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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction
This is the Executive Summary of the Progress Report on North Yorkshire’s second Local Transport Plan (LTP2) which the County Council is required to submit to Government during 2008.

A full version of LTP2 and the Progress Report is available on the County Council’s web site at www.northyorks.gov.uk .

The Progress Report gives details of the implementation of LTP2 since it was adopted in April 2006, how this has contributed to achieving the LTP Targets and Objectives, proposals for improving delivery for the remainder of LTP2 to 2011 and looks to future transport related issues that need to be considered.

Implementation of North Yorkshire’s second Local Transport Plan started in April 2006. The Plan set out how local transport can contribute towards achieving the County Council’s corporate vision of

‘A County which provides opportunity, independence and security for all’

by adopting seven key transport objectives which the Plan seeks to improve. The LTP2 Objectives are:

Accessibility
Safety
Environment
Congestion
Quality of Life
Economy
Efficiency
The County Council identifies the transport improvements required in a number of ways but the main method is through the Service Centre Transportation Strategies. This is where we consider all the transport related needs and issues in a settlement and its surrounding area and prepare a package of schemes to address these issues in consultation with local people.

Other ways we identify improvements include:

- A road safety strategy which seeks to reduce road casualties through initiatives developed on the basis of analysis of road accident data
- An accessibility strategy which seeks to improve access to services through improved transport and local delivery of services
- A congestion and air quality strategy which seeks to reduce traffic congestion and associated air quality problems at specific hot spots in the County.
- Public transport strategies, which identify how public transport can improve accessibility and reduce congestion.

In order to ensure that we achieve the maximum contribution towards our objectives with the limited funding available for transport improvements, we have developed and adopted a rigorous scheme prioritisation system. All improvement schemes are rated on the basis of their overall contribution to all seven of the LTP2 Objectives and only the highest scoring schemes are implemented.

The LTP also identifies the importance of maintaining the network of roads, footways and cycle tracks that make up the highway network of North Yorkshire. As with improvement schemes the County Council has developed a prioritisation system to ensure that the limited funding available for highway maintenance is spent on improving the overall condition of the highway.
network based on an assessment of current conditions ands relative importance of routes.

**Progress to Date**
In the first 2 years of LTP2, the County Council has completed Service Centre Transportation Strategies for Stokesley, Helmsley, Thirsk, Ripon, Boroughbridge, Selby, Glusburn, Settle and Hawes.

We have also completed 38 safety related schemes, 54 accessibility schemes, 13 congestion schemes and over 952 km of footway and carriageway maintenance schemes.

Typical examples of schemes include:
- Boroughbridge Road puffin crossing improving pedestrian links to Northallerton railway station.
- A major contribution to the Craven Hub scheme, which provides minibuses and infrastructure to significantly improve and expand community transport in the Craven district.
- A new rural footway / cycle track which allows people to safely cycle between Pickering and Thornton-le-Dale.
- Traffic calming near the schools on Darlington Road, Richmond to improve road safety and pedestrian access to the schools.
- Improved traffic signal control in Harrogate to reduce congestion and help buses run on time.
- Improved bus stops, shelters and services on the Easingwold to York route to encourage more people to use the bus rather than drive.

Together these schemes have helped us: save 250 road accident casualties, including saving 20 lives; improve accessibility opportunities for over 600,000 people; and increased bus use by 14% overall and by over 27% on the most important routes.

We are also very close to completing two major improvement schemes, a bypass of the village of Reighton near Filey and the Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme (SITS). This scheme consists of a major diversion of the A165 south of Scarborough, the provision of two new Park and Ride sites, associated bus priority measures on roads into the town centre and providing Park and Ride bus services to Scarborough town centre and seafront.
**Improving Delivery**

Although we are recognised by the Government as a Centre of Excellence for LTP delivery we cannot rest on our laurels. In preparing this Progress Report we have therefore carried out a number of investigations to identify how we can improve our performance further. These include an assessment of our performance against LTP targets, a formal review of our Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT analysis) and engagement with stakeholder groups to help determine whether our LTP objectives remain relevant and how well we are delivering. From these investigations we have developed an Improvement Action Plan (Table 4.8 in the Progress Report) which we are already implementing.

We have also assessed our performance against our 19 key performance indicators, the status of which, are currently as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>On Track</th>
<th>Not On Track</th>
<th>Further Analysis Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2 Patronage on Quality Commercial Bus Routes</td>
<td>NI 168 (BVPI 223) Principal Condition: % Where structural maintenance should be considered.</td>
<td>NI 47 (BVPI 99a LAA PI) Number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents</td>
<td>NI 178 (LTP5) Bus Punctuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 Patronage on Quality Contract Bus Routes</td>
<td>NI 169 (BVPI 224a) Non Principal Condition</td>
<td>NI 48 (BVPI 99b) Number of children killed or seriously injure in road traffic accidents</td>
<td>L5 Percentage increase in cycling journeys to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4 Public Satisfaction with public transport information</td>
<td>BVPI 224b Unclassified Road Condition</td>
<td>L1 Number of Fatal Casualties in York and North Yorkshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 99c Number of people slightly injured in road traffic accidents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 177 (BVPI 102) Public Transport Patronage</td>
<td>BV 104 Satisfaction with local bus services</td>
<td>BVPI 187 Footway Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 175 (LTP1 LAA PI) Number of Community Transport journeys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP3 Number of cycling trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP 4 Modal share of journeys to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current indications are that actions we have taken to improve performance have resulted in the three road safety targets now being back on track.

**New and Changing Issues**

Since LTP2 came into effect in April 2006 there have been a number of significant changes in circumstances and government policy that impact on transport. Some of the main issues are highlighted below.

A new North Yorkshire Local Area Agreement (LAA2) between government and local delivery organisations including the County Council includes road safety and access to services as high transport priorities. LTP2 shares these high priorities and is the main means of delivering them.

The Yorkshire and Humber Plan was approved earlier this year. This highlights the importance of the Leeds City Region as one of the main economic drivers of the region. Craven, Harrogate and Selby Districts lie within the Leeds City Region and transport links are a key issue in improving the economy of it. Although the Tees Valley City Region does not actually extend into North Yorkshire it is recognised in the Tees Valley City Region’s Business Plan that its ‘sphere of influence’ extends into North Yorkshire. We have therefore reiterated and demonstrated our commitment to work in partnership with other authorities in both of the City Regions to ensure that transport improvements help to sustain economic growth.

Since LTP2 was introduced the District Councils and National Parks have further developed their Local Development Frameworks. These are the planning documents that set out where future developments such as housing and industrial estates will be allowed. Clearly it is vital that new developments are adequately served by transport and we have therefore continued to work very closely with these planning authorities to ensure the LDF’s and LTP are integrated.

The County Council has also recently successfully achieved regional endorsement for the A684 Bedale, Aiskew, Leeming Bar Bypass. This is the first step towards delivering a new bypass which links into the Highways Agency’s scheme to upgrade the A1 from Dishforth to Barton to motorway standard, before the end of 2014.

**Conclusion**

During its first two years our LTP2 has made good progress and continued to deliver schemes and programmes which tackle all of the Government’s shared priorities, but in particular, road safety and accessibility problems, which are of the greatest significance to people living in North Yorkshire.
However, we know that in order to fully deliver on our commitments from LTP2, we must continue to re-evaluate and assess our performance to ensure that we meet all 19 of our targets and indicators.

Our stakeholder engagement and SWOT analysis has shown that we need to introduce:

- A revised SCTS process
- Actions to ensure road safety targets are achieved
- Effective resource management
- An improved performance management framework
- Enhanced LTP information and understanding across the HNY Partnership
PART 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background

1.0.1 This document is the statutory mid term Local Transport Plan (LTP) Progress Report for North Yorkshire, required to be submitted to Government during 2008. It includes a summary of progress made on delivering the second Local Transport Plan (LTP2) since April 2006, details of improvements to be made to enhance delivery of the LTP2 and updates on new and changing issues that have arisen since 2006.

1.0.1 A full version of the second Local Transport Plan, the LTP2 Annexes, and a non statutory 2007 Progress Report are available to view or download on the County Council’s website at www.northyorks.gov.uk

1.1 Layout of this Report

1.1.1 This report is produced in accordance with the guidance published by the Department for Transport (DfT) in December 2007 and is intended to inform both the Government and the transport users in North Yorkshire.

1.1.2 The full Progress Report consists of two documents. The first document forms the Progress Report itself and is, in general, of a non technical nature, providing concise details of the actions of the County Council and its partners. The second document consists of technical appendices to the Progress Report and is primarily intended to provide more detailed information to Government.

1.1.3 The Progress Report is sub-divided into 5 parts as set out below:

Part 1 – Introduction

Part 2 – Content of LTP2 – This provides a summary of the Vision, Aims and Objectives of LTP2 together with brief details of the policies and actions to deliver improved transport across North Yorkshire.

Part 3 – Progress to Date – This section describes the progress made since the start of LTP2 to date and provides examples of schemes and initiatives that have been delivered by the County Council and its partners and the outcomes of these initiatives.

Part 4 – Improving Delivery – This section includes an analysis of our performance to date and gives details of actions which will be taken to ensure improved delivery of the LTP2 and local transport until the end of LTP2 thus improving local transport to 2011 and beyond.

Part 5 – New and Changing Issues – Since the LTP was produced in 2006 a significant number of new transport related issues have arisen and some of the issues incorporated into LTP2 have changed. This section updates the LTP2 Strategy, Policies and Plans to take into account these changes.
1.2 Achievements

1.2.1 During the first two years of LTP2 (April 2006 to March 2008) the County Council and its partners, through the LTP have undertaken:

- 9 Service Centre Transportation Strategies
- 9 congestion strategies
- 92 fatal accident site investigations
- 6 route safety studies
- 1600 bridge inspections
- 73,000km of carriageway inspection
- 12,000km of carriageway inspection

These processes have identified transport issues and solutions which have resulted in the delivery of:

- 38 schemes primarily focussed at addressing safety issues
- 54 schemes primarily focussed at addressing accessibility issues
- 13 schemes primarily focussed at reducing congestion
- 87 bridge maintenance schemes

A combination of safety and inspection condition surveys has resulted in:
- 763km of carriageway maintenance schemes
- 189km of footway schemes.

