
Parking Standards

The District Council is keen to see adoption of parking standards for the County that reflect recent advice in PPG13, PPG3 and the Regional Planning Guidance for Yorkshire and Humber. North Yorkshire County Council has recently adopted revised parking standards for the County and there is a commitment in the Ryedale Local Plan to adopt the finalised parking standards for development control purposes, provided that they reflect national and regional planning guidance. There is currently (July 2003) further work to be done on a local agreement regarding the application of the new standards to the market towns in Ryedale, however once this has been agreed, it is anticipated that the new parking standards will also be adopted by this Authority.

The A64 (including links between Malton/Norton and the A64)

The District Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Scarborough Borough Council are all anxious to achieve a major up-grading of the A64 trunk road between York and Scarborough in order to significantly improve safety, reduce congestion and delays, lessen impact of the road on local residents and bring about associated economic benefits. To that end, the three authorities, in partnership with regional bodies and the Highways Agency, have funded a detailed study to investigate the benefits of upgrading this section of the A64. The three local authorities, together with the Regional Assembly and Yorkshire Forward, are now pressing for the upgrading to be a regional transport priority to reflect the outcome of the Study (which concluded that there was a case for significant upgrading beyond the Route Management Strategy (RMS) proposals). Support is being sought from Government for undertaking further studies regarding the cost and environmental impact of detailed proposals.

A major issue, both in terms of the initial work on the Malton/Norton Transportation Study, the A64 Route Management Strategy and the recent partnership approach to the future of the A64 has been significant concern regarding the poor connections between the A64 and Malton/Norton. Currently, there are restricted movement junctions serving both Malton and Norton, and no junction at all between the A64 and the B1257. The result is that far more traffic (particularly HCVs) travels through central Malton/Norton than would be the case if the junctions were upgraded to allow these movements to take place using the A64 (NB detailed information regarding this matter is being produced through the NYCC Transportation Study of the twin-towns). These traffic levels cause significant delay and congestion and detract greatly from the quality of the environment within the towns. In addition to precluding enhancement of the central areas, the traffic problems act as a major obstacle to the redevelopment of several key brownfield sites within the towns. Consequently, this Authority and the County Council are anxious to achieve A64 junction upgrades at the earliest opportunity and have agreed a partnership approach with the Highways Agency to realise this ambition (NB the A64 RMS includes the junctions at Malton/Norton as a medium term action, and therefore several years away). An element of this partnership approach will include seeking developer contributions towards the cost of upgrading the junctions.

Ryedale Community Safety Strategy 2002 – 2005

The Audit of Crime and Disorder in Ryedale carried out in 2001 showed that people have a wide range of concerns that can potentially be addressed by proposals in the LTP. The concerns relate to speeding traffic, poor public transport, drink driving and the increase in the number of injuries and casualties on the roads of Ryedale. One of the key aims of the Strategy relates to quality of life and the need to "increase the safety and feeling of well being for people in Ryedale both in their homes and out in the community". The Strategy aims to reduce the incidence of drink driving and general speeding traffic throughout
Ryedale and influence driver behavior by education programmes, innovative projects and enforcement.

Recent activities promoted by Safer Ryedale include the purchase a mobile speed display unit that Parishes can loan to display the speed of motorists that are passing through their village. The mobile unit can also display a message to the speeding motorists. In addition, Safer Ryedale has carried out 2 operation siren events, a driver education initiative relating to speed offences, involving the emergency services, and has had a good response to this initiative.

Rural Transport Partnership

The District Council, in partnership with the County Council, North York Moors National Park, the North Yorkshire Health Authority, Scarborough Borough Council and others, contribute to the Rural Transport Partnership (RTP). The District Council is the lead partner in the RTP. The RTP funding is largely revenue whereas the LTP involves capital expenditure so there are opportunities for match funding for significant amounts of finance. The Partnership has developed various initiatives to improve access to employment, training and services in rural areas including a ‘Wheels to Work’ (moped loan) scheme, a minibus ‘brokerage’ scheme and further development of the Social Car Scheme. The Wheels to Work Scheme has twelve bikes, all of which are currently allocated. Additional funding has been secured through SRB for a further four bikes.

The Partnership secured RTP funding to enable staff at Ryedale Voluntary Action to train and assess volunteer drivers to the nationally recognised Minibus Driver Awareness Scheme (MiDAS), and Minibus Emergency Evacuation Procedures Scheme (MEEPS) standards. Building capacity in this way enables RVA to generate additional revenue.

The RTP is also working with Ryedale Voluntary Action to develop their role as a community transport provider. The Partnership is currently working with officers from County Council and RVA in order to put together significant SRB and Rural Bus Challenge bids.

Work is ongoing to put together a bid for RTP funding to enable RVA staff to undertake Certificate Of Professional Competence (CPC) and Passenger Carrying Vehicle (PCV). This will enable RVA to apply for an Operator’s License and then bid for local public service contracts once the organization has its own vehicles. This they would be unable to do with their existing ‘small bus’ (Section 19) permits.

A Business Plan was completed on behalf of a Working Group involved in developing Phase One of Malton/Norton Transport Interchange (NB this issue is also discussed in relation to the Market Towns Initiative below). Progress has been achieved in terms of small-scale, but significant improvements at Malton Rail Station. CCTV has now been installed, with work soon to begin on new lighting, signage, information cases, bench seats and cycle lockers, all in a style in keeping with the listed status of the station buildings. Funding has been secured through Market Towns Initiative, SRB, Norton Town Council, Malton Town Council and Ryedale District Council. The Working Group hopes to build on these initial improvements by linking large-scale infrastructure development (Phase Two), particularly of the bus station and information systems, to the forthcoming review of the LTP.

The Countryside Agency’s Parish Transport Grant can play a significant role in terms of localised service provision (although there are currently significant constraints on the levels of funding available). ‘Needs Assessments’ have been carried out in Leavening, Pickering, Lockton and Levisham as part of the scheme and the District Council is keen to encourage progression of these projects. In Pickering, the ‘Needs Assessment’ is being developed through the Pickering Community Investment Prospectus. Other Community Investment Prospectuses are being developed.
The Partnership has supported the development and implementation of Taxi voucher schemes in Pickering, Burythorpe and Leavening.

**Malton/Norton Market Towns Initiative and SRB**

The District Council is keen to encourage improved co-ordination between the bus and rail services at Malton and is currently involved in proposals to develop a transport interchange in the towns. There is an urgent need to progress this project to tie in with timetables for other funding programmes including SRB and Rural Transport Partnership funding. The existing bus and rail stations are in close proximity with each other and development of this facility will have significant economic, social, tourism and leisure benefits for the town and its hinterland, and, it is hoped, will lead to greater integration between rail and bus services, together with improved facilities for public transport users. A partnership group, the Malton and Norton Transport Interchange Working Group (involving Ryedale District Council, North Yorkshire County Council, bus and rail operators, the Rural Transport Partnership and community and landowner representatives), has been established to progress this initiative. This has led to a 2 phase enhancement plan being prepared for the area, with initial work (involving some SRB funding) having begun to improve signage, provide CCTV, provide seating and cycle lockers and make cosmetic improvements. The second phase of the enhancement requires significant funding and involves the replacement of the existing bus station, with possible re-routing of Railway Street. This scale of improvement would require the project to be progressed through the next, post 2006, Local Transport Plan. This Council is anxious to work with the County Council and the Interchange Working Group to progress the significant enhancement of this area and to ensure that this major project forms part of the next North Yorkshire LTP.

A consultants study of potential redevelopment and enhancement areas in the river-rail corridor in Malton-Norton is also to look at the transport interchange area with a view to further developing proposals for the enhancement of this area and the facilities available. This Study should be completed in late 2003.

**Air Quality**

The present National Air Quality Strategy was published in January 2000. The strategy establishes the framework for achieving improvements in ambient air quality in the UK. The strategy sets health based standards for eight important pollutants and identifies what needs to be done at local national and international level to achieve air quality objectives. An Addendum to the Strategy was published in February 2003.

Objectives for seven of the eight pollutants have been prescribed in The Air Quality Regulations 2000, made under the Environment Act 1995. The seven pollutants are:

- Benzene;
- 1,3-Butadiene;
- Carbon monoxide;
- Lead;
- Nitrogen dioxide;
- PM$_{10}$;
- Sulphur dioxide.

Under provisions of The Environment Act 1995, local authorities are required to carry out a periodic review of local air quality in their district and to assess present and predicted future air quality against the prescribed air quality objectives.
If, on completion of a review and assessment, it is considered unlikely that an air quality objective will be met by the deadline, the authority must designate an air quality management area and formulate an action plan for the improvement of air quality.

The Council completed its first Local Air Quality Review and Assessment in July 2000 and concluded that the objectives are likely to be satisfied by the target dates. A further Review and Assessment of Local Air Quality (an Updating and Screening Assessment) has now been undertaken and was submitted to Defra in May 2003. The Updating and Screening Assessment concluded that in respect of the following pollutants a risk has been identified that an air quality objective/provisional objective will be exceeded at a location with relevant public exposure:

- Nitrogen dioxide
- PM$_{10}$

Consequently, the Council must now undertake a Detailed Assessment for Nitrogen dioxide and PM$_{10}$, in order to identify with reasonable certainty whether or not an exceedence is likely to occur at the locations in question. The Detailed Assessment, which will involve real time continuous monitoring of pollutants for a six-month period at a Malton town centre location, is due to be completed by the end of April 2004.

