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Introduction

1.1 Background

Service Centre Transportation Strategies (SCTS) involve the identification of transportation improvement schemes and initiatives aimed at helping to build sustainable communities, through contributing to the objectives of the North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) Second Local Transport Plan (LTP2).

A total of 28 Service Centre study areas have been identified across North Yorkshire using the outcomes from the Regional Spatial Strategy Settlement Study, carried out by NYCC on behalf of the Regional Assembly. The SCTS process builds upon the success of the Town Centre Traffic Management Studies (TMS) developed for 14 of the 28 Service Centres as part of the first Local Transport Plan (LTP1) for the period 2001 – 2006. For the 14 areas where a TMS has been undertaken the aim of the SCTS approach is now to capture and report on the transportation and accessibility issues also affecting the rural hinterlands and develop potential improvements within these areas which complement the measures already identified within the town centre. For those study areas where a TMS has not been undertaken (of which Masham is one) the aim is to capture and report on the transportation and accessibility issues affecting both the town centre and the rural hinterlands in order to develop potential improvements within both areas.

For further information on the process and the delivery of the SCTS, reference should be made to chapter 4 of the NYCC LTP2 which covers the period 2006 to 2011. This document can be found on the NYCC website at: http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/ltp.

1.2 Report Purpose

In April 2008, Jacobs was commissioned by NYCC to undertake the Masham SCTS. This Strategy Report summarises the final stage in the development of the SCTS. It identifies the schemes which have been prioritised for delivery through the SCTS process and how they are to be monitored and evaluated, once delivered. The Masham SCTS study area is illustrated in Figure 1.1.

1.3 Report Structure

The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- Chapter 2 – Key Stages in the Development of the Masham SCTS
- Chapter 3 – Prioritised Improvement Schemes
- Chapter 4 – Improvements Subject to Alternative Funding / Delivery Mechanisms
- Chapter 5 – Monitoring and Evaluation
- Chapter 6 – Summary and Conclusions

1
Figure 1.1: Masham SCTS Study Area
2.1 Introduction

The key stages in the development of the SCTS are illustrated in Figure 2.1 and discussed in more detail within the subsequent sections of this chapter.

Figure 2.1: SCTS Key Stages

2.2 Issue Identification

The Issue Identification stage involved the sub-stages outlined below, in chronological order. Each of these sub-stages are summarised within the following paragraphs.

- Data Collection
- Liaison with NYCC Officers
- First Member and Stakeholder Consultation
- First Officer Team Meeting

**Data Collection:** The first sub-stage in the Issue Identification process was the Data Collection exercise. This involved the collation and analysis of existing data and familiarisation with the study area. It provided an important evidence base for the evaluation of existing problems and issues and the subsequent development of possible improvement schemes.

**Liaison with NYCC Officers:** The purpose of this sub-stage was to liaise with relevant Officers from NYCC to utilise their local knowledge of the area and to identify any historic proposals or improvement schemes which should be considered as part of the development of the SCTS. This stage included liaison with the Highways North Yorkshire Area Manager and Improvement Manager.

**First Member and Stakeholder Consultation:** The views of NYCC Members and key stakeholders were sought as part of this sub-stage. The consultation was undertaken by
letter and gave both Members and key stakeholders the opportunity to be involved in the SCTS from the outset.

The views of the Members were sought first. They were asked to give their views on the historic schemes identified through liaison with NYCC Officers and were then given the opportunity to identify additional issues/schemes they felt should be investigated as part of the SCTS process. In order to carefully manage the process and make the most efficient use of available funds, Members were asked to identify their top five priority issues.

Members were also invited to meet with the SCTS project team to give them the opportunity to seek clarity on the process or to discuss in detail any specific issues within the study area.

Following the first Member Consultation exercise a wider consultation exercise was undertaken involving key stakeholders within the study area.

The stakeholder consultation was undertaken using the same approach as the Members Consultation exercise. The stakeholders were first asked to comment on historic proposals identified through discussions with NYCC Officers and then asked to identify their top five priority issues which they felt should be investigated as part of the SCTS process.