These schemes have contributed towards:
- saving approximately 20 lives
- saving approximately 240 other road accident casualties
- improving pedestrian facilities for over 300,000 people
- improving cycling facilities for over 58,000 people
- improving the availability of community transport with over 750,000 passengers travelling
- increasing community transport use by 20%
- increasing bus use by 14% overall and by over 27% on the most important routes
- increased satisfaction with bus service information to almost 80%

1.2.2 This report will demonstrate how we have achieved this, give examples of typical schemes and initiatives and show how we intend to improve our performance for the final three years of LTP2 and beyond.

---

1 This is the population of the areas that have benefited from improved facilities
2.1 Background

2.1.1 The second North Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (LTP2), which covers the period April 2006 to March 2011, was produced by the County Council and submitted to Government in March 2006. This plan is the main transport strategy and policy document for the County and sets out how the County Council and its partners intend to improve local transport.

2.1.2 In the autumn of 2006 the Government rated the County Council’s delivery of its first Local Transport Plan (LTP1) and the quality of planning in LTP2. The Council were rated as ‘Excellent’ in both LTP1 delivery and LTP2 and as such were awarded a 25% uplift in funding for transport improvements (integrated transport block allocation) which is approximately £6m extra to invest in transport in North Yorkshire by 2011.

2.1.3 This section of the Progress Report summarises some of the key commitments, strategies, policies and actions included in LTP2. It is not intended to be comprehensive rather it illustrates how the implementation of LTP2 will contribute to achieving the County Council’s corporate vision for the County:

‘A County which provides opportunity, independence and security for all.’

Further details are available in the full Local Transport Plan and supporting Annexes.

2.1.4 In order to deliver the LTP the County Council draws upon a number of finance sources. These include County Council revenue budgets of around £24m per year for routine maintenance works and around £5m per year supporting necessary local bus services. Much of the finance for the delivery of the Local Transport Plan is provided to the County Council through a Capital Allocation. Details of the LTP2 Capital Allocation (inclusive of the 25% integrated transport uplift) and the transport revenue budgets are shown in Tables 2.1 and 2.2 below.
Figure 2.3 illustrate that over 65% of local transport spending in the county comes directly from the County Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Integrated Transport</th>
<th>Road Safety Grant (Capital)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 / 2007</td>
<td>£21.627m</td>
<td>£7.317m</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 / 2008</td>
<td>£17.218m</td>
<td>£9.025m</td>
<td>£0.452m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 / 2009</td>
<td>£19.942m</td>
<td>£8.792m</td>
<td>£0.442m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 / 2010</td>
<td>£21.442m</td>
<td>£8.650m</td>
<td>£0.435m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 / 2011</td>
<td>£23.211m</td>
<td>£8.471m</td>
<td>£0.429m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£103.440m</td>
<td>£42.255m</td>
<td>£1.758m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 – LTP2 Capital Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Road Safety Grant (Revenue)</th>
<th>Bus Services</th>
<th>Home to School Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 / 2007</td>
<td>£22.657m</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£5.16m</td>
<td>£19.69m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 / 2008</td>
<td>£24.079m</td>
<td>£2.033m</td>
<td>£5.64m</td>
<td>£20.43m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 / 2009</td>
<td>£24.126m</td>
<td>£1.986m</td>
<td>£5.72m</td>
<td>£22.00m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 / 2010</td>
<td>£24m*</td>
<td>£1.957m</td>
<td>£5.70m*</td>
<td>£22.83m*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 / 2011</td>
<td>£24m*</td>
<td>£1.926m</td>
<td>£5.70m*</td>
<td>£23.69m*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£118.862m*</td>
<td>£7.902m</td>
<td>£27.92m*</td>
<td>£108.64m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated figures for 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 as budgets are yet to be confirmed.

Table 2.2 – County Council Transport Revenue Budgets

Figure 2.3 - Funding sources for Highways and Transportation (2006-2011)
2.2 LTP2 Vision, Aims and Objectives

2.2.1 In line with national transport policy, LTP2 follows the philosophy that transport is primarily a means of people accessing the services they require and that most of these services can be provided in local communities. LTP2 therefore adopted the Vision, Aims and Objectives shown below. Objectives 1 to 4 also reflect Government and Local Government shared priorities for transport and as such are of both national and local importance.

2.2.2 During the preparation of LTP2 the public and other stakeholders were widely consulted. Based on these consultations the County Council’s decision is that whilst all seven LTP Objectives were seen as important, Objective 1 – Accessibility and Objective 2 – Road Safety were higher priorities for North Yorkshire as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP2 Vision, Aims and Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better access and sustainable communities for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aims</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make North Yorkshire a better place by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing equality of opportunity for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protecting and enhancing the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving the safety and health of residents and visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing economic prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building sustainable communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the need and demand for travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1 (Accessibility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2 (Safety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3 (Environment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4 (Congestion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5 (Quality of Life)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6 (Economy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7 (Efficiency)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.3 In addition to the Vision, Aims and Objectives LTP2 also set out the strategies which the County Council and its partners adopted in order to deliver improved transport across the County. A summary of the process adopted for the implementation of improvement schemes and initiatives is shown in Figure 2.4 below.

Figure 2.4– LTP2 Approach to Integrated Transport schemes and initiatives
2.3 Contribution to Wider Objectives

2.3.1 As previously stated, transport is generally a means to an end rather than the end product in itself. The LTP therefore includes commitments to ensure that transport improvements and network maintenance not only fulfil the 7 LTP objectives but also contribute towards wider planning, environmental, economic and health objectives. These include links to tourism strategies, regional and local economic strategies and crime and disorder strategies. Some more detailed examples of these commitments to contributing towards the wider policy objectives are given below.

2.3.2 North Yorkshire has two tiers of local government with the County Council being the transport authority and the seven District Councils (and two National Park Authorities) being the land use planning authorities. The County Council are the planning authority for minerals and waste disposal. In order to ensure a coherent approach to transport and land use planning the County Council works very closely with the planning authorities. This is both at a strategic level when considering land allocations for new housing and employment developments and at a more local level in considering specific planning applications. In both cases the aim is to ensure that the local and strategic transport services, networks and infrastructure are sustainable and sufficient to meet the requirements of residents and other transport users now and in the future.

2.3.3 Transport is a major source of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gasses. Whilst most of the schemes and initiatives undertaken through the LTP are not directly aimed at cutting the carbon footprint of transport in the County many of them do so indirectly. For example encouraging the use of public transport as opposed to private cars is primarily aimed at cutting congestion and its direct impacts. However, mass transport, such as buses and trains, is more carbon efficient than using numerous private cars. Re-use and recycling of construction materials and energy efficient street lighting also reduce the carbon footprint of transport in the County.
2.3.4 With growing levels of obesity in children and an ageing demographic profile, health related issues are becoming more important in the County. The County Council therefore continues to support directly some transport based health schemes such as the voluntary health walks. However, of much greater significance and long term impact is the encouragement of ‘active travel’. Walking and cycling are both good forms of exercise and if done as part of an every day journey become part of every day life rather than an activity in themselves. An early introduction for children to walking and cycling accompanied by parents or other adults can also benefit road safety. By instilling a better understanding of crossing the road or on-road cycling at an early age the risk to the child as they get older and become more independent can be reduced. The health benefits of initiatives to promote active travel are therefore manifest. Through the LTP this is encouraged both by provision of infrastructure (footways, crossings, cycle tracks) and softer measures (school travel awareness, cycle training). Active travel is linked across the County with for example its inclusion in action plans in the County Council’s older persons’ strategy ‘Our Future Lives'. This strategy can be found on the North Yorkshire County Council website.

2.3.5 Working in partnership with local voluntary services in Selby and Richmondshire we are part-funding pilot projects developing the growing and delivery of fresh vegetables to disadvantaged members for the community. The delivery of the boxes uses spare capacity on local community transport services, whilst the actual growing of the vegetables provides employment and training for local people. This contributes to wider objectives such as improving health (healthier eating and exercise related to working in the gardens) and reducing the carbon footprint (sourcing local produce) and improving the local economy.

2.4 Integrated Transport Scheme Prioritisation

2.4.1 The DfT Integrated Transport funding is provided specifically to make progress against the LTP2 objectives. We have therefore developed a prioritisation system to ensure that each pound spent on transport improvements makes the largest possible contribution to achieving our aims, objectives and targets. The prioritisation system is a bespoke NYCC designed system to assess the contribution of all Integrated Transport schemes and initiatives to all seven LTP objectives and in particular accessibility and safety (see section 2.2.2.) The system takes into account negative effects (disbenefits) on objectives as well as positive effects (benefits). In this system, weightings are applied to the LTP2 objectives considered to be of greatest importance, namely
accessibility and safety. A formula is used to calculate a comparative score (compared to all the other schemes assessed) for all schemes and initiatives and then schemes are prioritised in order to develop a programme for delivery. Table 2.5 below shows the main factors taken into account in determining a scheme’s relative priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Prioritisation Criteria</th>
<th>Main Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>An assessment of the contribution the scheme makes to improved access to education, employment, health and food. Takes into account an estimate of the number of people benefiting and the scale of the problem addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>An assessment of the number of personal injury road accidents in the last 5 years and ranked by severity/child accidents/deprivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>An assessment of the impact of the scheme on noise, air quality, landscape, biodiversity and heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>An assessment of improved flow of traffic, hindrance to flow of traffic (negative effect) or promotion of non car modes to reduce traffic volumes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>Added Value</td>
<td>An assessment of the impact of the scheme on the local economy, transport efficiency, life quality and an added value score for other benefits of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>The whole life costs of the scheme, which includes the cost of construction and any future maintenance liability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5 – Scheme Prioritisation Criteria

2.4.2 An important feature of the prioritisation system is the ability to adjust the weightings given to each of the criteria shown above. Through analysis of our performance against the LTP Indicators (see Part 4) we will be able to identify if we are failing to meet any targets. Feedback of this information into the prioritisation weightings will allow us to get back on track by increasing the score of schemes contributing towards that target or amending the target if appropriate.