**Car Parking**

In line with the Best Value process the Authority has undertaken a fundamental service review of the car parking service.

A series of strategic objectives have been developed which seek to encourage local use of local facilities through the marketing of a subsidised residents parking scheme, in addition to differential parking to increase turnover and footfall of premium town centre locations.

A substantial amount of regulated and unregulated parking takes place within the District. Though Ryedale District Council currently controls none of these spaces they clearly have a significant part to play regarding the overall picture of car parking provision. It is proposed that investigations will take place to research the possibility of developing partnership arrangements with other parking providers.

A Car Parking Strategy will be prepared during the year 2003-4 which will outline the development of the service in the medium term. The current strategic objectives of the service will be reviewed, to take into account the aims of the Community Plan, the results of consultation and corporate/service objectives.

As part of this process Ryedale District Council will continue to work with all stakeholders to improve and develop the service and to address local concerns with regard to the amount of regulated and unregulated parking within the District.

**Public Transport**

The District Council recognises that in sparsely populated rural areas the conventional bus service cannot serve every need. There are good bus services along the principal transport corridors, particularly on the A64 between the regional service centres of York and Scarborough. Service and infrastructure development has taken place along the B1257 between Hovingham and Malton. However, conventional services outside these corridors tends to be infrequent or absent. In areas of low population density, flexibility of service provision is the overriding imperative. This should involve a combination of scheduled and demand responsive services, wherever possible integrating with and feeding into the core transport network. The development of Ryedale Community Transport will be consistent with
these aims. The Post-Bus, although providing an important service to a number of communities in the Yorkshire Wolds, is only a partial solution, as it is not conducive to all work journeys. There is a need to seek better use of all existing non-conventional transport opportunities. Access for employment and training is problematic where there is no public transport. Solutions include the ‘wheels to work’ scheme and maximised use of the Parish Transport Grant Scheme and the Rural Transport Partnership Fund. More effective use of existing resources is important, i.e. Social Services minibuses that are underused in evenings and at weekends. A Section 22 permit would enable these vehicles to be used effectively as a public service (but drivers would have to be volunteers) and the purchase of community cars could link in with brokerage. Regular transport for residents in the more isolated communities could be met through the provision of Section 19 services, using paid drivers, partially funded through the revenue-only RTP fund.

To this end, the District Council, in partnership with the County Council, North York Moors National Park and others, contributes to the Rural Transport Partnership for Ryedale and North East Yorkshire. This Partnership is seen as fundamental in an area where passenger journeys are small in number and where innovative schemes will be required to fulfill demand. The Partnership has facilitated the development of a Ryedale Community Transport Project, which utilises the existing Car Scheme in combination with minibus “brokerage” to provide a more flexible and responsive service across the whole of the District. The District Council has developed a community transport fund to boost take up of the Countryside Agency’s Parish Transport Grant scheme and to assist with the provision of an integrated rural transport system in the District.

In connection with this, the issue of adequate up-to-date information on services – both conventional and non-conventional - will be vital and the District Council would totally endorse the approach of the County Council. Tourist Information Centres may assist in this role, along with new approaches to providing better information and access to services for the public in Ryedale, such as are being developed through the North Yorkshire ICT Partnership.

The move to improved ticketing equipment is supported. In addition, the improvement of the infrastructure at interchange points is to be welcomed and the District Council is working with the County Council regarding improvements to the transport interchange in Malton and Norton (see above).

***************
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STATEMENT BY SCARBOROUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
Introduction

The Borough Council recognises that the effective implementation of the proposals of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) relies upon their co-ordination with a range of other local authority initiatives. It is therefore committed to ensuring that its responsibilities and actions are carried out in such a way as to both reinforce and build upon the measures contained in the LTP.

The area of Scarborough Borough extends for 41 miles along the entire stretch of the North Yorkshire coastline. In terms of the LTP key policy areas, its boundaries encompass not only Scarborough itself, but also parts of the North York Moors and A64 corridor. As a planning authority however its jurisdiction extends only to those parts of the Borough outside the North York Moors National Park, that is the southern area around Scarborough and Filey and extending west as far as Snainton, and also Whitby. In other functions, such as environmental health and certain aspects of tourism policy, its responsibilities extend across the whole Borough.

The Local Plan

The Scarborough Borough Local Plan was adopted in April 1999. A guiding principle of the plan is the protection of the environment. This is expressed geographically by concentrating new housing and industrial development in the urban areas of Scarborough, Whitby and Filey. This approach supports the need to minimise travelling distances, and maximise opportunities for alternative modes of transport.

The approach received the full support of the Local Plan Inspector. Its prime objectives are:

1. To minimise the need to travel.
2. Where travel is necessary, to provide for the safe, speedy and efficient movement of people and goods into and out of town centres, prime holiday destinations and major employment sites.
3. To minimise the negative impact of transport systems on the local and global environment.

It is recognised that it is no longer appropriate for environmental and economic reasons to increase the capacity of the road network or accommodate further parking, either in the town centre or in new developments.

In order to increase accessibility while minimising environmental impacts there must, therefore, be an integrated strategy in which the most harmful elements of road traffic are discouraged while alternative means of transport are provided.

Policy T4 outlines the need for traffic management measures to improve safety and access for public transport, cyclists and pedestrians. These measures include traffic calming, junction improvements, accident prevention measures and better traffic signing.

Policy T5 allocates three sites in Scarborough for ‘park and ride’ facilities in line with LTP proposals. These sites are at Weaponness, (an extension of the existing facility), a site
adjacent to the proposed Scarborough to Lebberston by-pass, and a site on the A64 adjacent
to Dean’s Garden Centre. The present site at Weaponness supports the recently implemented
Parking Strategy. The other two sites are currently at the planning application stage. The
Plan text also makes reference to further ‘park and ride’ sites off the A170 and A165 to the
west and north of Scarborough and A171 to the west of Whitby. These may come to fruition
when a demand is identified, and this is already the case in Whitby. The emphasis is on
reducing the need to travel into town centres, and promoting alternative modes of transport.

Policy T7 covers parking policy which echoes the LTP approach of managing town centre
public parking to favour short stay use.

Appendix 3 of the Plan gives maximum standards for car parking. These standards will be
superseded by Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in line with new government
guidance published in PPG13 (2001) and PPG3 (2000). This SPG will divide the Borough
into zones of accessibility, and parking standards will take account of public transport
accessibility and location. The standard will be linked to brownfield sites and work being
done as part of the Urban Capacity Study and will complement standards set by the Highway
Authority.

Policy T8 deals with public transport and reflects the need for a central terminal point for bus
services. A bus terminal is currently being developed in Scarborough town centre. T8 also
requires new developments to be accessible to buses and incorporate bus stopping and
passenger waiting facilities. Policies T10 and T11 deal with improving facilities for cyclists
and pedestrians respectively. T10 provides for new cycle routes and for cycle parking in
town centres and in association with new developments. These elements have been enlarged
upon in the adopted Scarborough Cycling Strategy, on which progress is monitored by the
Scarborough Cycling Forum. Other cycling forums in Filey and Whitby are being formed,
and cycling will be promoted in rural areas.

Whilst the transportation policies set out in the Local Plan broadly accord with Government
policy, the revised PPG13 highlighted a number of issues that were missing from the Local
Plan. As a result additions to the Transport Chapter are being considered. These additions
will comprise policy guidance on:

- Parking Standards for new developments (see comment on Appendix 3 above);
- Green Travel Plans (what the Planning Authority expects to see in GTP and advice to
developers on how to produce one);
- Transport Assessments (what the Local Authority expects from a Transport
  Assessment, and guidance on mitigation measures to be included).

**Development Control**

In handling planning applications the Development Control function introduces significant
opportunities for supporting the transportation policies of the Local Plan, and helping to
achieve the aims of the LTP. Planning Officers consult closely with traffic and transportation
colleagues, public transport operators, and other relevant groups to ensure new developments
are designed to be accessible to all forms of transport, and to encourage a modal shift from
private car use to public transport, walking or cycling.
In line with the recent PPG3, housing developments will be of a higher density and will be planned for cyclists, pedestrians, and public transport before the car. In line with this guidance, the number of off-street parking spaces in new developments will not exceed 1.5 per house on average, and may be less in more accessible areas, which will be identified in forthcoming SPG as part of the current Local Plan alteration. This presents a challenging opportunity to plan attractive, pedestrian and cycle friendly environments for housing, both in rural and urban areas. Development Briefs are being prepared for all large allocated sites to ensure that appropriate standards of design and sustainable development are encouraged. Major commercial developments, which are likely to generate large amounts of commuter traffic, are being required to produce Green Travel Plans (GTPs). These GTPs must show that the development will not conflict with the Council’s aims to improve air quality and improve the local environment.

**Other Planning Initiatives**

The Borough Council has led in the establishment of a Town Centre Management Forum for Scarborough. Among the aims of the Forum is increasing the attractiveness of the town centre relative to out-of-town shopping facilities which are more reliant on the private car, and the Forum is currently initiating a shop-mobility scheme.

The Borough Council has adopted an “Access for All” document containing guidelines on the improvement of the external environment for disabled and elderly people. Recommendations are included for car parking, pedestrian routes and street furniture.

**Transportation**

Whilst the amendments to the Local Plan will ensure that planning strategies reflect and support the integrated transport strategy, the Council is ensuring that positive and tangible transport initiatives are implemented through the Local Transport Plan Programme.