**First Officer Team Meeting:** Following the Member and stakeholder consultation process, a meeting was held with the Officer Team. The Officer Team was made up of the following personnel:

- Martin Parker (NYCC Special Projects Group)
- James Malcolm (Acting NYCC Area Highways Manager)
- Donna Hodgson (Acting NYCC Area Improvement Manager)
- Steve Hill (NYCC Road Safety and Travel Awareness)
- Paul Roberts (NYCC Planning - Development Control)
- Iain Burgess (Nidderdale AONB Project Officer)
- Helen Firth (Jacobs)
- Keith Barber (Jacobs)
- Jonathan Dowding (Jacobs)

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the issues/potential schemes identified as part of the Members/stakeholder consultation process and to determine a shortlist of potential schemes to be taken forward to the next stage of the SCTS. Harnessing the local knowledge of the Officer Team at this early stage ensured that all aspects regarding the development of potential options were considered and understood. At this stage, if it was considered that potential schemes were unlikely to be physically or technically feasible, or fail to contribute sufficiently towards NYCC’s priorities for transport, such schemes were not considered further as part of the SCTS process.
2.3 Draft Strategy

Based upon the local and strategic issues identified as part of the Issue Identification stage and those historic schemes identified to be taken forward for further consideration, the second stage in the process involved the production of the ‘Draft’ Strategy. This included the development of improvement schemes identified based upon the identified problems and issues and included further consideration of strategic issues and how to best take them forward. The ‘Draft’ Strategy consisted of the sub-stages listed below, which are discussed in more detail within the following paragraphs.

- Option Identification and Development
- Option Appraisal
- Second Officer Team Meeting
- Monitoring and Evaluation

Option Identification and Development: Based on the findings of the Issue Identification stage, a series of potential transport improvement schemes were developed. All potential improvement schemes aimed to resolve specific issues identified through the Member / stakeholder / Officer Team consultation process.

Option Appraisal: All potential improvement schemes which were deemed to be technically and physically feasible as part of the Option Identification and Development stage were then assessed in terms of their potential contribution to NYCC’s objectives for transport. This was achieved using the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System which appraised and scored each of the potential improvement schemes based upon the extent to which they contribute to NYCC’s Priorities for Transport and ultimately the LTP Delivery Objectives.

Schemes that failed to contribute sufficiently to NYCC’s objectives for transport were not considered further as part of the SCTS process.

Second Officer Team Meeting: Based upon the outcomes of the option appraisal exercise, a prioritised list of potential improvement schemes was circulated to the Officer Team for comment.

A second meeting was then held with the Officer Team and their views sought regarding each of the proposals. As with the First Officer Team Meeting, harnessing local knowledge of the Officer Team at this stage ensured that all aspects were considered as part of the development of the individual schemes and that there were no known local conflicts which may prevent the schemes from being taken forward.

The Second Officer Team Meeting therefore assisted in the management of expectations and enabled an additional filter of options to be undertaken. A robust justification for any schemes discounted from the process at this stage was provided.

Monitoring and Evaluation: As part of the development of the ‘Draft’ Strategy, consideration was given to how each of the proposed improvement schemes would be monitored and evaluated within future years in order to ensure that, once implemented, they
would, in fact meet their objectives and contribute to the NYCC LTP2 key targets and indicators.

2.4 Consultation

Following the production of the ‘Draft’ Strategy, the prioritised list of potential improvement schemes were taken forward to consultation. The consultation process involved the sub-stages identified below, which are discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

- Second Members Consultation
- Stakeholder Workshop
- Public Consultation

**Second Members Consultation**: The prioritised list of potential improvement schemes was circulated to the Members in advance of the Public Consultation exercise. This was undertaken by letter and gave the Members an opportunity to comment on each of the specific proposals put forward. Members were also invited to a meeting to once again give them the opportunity to seek clarity on the process and comment in detail on any of the proposed improvements put forward.