2.5 Highway and Bridge Maintenance Scheme Identification and Prioritisation

2.5.1 The highway network (roads, bridges, footways, cycle tracks, bus shelters, public rights of way etc) is the transport network for most travel in the County. The highway network allows trips by car, bus, commercial vehicles, community transport, cycles and pedestrians. Even for other forms of transport (e.g. rail and air) the journey to the station or airport
The need for maintenance on a particular stretch of carriageway or footway is identified using a variety of routine inspections and condition surveys. The County Council's annual network condition surveys are now well established and cover all classified (A, B and C) roads every 2 years, all unclassified roads every 4 years and all of the heavily used footways every 2 years. In order to monitor skid resistance and contribute to the various road safety initiatives the Council introduced testing to identify the skid resistance of the road surface four years ago and monitors some 4,000 lane km per year. The data collected during annual network condition surveys is analysed and the results assist in identifying locations for more detailed assessment.

The outcome of the analysis process provides objectively ranked locations for maintenance works. The treatment of these sites achieves one of the two objectives set for highway maintenance in the initial 10 year plan, which are either to halt the rate of deterioration on the network or to reduce the maintenance backlog (see section 3.1.24.) During the latter stages of LTP 1 the Council developed a theoretical network model which utilised ‘whole maintenance treatment programme’ costs to assist in budget allocation and the testing of various maintenance strategies. For example, the cost of reducing the maintenance backlog for the highest category footways by 1% can now be calculated and is currently approximately £150,000, whilst the cost of reducing the maintenance backlog on principal (A) Roads by 1% is approx £4,000,000. As a consequence of investment in both undertaking the condition surveys and improving its data analysis / performance monitoring of maintenance treatments, the County Council is shifting the emphasis from backlog reduction to a more proactive / preventative maintenance strategy to address the more pressing issue of network deterioration.

To ensure that the funding available for major and minor structural maintenance and strengthening schemes is effectively targeted, a prioritisation system has been developed. Proposed works on bridges
and other structures are assessed and prioritised against a fixed revenue budget. The criteria used in the prioritisation process are:

- traffic sensitivity of the route
- health and safety aspects
- maintenance requirements of the structure.

### 2.6 Performance Monitoring

2.6.1 In order to ensure that the money invested in local transport through LTP2 contributes to its aims and objectives, the County Council selected 19 headline LTP2 indicators. Fourteen of these are mandatory indicators in that the Government require them to be included in Local Transport Plans. The other five are local indicators and were selected by the County Council to monitor progress toward local priorities. For each of the indicators selected the County Council has set a target level to be reached by the end of the implementation of LTP2 and a trajectory to determine progress during the plan. Table 4.4 in section 4.2 shows the indicators selected with full details being included in Annex I of the Local Transport Plan. Progress against each of these indicators is, wherever possible, monitored on a quarterly basis to ensure that early action can be taken to remedy any issues arising. Monitoring of the progress against LTP targets is an integral part of the County Council’s Performance Management Framework (see figure 4.1). Quarterly performance reports are produced containing performance information tailored to the needs of people at various levels throughout the organisation culminating in a report to the County Council’s Executive.

2.6.2 In addition to the quantitative monitoring of the headline targets described above the County Council also monitors progress on over 50 specific commitments or actions from LTP2. This includes for example; the commitment to produce 28 SCTS’s before the end of the plan, progress on delivery of the ‘95 Alive’ action plan and the production of congestion action plans for each of the identified hot spots. As with the targets and indicators this qualitative monitoring of progress against commitments is carried out each quarter.
3.0 BACKGROUND

3.0.1 We are now almost half way through the plan period of LTP2. The identification of schemes and initiatives that will contribute towards delivering the LTP Aims and Objectives is well underway. We are also now in the third year of the actual delivery of LTP schemes. The following sections will give details of the progress made on identifying transport issues and actions through the Service Centre Transportation Strategies, Road Safety Strategy, Congestion Studies and other means. It will also include examples of specific schemes and initiatives that have already been delivered or are underway and how these contribute to the LTP2 and wider objectives. Following on from this, section 4.2 will also include an update on how we are performing on the 19 LTP2 targets and indicators and on delivery of the wider LTP2 commitments.

3.0.2 An important difference between improvements delivered through LTP2 compared to LTP1, is that many more schemes and initiatives are multi-functional. That is, they contribute towards more than one LTP2 objective (e.g. safety and accessibility). This is illustrated in figure 3.1 below. (This diagram represents the numbers of schemes delivered and is not an indication of the relative importance of each of the shared priorities.)

Figure 3.1 – Contribution of Integrated Transport schemes to the shared priorities

3.0.3 This change to multi-purpose schemes is intentional and was brought about by the adoption of the new objective based scheme prioritisation system (see section 2.4) and is intended to ensure best value for money. Whilst this does not necessarily mean that there are no longer any single-function schemes (e.g. schemes solely aimed at addressing a problem at a high risk accident location) the proportion of these has reduced and / or the type of scheme developed to address the problem...
has changed to consider possible contributions to other LTP2 objectives. As more new schemes are it is envisaged that there will be continued growth in the proportion of multi-functional schemes. It is also intended that, wherever possible, improvement schemes (providing new infrastructure) will be progressively combined with maintenance schemes (maintaining existing infrastructure) at the same location. This will again ensure best value for money and minimise disruption to highway users from road works.

3.0.4 Table 3.2 below gives an overview of the numbers and types of schemes and initiatives carried out during the first two years of LTP2 along with an estimate of the amount invested in these schemes and the benefits they have brought to residents and visitors to North Yorkshire. This is not a comprehensive list and is intended only to provide an indication of the scale of the initiatives. As it is not possible in a summary report such as this to provide details of every scheme and initiative delivered since 2006, some typical examples are included in this section with a more complete list included in Appendix 5.

**Freight Quality Partnerships**

The movement of freight is essential to the economic success of both the County and Country as a whole. However in specific instances freight transport can cause issues, such as noise or disturbance. In order to address these issues the County Council has introduced a range of Freight Quality Partnerships (FQP). FQP’s are partnerships made up of a wide range of key stakeholders who work to develop mutually acceptable solutions to the specific issues. The FQP’s currently in operation include:

- **Settle Area FQP**: looking at ways of reducing the impact of quarry vehicles travelling through Settle and the surrounding area.
- **North Yorkshire Timber FQP**: working alongside the timber industry to develop best practice and common ways of working across the County.
- **Sutton Bank FQP**: developing solutions to reduce the number of HCV related blockages on Sutton Bank.

The council as part of its role as Centre of Excellence for local transport delivery will be holding a Timber Transport Seminar in Autumn 2008 to promote the work of this FQP and the role of timber transport in the County to a wider audience, including other Local Authorities, in order to share best practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Priority</th>
<th>Scheme / Initiative Type</th>
<th>Approx Spend</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>£400K</td>
<td>5 corridor improvements serving communities with a total population of 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Made almost 400 improvements to bus stops and shelters across the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting Public Transport</td>
<td>£18m</td>
<td>Support 3.3 million bus journeys (20% of all passenger journeys) on non-commercially viable, but socially essential services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Transport</td>
<td>£0.35m</td>
<td>Assisted in purchasing 11 new vehicles for community transport operators across the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle Facilities</td>
<td>£1.2m</td>
<td>Made almost 400 improvements to bus stops and shelters across the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>£1.4m</td>
<td>Lead partner in developing the Craven Hubs Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 rural cycle routes serving areas with a population of over 27,500.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 main urban cycle routes serving communities with a population of over 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 rural footways serving communities with a total population of 72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 urban accessibility improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing facilities serving communities with a population of 96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£21.35m</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>£1.5m</td>
<td>Education courses for mature drivers, lone drivers and winter driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 1,000 school visits to promote road safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Targeted education for high risk groups such as motorcyclists and young male drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>£0.5m</td>
<td>Working as part of the ‘95 Alive’ partnership, partner on several high profile enforcement campaigns including the successful 2007 Christmas Drink Driving Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting North Yorkshire Police on high profile enforcement operations such as operations Helical and Anvil targeting motorists and motorcyclists on high risk routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>£2m</td>
<td>23 highway improvements addressing road safety issues at locations with 200 accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 traffic calming schemes aimed at reducing accidents at locations with over 100 accidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£4m</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion &amp; Environment</td>
<td>Pedestrians and Cyclists</td>
<td>£120K</td>
<td>2 new major combined footway and cycle schemes in Whitby and Scarborough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Transport (including P&amp;R*)</td>
<td>£750K</td>
<td>3 major schemes to improve bus services and facilities within urban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Signals / UTC</td>
<td>£250K</td>
<td>Contribution to increasing platform sizes on the York –Harrogate-Leeds railway line to enable stations to accommodate longer trains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£1.2m</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 Problem and Solution Identification

3.1.1 This section describes the main means by which we identify local transport related issues and potential solutions. It includes details of progress made on scheme identification and opportunities and/or problems encountered during the first two years of LTP2.

3.1.2 Service Centre Transportation Strategies – Service Centre Transportation Strategies (SCTS’s) adopt the principle that a local town provides many of the vital services for both its residents and the residents of a surrounding rural hinterland. The SCTS therefore considers transport and access issues in the main town and the surrounding area.

3.1.3 A key element of the SCTS is that through data analysis, local knowledge and engagement with the local community the strategy will

*SCTS’s and the Regional Settlement Study*

In 2004 the County Council carried out the ‘Regional Settlement Study’ on behalf of the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Assembly. The purpose of the study was to identify which towns provide an important focal point for services, facilities and employment in the region and to produce a hierarchy for inclusion in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and Local Development Frameworks.