This commenced with the introduction of extensive parking demand management in the town in 2000/2001. This scheme includes both on-street parking for payment and residents’ priority parking. Tariffs for both the on-street and the Council’s off-street car parks are now being harmonised and the permit structure has been tightened to minimise exemptions. The charging regime favours short-stay in the town centre, whilst the controls in the residents’ zones eliminate commuter parking. The scheme should start to return surpluses in the current year, which in future will be recycled into further traffic, parking, highway and public transport improvements.

The programme also includes traffic management measures to improve road safety and ease congestion. Three local area safety schemes have been introduced, which incorporate 20mph zones. Traffic signals and controlled crossings are being upgraded to include full disabled facilities, and Toucan crossings to assist cyclists in linking to cycle lanes have been installed on the A171 and B1261. A major new cycleway has been completed between the northern suburbs and Scarborough town centre.

Cycling strategies have been prepared for Scarborough, Eastfield and Filey. A pedestrian strategy for Scarborough has been prepared and works have commenced on an extensive network of pedestrian routes. Preparation of the strategies has been jointly undertaken by Planning and Transportation Officers. Other measures to improve facilities for disabled pedestrians are in hand and are supported by Access Groups.
Public transport infrastructure has been improved by enhancements to bus stops on major bus routes. These improvements include provision for wheelchair users and those with restricted mobility. The opportunity is being taken to streamline accessibility for the buses into these stops. Prudent funding provision has been made for a central terminal facility for bus services and work is expected to start this year. The Scarborough Integrated Transport Package was approved in December 2002 and includes bus priority measures to support two new Park and Ride sites, together with an enhanced urban traffic control system. The Council is working with the County Council and bus operators to improve information to the public on bus services. The Council supports the National Concessionary Fares Scheme and a local scheme for the Borough was introduced in 2001.

In Whitby, a Traffic Management Strategy has been approved and is currently being implemented. Its key elements include options to implement ‘park and ride’ proposals with associated improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and buses; ‘pay and display’ on the West Cliff, residents’ parking zones, junction improvements and car park extensions.
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STATEMENT BY SELBY DISTRICT
The District Council is actively involved in the delivery of the Local Transport Plan strategies and targets, in partnership with the County council and other stakeholders in the following ways:

1. **Selby Strategy Forum**

   Selby Strategy Forum, the local strategic partnership, for the District, has produced a Community Strategy, which states its aims and plans for improving the quality of life for local people. A key aim of the partners is to work together to make sure that we have a long-term integrated public and community transport system.

2. **Local Plan**

   The Selby District Local Plan promotes sustainable patterns of development, which minimise the need to travel by car and maximise the scope for alternative means of travel such as public transport, cycling and walking, and the movement of freight by rail and water. Allocations of land within or close to market towns incorporate interlinked cycleways and footpaths providing access to adjoining areas, town centres and rail stations.

   Policies in the Plan cater specifically for the needs of cyclists’ (T7), pedestrians (SEL/14), and disabled people (VP1), and promote more effective bus and rail services (T6). The Plan acknowledges the potential for increasing non-road freight, and allocates land for a freight transhipment interchange in Barlby.

3. **Development Briefs**

   The Council is preparing a series of development briefs for major residential sites in consultation with developers, local communities, and other stakeholders, which will ensure that provision for cyclists and pedestrians is an integral element in the overall design. Estate layouts will be required to discourage trips by car, (including school trips) and bus companies are being involved in the process at an early stage to ensure the provision of new bus routes.

4. **Rural Transport Partnership**

   A broad objective in the Council’s Corporate Plan is to provide for vulnerable residents by improving rural transport in rural areas through support of the Selby and York Rural Transport Partnership (RTP). The District Council is taking an active role, as lead partner, in the RTP, which is part-funded by the Countryside Agency. This scheme allows for both small grants to facilitate small-scale transport solutions and for larger transport projects, which will respond to needs identified in the Partnership’s Action Plan.

   The Partnership’s Members are acutely aware of the specific transport needs of the District’s more vulnerable residents and of the geographical areas within which residents have most difficulty in accessing key services. The Partnership Officer will continue to develop and implement specific schemes to address mobility issues.

5. **Traffic Management**
Both the Selby and Tadcaster Regeneration partnerships are concerned with traffic issues regarding their towns and environs.

The Tadcaster Partnership has been very active in the development of a comprehensive Traffic Management Strategy for the town. This includes the creation of a pedestrian priority area in Kirkgate, the use of Chapel Street and St Josephs Street for one-way traffic, and other measures including cycleway provision. Implementation of the Strategy has now commenced.

Work has recently started on a similar study for Selby to be completed early 2004. The District Council and other partners will take an active part in the identification and examination of traffic management options, which can be implemented immediately after the completion of Selby bypass which is due to open in spring 2004.

The introduction of traffic management measures in the market towns will complement planned development and regeneration activity in Selby, Sherburn-in-Elmet, and Tadcaster. The District has also been included in the next phase of Yorkshire Forwards Renaissance Programme and it is envisaged that this will have a significant and beneficial impact on future transport strategies and improvements.

Elsewhere the District Council will continue to support traffic calming and other local measures.

6. Freight

The District contains several major freight-related industries. The Sherburn Enterprise Park is growing into a key regional focal point for road based distribution activity and this site also provides scope for future development of rail freight, thereby providing inter-modal facilities. The District also contains a key inter-modal facility in Selby Town, allowing for more flexible freight-related activity to develop in future years which should complement environmental objectives concerned with reducing road-based vehicle movements.

7. Air Quality Management

The District Council has completed its screening assessment of major pollutants within Selby District as required under the Environment Act 1995. This indicates that the national air quality objective for Nitrogen Dioxide is unlikely to be exceeded in either 2005 or 2010 near main roads or busy junctions. The national air quality objectives for Particulate Matter (PM10) will be met in 2004 but may be exceeded close to main roads and busy junctions in 2010. There is currently no need to declare any air quality management areas. A further update will be carried out in 2005.

8. Community Safety

One of the key aims of the Selby District Community Safety Strategy concerns road safety. A Road Safety Action Plan has been developed in response to concerns raised by the local community, in consultation with North Yorkshire Police and the Highways Department of North Yorkshire County Council. This includes amongst its
objectives the achievement of casualty reduction targets, and raising awareness of road safety issues. The District Council has allocated £60,000 to assist in improving road safety.

In addition the Council has over the last few years introduced CCTV coverage within Selby town, Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet. The local authority has progressively introduced CCTV coverage of pay and display car parks and will be continuing to extend that approach to other car parks within its ownership. The Council aims to provide safe and secure car-parking facilities.

9. **Off Street Parking**

The District Council has 9 pay and display car parks in Selby Town, 2 free car parks in Tadcaster and 1 free car park in Sherburn in Elmet. There is a mix of long and short stay parking. A Best Value Review of the Council’s car parking service was completed in January 2003 which sets out a number of action points to improve the car park service.

The Britannia car park in Tadcaster has now been redeveloped and the Council is starting the legal process to introduce car parking charges within this car park. It is hoped that this will help to rejuvenate the area, as it will increase the number of car park spaces available to visitors.

The Council is working to meet the standards contained within the Association of Chief Police Officers Secured Car Parks award by October 2007. This standard sets out methods to help reduce crime within the car parks.

The Council is also reviewing the issue of residents parking in conjunction with north Yorkshire County Council and is planning to undertake a consultation exercise on the introduction of a residents only permit within the Brook Street area of Selby. It is hoped this will be completed by January 2004.
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STATEMENT BY NORTH YORK MOORS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
Driving forward the Local Transport Plan

The North York Moors National Park Authority continues to play an active role in the development, implementation and monitoring of the Local Transport Plan which offers a key way of meeting National Park Authority statutory purposes and of developing a more sustainable transport system for all. We see the LTP supporting local social, economic and environmental goals through four interlinked objectives of raising awareness, managing demand, reducing impact and improving options.

The very rural nature of this area brings additional challenges with it. For instance, we are acutely aware that programmes such as safety camera partnerships and decriminalised parking schemes could have an unplanned and adverse effect on the rural area. If resources are deployed to urban or heavily trafficked routes, this could result in less enforcement in the North York Moors resulting in more illegal parking, increased vehicle speeds and a resultant rise in the frequency and severity of accidents. We hope that the LTP and other policies will address this and find alternative ways of delivering benefits for this area.

The difficulty of identifying robust solutions is highlighted in continuing problems associated with a number of issues such as: HCV breakdowns and blockages of Sutton Bank; accidents especially involving motorcyclists; sheep deaths on moorland roads; inappropriate speed; failure to address the different travel needs of visitors; and the continued march of urban solutions and signage in this protected area.

We appreciate the genuine difficulties and costs of dealing with transport in a rural area, but look to the highways authority and its other partners to seek creative solutions to the interrelated problems of increased traffic and accidents, and reduction of the area’s special qualities.

Inevitably there has been slippage in implementing some elements of the plan and it is disappointing to note that the target of traffic restraint has not been achieved in 2002. (We are aware that, as much traffic is tourism-related, these figures may reflect the volatility of visitor numbers.) Nevertheless, it is hoped that initiatives and projects will result in greater traffic restraint and accident reduction during the rest of the LTP period.