**Stakeholder Workshop**: Following the Second Members Consultation exercise a Stakeholder Workshop was held. Key Stakeholders involved in the first round of consultation were invited to the workshop to provide feedback on the proposals put forward prior to the wider Public Consultation exercise. A key aim of the workshop was to discuss the proposals within the Draft Strategy and to relate them to the initial issues raised as part of the First Member and Stakeholder Consultation exercises.

**Public Consultation**: Following the Second Member Consultation a wider Public Consultation exercise was undertaken. This involved a postal survey to all households and businesses within the study area and gave everyone an opportunity to comment upon the schemes put forward. Analysis of responses by geographical location and demographic group enabled the identification of any ‘under consulted’ groups within the study area.

2.5 The Strategy (this stage)

This document, the ‘final’ Strategy has been compiled following the Public Consultation exercise and incorporates all aspects of the SCTS development process, including the prioritised improvement schemes presented as an Implementation Plan.

The level of public support for each scheme, together with the results from the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System, have been used to determine which schemes have been taken forward for delivery as part of the ‘final’ Strategy.

NYCC has a reserved budget set aside for the development of the SCTS and delivery of capital improvement schemes put forward within the Implementation Plan. This budget will be used to deliver those schemes identified by the priority given in this report. As such, not all schemes may be deliverable within the available budget. Those schemes which are not delivered within the available budget will join the NYCC Reserve List of Capital schemes.
3 Prioritised Improvement Schemes

3.1 Introduction

As outlined within the previous chapter, the SCTS process has resulted in the development of a range of improvement schemes aimed at resolving the transportation issues currently affecting people living and working within the Masham SCTS study area.

These proposals have been developed based upon the views expressed by local stakeholders and the public, technical justification for the scheme and technical / physical feasibility.

This chapter details those improvement schemes to be taken forward using the reserved SCTS budget from the LTP as well as providing a justification for those discounted from the process.

3.2 Prioritised Improvement Schemes

Based on the results of the consultation process and the assessment score determined by the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System, a prioritised list of five capital improvement schemes has been put forward. These are detailed in Table 3.1 and illustrated on the location plan within Appendix A.

The SCTS process has tried to ensure that these prioritised improvement schemes are focused upon meeting the needs of the people living and working within the SCTS study area whilst ultimately assisting in the delivery of the NYCC LTP2 objectives.

The cost estimates included within the table are based upon the information available at the time of investigation and as such may be subject to change due to the early stage of scheme development and future detailed investigations. Full details of each of the proposed improvement schemes are included within Appendix B.

The total estimated costs of schemes A, B and E are less than the funds allocated to the delivery of the SCTS. Thus, the decision was made to use the remaining funds to repair the extensive damage to the county’s road network. The NYCC Harrogate Area Highway Team were asked to provide details of their top five highway maintenance priorities for the study area. These were discussed at the Stakeholder Workshop and it was decided that only two of the five were deemed necessary by the stakeholders (Schemes D and E). Thus, these two have been included in the Implementation Plan.
Table 3.1: Prioritised Improvement Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: A package of measures to improve pedestrian safety in Masham Town Centre</td>
<td>£90,000</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Road safety improvements on the A6108, Leyburn Road, Masham</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>No overall majority view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: A package of measures in the village of Fearby to improve road safety through the village</td>
<td>£13,000</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>No overall majority view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Repair of pot holes along Red Lane, Masham</td>
<td>£14,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lack of Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Repair of pot holes and re-surfacing along Fearby Road between Fearby and Masham</td>
<td>£102,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lack of Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- Support
- No overall majority view
- Lack of Support

Although schemes B and E do not score sufficiently against the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System, results of the public consultation exercise show that they both have strong support from stakeholders and the public. The results showed that scheme B has strong support (61% of the public agreed or strongly agreed with its implementation compared to 23% who disagreed or strongly disagreed). Similarly, almost double the number of respondents were in favour of scheme E than those who opposed it (44% vs 26%), and 26% had no opinion. Scheme E is a localised improvement focusing specifically on the needs of residents within Fearby which is why a high percentage of respondents had no opinion on the scheme. It also received support from some members of Fearby Parish Council at the Stakeholder Workshop. In light of this, it was decided to include both schemes within the Implementation Plan. Full details of each of the proposed improvement schemes are included within Appendix B.