The settlements selected as the main service centre for each of the SCTS’s are based on the hierarchy from the Regional Settlement Study and are all classified in the RSS as sub regional towns, principal towns or local service centres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Initiative Type</th>
<th>Approx Spend</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Roads</td>
<td>£3m</td>
<td>Over 50 capital maintenance schemes aimed at improving the standard of the principal road network across the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Non Principal Roads</td>
<td>£3m</td>
<td>Over 50 capital maintenance schemes aimed at improving the standard of the classified non principal road network across the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-classified Non Principal Roads</td>
<td>£1.8m</td>
<td>Nearly 60 capital maintenance schemes improving the unclassified road network across the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footways</td>
<td>£3.3m</td>
<td>Almost 150 capital maintenance schemes improving both urban and rural footways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Projects</td>
<td>£1.8m</td>
<td>A wide range of schemes dealing with site specific issues such as landslip prevention, flooding prevention and cobble maintenance / upgrade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Treatments and Drainage</td>
<td>£16.6m</td>
<td>Wide range of patching, surface treatments and drainage repairs across the highway and footway network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Maintenance</td>
<td>£10.5m</td>
<td>Over 7000 trips completed by gritters across the county, gritting over 3800km of highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£40m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding SITS (see section 3.9.3)

Table 3.2 – LTP2 Outputs April 2006 to March 2008.
identify local transport related issues and appropriate local solutions. This process is intended to consider all of the transport issues in the area across the whole range of the Shared Priorities and other LTP2 objectives. The strategies include revenue funded initiatives (such as improved public transport services) as well as schemes for implementation from capital budgets.

3.1.4 Whilst it is likely that some of the schemes and initiatives identified may not be deliverable during the current LTP period it is important that they are included in the strategy to identify longer term needs and aspirations. However, in order to ensure public support for the process, a guaranteed minimum expenditure on initiatives arising from each SCTS has been set for up to two years after adoption. This is based on the size and population of the area and enables the early implementation of a number of smaller scale schemes and initiatives which, whilst they contribute towards LTP2 objectives, may not normally have been prioritised for a number of years.

3.1.5 Over the period of LTP2 the County Council intends to produce 28 SCTS’s (see Figure 3.3 below) which will ultimately cover the entire geographical area of North Yorkshire. Full details of the Service Centre Transportation Strategy approach are included in Chapter 4 of LTP2.

Figure 3.3 - Service Centre Transportation Strategies
As shown in Figure 3.4 above to date we have completed 9 SCTS’s and have commenced 6 others which will be completed during 2008/09. We have also adopted an accelerated programme and revised methodology for completing SCTS’s (see section 3.1.7). This will allow us to deliver the remaining 13 SCTS’s before 2011.
Figure 3.5 above shows the locations and approximate geographical extent of the strategies already completed or underway. This clearly shows how, once all the SCTS’s are complete the whole of the County will be covered by a series of interlocking local transport strategies.

3.1.7 Examples of schemes identified through Service Centre Transportation Strategies include:

- Upgrading a public footpath by widening and providing an improved surface between Eastburn and Sutton-in-Craven which reduces the walking distance between these communities by almost 1 km and improves general accessibility especially to the nearby Airedale General Hospital (South Craven SCTS).

- Introduction of traffic signals with a pedestrian phase at the Station Road/ Main Street junction in Crosshills to improve pedestrian safety and improve the operation of the junction. This is on a main walking route to the South Craven secondary school (South Craven SCTS).

- Speed reduction measures to improve safety at the Pool Lane /A59 and Station Road / Cattal Street / A59 junctions near Green Hammerton (Boroughbridge SCTS).

- A roundabout at the junction of the A172 and B1292 at Tree Bridge Farm where there have been 9 injury accidents (including 1 fatality) in the past 5 years (Stokesley and Great Ayton SCTS).

- A shared use off road cycle / walking route between Malham in the Yorkshire Dales and Kirkby in Malhamdale primary school (Settle SCTS).

3.1.8 SCTS’s are the cornerstone of scheme identification and they are a vital part of the successful delivery of LTP2. It is therefore important that they are effective and efficient in both their process and outputs. We have carried out a comprehensive mid term review of the SCTS’s which has shown that whilst, in principle, the SCTS process is generally welcomed and supported by the public and stakeholders there have been a number of concerns expressed about how the process is carried out. These include concerns from stakeholders that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments on Service Centre Transportation Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Appears to encompass all issues, well thought out” Boroughbridge Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Provides a comprehensive approach to transport issues” Selby DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Local involvement at a local level gets to the specific problems that concern local people” Ryedale &amp; North East Yorkshire Rural Transport Action Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Involves local people who can articulate local issues” Cllr Gillian Ivey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Only if it is implemented and meets the needs of the issues parishes consulted and takes account of their concerns” Kelfield Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the strategies concentrate too much on delivering the LTP Objectives (Shared Priorities) and do not deliver local aspirations. The converse view has also been expressed in that the strategies are seen by some as not being strategic enough and only concentrating on a local wish list of small unconnected schemes. (Further details of this review and planned improvements are included in Part 4 –of this report.) In addition, the first strategies took too long to develop, in the main due to the level of stakeholder engagement. Preparation of the SCTS’s is however an ongoing learning process. Problems encountered and lessons learned from each strategy and from the mid term review are taken forward into future strategies to ensure continuous improvement and have resulted in the adoption of a more streamlined and focussed process. Consequently, we have seen a marked change between the delivery of our pilot SCTS in Stokesley and one of the most recent, in Selby.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stokesley</th>
<th>Selby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 months from first workshop to adoption</td>
<td>13 months from first workshop to adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops were a general discussion</td>
<td>Workshops more focussed on issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to survey was 5%</td>
<td>Response to survey was 17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.6 – From Stokesley to Selby

3.1.9 **Passenger Transport** - Increased availability and use of passenger transport (e.g. buses, trains and community transport) can make a significant contribution to improving accessibility and through modal shift from cars reduce congestion and pollution. LTP2 therefore included strategies and measures to improve bus, rail and community transport.

3.1.10 Although the County Council doesn’t have direct responsibility for rail services or rail infrastructure, the rail network is an important element of passenger transport provision in the County. This is particularly so, to address transport needs of commuters and mitigate the impact of congestion. The cross boundary action plan sets out our aspirations for passenger rail, and by working through local partnerships, interventions are identified and delivered.

3.1.11 The Council’s Bus and Bus Information Strategies form Annexes E and F of LTP2. The Bus Strategy includes three ranked priorities, which are used to direct programmes of work and investment priorities and are as follows:

- **Priority 1** - Local services in major towns and key inter-urban links
- **Priority 2** - Local services in market towns and those services not included in priority 1 where the daytime frequency is at least hourly.
- **Priority 3** - Other services where the frequency is at least 2 hourly.
3.1.12 In many cases the best means of ensuring rural and urban accessibility, remains conventional bus based public transport. The Bus Strategy recognises this and working closely with operators, improvements to infrastructure, information, buses and services are identified. This is done primarily through an Area Review Process that involves a review of all bus services in a district area including an assessment of the access needs of communities in the area. We then evaluate how well the commercial network meets the identified needs and, where appropriate and affordable, specify contracts for services which are socially necessary but not provided commercially. Reviews for each district in North Yorkshire are carried out every 4 years. Since the start of LTP2 in 2006 reviews have been carried out for Harrogate, Hambleton, Richmondshire, Craven and Ryedale and one is currently underway in the Selby district.

3.1.13 In 2004, the Council commissioned the development of a Community Transport Strategy for North Yorkshire. This strategy was prepared in partnership with District Councils, Health Authorities, Rural Transport Partnerships and most importantly community transport providers. Working closely with Harrogate District Community Transport, Bentham Community Transport and RYECAT Ltd, we supported their successful bid to secure £1.1m investment from Futurebuilders England. This funding has built capacity in the community transport sector and has enabled operators to take on competitively tendered contract work. The objective of this is to deliver better efficiency both for the County Council and operators, and provide high quality, affordable services for passengers.

3.1.14 Structural Highway Maintenance
At the start of the LTP process the Department for Transport (DfT) identified two targets for Highway Maintenance:
- To halt deterioration of the network by 2004/05
- To remove the maintenance backlog by 2010/11

And with regards to Bridge Maintenance:
- To achieve a steady (condition) state in the bridges stock over the same timescale
3.1.15 As part of the LTP 1 reporting process in 2004/05 the County Council identified, using both BVPI (Best Value Performance Indicators) results and generic works programme costs, that the structural highway maintenance backlog in North Yorkshire was in excess of £400 million. The DfT acknowledged that they would be unable to provide sufficient funding to meet their target in North Yorkshire. However, the DfT did undertake to increase the County Council’s budget allocation in their published planning guidelines for LTP2 in order that the County Council could actively reduce the maintenance backlog over time. As a consequence of budgetary pressures across Government Departments the County Council’s confirmed highway maintenance settlement will still be £6.715m less than the planning guidelines over the LTP2 period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Planning Guidelines</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Deficit</th>
<th>% planning guideline received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>£21,627,000</td>
<td>£19,528,000</td>
<td>£2,099,000</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>£19,876,000</td>
<td>£17,218,000</td>
<td>£2,658,000</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>£21,001,000</td>
<td>£19,942,000</td>
<td>£1,059,000</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>£22,152,000</td>
<td>£21,442,000</td>
<td>£710,000</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>£23,400,000</td>
<td>£23,211,000</td>
<td>£189,000</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7 Maintenance planning guideline and actual settlement

3.1.16 Key Outputs and Outcomes
In order to achieve the DfT’s targets for structural highway maintenance the County Council allocates separate budgets to both ‘highways’ and ‘bridges’. The bridges budget is further divided between bridge strengthening, general bridge maintenance, retaining walls, culverts, highway footbridges, PROW (public rights of way), footbridges and structural inspection surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 187</td>
<td>Condition of category 1, 1a and 2 (heavily used) footways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 223</td>
<td>Condition of principal ‘A’ roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 224a</td>
<td>Condition of non-principal ‘B’ and ‘C’ roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 224b</td>
<td>Condition of unclassified roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.17 To monitor progress in addressing the DfT’s maintenance backlog target four network condition indicators were introduced in 2001/02; progress on achieving these indicators is discussed further in part 4 of this report.
3.1.18 The information provided by these indicators, as well as detailed analysis of the BVPI output report allows us to decide how best to allocate the Highway Maintenance capital budget and also to determine which types of treatments need to be targeted to which locations to receive the best outcome. Additional funding is also made available to address other asset management demands, principally associated with landslips, drainage replacements and upgrades and ‘other’ special engineering schemes (e.g. cattle grids, cobbled areas, back streets etc).