Raising awareness

We will continue to work in partnership to promote travel awareness messages – especially to the nine million visitors who come to the Park. This sector shows significantly different journey profiles and opportunities for modal shift and accounts for the majority of traffic on roads in the National Park. However, it is also more difficult (and costly) to target these users who may, quite literally, come from anywhere in the world.

In addition we will encourage increased awareness of traffic and transport issues, including road safety, with the local community and in partnership with other agencies including Community Safety Partnerships.

Demand management

We acknowledge the difficulties of demand management and public transport accessibility in a sparsely populated area, but wish to encourage solutions which will make a real contribution to lessening the negative impact of the private car whilst safeguarding and improving local and recreational access.

To support this aim, the National Park Authority already spends a higher proportion of its budget on traffic and transport related activity than any other National Park in the U.K. We will continue to use all in our power, including through practical measures, to ensure that the principles of sustainability are upheld.

Although there are practical difficulties for road user charging in a rural area (including the needs of local communities), in the longer term it should not be discounted as an approach to demand
management in the North York Moors and options should be considered in the light of experience elsewhere.

The LTP programme for the North York Moors must reflect the specific problems of the area and a willingness to pilot techniques which will have positive social, economic and environmental impacts. These solutions need to acknowledge that many rural communities are resistant to change.

**Reducing traffic impacts**

In addition to decreasing negative social and environmental impacts by reducing traffic volume, we are aware of the need to reduce other negative effects including accidents, inappropriate signage, road ‘improvements,’ inappropriate use of routes by heavy vehicles, fragmented communities and disconnected networks for walking, cycling and horse riding. In the past these issues appear to have been sidelined.

There has often been little consultation on, for instance, signage with inappropriate size, colour and duplication being a particular cause of concern. Similarly, carriageway markings appear to be used without real consideration for their effect on driver perception and behaviour, let alone on the environment. The use of temporary signs for special events is also one which requires rationalisation.

Speed is still cited as a major issue on roads in the North York Moors. Indeed, the accident record may suggest that inappropriate speed is a growing problem. The majority of roads in the North York Moors are subject to the national speed limit which is clearly inappropriate. We continue to seek support in identifying approaches which will reduce traffic speed on most roads to better reflect the multiple hazards which drivers will encounter.

We will campaign for reduced speed limits on much of the road network within the National Park in order to improve safety, protect the environment, and to support demand management and modal shift. As with parking, we acknowledge the difficulties of speed enforcement in a rural area.

Accidents on rural roads affect a significant number of people, especially if a resultant temporary road closure causes diversions on lengthy and inappropriate routes. This also disadvantages bus users whose confidence is eroded if journey time is extended by perhaps an hour and onward connections missed. Given the accident record on roads in the North York Moors (including serious collisions involving motorcyclists), current approaches appear to be having a limited impact on accidents, but a significant negative impact on the landscape. Careful consideration of awareness campaigns and alternative solutions are likely to be required if quality of life and the special environment of this area are to be protected for present and future generations.

We welcome the suggestion that NYCC will look more positively at Variable Message Signs and Vehicle Activated Signs, both of which have been proposed by the National Park Authority as worthy of experimentation in this area.

Opportunities to develop a good practice guide for the area (along with the Yorkshire Dales National Park) could ensure that projects are implemented in a more appropriate and sensitive way than has been the case in the past. This is an urgent requirement.

**Improving options**

We would like to see greater overall emphasis on the green modes of transport. Currently there is little evidence of joined up thinking, with traffic management or local safety schemes often not seizing the opportunity of making all-round improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users.

Improving public transport infrastructure is probably even more important where services are infrequent and to this end we note that additional resources may be required to make a real difference to passenger facilities in the North York Moors area, and simultaneously to raise the profile of local public transport.
There may be a requirement to adopt different criteria than elsewhere in the county. For instance, in developing bus stops and shelters in tourist areas there is a need to identify the location by name for those not familiar with the area. Information provision also requires a different approach for tourists and it is unclear whether the policy of persuading a local bus operator to be responsible for publicity along a route will deliver the necessary quality and comprehensiveness. For instance, real-time information (or an equivalent) may have more of a role to play where services are very infrequent, compared to places which have many services.

We would also like to see bus priority measures featuring in traffic management and local safety schemes as the norm.

The development of Park and Ride in the area has unfortunately seen slow progress, with both the Whitby and Pickering proposals being delayed. The National Park Authority sees these schemes as offering great potential in reducing the impact of tourist traffic in the area.

Opportunities to raise the profile (and usage) of the rail network need to be advanced. The Esk Valley Railway Development Company is an innovative approach and we look forward to a commitment to increasing support for this national pilot scheme. The role of the North Yorkshire Moors Railway and the potential for re-opening the Malton to Pickering line should also feature.

**Conclusion**

Meeting long term social, economic and environmental objectives for the North York Moors area will be a challenge for all involved in developing, implementing and monitoring the Local Transport Plan.

None of this will be easy or cheap. But we are increasingly concerned that traffic is such a fundamental issue – potentially for good and evil – that creative solutions must be identified and implemented through this LTP as a matter of urgency.
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STATEMENT BY YORKSHIRE DALES NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
Conserving the Environment

Promoting Enjoyment

Supporting the Economy

The National Park Authority is playing an active role in the development and implementation of the Local Transport Plan, and is firmly committed to the principle of working in partnership with North Yorkshire County Council to these ends. It is the view of the National Park Authority that traffic and the measures introduced to manage traffic are one of the main threats to the special qualities of the National Park and the opportunities it offers for the nations’ enjoyment.

It is therefore essential that due regard is paid to section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 in the assessment of North Yorkshire’s Local Transport Plan submission and in the level of the allocation made. This is in order that schemes can be designed to an appropriate standard for a landscape of national importance.

NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY LAND USE POLICIES AND TRAFFIC POLICIES

As the Local Planning Authority for the Yorkshire Dales, the National Park Authority has developed land use policies which are contained in the Yorkshire Dales Local Plan, adopted in 1996. The overriding aim of the Local Plan is to contribute to the achievement of National Park purposes. This fits well with the County Council's aims of protecting and enhancing environmental quality and promoting economic prosperity and social equality. The Local Plan is currently being reviewed and is at the deposit stage. The deposit plan contains a number of new policies, which support measures to reduce the level of and impact of traffic in the National Park.

The Local Plan's approach to the rural economy is to encourage sustainable growth and support existing businesses in ways that do not conflict with conservation of the environment. Small sites are allocated for local industrial and business development within or close to a number of the larger settlements in the Park and appropriate small-scale development for employment purposes is encouraged adjacent to villages.

To stimulate regeneration, the Plan supports the expansion of existing business premises where environmentally acceptable and encourages the conversion of traditional farm buildings and the diversification of farm businesses where the character, scale and location of the proposals are compatible with National Park objectives.

More specifically, the Local Plan's policies support the County Council's strategic transport objective:

To limit traffic growth by minimising the need to travel.
To minimise the adverse impact of traffic on the environment.
To promote a quality public transport system for as many residents as possible and which recognises the importance and impact of tourism.

To facilitate opportunities for economic regeneration and growth and the sustainable movement of goods. Job-creating development is encouraged where well related to existing centre of population. Opportunities for new housing developments are concentrated mainly in the larger settlements which have a relatively high level of local services and facilities. Proposed developments providing facilities and services for visitors and assisting informal recreational use of the National Park are supported by the Local Plan, where they are in scale and in keeping with the character of their surroundings and are not likely to generate levels of traffic that would be detrimental to the environment. The provision of
additional car or coach parking for visitors is only supported where it is compatible with visitor management in the locality.

**Advisory Road Hierarchy**

In line with Government advice the National Park Authority has worked with local Highway Authorities to develop an Advisory Road Hierarchy for the National Park. This involved categorising all the roads in the area according to their physical and environmental capacities and appropriate function. This “Advisory Hierarchy of Roads” has been published as guidance to road users and is incorporated in the Local Plan.

The Advisory Hierarchy of Roads provides guidance for the National Park Authority in carrying out its various statutory responsibilities including the expression of views on proposed road improvements and participation in road traffic management schemes. The co-operation of coach operators, motoring organisations, caravan and other recreational bodies is sought in routing traffic in accordance with the adopted hierarchy and is given publicity by National Park Authority.

Development proposals are assessed against this Advisory Road Hierarchy to ensure that the physical and environmental capacity of the roads that would serve them is adequate for the traffic likely to be generated.

In considering proposals for mineral extraction, the increased use of rail for the transport of quarry products is sought whenever opportunities arise. Where this can be achieved, the adverse impact of quarry vehicles on the open countryside and the environment of villages on routes through the National Park might be reduced, if not eliminated.

**Traffic and Visitor Management strategy**

Building on the Advisory Road Hierarchy the National Park Authority has produced a Traffic and Visitor Management strategy for the National Park with various strategic aims. This forms the basis for the work in the Dales Policy Section in the North Yorkshire Local Transport Plan which was drafted by the National Park Authority.

The strategic aims of the Traffic and Visitor Management Strategy are as follows:

1. To create a special identity for the National Park in the minds of both visitors and residents and to encourage activities which respect its landscape and lifestyle and minimise adverse impacts.

2. To define and manage sustainable levels and patterns of recreational use of the National Park.

3. Use the 1994 data as a target for the stabilisation of traffic flows against which the success of subsequent policies for containment will be judged.

4. Increase the proportion of staying visitors.

5. Maintain the annual pattern of visitor activity.

6. Reduce weekend peaks.

7. Protect the quieter and more fragile areas of the Park.
8. To remove unnecessary and inappropriate traffic from the National Park, encourage use of appropriate routes and to redistribute traffic activity towards appropriate areas.