The total estimated costs of schemes A, B and E are less than the funds allocated to the delivery of the SCTS. Thus, the decision was made to use the remaining funds to repair the extensive damage to the county’s road network. The NYCC Harrogate Area Highway Team were asked to provide details of their top five highway maintenance priorities for the study area. These were discussed at the Stakeholder Workshop and it was decided that only two of the five were deemed necessary by the stakeholders. Thus, these two have been included in the Implementation Plan.

As part of the public consultation process, some stakeholders raised concerns regarding schemes A and B. Although members of Masham Parish Council were in support of scheme A at the stakeholder workshop, during the public consultation exercise, a letter was received from the Parish Council stating that they felt that scheme A did not sufficiently improve pedestrian safety on Church Street or Silver Street. They also felt that it would add to the congestion problems in the town. In addition, one of the major businesses in Masham, I’Ansons, felt that most of the proposals in scheme A were mostly unnecessary and / or inappropriate for HGVs to negotiate. I’Ansons suggested that the traffic in the town, both parked and queuing, provided natural traffic calming and therefore other measures were not required.

Masham Parish Council were not supportive of the provision of yellow backed reflective signs which are proposed as part of scheme B due to their obtrusive visual impact. Although this was highlighted as a potential issue at the stakeholder workshop, the Stakeholders agreed to their inclusion.
The development of the Masham SCTS also raised a number of issues with regard to Passenger Transport service provision within the study area. As identified within LTP2, such improvements are subject to cooperation between both the County Council and the Service Providers and thus deemed to be external to the SCTS process. The opportunity does however exist for these issues to be considered as part of the NYCC Passenger Transport Review process and ongoing investigations. As such, key issues identified as part of the SCTS will be considered by the NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport (IPT) team.

The key concerns raised regarding Passenger Transport service provision as part of the stakeholder and public consultation exercises are summarised below, with responses provided by the IPT Team where specific investigations have been undertaken. The views expressed are those of the stakeholders and the public and have been included for further consideration / investigation by the NYCC IPT Team. As such they have not undergone detailed analysis as part of the SCTS process.

**Passenger Transport Issue 1**: Absence of a late night transport service connecting Masham with nearby towns such as Bedale, Ripon and Northallerton. It was suggested that similar services had operated in the past and had proved popular amongst young people.

*IPT Comments*: The County Council has a limited amount of resources at its disposal. As with all service teams within the Authority there is a need to balance the provision of services with the need to secure value for money overall.

**Passenger Transport Issue 2**: Buses between Masham and Bedale are not timetabled to connect with the buses between Bedale and Northallerton. Many people wish to travel between Masham and Northallerton in order to attend hospital appointments. However, to make this journey via public transport involves a long wait in Bedale.

*IPT Comments*: The County Council has a limited amount of resources at its disposal. As with all services within the Authority there is a need to balance the provision of services with the need to secure value for money overall.

All the improvement schemes identified and prioritised within Table 3.1 above are all subject to further detailed analysis as part of the future design process. This may necessitate further localised consultation and detailed physical / technical feasibility assessments undertaken by the NYCC Area Highway Teams to establish ultimate deliverability.
4 Monitoring and Evaluation

4.1 Introduction

This chapter details the process to be adopted in order to monitor and evaluate the improvement schemes which will be delivered as part of the SCTS budget.

As stated within the NYCC LTP2, it is important to identify the local outcomes which can be effectively measured following the implementation of the improvement schemes contained within the strategy. This approach enables their contribution, and ultimately the whole strategy’s contribution to the Shared Priorities for Transport to be effectively measured.