3.1.19 In order to reduce the rate of (and ultimately halt) deterioration of the network, it is necessary to introduce a ‘preventative / proactive’ maintenance strategy. For both carriageways and footways this takes the form of programmes of minor ‘patching works’ and programmes of ‘surface treatments’. This means that sometimes less costly treatments such as surface dressing may be as much of a priority as reconstruction schemes in order to maintain the network condition.

3.1.20 By applying a year on year increase to the surface treatments budget for carriageways, we are making positive steps towards achieving a theoretical cyclic treatment of 10, 15 and 20 years respectively for the three classes of carriageway (principal, non-principal and unclassified) covering the carriageway classes.

3.1.21 Development of the TAMP following the implementation of the Highways maintenance Plan has however identified that the strategy needs to be extended to cover each carriageway category with the network hierarchy (2, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b and 5) as these better reflect both use and maintenance need.

3.1.22 As part of a proactive approach to pavement management and road safety we undertake SCRAM in-service skid resistance testing on our most heavily trafficked roads (i.e. Category 2, 3a and 3b) in order to start to address locations where skid resistance is becoming poor. SCRAM ‘red’ sites have been allocated £890K for 2008/09. Future allocations will be subject to progress being made in reducing the extent of network falling into this category.

3.2 Scheme Delivery and Outcomes

3.2.1 During the first two years of LTP2 the County Council has invested over £16m in Integrated Transport capital improvements, £10m in revenue funding supporting bus services and almost £90m (capital and revenue) on maintaining the highway network. This has delivered over 120 improvement schemes and 1200 maintenance schemes, increased customer satisfaction and patronage as well providing day to day essential services such as street lighting, traffic signals, highway grass cutting, gully emptying and winter snow clearance and gritting.

3.2.2 The following section will give some typical examples of the types of
schemes and initiatives which we have delivered in the last two years together with details of what we hoped to achieve and an assessment of how successful we were. Delivery of schemes and initiatives is ongoing with an Integrated Transport capital programme of approximately £9m for this year and almost £45m funding for highway maintenance as well as £5.7m revenue funding for supporting bus services. Good examples of schemes in progress will also be included in this section of the report.

3.3 Accessibility

3.3.1 Problem and Solution Identification Schemes and initiatives to improve people’s access to the essential services they require (employment, education, healthcare and food shopping) are identified in a number of ways. SCTS’s identify where the essential services are provided, where the population live and the transport provision between them. Through this process, areas of poor accessibility are identified. This information is supplemented through local consultation to identify other local accessibility issues, many of which may not be obvious through data analysis.

3.3.2 To supplement the identification of accessibility issues through the SCTS, the Accessibility Strategy investigates issues at a more strategic level. Through the analysis of geographic, transport and census data the Strategy identified areas of the County where access to one or more of the key services was difficult for significant sectors of the population. These difficulties may arise from social or personal circumstances (e.g. lack of money to afford transport or mobility impairment), geographical isolation (e.g. distance from service providers), lack of service provision (e.g. no local employment opportunities) or a combination of any or all of the above.

3.3.3 Additionally, accessibility problems are identified as part of the bus service area reviews (see section 3.1.15) and reviews of local community transport services. If a bus service is not considered commercially viable and cannot be provided by a bus operator without subsidy, the County Council will assess whether they are able to support the service financially to ensure it can continue to operate.

3.3.4 Improving accessibility can also contribute towards ensuring that rural communities remain sustainable. Improved access to services, both through improved transport but more importantly by the local delivery of services reduces social exclusion and by allowing people to remain in the locality can help to stop rural communities becoming commuter communities.

3.3.5 The Accessibility Strategy published with LTP2 identified that the main priority for 06/07 and 07/08 would be access to healthcare at Scarborough General Hospital. In 2006 the County Council worked with MSc students from Leeds University’s Institute for Transport
Studies to carry out a study into access issues to and at the Hospital. Working with the Health Authorities and transport providers an action plan was developed to address the issues identified.

3.3.6 During 2007/08 the County renewed its successful partnership with the Institute for Transport Studies and sought the students’ help to identify issues in relation to accessing healthcare and other services in Craven. The key accessibility issues in Craven were found to arise mainly from the geographical remoteness of much of the rural population together with, the limited commercial bus network in much of the district. The County Council has therefore adopted an approach of local provision of services, such as adult learning schemes, together with a significant investment in community transport mini buses to improve access to service centres.

3.3.7 Schemes and Initiatives Accessibility problems may be either very localised, such as the lack of a safe walking route to the village shop, or on a larger scale, such as there being no bus service from a village to get to a hospital appointment. The types of scheme or initiative to address these very different problems are also therefore very different. This section includes examples of schemes to address both types of accessibility problems as well as examples of where these issues have been addressed through innovative local service delivery rather than through the provision of new or improved transport services.

3.3.8 In many cases conventional bus based public transport remains the best way of ensuring rural accessibility. The County Council’s Bus Strategy recognises this and despite significantly increased tender prices from operators and increasing pressures on limited revenue budgets during 2006/07 and 2007/08 the County Council invested almost £11m supporting necessary local bus services that were not commercially viable. This investment supports approximately 3.3 million passenger journeys per year, or around 1/5 of all bus passenger journeys in the county.

3.3.9 The following chart illustrates the success of our approach to specify high quality Premiere Specification contracts. These are targeted to corridors where all services are operated under contract and where patronage growth is likely.

The two examples show services between Northallerton and Stokesley and in the Wharfedale area of Craven District which have grown by 12% and 14% respectively last year.
3.3.10 Our Bus Strategy recognises that this commercial and contracted network is now quite extensive, and that further work should focus on making these services more accessible through improving the quality of vehicles and infrastructure. Through the area review process we have identified areas where we could specify better quality low floor easy access vehicles. For example in April 2007, accessible vehicles were specified on the Ripon – Boroughbridge – York service. In preparation for this change the County Council provided new infrastructure (shelters, signs, raised Kassel kerbs) on this corridor in advance of the new vehicles arriving, to allow passengers to take full advantage of the improved service. During the course of the first LTP, the proportion of low floor vehicles operated by the 4 larger operators increased to 67%. This investment in vehicles is continuing with new vehicles being introduced on Airedale services, Coastliner services and on the 121 and 128 services. We have also seen investment in new vehicles by some of the smaller bus operators, and now have low floor vehicles on Ripon and Thirsk town services, Ripon – Northallerton and Thirsk – Northallerton services.

3.3.11 Yorkshire Xpress X54 Harrogate – York
This service is an example of one of the progressive bus operators in North Yorkshire taking the initiative and introducing a brand new service. Introduced in April 2008, seven return journeys operate between Harrogate and York 6 days per week using modern, high quality, accessible buses. Since its introduction, the bus operator has been delighted with the welcome the service has received and due to very encouraging passenger usage they have already increased the service frequency to 10 return journeys per day. The County Council will continue to work to support operators in their plans to deliver high quality attractive services.
3.3.12 We have seen partnership investment with large bus operators resulting in delivery of good performance. However this type of partnership working is not confined to the larger operators. In a rural county such as North Yorkshire, many less populated areas have smaller bus operators, providing valuable, much needed and reliable services. In 2005/6 we supported one such operator through our successful Kickstart bid for enhancements on the number 40 Easingwold – York service.

3.3.13 The project saw the enhancement of the rural bus service operated by Reliance Motors between Easingwold and York through the villages of Huby, Stillington and Sutton on Forest. An improved timetable provided a 60 minute frequency during the day and a 30 minute frequency at peak times and extra evening and weekend services. Reliance has invested in new low floor, accessible buses and the new timetable makes more intensive and effective use of those vehicles. During the first year of service (2006) DfT Kickstart funding of £89,000 was used to support the operating costs for the improved timetable and for an initial marketing promotion. During the first two years of LTP2 £15,000 of LTP funding has been spent on improved infrastructure on the route. The enhanced service is clearly valued with passenger numbers for the year increasing from 93,000 in 2005 to 135,500 in 2006/7 and 136,336 in 2007/8.

3.3.14 Improving accessibility is not just about providing local bus services and community transport. It is often about providing information to let people know what is actually out there. Following the priorities outlined in our Bus Information Strategy, we have invested in systems to provide information electronically, over a mobile phone, via text message and mobile platforms (WAP) or from the internet.
3.3.15 Since 2006 we have been working with the West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire PTE’s to ‘buy into’ and extend their real time and SMS bus information system into North Yorkshire.

3.3.16 Using mobile phone text messages, BUSTRACKER provides either real time information about how long before the bus will actually turn up, or scheduled information about the times of the next four departures. Since its launch in November 2006 usage has increased steadily, with over 2600 texts sent per month.

3.3.17 In the Autumn of 2006 we launched BUSTRACKER in Selby together with Arriva Bus Company. This was followed by services operated by Transdev Blazefield in Harrogate and South Craven and on the Coastliner service. We are currently expanding the service in Scarborough and the East coast. When this latest phase is complete, over 70% of passengers will be travelling on vehicles fitted with this equipment. Large Information Technology (IT) projects are often complicated and costly to deliver. Working with our neighbouring authorities, taking advantage of their systems and experience gained has proved to be an efficient way of extending these benefits into North Yorkshire.

3.3.18 It must be recognised that whilst electronic communication of bus times is a very valuable and powerful tool, not all sections of society can or want to access information in this way. This is especially the case for many older people who may be less likely to use computers or mobile phones to access information and who are often more likely to be without access to other means of transport. In order to address these issues, the County Council has recently launched a ‘Timetables by Post’ service. This service allows people to register details of services for which they would like to receive timetables. Customers are then automatically sent updates when services change, in addition to copies of timetables being delivered by post as requested. This service has been well received with over 1,800 people registering and over 6,000 timetables sent out to date. Initial indications are that the service has improved accessibility and customer satisfaction with both bus services and bus service information.