9. To ensure that the landscape character of the route network in the National Park is retained and enhanced.

10. To increase the use of alternative forms of transport to the private car and to encourage use of more sustainable forms of transport for travel to and within the National Park.

11. To provide an attractive public transport network, serving the National Park that will afford the resident population to a level compatible with its needs.

**Transport Work currently being undertaken by the Yorkshire Dales National Park**

Besides direct involvement with North Yorkshire County Council in the implementation of the local transport plan process and in particular Hawes traffic management strategy the development of the Dale’s Cycle plan this year the National Park Authority are implementing a number of transport related projects including:

1. Development of Authority Car Parks into integrated transport interchanges

2. Provision of bus services to provide access to the National Park including a bike bus service.

3. Public Private sector collaboration on production of cycling maps of the Dales.

4. Lead Authority on a Public Transport demand Study on the needs of local people and visitors to the Yorkshire Dales

5. Public Transport Promotion work, including web site upgrade, displays in information centres and articles in visitor newspaper.

6. Provision of cycle stands at attractions in the Yorkshire Dales with funding from the regional development agency and the private sector.

7. Partner with the Youth Hostels association on their exceeding the expectations of cyclists’ project.

8. Partner in the European TARGET project with lead responsibility for the Yorkshire Humber region’s work on Transport and Leisure. Which through the co-operation of local regional and national organisations provides a program of research integrated with proactive measures to tackle urban-rural car dependency and increase social inclusion for visits to the countryside. It promotes the health benefits of visits to the countryside for walking and cycling, and supports the rural economy by promoting public transport based short breaks. This is achieved by: increasing the patronage of urban-rural public transport, by developing through ticketing and a program of marketing initiatives aimed at particular target audiences including current car users, young people, families, ethnic and socially excluded communities.

**Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority Observations**

We appreciate the genuine difficulties and costs of dealing with transport in a rural area, but look to the highway authorities to seek creative solutions to the problems of increased traffic. We are concerned
that the Plan has not set a target of traffic reduction but sets a target of a level of traffic growth below national trends.

Inevitably there has been slippage in implementing some elements of the plan and, in the Yorkshire Dales context. In particular we are disappointed about the progress made on the cycle plan work, progressing quiet roads, and the development of passenger services on to the Swinden Quarry line and connection to the line to Bolton Abbey. We are also particularly concerned about the progress being made to implement traffic regulation orders to protect un-surfaced unclassified county roads from the impact of trail bikes and 4X4 vehicles. These are having a detrimental affect on the special qualities of the National Park and other users enjoyment of the National Park.

We see the development of a design guide for highway engineers when carrying out our work in the National Park is essential, as this would assist in ensuring that highway, works and traffic management schemes are of an appropriate standard for a National Park context. To ameliorate the damage already done to the special qualities of the National Park by such work in the past the Authority would like to see an audit of all highway signage and lining. This would identify what is unnecessary, which can be removed or changes made as a means of lessening the visual impact of such works and that directional signs direct drivers to the higher categories of road in the advisory road hierarchy.
EXPLANATORY NOTES

This document contains a series of Appendices to North Yorkshire County Council's 2003 Annual Progress Report (APR). Appendices A to M inclusive take the form of "themed" statements, each of which reviews the activities and expenditure of the County Council and its many partners during 2002/03 with regard to the relevant aspects of the Local Transport Plan (LTP). They shown the progress achieved to date towards meeting the appropriate objectives, targets and outcomes set out in the LTP; review their ongoing relevance; and look forward to what is planned in 2003/04.

For the purposes of the APR and its various Appendices, all references to "North Yorkshire" and "the County" mean the administrative area of North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) unless indicated otherwise - ie they exclude the City of York. Similarly, references to the "LTP" mean the Local Transport Plan 2001 – 2006 for the area administered by NYCC (there being a separate LTP for the City of York). Consequently, the words "we" and "our" are used in reference to the policies, strategies, actions, achievements, activities, expenditure and so on (as the case may be) of or by NYCC, its agents and its LTP partners as appropriate.

References to the Government Department responsible for transport matters in the APR and all its Appendices vary according to the period of time concerned. They are the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR); the Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (DTLR); and the Department for Transport (DfT).
Appendix T - Integrated Transport Capital Programme
APPENDIX T

INTEGRATED TRANSPORT CAPITAL PROGRAMME

1. INTRODUCTION

This Appendix covers four topics. Firstly a comparison of programmed schemes versus completed schemes for 2002/03. Secondly a list of schemes completed in 2002/03 showing which of the National PSA target, the County Council local targets and the County Council Corporate Objectives they support. Thirdly this Appendix outlines the process involved in determining the programme of works for the Integrated Transport element of the programme for 2003/04. Finally the outturn revenue expenditure for 2002/03 is also included.

2. COMPARISON OF PROGRAMMED SCHEMES VERSUS COMPLETED SCHEMES FOR 2002/03.

The table below shows the number of schemes expected to be completed in 2002/03, as reported in the Annual Progress Report 2002, compared to the actual number of schemes completed.

Comparison of Programmed Schemes vs Completed Schemes for 2002/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>02/03 Estimated No of Schemes to be Completed</th>
<th>02/03 Actual No of Schemes Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Transport</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety Scheme</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Strategy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The majority of the work carried out under the heading Traffic Management came from seven Traffic Management studies that at the time of publication of the previous APR had not identified any specific schemes. A total of 12 schemes have been completed in 02/03 as part of the six approved Traffic Management Strategies.

(2) The majority of the work carried out under the heading Disabled Strategy is the construction of dropped crossings. These had not been individually identified at the time of publication of previous APR. The work has been split by the seven Divisions that are carrying out dropped crossing construction. The remainder of the schemes are pedestrian crossing upgrades.

The above table shows that the number of schemes completed in 2002/03 broadly matches the estimates provided in the 2002 APR. In the case of the Traffic Management and Disabled Crossing categories it was not possible to identify a specific number of schemes in 2002. Therefore in order to have a representative comparison it has been necessary to adapt the number of schemes, as seen in the footnote to the table.
Generally more schemes were completed than previously estimated, as reflected in the overspend. The only significant divergence is in cycling where only 10 schemes have been completed as opposed to the estimated 14. This was caused by extensive consultation on a number of schemes delaying starts on site. Since the start of the new financial year all these schemes have got under way.

3. National PSA Targets, Local Targets, Corporate Objectives

The table following lists all the schemes completed in 2002/03 along with which targets and objectives the scheme helps to support.

National Targets as follows:

NATIONAL PSA TARGETS

1. Reduce congestion on the inter-urban trunk road network, and in large urban areas in England, below 2000 levels by 2010.

2. Improve accessibility, punctuality and reliability of local public transport (bus and light rail) with an increase in use of more than 12 per cent from 2000 levels by 2010.

3. Reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured in Great Britain in road accidents by 40 per cent and the number of children killed or seriously injured by 50 per cent, by 2010 compared with the average for 1994-98, tackling the significantly higher incidence in disadvantaged communities.

4. Improve air quality by meeting our national air quality strategy objectives for carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, particles sulphur dioxide, benzene and 1-3 butadiene (shared with DEFRA).

10 YEAR PLAN TARGETS & INDICATORS (not covered by the above)

5. By 2010 to triple the number of cycling trips compared with a 2000 base.

6. To achieve a one-third increase in the proportion of households in rural areas within about 10 minutes walk of an hourly or better bus service by 2010.

7. Provide sufficient resources to local authorities to halt the deterioration in the condition of local roads by 2004 and to eliminate the backlog by the end of the Plan period.

Local Targets are from Table B - Progress Towards Achievements of The North Local Safety Scheme at Bentham Toucan Crossing, Scarborough
Transport Plan Objectives and Targets.