4.2 Monitoring Improvement Schemes

In this context, monitoring and evaluation is about objectively monitoring and assessing the impacts of individual improvement schemes recommended within the strategy. This will provide NYCC with valuable information to inform future decision making in the locality and also for improvement schemes throughout the county of similar scale and nature.

As part of the SCTS process, schemes A, B and E will be monitored post-construction to assess their impact on the problems which drove their development and their contribution to the Shared Priorities for Transport. This will be undertaken as part of the LTP process with the level of assessment influenced by the size and scale of the improvement scheme in question. To assist in this process a set of local indicators have been derived to act as a means of measuring the performance of the individual improvement schemes which are implemented.

The local indicators which have been derived to measure the performance of each of the improvement schemes are detailed in Table 4.1 below with definitions provided within the following sections.

Table 4.1: Improvement Scheme Local Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme</th>
<th>Local Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: A package of measures to improve pedestrian safety in Masham Town Centre</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Road safety improvements on the A6108, Leyburn Road, Masham</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: A package of measures in the village of Fearby to improve road safety through the village</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Repair of pot holes along Red Lane, Masham</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Repair of pot holes and re-surfacing along Fearby Road between Fearby and Masham</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Letters A-E represent the scheme identification letters as used within the Public Consultation Postal Questionnaires.
Definitions of each of the Local Indicators are provided below. It is however noted that these should only be treated as a guide and each case will be assessed in detail on a site by site basis by the NYCC Area Highways Manager in order to determine whether the local indicators will clearly demonstrate the contribution the improvement scheme has had towards the Shared Priorities for Transport. In accordance with the NYCC LTP2, monitoring of performance against these Local Indicators and their contribution to the Shared Priorities for Transport will be a key part of the annual review process carried out by the Steering Group once the Strategy is adopted.

**Accident Reduction** – In order to assess the impact a particular improvement scheme has upon the accident numbers at a specific location, historical accident figures supplied by North Yorkshire Police from the ‘Stats 19’ database will be compared to those post implementation from the same source. It is recognised that the implementation of some improvement schemes may only reduce accident numbers over the short term. Accidents will therefore be monitored over a period of years to ensure that short term trends do not give a false representation of the situation.

**Observational Surveys** – The greatest understanding of a situation is often gained through observation. This is particularly true of instances where the problems which an improvement scheme aims to address are those which are not easily measured and tend to be derived from local experience and perception.

**Attitudinal Indicator** – As the SCTS process has been driven by the needs / desires of local stakeholders and the public, an indication of the success of individual improvement schemes can be measured through local attitudes. The methodology to be adopted and appropriateness of this indicator would be determined on a site by site basis by the NYCC Highways Area Manager. Possible methodologies include face-to-face interviews and leaflet / questionnaire drops.

**Increased Pedestrian Use** – Before and after footfall surveys will be used to assess whether the introduction of an improvement scheme has assisted in encouraging pedestrian usage.

**Speed Reduction** – Measurements of traffic speed will be recorded prior to and post implementation to assess the level of impact the improvement scheme has had on overall vehicle speeds. Again, as in the case of the Accident Reduction indicator detailed above, trends will be analysed over an extended period of time to ensure initial benefits do not fall away over time.

### 4.3 Monitoring the Strategy

The implementation of the improvement schemes within the Strategy will be monitored over the next 2 years. This element of the monitoring process will be ‘owned’ by the NYCC Highways Area Manager who is responsible for the design and implementation of the improvement schemes contained within the Strategy. As above, this will be reported through the NYCC Local Transport Plan process. An annual report will be produced by the Area Manager for the Service Centre for consideration by the County Council’s Area Committee. This will report progress on improvement scheme implementation, forthcoming projects and any new projects suggested for inclusion within the Strategy.
In addition the Strategy will be treated as a ‘live’ document which is flexible in nature and able to accommodate changes in local, regional and national policy as well as available funding and third party influences such as developer contributions. Significant changes in these areas may trigger the need to revisit the Strategy and update its findings to accommodate changes.
5 Summary and Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

This final chapter of the document presents the Strategy for the Masham Service Centre. It summarises the prioritised improvement schemes as an Implementation Plan and provides a qualitative commentary on the perceived benefits of the Strategy in the context of the Government’s Shared Priorities for Transport. Finally, it outlines the next stages in the process and how the Strategy will be adopted and then delivered.