3.3.19 A key element of the strategy to improve accessibility is to boost the provision and capacity of community transport. Using a combination of funding from the LTP, Yorkshire Forward and Futurebuilders England, 15 new vehicles have been provided for use by community transport.
operators, improving vehicle availability and allowing new services to be developed. For example in 2006 RYECAT Ltd, operating mainly in Ryedale district has used one of the new low floor minibuses to introduce a new Wolds Ring and Ride service. This combines services around the market towns of Malton and Norton and the rural hinterland where conventional local bus provision is recognised to be difficult. This initiative has helped improve access from rural areas to local centres for people without access to a private car.

3.3.20 One of the largest and most challenging community transport initiatives that the County Council is working with partners to deliver is the Craven Transport Hubs Project. The Settle SCTS and the accessibility strategy identified accessibility issues as a key concern of the public in the area. The Craven Hubs Project will assist in addressing the identified accessibility issues and the project forms an integral part of the final delivery of the Settle SCTS.

The vision of this project is:

‘To improve access to services in Craven through the creation of a sustainable network of independent community transport operators working collaboratively to achieve shared outcomes.’

3.3.21 This project combines several investment programmes in order to improve accessibility for residents in the Craven District of North Yorkshire. It will do this through four key areas:

- Supporting the community transport sector to take on an enhanced role in transport delivery
- Developing Bentham and Settle as new transport hubs along with Skipton
- Promotion of community transport services and joint-marketing of all transport modes
- Developing capacity for off-peak travel options specifically for younger people.

3.3.22 As part of the Community Transport Strategy the County Council is providing financial investment to help to incentivise and reward the voluntary sector for collaborative working and delivery of a range of demand responsive services. We are also keen to pilot the Future Builders financial model for community transport to evaluate its effectiveness in delivering long term sustainability and security for community transport organisations. The County Council is therefore providing £250k of capital (LTP) funds and £200k revenue funding. This is supplemented by £150k of PSA4 funding.

3.3.23 This funding has provided 8 new minibuses, improvement works at
Bentham Station (including office refurbishment and a youth and community café) and improvement works at Settle Station (including a refurbished waiting room and new toilets). The project started delivering services at the end of April, and early indications are that it is successful. Already the first quarter of 2008 has shown an increase of 33% in the passengers carried over the same period last year. Additionally there are now increased opportunities for community transport journeys with additional demand responsive services soon to be operated in Lonsdale, Ribblesdale, Wharfedale and Airedale.

3.3.24 The Craven Transport Hubs project will be monitored by the County Council and if it is successful the model may be applied to other areas of the County.

3.3.25 Wheels to Work is an access solution where 50cc mopeds are provided to enable access to employment and education opportunities for people in rural areas without access to other transport. The County Council has contributed towards two Wheels to Work schemes operating across Hambleton, Richmondshire, Ryedale, Scarborough and Selby. This service has now been extended to cover Craven and Harrogate, so covering the whole of the County. In the last two years, 600 people have benefited from this service.

3.3.26 In the more rural areas of North Yorkshire there are many examples of neighbouring communities that are too far apart to regularly walk between but which are ideally suited for cycling. An example is Thornton-le-Dale on the southern edge of the North York Moors National Park. Although there are a number of local shops, many of the essential services and employment are provided in the nearby market town of Pickering which lies about 4km away. The most

---

**The Craven Hubs Project**

Craven Hubs is a pilot project, funded through several investment programmes, which provides 8 brand new minibuses and serves a wide range of the local community through community transport services and improvement works to local facilities such as Bentham Station and Settle Station.
direct route to Pickering is along the busy A170. Whilst there was a narrow under utilised footway adjacent to the road there were no suitable safe facilities for cyclists. During 06/07, at a cost of £150k the existing footway was upgraded to a shared footway / cycle route. This has improved accessibility to goods and services in the local area and, as it runs past the Thornton Road industrial estate in Pickering, has the added benefit of improving access from the town centre and residential areas to a main employment area.

3.3.27 In the larger towns such as Scarborough cycle routes can also improve access to services. The main route from Scarborough town centre to the large housing area of Eastfield, the Eastfield Industrial Estate and Scarborough Business Park is along the busy A64. The A64 carries almost 30,000 vehicles a day in the summer tourist season and cyclists previously had to share this busy road space. During 2006/07 a new off road shared cycle / pedestrian facility running from Eastfield to Queen Margaret’s Road was provided. This new route provides much improved and safer access to the industrial areas at Eastfield and the Town Centre for both cyclists and pedestrians.  

3.3.28 Pedestrian accessibility can also be a major issue in both rural and urban areas. During the first 2 years of LTP2 the County Council constructed 19 new footways and installed 9 new pedestrian crossing facilities. New footways such as the one between Ainthorpe and Danby in the North York Moors National Park can significantly improve accessibility in a local area. The villages of Ainthorpe and Danby are less than half a mile apart separated by the River Esk, but the footway between the villages was incomplete. The provision of a new footway and protected area for pedestrians on the Esk Bridge has helped pedestrian access from Ainthorpe to the shops and pubs in Danby and conversely has improved the walking route from Danby to the village school in Ainthorpe which serves both villages.  

3.3.29 In urban areas pedestrian accessibility is more often reduced by severance of walking routes by a busy road rather than the lack of a footway. A good example of the type of scheme used to address such an issue is the traffic light controlled ‘Puffin’ crossing on the A167 Boroughbridge Road, Northallerton. This allows easier and safer crossing of this busy road which severs the main pedestrian route to Northallerton railway station from the town centre and large residential areas. Additionally buses serving Northallerton station do not enter the station but drop off and pick up on Boroughbridge Road. The bus stops serving the station are less than 50m from the crossing. The crossing
therefore also improves integration of services. Other examples include the crossing provided for the A169 Kirkham Lane in Pickering which was identified in the Pickering Traffic Management Strategy (the predecessor to the SCTS’s). The A169 severed a busy cross-town pedestrian route between two schools, and from housing to the north of the town to the town centre. Following consultations a puffin crossing was installed, the adjacent junction with Ruffa Lane was re-aligned and sections of the footway were widened. As part of the County Council’s approach of integrating improvement and maintenance where appropriate, the footways in the vicinity of the crossing were also resurfaced at the same time as the crossing was installed.

3.3.30 Part of the Public Service Agreement (PSA4) target, agreed by the Local Government Association and Central Government is to improve the accessibility of services for people in rural areas. Working with Yorkshire Forward the County Council agreed to take the lead role and become the accountable body for the delivery of this responsibility in York and North Yorkshire.

3.3.31 In 2007 we established a partnership which includes a wide range of local service delivery and commissioning agencies and have developed a framework for delivering a programme to improve accessibility in the county. The partnership combines funding from DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs) (£2.1m) and ourselves, together with Rural Social Community Programme from GOYH (Government Office Yorkshire and Humber) and some district and health authority funding to deliver the programme.

3.3.32 To help to deliver the programme four Rural Services Development Officers (RSDO) have been jointly funded and appointed. These officers work with community groups and both public and private sector organisations to deliver transport related projects such as taxi-voucher schemes and dial-a-ride services. They also develop initiatives to share resources with other transport providers, to deliver training and to seek to expand the range of services provision through purchasing equipment (i.e. retail equipment, IT etc). Additionally the RSDOs sponsor work by partners (e.g. Job Centre Plus to assist carers back into work and library services to improve mobile IT access). To date some 117 groups have been assisted with projects that deliver access to services, 210 people have been assisted into employment through skills development opportunities. This initiative is still in its early stages but has also already contributed toward the purchase of a ‘Skills Mobile’ by the County Council education directorate which will be used for Community Education especially in the remote rural areas.

3.3.33 As discussed earlier a key accessibility issue in the county is access to healthcare. The County Council decided that access to health care in Scarborough would be a priority for 2006/07. In order to deliver improvements in partnership with other bodies the County Council has initiated the Scarborough Access to Health Action Group. This group
brings together the users and suppliers of healthcare and transport. To date initiatives implemented include:

- Transport Direct software installed on GP surgery reception computers to allow advice on travel arrangements to Scarborough General Hospital to be given.
- One Stop Shop for Travel Information at Scarborough Hospital
- The adoption and implementation of an agreed and easily recognisable Hospital symbol for travel to Scarborough Hospital. This is being placed on bus stops and shelters where people can catch services which go to the hospital.
- Provision of a new bus stop opposite the hospital entrance.
- The preparation of a bespoke travel information leaflet advising on how to reach the hospital by sustainable modes of transport.

3.3.34 Improving accessibility is not solely limited to providing various forms of transport to the public. Accessibility can also be improved by providing services at a local level. For example, in some of the more remote parts of the Craven district the County Council had identified that many people with low levels of educational attainment were often unable to access education opportunities. A scheme was developed to provide facilities in three local schools to enable adult classes to be held in various subjects. This linked with a Community Transport Strategy project to improve the provision of transport in the Craven area and to ensure that those with no access to a private vehicle could use community transport to travel to the training sessions.

3.3.35 It is also hoped that by using new communication technology based on the internet and video that similar schemes can be developed across the County to enable a wider range of services and, in particular those related to education, to be delivered to a greater number of people.

3.4 Road Safety

3.4.1 In 2004 the County Council was a lead partner in setting up the York and North Yorkshire Road Safety Partnership, which brought together all the relevant bodies involved in improving road safety in York and North Yorkshire. This partnership jointly produced the Road Safety Strategy for York and North Yorkshire 2005 to 2010. The strategy, which is also known as ‘95 Alive’, has a headline vision of saving 95 lives by the end of 2010. Details of the strategy that was adopted by all partners can be found in Annex C of LTP2.
3.4.2 The ‘95 Alive’ Partnership has developed rapidly and now provides a comprehensive means of delivering education, publicity and enforcement campaigns. The Partnership is moving forward with the 95 Alive Action Plan to reduce crashes and casualties on our roads. Measures employed to date include:

- Developing campaigns to address specific problems in an effective way that connects with the people involved e.g. motorcyclists
- Enabling campaigns to be delivered throughout the County by pooling resources and manpower
- Providing good quality publicity to support and strengthen enforcement operations together with providing additional funding to sustain widespread policing of the roads on identified higher risk routes and at the times when crashes are shown to happen.
- Funding educational programmes to reach students in a variety of ways to effectively influence their thinking and behaviour, in cars and as road users
- Providing a source of funding, which is available for local partnerships and safety groups to use to develop their own local initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>York City Council</th>
<th>North Yorkshire Police</th>
<th>Scarborough Borough Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate Borough Council</td>
<td>North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service</td>
<td>Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td><strong>95 Alive Partnership</strong></td>
<td>Yorkshire Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire County Council</td>
<td>Community Safety Partnerships for the 7 North Yorkshire districts</td>
<td>GOYH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire Moors National Park Authority</td>
<td>Yorkshire Air Ambulance Service</td>
<td>North Yorkshire and York Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.9 – Members of '95 Alive' Road Safety Partnership**

3.4.3 Whilst following the traditional approach of education, enforcement and engineering the strategy adopted a more targeted approach to road casualty reduction and included an action plan, which identified 9 key actions for implementing the strategy.
3.4.4 Problem and Solution Identification

- Data led
- Dynamic accident analysis
- Targeted activities
- Safety Cameras?