Corporate Objectives (draft) are as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Corporate Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><strong>Security for all</strong> - by promoting safe, healthy and sustainable communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><strong>Growing up for the future</strong> - through good education and care and protection when it is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td><strong>Independence</strong> - through employment, opportunity and appropriate support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><strong>Keeping us on the move</strong> - with a safe and reliable transport system and powerful communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td><strong>Strengthening our economy</strong> - by supporting business, developing our infrastructure and helping people improve their skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td><strong>Looking after our heritage</strong> - in the natural and built environments of our countryside and towns and villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td><strong>Keeping in touch</strong> - by listening to your views, by planning to meet your needs and by telling you what we are doing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Corporate Objectives are contained within the Council Plan which is currently being developed. Therefore the Corporate Objectives are currently draft, however, they have been included to show how the LTP ties in to them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>National PSA Targets</th>
<th>Local Targets</th>
<th>Corporate Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 A2 A3(a) A3(b) A9 B1 B2 B3 B6 B7 B15(b) B15(c) B16 D1 D3 E1 E2 F1 F2 F3</td>
<td></td>
<td>A B C D E F G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passenger Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate Bus Station</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A61 Agency Area Bus Corridor</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A61 Rural Corridor (Ripon - Leeds)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Bus Quality Corridor</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunmanby</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride (Weaponess)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster Bus Station</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby Bus Station</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawes</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipton to Grassington</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettlewell Green Point</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyburn Market Place and Wensleydale Corridor</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northallerton/Stokesley Quality Corridor</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Stokesley</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedale - Northallerton Corridor</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Northallerton</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Malton - Hovingham Corridor</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Malton - Pickering Corridor</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton Bus Shelters</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipton/Keighley Quality Corridor</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentham</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Passenger Facilities</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>National PSA Targets</td>
<td>Local Targets</td>
<td>Corporate Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3(a)</td>
<td>A3(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate Highway Improvement Schemes</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6265 Ripon Bypass to Hewick Bridge</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6265 Hewick Bridge to Little Givendale</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A658 A658/Haggs Road</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C37 Long Swales, Kirby Matzeard, Junc. Imp</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6161 Pennypot Lane Roundabout</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A61 Ripon to Ripley</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19 Burn</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19 Whitley Br, M62 to Baile Moor Crossroads</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A169 A169 / A170 Junction Sleights</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C32 Hawes to Buckden - Fleetmoss</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A59 Moor Monkton Crossroads</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A684 Market Place / Emgate, Bedale</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A684 Brompton Road, Northallerton</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A67 Darlington Road, Northallerton</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1248 Commercial Street, Norton</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1248 Four Lane Ends/Giggleswick - Mini Roundabout</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate Rural Safety Schemes</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A59 Pace Gates to Mossy Sikes &amp; Mossy Sikes to Kexgill</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A167 Darlington Road, Northallerton</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1248 Commercial Street, Norton</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Lane Ends/Giggleswick - Mini Roundabout</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate Rural Safety Schemes</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A59 Pace Gates to Mossy Sikes &amp; Mossy Sikes to Kexgill</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>National PSA Targets</td>
<td>Local Targets</td>
<td>Corporate Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate Road / Lead Lane Ripon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunmanby</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19 Burn</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C399 Embroy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6136 Catterick Village</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6271 Brompton - on - Swale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6131 Keighley Road, Skipton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6480 High and Low Bentham</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood, Leyburn</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1448 Topcliffe Rd, Sowerby</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6274 Gilling Rd, Richmond</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6136 Richmond Rd, Catterick</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linhead School, Burniston</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goslipgate, Pickering</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterstead Lane, Whitby</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbots Road, Whitby</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley Rd, Norton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge St, Sutton in Craven</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settle Primary School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnside Estate, Skipton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest Bank, Kildwick</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby Hill School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coxwold</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brafferton/Helperby</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouston Lane, Tadcaster</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwick Parade, Selby</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Field names: A2 A3(a) A3(b) A9 B1 B2 B3 B6 B7 B15(b) B15(c) B16 D1 D3 E1 E2 F1 F2 F3 A B C D E F G
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>National PSA Targets</th>
<th>Local Targets</th>
<th>Corporate Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>A2 A3(a) A3(b) A9 B1 B2 B3 B6 B7 B15(b) B15(c) B16 D1 D3 E1 E2 F1 F2 F3</td>
<td>A B C D E F G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Skipton Road Traffic Study</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Knaresborough High St (Scoot &amp; Bus Priority)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Skipton Road UTMC Cameras</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A61</td>
<td>Leeds Road</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decriminalised Parking (Directly Managed Area)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped kerbs, Tadcaster</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped kerbs, Helmsley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Lane Footways</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lane, Whitby</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Place, Hawes Bus stop Improvements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped kerbs, Richmond</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Improvements, Richmond</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped kerbs, Skipton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stop improvements, Skipton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aireville Park, Skipton footway improvements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A59</td>
<td>Knaresborough High Street</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier Street Pedestrianisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1c</td>
<td>Clotherholme Road, Ripon - Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6161</td>
<td>Footway, Leathley</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A61</td>
<td>Leeds Road</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street, Starbeck</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A658</td>
<td>Harrogate Road, Huby</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>National PSA Targets</td>
<td>Local Targets</td>
<td>Corporate Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C233 Sharrow footway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulc Cayley, Brompton-by-Sawdon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulc Field Lane, Scarborough</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulc Carr Lane, Escrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulc Barwick Parade, Selby - Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C377 Bondgate, Ripon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A170 High St, Snainton - Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A170 Welton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A174 Downendinner Hill, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1460 Castle Road Whitby (Puffin Crossing)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A170 Kirkbymoorside - Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6255 Turfy Hill - Mossy Lane, Hawes footway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6265 Birch Tree Inn, Glasshouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A59 Bolton Bridge Footpath (PROW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C99 Carlton Husthwaite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C99 Boroughbridge Road, Northallerton - Ped Crossing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C99 Hutton Sessay footway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C100 Newton Road, Tollerton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C100 Hutton Rudby Footpath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1248 York Road / Castle Howard Road, Malton refuge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1248 Back Gate, Ingleton - Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6069 Broughton Road, Skipton footway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C398 East Lane, Embsay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C278 A59 to Cattal Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C195 Friar's Lane, Sinnington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C195 Guisburn St, Skipton footway improvements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C195 Short Bank Road, Skipton footway improvements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>National PSA Targets</td>
<td>Local Targets</td>
<td>Corporate Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footbridges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate / Knaresborough Cycle Plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield Phase 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Schemes in Sherburn</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northallerton and Thirsk Cycling Schemes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North St, Ripon - Crossing Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings - Harrogate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Upgrades (Harrogate Agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Upgrades - Scarborough</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings - Scarborough</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield Rd, Whitby crossing upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street, Seamer crossing upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings - Division 1 - Richmond</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings - Division 2 - Thirsk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings - Division 3 - Whitby</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings - Division 4 - Kirkbymoorside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings - Division 5 - Skipton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings - Division 6 - Starbeck</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings - Division 7 - Selby</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. BACKGROUND TO DETERMINING THE PROGRAMME

In order to give local people a greater say in Council affairs the County Council established in September 2000, as part of the New Political Structures Agenda, Area Committees based on the seven District/Borough Council areas in North Yorkshire. The membership of these Committees comprises local Members of the County Council, District Council Members, Parish Councillors and members of other representative organisations. Members of the public are able to ask questions and make statements at meetings of the Area Committee. Each Committee meets at least four times per year. The Area Committees have a responsibility to consider and make recommendation on schemes to be included in the Integrated Transport Programme and to deal with a wide range of traffic management activities eg HCV restrictions, speed limits, waiting restrictions and signing and lining schemes.

In Autumn 2000 the County Council approved a revised method of setting the priority of schemes being considered for inclusion in the Capital Programme in order to ensure consistency with the LTP objectives. The County Council’s Agents in Harrogate and Scarborough and its Area Committees were consulted and supported this revised method of assessment. This new approach was introduced in early 2001.

The County Council’s seven Area Committees play a key role in determining the Integrated Transport Capital Programme. Each Area has a reserve list of schemes awaiting inclusion in the Programme. This is sub-divided into various categories eg Local Safety Schemes, Traffic Management, Pedestrian Facilities, Cycling Facilities and Public Transport. Schemes are added to the reserve list at the request of individuals and through consultation with Parish Councils, District Councils, National Park Authorities, County Councillors and Officers. On an annual basis the priority of schemes on the reserve list is updated using the approach introduced in early 2001. In the Autumn of each year the Area Committee consider the reserve list relating to its area and agree which schemes should be included in the programme for the next financial year and an indicative programme for the subsequent year in accordance with the available resources. The diverse membership of the Area Committee means that a wide range of bodies can have the opportunity to comment on the individual schemes to be included in the Capital Programme.

Table 2 below sets out the planned expenditure by category for future years of the LTP taking into account changes in priority identified in the APR and supporting Appendices. The Table also includes outturn expenditure for the respective categories for 2002/03. Also an estimate of proposed expenditure for 2006/07, the first year of the next LTP.

5. OUTTURN EXPENDITURE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT 2002/03

Annexe A identifies the expenditure in 2002/03 for each work category, and sub-categories. the total expenditure for 2002/03 for Integrated Transport was £11,564. This level of expenditure has meant we have caught up the underspend for 2001/02 and expended additional money sufficient to counteract the underspend in Structural Maintenance of Bridges.

A detailed breakdown of the expenditure in 2002/03 and explanation of any overspend/underspend by work category is included in the APR in the section “Progress Towards Targets and Objectives”.
Table 2 - Expenditure Profile for schemes delivered in 2002/03 and planned for future years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000/01</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£k</td>
<td>£k</td>
<td>Original £k</td>
<td>Actual £k</td>
<td>Variance £k</td>
<td>£k</td>
<td>£k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>3,229</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Safety Schemes</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>4,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>-175</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Strategy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road over Rail Schemes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Strategy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Awareness</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>9,661</td>
<td>11,564</td>
<td>1,903</td>
<td>8,547</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Roads</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Principal Roads</td>
<td>5,312</td>
<td>7,611</td>
<td>7,611</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>4,446</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>6,416</td>
<td>4,939</td>
<td>-1,477</td>
<td>4,277</td>
<td>8,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,744</td>
<td>11,927</td>
<td>16,746</td>
<td>15,289</td>
<td>-1,457</td>
<td>17,707</td>
<td>24,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>9,817</td>
<td>18,090</td>
<td>26,407</td>
<td>26,853</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>26,254</td>
<td>36,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,817</td>
<td>18,090</td>
<td>26,407</td>
<td>26,853</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>26,254</td>
<td>38,547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
1 Overspend offset by additional £250k SCA for Road over Rail Schemes.
2 Expenditure excludes £500k funded from revenue as part of Performance Improvement Fund.
3 Budget allocation £10,200k reduced by net overspend in 2002/03 of £1,653k.
4 Budget allocation £4,600k reduced by net overspend in 2002/03 of £20k.
5 Budget allocation £2,800k increased by net underspend in 2002/03 of £1,477k.
6. **INTEGRATED TRANSPORT PROGRAMME 2003/04**

Attached, as Annexe B is the programme of works for 2003/04, approved by the Executive Members in November 2002. This programme was then sorted into Area Committees so that they could be presented to them for comments.