5.2 The Strategy

Table 5.1 outlines the prioritised improvement schemes recommended for delivery as part of the Masham SCTS. In order to determine the anticipated benefits of the Strategy as a whole, the anticipated contribution of each of the improvement schemes to the Shared Priorities for Transport, and hence the aspirations within the NYCC LTP2, has also been provided.

Table 5.1: Recommended Implementation Plan (the Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme</th>
<th>Contribution to Shared Priorities and LTP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCTS Budget Improvement Schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: A package of measures to improve pedestrian safety in Masham Town Centre</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Road safety improvements on the A6108, Leyburn Road, Masham</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: A package of measures in the village of Fearby to improve road safety through the village</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Repair of pot holes along Red Lane, Masham</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Repair of pot holes and re-surfacing along Fearby Road between Fearby and Masham</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the schemes identified within the Implementation Plan were presented for consideration by Council Members at the Harrogate Area Committee on the 28th October 2010.

Due to the recent reduction in funding announced by the Government, the original SCTS budget of £200,000 that was allocated from the Integrated Transport Capital Programme for the implementation of the Strategy has had to be reduced. In this financial year £50,000 has been allocated to the Masham SCTS budget and as a result of the damage that occurred to the network during last winter, this will largely be directed towards maintenance schemes.

In light of this reduction in funding, the Executive Members for NYCC Business and Environmental Services reviewed the criteria for the inclusion of schemes in the SCTS Implementation Plans. This review resulted in the introduction of the following ‘revised’ guidelines for the inclusion of schemes within an Implementation Plan.
1) Safety schemes should achieve an assessment score of 15 or more when appraised using the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System.

2) All non-safety schemes should achieve an assessment score of 25 or above when appraised using the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System.

3) Schemes which do not meet criteria 1 or 2 above can still be included in the SCTS Implementation Plan if there is considerable Member support for the scheme to be retained.

As such, Council Members were requested to consider the revised guidelines as part of their recommendations and voted to take forward schemes C and D only.

5.3 Final Implementation Plan

Table 5.2 details the final Implementation Plan following the recommendations / decision of the Harrogate Area Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C: Repair of pot holes along Red Lane, Masham</td>
<td>£14,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Repair of pot holes and re-surfacing along Fearby Road between Fearby and Masham</td>
<td>£102,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The schemes prioritised for delivery within the final Implementation Plan have a total estimated capital cost of £116,000. It is recognised that this exceeds the £50,000 budget. Thus, the decision was made at the Harrogate Area Committee that £14,000 of the budget would be spent on providing all of Scheme C and £36,000 will contribute to providing Scheme D. The remaining £66,000 required to provide Scheme D would need to be funded from alternative sources.

5.4 Next Steps

The next stage in the process will be for the Strategy to be adopted by the NYCC Area Highway Manager for the Masham SCTS study area. Following its adoption the improvement schemes will be taken forward for implementation by the NYCC Highways Area Manager and the success of the Strategy will be monitored against the approach identified within Chapter 4.
Prioritised Improvement Schemes within the study area:

1. Package of improvement measures in Masham Town Centre
2. Road safety improvements on A6108, Leyburn Road, Masham
3. Repair of pot holes along Red Lane, Masham
4. Repair of pot holes and re-surfacing along Fearby Road between Fearby and Masham
5. A package of measures in the village of Fearby to improve road safety through the village

Anticipated Contribution to Shared Priorities:
- Helping to deliver Safer Roads within the Service Centre
- Improving Accessibility within the Service Centre
- Assisting in improving Air Quality within the Service Centre
- Tackling Congestion within the Service Centre
Improvement Scheme A: A package of measures to improve pedestrian safety in Masham Town Centre

Background

The residents of Masham have raised pedestrian safety concerns for those walking to/from the Market Place. There is a concern that the widths of some of the footways on Church Street and Silver Street are not sufficient for the number of pedestrians which use them, forcing some pedestrians to walk on the road. In addition, pedestrians also find it difficult to cross the road between Church Street and the Market Place, due to lack of visibility. In the past five years there have been 2 reported accidents, including 1 serious, in the vicinity of the Market Place.