We retain a strong focus on data led activity. Alongside the actions identified in the ‘95 Alive’ strategy, the Council has continued to enhance its accident data analysis capability and investigation activities. Statistical analysis of the STATS 19 personal injury accident data has enabled the Council to identify high risk accident locations and routes. For example, our work on mapping the road network according to accident risk now allows us to identify, prioritise and then treat those routes which have the worst collision history (relative to distance travelled). Detailed analysis of the causes of each of the accidents at these locations and on these routes allows the identification of appropriate remedial solutions. This work, in tandem with our continued use of the High Risk Site list as a scheme generation tool, ensures that resources are targeted with greater effect at specific links and problem sites, where they will achieve optimum casualty reduction benefit. This in turn has a proportionately greater impact on our road casualty reduction targets. It is also our intention to use these maps and data split by district, in order to engage more closely with the local community safety partnerships and enhance communication across the ‘95 Alive’ Partnership. High risk accident sites are also used to identify requirements for route action studies which consider the route as a whole as well as looking at individual sites. The main benefit of carrying out this type of study is that a consistent approach can be adopted along the whole route which will ensure that those unfamiliar with the route understand what is expected of them as they approach bends and junctions, and travel through the many villages and settlements along the route. This consistent approach increases drivers' awareness of the hazards ahead, by increasing the predictability of the road environment.

3.4.5 In addition, through our own detailed analysis of road traffic accident data, and the wealth of information partners make available to us through 95 Alive, we continue to strengthen our dynamic approach to the identification of high risk groups and emerging trends. For example, working closely with North Yorkshire Police, it became increasingly apparent during 2007 that migrant workers, predominantly from the former Eastern Bloc countries, were featuring disproportionately in the road traffic accident statistics. Today, our Action Plan to reduce road casualties in this category forms an important element of our Road Safety Strategy, and the DfT has expressed a specific interest in being kept up to date on outputs and outcomes in this area. In addition, our recent investment in statistical analysis software and training for staff in its use and application now provides us with a sophisticated approach to forecasting and predictive trend analysis.
3.4.6 During 2007-08 the County Council's Road Safety and Travel Awareness Teams were amalgamated into one multi-disciplinary team to improve focus and service delivery on these closely inter-linked areas of work. They are now well founded to deliver the complementary issues of road safety education, training and publicity in conjunction with the promotion and enabling of sustainable travel and individual, school, college and business travel planning. It is logical and more effective to consider the sustainability and safety aspects of travel at the same time as all modes of travel impact on safety, the environmental effects and sustainability. The Road Safety & Travel Awareness team provides an integrated service to the whole community with a new action plan that has been designed to deliver both county wide “foundation” education together with a focussed ‘additional level of service’ that is designed for specific user groups. These user groups are those groups whose involvement in road crashes is a particular cause for concern (e.g. young/elderly drivers, motor cyclists, business drivers) each of whom are over-represented amongst road casualties. This “foundation” plus the ‘additional level of service’ approach, directs resources to where they are most needed and can make the greatest saving in lives and injuries whilst maintaining a standard level of road user education and training for all (e.g. Child cyclist training is offered to every primary school in the County). The team works with a wide range of stakeholders such as teachers, ‘95 Alive’ partners and Parish Councils to direct delivery, expertise and expenditure towards those areas and communities where they can make the most difference and save the most lives. The team also includes the data analysis service and the school crossing patrol service and supports the work of the ‘95 Alive’ Road Safety Partnership.

3.4.7 Schemes and Initiatives

Education

Building on information about at-risk groups from the ‘95 Alive’ data analysis we ran a number of targeted public courses in 2006, 2007 and 2008. These included courses for mature drivers and lone drivers and also courses giving advice on winter driving. For example, the mature driver course was particularly aimed at people 55 and over and was designed to refresh and update driving skills. The course also allowed a forum for discussion of some of the types of issues that can particularly arise as people get older, such as deterioration of eyesight and hearing and possible reliance on forms of medication. The County Council ran five courses and helped to organise another twenty three courses. In total over 1,000 people attended these courses, which proves how well received they have been.

3.4.8 We make a point of seeking feedback from course participants and at the suggestion of people attending the mature driver courses we developed the lone driver course aimed at people who drive alone in connection with their work. This dealt with such issues as drivers travelling alone at night and or in secluded locations, dealing with road
rage and general safety while travelling. The courses were delivered with the assistance of North Yorkshire Police and in total almost 400 people attended at the various locations.

3.4.9 We have also run a series of winter driving courses across the county which have been attended by a total of 350 people. These courses were designed to help people prepare both themselves and their vehicles for dealing with rain, fog, ice and snow and to provide advice on avoiding skidding and other winter hazards.

3.4.10 In addition to these targeted courses we have continued our traditional road safety awareness training with schools. Our road safety and travel awareness officers make over 500 scheduled visits to schools in the county each year. During these visits they perform presentations and hold workshops tailored to the age group and interest of the audience. Cycle training in primary schools in North Yorkshire also continues to experience a very high take-up rate. The Road Safety and Travel Awareness officers work closely with school governors, parish councils and other interested agencies and have proved very effective in responsive road safety education in schools. In one example a child was very seriously injured when he ran out in front of a lorry whilst playing. At the request of the Head Teacher, and with the agreement of the child’s parents, whilst the issue was still at the forefront of his peers’ minds the local road safety and travel awareness officer visited the school to highlight the very real dangers of road accidents.

3.4.11 Since 2006 two theatre in education plays namely ‘Thrills, Pills and Automobiles’ and ‘Legal Weapon’ were taken into over 20 secondary schools in North Yorkshire. Work has continued on providing in-car child safety initiatives. Our child car seat checking services have continued to be provided for individuals requesting a check and we run drop in sessions at supermarkets, clinics and events around the county in partnership with colleagues from the Fire and Rescue Service.

3.4.12 Education and Enforcement
Using the additional revenue and capital funding available through the Road Safety Grant we are substantially expanding road safety education and enforcement initiatives. We have undertaken ever more enhanced and in-depth analyses of crash and casualty data specifically to identify those locations, areas, routes and road user groups that are most often involved or who are over-represented in road crashes. We are in the process of installing more sophisticated data, factor and predictive analysis software to enable us to further target our efforts.
and campaigns to where we can make the most significant improvements in terms of casualty reduction.

3.4.13 For example in 2007/08, the first year in which Road Safety Grant funding became available, we developed a new partnership campaign framework that closely combines enforcement, education and publicity and engineering work to maximise the value of coordinated programming.

3.4.14 The first such partnership campaign was the month long 2007 Christmas anti drink driving campaign, which we led and which was aimed at reducing the number of casualties caused by drink drivers over the Christmas period and specifically raising awareness of the dangers of ‘morning after’ alcohol levels. This campaign is now being followed up by further coordinated campaigns including the summer drink driving campaign and a campaign to improve safety on the most popular motor cyclist routes. More campaigns are being planned aimed at; speeding, seatbelt wearing and other aspects of in-car safety. As a result of this joint working, the take up for assessments and advanced motor cyclist training has increased dramatically during the first four months of the 2008 season with North Yorkshire Police BikeSafe assessments now fully subscribed for the rest of the year and more advanced training course places are being booked.

3.4.15 Working with North Yorkshire Police the County Council has continued to provide technical and financial support for high profile enforcement campaigns. The latest operations, Helical, and more latterly Anvil, have expanded activity from focussing purely on motorcyclists (operation Halto) to target all motorists. The campaigns are carried out on a network of roads that have been identified, through detailed casualty analysis, as having a high number of instances of motorcyclist killed and seriously injured casualties.

### 2007 Christmas Drink Driving Campaign

The Christmas drink drive campaign in 2007 was the largest ever conducted in North Yorkshire. The campaign, coordinated by the ‘95 Alive Partnership’, included high level publicity campaigns to warn motorists of the dangers of drink driving.

The number of people arrested for drink driving or refusing a test during the campaign was 2.7% of all tests compare to a national average of 5%. This is despite a 52% increase in the number of breath tests administered by North Yorkshire Police. In total 4378 people were tested.
3.4.16 In response to the occupational road risk issue identified in the ‘95 Alive’ action plan the County Council project “Your Driving Your Business” continues to progress with the first seminar “Managing Occupational Road Risk & Corporate Manslaughter Seminar” having been held in May 2007. Further seminars are being planned in the light of positive feedback.

3.4.17 In order to ensure continued progress against the challenging road casualty reduction targets it is necessary to consider all of the available tools at our disposal. For this reason, we have commissioned a study through the 95 Alive Road Safety Partnership to investigate the feasibility and potential casualty reduction benefit that might be obtained by use of camera enforcement within North Yorkshire and York. The study is on-going and the 95 Alive Steering Group is to consider a report recommending a proposed way forward in January 2009. Any decision to take forward camera enforcement would then require the approval of key partners specifically the County Council, City of York Council, North Yorkshire Police and the Highways Agency, along with HM Courts Service and the Crown Prosecution Service. In the case of the County Council, the matter would be the subject of reports to the Transport and Telecommunications Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Executive Committee and ultimately the full County Council.

3.4.18 **Engineering**

Since 2006 the County Council has carried out detailed investigations at 37 high risk accident locations including studies on the A59 at Saltergate, the A6055 between Knaresborough and Boroughbridge and the bends in the vicinity of Ellerbeck Bridge on the A169.