The budget available for Integrated Transport in 2003/04 is £8,547, which has been reduced by the net overspend of £1,653k.

In order to manage any risk of underspending the programme includes works totalling £12,768k.

In drawing up the detailed programme for each scheme a period of time is required for public consultation when appropriate. In some instances it is often necessary to carry out a second, and in exceptional cases, third round consultations before all parties are satisfied. This can result in the preparatory stage of the scheme pushing the scheme beyond the year end. For example 16 local safety schemes started in 2002/03 will be completed in 2003/04. Also some schemes may require land or statutory orders, with these schemes we cannot be certain of the timescales. Monthly progress meetings are held with our Partners, Mouchel North Yorkshire and Raynesway to track the progress of schemes, identify any areas of concern and to modify the programme as necessary.

7. **INTEGRATED TRANSPORT PROGRAMME 2004/05**

Attached, as Annexe C is the indicative programme of work for 2004/05, approved by Executive Members in November 2002. The expenditure of £7,031k for this programme has been set lower than the indicative allocation of £8,100k as given in December 2000. This is to allow for the over programming to be reduced by £1,000k while still maintaining sufficient workload to limit any chance of under spending. This level will be reviewed in autumn 2003 and the 2005/06 programme is provisionally prepared.

8. **REVENUE EXPENDITURE**

Attached, as Annexe D is the Council’s Revenue Expenditure (Transport). Information is included for all aspects of work carried out in respect of transport.
## Integrated Transport Plan 2002/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2002/03 By Category £'000</th>
<th>2002/03 Actual £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Corridors</td>
<td>937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,253</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,253</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Safety Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Improvement</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Routes to School</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20mph Zones</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,594</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,594</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM Studies</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM schemes</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,701</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,701</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crossings</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway schemes</td>
<td>860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,168</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,168</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Plans</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle schemes</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>589</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disabled Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Upgrades</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>701</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road over Rail</strong></td>
<td>558</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport Studies</strong></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freight Strategy</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Awareness</strong></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Contributions</strong></td>
<td>520</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,564</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Traffic Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rossett Beck, Harrogate</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 422 North Street/ Coltsgate Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 423 Park Street/ Firby Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirsk Market Place</td>
<td></td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry Road, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRO's Signs &amp; Lines- Harrogate BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 61 Ripon Road ( Harrogate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipton Road UTMC Cameras ( Harrogate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRO's Signs &amp; Lines- Scarborough BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby T.M. Schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements, Station Road, Tadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements, Wetherby Road, Tadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements, Leeds Road to Station Road, Tadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway &amp; crossing improvements, Leeds Road, Tadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade existing Zebra crossing to Puffin crossing standard, Leeds Road,</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle parking central area, Tadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mph gateway feature, Leeds Road, Tadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 &amp; 40mph gateway feature, Wighill Lane, tadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming horizontal measures and 40 mph buffer zone, Leeds Road,</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central area traffic calming and 20mph zone, Tadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing Audit, Tadcaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby Town Centre T. M. Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, New Bridge ramps, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, Beech Grove / Ash Grove footway, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, Laburnham Grove / Byland Road footway, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, Prospect Hill footway, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer routes to school, Waterstead Lane lighting, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khyber Pass footway, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway to Hospital, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvement, Byland Road / Medical Centre, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle barrier at Swing Bridge end of Baxtergate, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway, Royal Crescent to car park, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfield Road Bridge safety parapets, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle routes, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle parking, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic restrictions on Pier Road &amp; Khyber Pass, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase short stay spaces near shops, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review spaces for disabled, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawsker Lane Widening Phase 2, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Strategy, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of existing car parks - preliminary design &amp; consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents parking scheme, Church St. &amp; The Ropery, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents parking scheme, Fishburn Park, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandsend / Love Lane Junction Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing Audit, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way traffic, South Terrace / Crescent Place, Whitby</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate bus stop on Bondgate, Helmsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puffin crossing on Bondgate at Carleton Road, Helmsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-carriageway cycle lanes Linkfoot Lane, Helmsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle parking in Market Place, Helmsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway features and 40 mph zone Linkfoot Lane, Helmsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming and 20 mph zone Carleton Lane, Helmsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signs audit, Helmsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyburn Traffic management Schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdcage Walk footway, Hawes</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandymires footway, Hawes</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Lane Car Park to Penny Garth footway, Hawes</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Lane to Turfy Hill footway, Hawes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle parking, Hawes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 684 Gateway features, Hawes</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Sign Audit, Hawes</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easingwold Traffic Management Schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes as a result of Northallerton T.M.Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian route improvements, Nun's Close to Rosemary Lane, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian route improvements, Rosemary Lane, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing at Station Road / The Batts, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Improvements, The Batts, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming, Rimmington Avenue, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming and 20 mph zones, Bargate and Cravengate, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area wide traffic calming and 20 mph zone, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents parking scheme, Cornforth Hill &amp; Waterloo, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents parking scheme, The Green, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents parking scheme, Frenchgate, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Sign Audit, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 90 Main Street, Sheriff Hutton - Roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped kerbs and Tactile Paving, Route 1, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements, Black Walk, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements, The Bailey to Regent Road, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing Upgrade, High Street, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian / Cycling Improvements, Canal Tow Paths, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian / Cycling Improvements, Carleton Road / Carleton New Road, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrianisation of Sheep Street, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV restriction on High Street, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mph zone, Brougham Street / Westmoreland Road, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming Brook Street/Canal Bridge, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Improvement, Water Street, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Sign Audit, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to Hall &amp; Ride service, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Parking Zone, Water Street area, Skipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Quay Road, Fencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRO's, Signs &amp; Lines- Directly managed , County Wide Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total for Traffic Management Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrian Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schemes from Killinghall Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Street Pedestrianisation (Harrogate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 375 Beechwood Tce. / Wallerthwaite Farm, Markington</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate Pedestrian Strategy (Harrogate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 661 Park Road, Spofforth, Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crossings (Harrogate 2 Sites)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes as a result of Scarborough Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes as a result of Filey Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 162</td>
<td>Lumby to South Milford</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 329</td>
<td>Temple Hirst Station Yard: East of R’way Br</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarry Moor Lane, Ripon</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements from Scarborough Pedestrian Strategy</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1222</td>
<td>Moor Lane, Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/C</td>
<td>Water Lane, Hemingbrough</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1223</td>
<td>Ulleskelf</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 171</td>
<td>Cloughton</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1257</td>
<td>High Street, Great Broughton</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aysgarth</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 884</td>
<td>Bainbridge</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 6160</td>
<td>Kilnsey</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 272</td>
<td>Barden Bridge Footway</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 6451</td>
<td>Nidd Bridge Footway, Summerbridge</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schemes from Grassington Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1365</td>
<td>Footway Through Manor Grounds</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1333</td>
<td>Ainderby Road, Romanby</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1258</td>
<td>Knapton Level Crossing Footway</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schemes as a result of Sherburn in Elmet/ South Milford Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 24</td>
<td>Ingleby Road, Great Broughton</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/C</td>
<td>Race Terrace, Great Ayton</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 6479</td>
<td>Selside Village- (National Trail Crossing)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/C</td>
<td>Frank’s Lane, Whixley</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 8</td>
<td>Dalton-on-Tees (road to North Cowton)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1333</td>
<td>Ainderby Road, Romanby - Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station Road, Stokesley - Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 6161</td>
<td>Footway Leathley</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 56</td>
<td>Grosmont</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/C</td>
<td>Sands Lane, Hunmanby</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 20</td>
<td>Marton</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giggleswick / Settle Footway Schemes (as a result of Action Plan)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 249</td>
<td>High Street, Sutton in Craven</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glusburn / Crosshills Footway Schemes (As a result of Action Plan)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total for Pedestrian Facilities Schemes** 856

**Pedestrian Action Plans**

- Filey | 5
- Sherburn/ South Milford | 5
- Kirkbymoorside | 5
- Great Ayton | 5
- Pateley Bridge | 10
- Settle | 9
- Killinghall | 5
- Glusburn/ Crosshills | 10
- Ripon | 10
- Pickering | 5
- Reeth | 5
- Askrigg | 5
- Malham | 5
- Ingleton | 10
- High / Low Bentham | 10