In addition, the standards of the bus shelters in the Market Place do not meet the criteria set in the Disability Discrimination Act (1995). Thus, they do not sufficiently meet the needs of the disabled, hindering public transport accessibility for some sections of the community.

Options

In order to improve pedestrian accessibility to the Masham Market Place and improve bus passenger waiting facilities for the disabled the following measures have been put forward:

- Widening sections of narrow footway on Church Street and Silver Street
- Provision of an informal crossing point between Church Street and Market
- Provision of raised kerbs and dropped crossing points at the bus shelters in the Market Place

A location plan of the scheme is shown in Figure 1. All improvements would be possible to undertake within the existing boundary. However, in order to widen the footway on the junction of Church Street and Park Square and maintain sufficient carriageway width, the parking bays on Park Square would need to be removed. Due to the status of the town centre as a Conservation Area, all construction materials used would need to sympathetic to their historic surroundings.

Estimated cost: £112,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 27.45
Figure 1: Location of Improvement Scheme A
Improvement Scheme B: Road safety improvements on the A6108, Leyburn Road, Masham

Background

Local residents have raised concerns over the speed and behaviour of drivers on the A6108, Leyburn Road, Masham. This section of road is subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, speed surveys taken in 2008 show drivers that over an average 24 hour period 85% of drivers travel at 49mph or less. Thus, over 15% of drivers travel in excess of 50 mph. One of the main reasons for the excess speed is thought to be that the change in speed limit from 60mph to 30mph is not obvious enough. In the past 5 years there has been 1 reported accident along this section of road.

Options

In order to emphasise the change in speed limit from 60mph to 30mph, the following measures have been put forward:

- Improvement to the gateway features which are present on the southbound carriageway of the A6108, Leyburn Road
- Provision of coloured tarmac surfacing and roundels

This scheme aims to emphasise the change in nature of the A6108 from a road subject to a national speed limit to a local 30mph road.

Currently, on the approach to Masham, there is a stone plaque, welcoming drivers to the village. However, this is not very prominent to drivers and it is considered that additional measures are needed in order to warn drivers that they were entering a built up area and that speeds should be reduced. It is proposed to enhance the stone plaque by installing a yellow backed village name plate, a 30mph speed limit sign and a road safety message. Although concerns were raised over the aesthetics of such a sign by local stakeholders, it was agreed that this would be the most efficient way of reducing speeds into the town. The signs would also be accompanied by contrasting tarmac surfacing and on road 30mph roundels. See Figure 2 for details.

Estimated cost: £10,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 8.10
Figure 2: Location of Improvement Scheme B

Key
- Existing gateway
- Reflective 30mph speed limit signs
- 30mph roundel

Leyburn Road (A6108)
Fearby Road
Masham
Improvement Scheme E: Provision of a package of measures in the village of Fearby to improve road safety through the village

Background

Residents of Fearby have raised concerns over excessive vehicle speeds through the village, especially from motorbikes. Although there are no recorded accidents in the village, records show average speeds to be above the 30mph limit through the village (39.5mph in both directions). One of the main reasons for the excess speed is thought to be that the change in speed limit from 60mph to 30mph is not obvious enough.

Options

In order to emphasise the change in speed limit from 60mph to 30mph, the following measures have been put forward:

- Provision of a yellow-backed village name plate and speed limit sign at the village gateway to the east of the village
- Provision of 30mph repeater roundels, contrasting coloured tarmac and a new village name plate at the village gateway to the west of the village

See Figure 3 for details.

Estimated cost: £13,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 3.72

Figure 3: Location of Improvement Scheme E