**Sub-total for Pedestrian Action Plans** 104
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Disabled Strategy</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings (Harrogate)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Upgrades (Harrogate Agency)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Crossings Scarborough</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Upgrades (Scarborough Agency)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley Road, Norton (disabled access)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6131 Skipton High Street Crossing Upgrade</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly managed County wide allocation</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total for Disabled Strategy Schemes</strong></td>
<td><strong>527</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Safer Routes to Schools</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough BC SRS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly managed Safer Routes to School-Countywide</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total for Safer Routes to School Schemes</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cycle Strategy</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schemes to be identified within Harrogate Area</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield Phase 2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate &amp; Knaresborough Cycle Plan</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Parking Town Centre, Scarborough</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filey Cycling Scheme</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster / Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North York Moors National Park Cycling Scheme</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Dales Cycle Plan Implementation</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northallerton / Thirsk / Easingwold</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallows Close to Scalby</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glusburn/ Crosshills/ Sutton in Craven Cycle Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling - added to Skipton TC-TM Schemes</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Cycle Network</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total for Cycle Strategy schemes</strong></td>
<td><strong>1333</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Passenger Transport</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 61 Real Time Bus Information, Harrogate</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilton to Harrogate QBC</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate to Knaresborough, QBC</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennyfield to Harrogate QBC</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Real Time Bus Information Study</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough-Filey-Bridlington Quality Bus Corridor</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough-Whitby-Loftus Quality Bus Corridor</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby Park &amp; ride</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmsley-Pickering-Scarborough QBC</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeth</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipton To Grassington QBC</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond - Ripon QBC</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedale Town Centre</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Location</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easingwold Town Centre</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokesley to Middlesborough QBC</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds - York Rail Line Study</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Terminal Facilities</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherburn - Pontefract</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipton Bus Station</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Terminal Facilities</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingleton/Settle Town Centre</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops Countywide Allocation</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Station Access Improvement Countywide</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettlewell Green Point Passing Facilities</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby to Leeds</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total for Passenger Transport Schemes</strong></td>
<td><strong>2549</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Over Rail</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Studies</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Strategy</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Awareness</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12668</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MINOR WORKS PROGRAMME 2004/2005

#### Highway Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B 6479</td>
<td>Selside Village- ( National Trail Crossing)</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 235</td>
<td>Carla Beck Lane junction, Carleton</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 684</td>
<td>Right turn lane - Netto entrance, Northallerton</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 169</td>
<td>Route Study Implementation of Schemes</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 170</td>
<td>Route Study Implementation of Schemes</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station Parade, Harrogate</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West of Market Place Link Road ( Part Contribution),</td>
<td>300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U /C</td>
<td>Quarry Moor Park, Ripon</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 59</td>
<td>Chain Bar Lane Junction- right turn lane</td>
<td>117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 59</td>
<td>Kexgill (Proposed barrier)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ripon City Centre ( Continuation of Refurbishment)</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrogate Agency Area Highway Improvement Scheme</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6136</td>
<td>Brough Lane Right turn lane</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U /C</td>
<td>Manor Rd/Northstead Drive- junction</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 171</td>
<td>Route Treatment as a result of study in 03/04</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 171</td>
<td>Egton / Lealholm junction</td>
<td>175.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 645</td>
<td>Hensall Crossroads, traffic signals</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 689</td>
<td>A64 Tadcaster Bar</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accident Investigation Block Allocation Countywide</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1882.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Traffic Calming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U /C</td>
<td>Raikeswood Rd/Salisbury St, Skipton</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U /C</td>
<td>Broughton Grove, Skipton</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U /C</td>
<td>Canal Street, Skipton</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 6479</td>
<td>Selside</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 422</td>
<td>Harrogate Road, Ripon</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 267</td>
<td>Stump Cross R/a to Ponderosa R/a, Boroughbridge</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1257</td>
<td>Newbiggin, Malton</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1248</td>
<td>Scarborough Road, Norton</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1039</td>
<td>Fixton</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U /C</td>
<td>Whin Bank/Stepney Ave point closure/ calming</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U /C</td>
<td>Irton Moor Lane</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1039</td>
<td>Muston Road, Filey</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1222</td>
<td>Stillingfleet</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-mph speed limits-Directly managed, County Wide</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>605.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Traffic Management Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skipton Town Centre T M Schemes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs Lines &amp; TROS( All Policy Areas)</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otley Road, Scoot ( Harrogate)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Urban Traffic Control Cameras ( Harrogate)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 61 Junction Killinghall- traffic signal control</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawes Town Centre T.M. Schemes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Town Centre T.M. Schemes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyburn Traffic management Schemes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmsley Town Centre T.M. Schemes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malton/Norton Town Centre T.M. Schemes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby Traffic Management Schemes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRO's Signs &amp; Lines- Directly managed, Scarborough BC</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby T.M. Schemes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster Town Centre T.M. Schemes</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1412.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Town Centre Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Footway Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glusburn Schemes/Crosshills as a result of the</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassington / Threshfield Schemes as a result of Ped.</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High / Low Bentham Schemes as a result of the</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingleton Schemes as a result of the Pedestrian Action</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malham Schemes as a result of Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settle Schemes as a result of the Pedestrian Action</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 6160 Kettlewell</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate &amp; Knaresborough Implementation of Plans</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u /c Fifth Avenue, Colburn</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 6271 Brompton-on-Swale: 58 Rich’d Rd/Parkgate Ln</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 7 Grunton Lane to Church, Manfield</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u /c The Springs, Middleham</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 170 High Street, Ebberston</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 170 Pickering Hill, Thornton le Dale</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U /C Pasture Lane, Malton</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 82 Goathland Station</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes as a result of Filey Pedestrian Action Plan</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 205 Gristhorpe to Leberston</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 1 Brier Hill, Danby</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Road, Scarborough</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1447 Hawsker village to Caravan Park entrance</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes as a result of Scarborough Pedestrian action</td>
<td>£k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes as a result of Sherburn in Elmet/ South Milford</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garthends Lane, Hemingbrough</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street, Hemingbrough</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total** 387.0

**Crossing Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crossing Facilities</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing Bondgate, Ripon</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puffin Crossings (Harrogate 2 Sites)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Road, Westbourne Gr. Refuge, Scarborough</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxhill Lane, Brayton</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total** 93.6

**Pedestrian Action Plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Action Plans</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thirsk</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boroughbridge</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total** 20.0

**Cycling Schemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycling Schemes</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northallerton / Thirsk / Easingwold</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate &amp; Knaresborough Cycle Plan</td>
<td>300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate (Bilton) to Ripley</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Dales Cycle Plan Implementation</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby Cycling Schemes</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalby Cycleway to North Bay, Scarborough</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filey Cycling Scheme</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Parking Town Centre, Scarborough</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North York Moors National Park Cycling Scheme</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherburn / South Milford</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total** 634.0
## Cycling Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settle</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipton (as part of T.M. Study)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boroughbridge</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total** 36.0

## Facilities for the disabled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly managed County wide allocation</td>
<td>300.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total** 300.0

## Passenger Transport Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thirsk Town Centre</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate Bus / Rail Interchange</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Real Time Bus Information Study</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops Countywide Allocation</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Station Access Improvement Countywide</td>
<td>125.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total** 660.0

## Passenger Transport Quality Bus Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Estimate £k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skipton To Burnley</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipton To Settle</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northallerton to Darlington</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilton to Jennyfield</td>
<td>166.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate to Otley</td>
<td>110.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby-Scarborough</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby-Loftus</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Bus QC</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby to Doncaster</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby to York</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total** 673.0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road over Rail</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Studies</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Strategy</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Awareness</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAND TOTAL                  7163.8
## North Yorkshire County Council Revenue Expenditure (Transport)

### Highways Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002/03 £'000</th>
<th>2002/03 £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Maintenance</td>
<td>8,235.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gully Emptying</td>
<td>1,194.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass Cutting</td>
<td>400.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Dressing</td>
<td>2,386.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing &amp; Reconstruction</td>
<td>596.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Maintenance</td>
<td>4,195.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Lighting</td>
<td>2,033.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Prevention Maintenance</td>
<td>994.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Maintenance</td>
<td>884.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing and Office Related Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>3,525.1</td>
<td>24,444.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLO Surplus</td>
<td>561.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Charge</td>
<td>660.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Charges</td>
<td>1,011.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>22,211.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Network Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002/03 £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing and Office Related Expenditure</td>
<td>956.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Charges</td>
<td>229.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>727.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Management of the Bridges Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002/03 £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Costs</td>
<td>219.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing and Office Related Expenditure</td>
<td>204.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002/03 £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Bus Operators</td>
<td>3,978.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Bus Challenge</td>
<td>437.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Transport Partnerships</td>
<td>134.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing and Office Related Expenditure</td>
<td>778.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Bus Grant</td>
<td>2,017.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Bus Challenge</td>
<td>437.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Transport Partnerships</td>
<td>134.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>285.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>2,454.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Traffic Management / Local Safety Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Type</th>
<th>Gross Expenditure</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Net Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Maintenance</td>
<td>128.5</td>
<td>487.5</td>
<td>1,587.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing and Office Related Expenditure</td>
<td>1,946.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,074.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>487.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,587.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Road Safety Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Type</th>
<th>Gross Expenditure</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Net Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Training &amp; Publicity</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>667.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Crossing Patrols *</td>
<td>211.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing and Office Related Expenditure</td>
<td>397.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>670.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>667.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Rights of Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Type</th>
<th>Gross Expenditure</th>
<th>Less Income</th>
<th>Net Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Works &amp; Grants</td>
<td>538.5</td>
<td>Countryside Agency Grant 94.7</td>
<td>818.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing and Office Related Expenditure</td>
<td>432.1</td>
<td>Other Income 57.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>970.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>818.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highway Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Type</th>
<th>Gross Expenditure</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Net Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on Properties</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>Rental Income 87.0</td>
<td>-52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>-52.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central Support & Administrative Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Highways &amp; Transportation</strong></td>
<td>30,992.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Highways & Transportation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30,992.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>