3.4.19 In 2006/07 and 2007/08 the County Council completed 59 major engineering schemes that contributed to addressing road safety and accident problems, at a cost of just over £2million. The Darlington Road, Richmond traffic calming scheme provides an example of the type of scheme that can be implemented in a market town and the wider benefits such a safety scheme can bring. The scheme cost £60k and was completed in September 2006. The scheme involved narrowing the carriageway to reduce existing traffic lane widths together with the extension of the existing 30mph speed limit and the introduction of transverse bar markings and ‘Gateway’ features to reduce vehicle speeds. In addition, to help reduce congestion and improve the safety of the school crossing patrol site outside the Richmond Methodist Primary School, ‘No waiting at any time’ restrictions have been
introduced. The scheme will improve road safety for all highway users, especially school children, travelling to and from the four schools on Darlington Road. During the three year period prior to the introduction of this scheme there had been eight collisions resulting in thirteen casualties, of which eight had been children. This scheme will therefore contribute towards achieving the County Council’s casualty reduction targets, particularly those relating to children. The scheme will also contribute to reducing traffic congestion on Darlington Road and will deliver associated environmental benefits.

3.4.20 In addition to identifying individual site specific engineering measures, route action studies carried out in 2006/07 and 2007/08 resulted in the identification of 9 schemes, including improvements at Beamsley Hill, on the A6055 between Ferrensby and Knaresborough Golf Club and at the A59 Rowden Lane junction. These studies also made recommendations on where targeted education or enforcement could assist with the reduction of accidents and casualties.

3.4.21 The A170 East Ayton to Scarborough local safety scheme provides a typical example of an engineering safety solution in a rural area. The scheme was identified through the A170 Helmsley to Scarborough route study. The cost of this scheme was £59K and it was completed in October 2006. The works included the replacement and enhancement of existing direction and warning signs and carriageway markings including highlighting the presence of right turn lanes with red textured surfacing. Additionally opposing flows of traffic on bends were separated and speeds reduced through the provision of centre hatched markings. Finally, where necessary, visibility from side road junctions was improved. This scheme will improve road safety for all highway users on this section of the A170 where there had been twelve collisions, of which two involved motorcycles, resulting in seventeen casualties in the three year period prior to implementation. Four of the seventeen casualties were either killed or seriously injured. This scheme will therefore contribute towards achieving the County Council’s casualty reduction targets particularly those relating to killed and seriously injured casualties.

3.4.22 Fatal collision inspections are also undertaken in partnership with North Yorkshire Police at all locations of fatal road traffic accidents. The aim of the inspection is to identify any road safety engineering measures that would reduce the likelihood of further accidents in the future. 92 inspections have been undertaken since 2006 with recommendations for improvement at 51 sites. These investigations have either resulted in the implementation of low cost remedial measures such as signing and lining improvements or in the case of more expensive solutions the inclusion of the site on the list of future possible capital schemes. An example of action being taken is the A170 in the vicinity of Spaunton Quarry where we have implemented improvements to visibility by the removal of trees and bushes, and improved the surface profile, surface skid resistance and signing. Another example is the B6161 at Oaker
Bank where measures proposed included improvements to existing traffic signs and road markings as well as improvements to the carriageway surfacing.

3.5 Congestion and Air Quality

3.5.1 North Yorkshire does not currently have any transport related Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) and congestion and poor air quality due to transport emissions is not a major issue in North Yorkshire as a whole. However, peak hour traffic congestion does occur in some of the larger towns in the County such as Harrogate, Scarborough and Northallerton, as well at discrete locations, as a result of tourism. In order to address these issues and to ensure that congestion does not increase, LTP2 included a Congestion and Air Quality Action Plan as Annex M. This identified the main areas of congestion and air quality concern in the County. The action plan identified seven urban areas and five tourism related congestion hot spots which suffered significant local congestion. These are shown on Figure 2.5 below.

Figure 3.10 – Congestion Areas

3.5.2 Working with Ryedale District Council as the planning authority to develop a traffic model and a developer funding contribution mechanism to reduce congestion and improve air quality at Butcher Corner in Malton is nearing completion. This is of particular importance as recent monitoring by the District Council indicates that Air Quality
(NOx) has worsened since 2006 and it is considered likely that Butcher Corner will be declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

3.5.3 The County Council has also, jointly with Hambleton District Council, developed a traffic model for Northallerton which is currently being used to assess the impact of Local Development Framework land allocations and potential new major infrastructure (see section 5.4). This model is also being used as the basis of a more detailed model to investigate short term traffic management and highway improvement measures to address congestion at the north end of the High Street.

3.5.4 All five of the tourism related congestion hot spots lie within the Yorkshire Dales or North York Moors National Parks. Rather than carry out investigations into individual locations the County Council is leading on wider investigations into congestion in the two National Parks. The two studies are being run in parallel with the co-operation of the National Park Authorities. It is anticipated that these investigations will be completed in late 2008 and schemes may be implemented by 2010.

3.5.5 Congestion in Crosshills and Ripon is being considered as an integral part of the development of the South Craven and Ripon SCTS’s. These are due to be completed and adopted during the early summer of 2008 and will include proposals to address the congestion and air quality issues.

3.5.6 As has already been stated traffic congestion in North Yorkshire is limited and generally confined to the larger urban areas. Consequently, the examples of schemes that have been delivered to reduce traffic congestion are taken mainly from the urban areas of Harrogate and Scarborough.

3.5.7 To date specific action plans have been developed for Harrogate (Harrogate and Knaresborough Integrated Transport Strategy) and Scarborough (Scarborough Integrated Transport Strategy) and schemes from these plans are already being implemented. These include the Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme which is a £31.5m investment in road improvements, Park and Ride and bus priority measures in Scarborough.

3.5.8 Harrogate
The largest and most congested area in the County is Harrogate. The mix of local traffic, commuters travelling to Leeds and York and through-traffic on the A59 and A61 all lead to peak hour, and sometimes off peak, traffic congestion in and around the town centre. The Harrogate and Knaresborough Integrated Transport Strategy (HAKITS) identified a strategy to address these issues by taking
forward measures to encourage modal shift. A key element of this is increasing the use of public transport. During the first two years of LTP2 the County Council continued its partnership with Harrogate and District Travel to improve bus infrastructure and services on key bus routes serving the town and together with Harrogate Borough Council, established a Harrogate Punctuality Improvement Partnership (PIP).

3.5.9 As part of a three year investment plan for the Harrogate PIP we are spending over £550k on improving traffic signals and layouts at locations identified by ourselves and bus operators as being a major cause for delays and a lack of reliability on bus routes. Experience in Harrogate has shown that this type of initiative has a real and measurable impact on patronage. Overall bus patronage in Harrogate has increased by around 22% since the start of LTP2. Although some of this is attributable to the introduction of concessionary fares for people over 60, a significant proportion is because of the improvements discussed above.

3.5.10 The junction improvements implemented as part of the PIP also provide a more effective method of managing congestion for other traffic modes. To supplement these improvements the County Council, working in partnership with Harrogate Borough Council as Highways Agent, has upgraded the traffic control system for Harrogate to a state of the art Urban Traffic Management Control (UTMC) system at a cost of £146,500. This allows real time monitoring of queues / demand and gives the ability to adapt green times to minimise congestion at all the main signal controlled junctions in the urban area.

3.5.11 In addition to the investment in bus based public transport, in 2007/08 the County Council made a significant investment to improve capacity on the York – Harrogate – Leeds railway line. Dramatic patronage increases on this route has resulted in overcrowding and potential further growth is limited by capacity constraints in the peak periods. In
order to address this constraint, with a view to allowing some of the car commuters to Leeds and York to transfer to rail travel, the County Council worked with the Harrogate Line Partnership Officer Group to deliver major improvements. The County Council contributed 450k towards an £8.5 m investment by West Yorkshire PTE, Yorkshire Forward and City of York Council. This was used to fund platform lengthening at Green Hammerton, Cattal, Knaresborough, Hornbeam Park, Pannal and Weeton stations to allow new, longer, higher capacity rolling stock to operate on the line. This allowed provision of 50% more seats on trains, which it is envisaged will relieve current overcrowding and allow for continued growth in the medium term.

3.5.12 Much of the cycle route network in Harrogate was completed as part of LTP 1. However an important link across the Stray is still required to improve the network. The Stray in Harrogate has a unique legal status, which provides a high level of protection from any development and requires a complex and lengthy legal process to allow any alterations to it, including developments such as cycle routes. Work is ongoing to finalise the legal processes to allow this route to be provided and it is hoped that construction will commence in 2011. This will complete the final significant section of the Harrogate Cycle Network which will provide a safe across town route to encourage further transfer from car use to cycling.

3.5.13 Following input from the national “bike-it” initiative, we have gone on to hold Bike promotion days at Harrogate Oatlands schools (as well as in Sowerby and Carlton Minniott near Thirsk). These have all attracted more than 100 bikes to the schools and have incorporated a learning component, parental involvement and road safety training. These initiatives are aimed at a long term behaviour change and as a result of will help meet targets for modal shift in the future.

3.5.14 Due to difficulties in measuring congestion it has not to date been possible to directly identify the overall benefits of HAKITS. However, for the first time the DfT is making Global Positioning System (GPS) based journey time Travel Master data for Harrogate available to the County Council. This data is taken from a sample of vehicles and records journey times on key routes through the area. The County Council will in future make use of this data to both monitor the overall
success of the strategy and where possible identify the main routes in need of further improvements.

3.5.15 Although not formally declared as Air Quality Management Areas, LTP2 identifies the A59 Skipton Road, Harrogate and the A59 High Street, Knaresborough as being areas of concern for traffic related air quality. At this stage it is not felt necessary to take any direct action in these areas to address the issue. It is believed that the measures described above to reduce traffic congestion will also help to improve local air quality. The upgraded UTMC system is especially useful in addressing these issues, as through the adjustment of traffic signal timings it will be possible to encourage traffic to take more appropriate alternative routes away from the air quality problem areas. The District and County Councils will continue to monitor traffic related air quality, especially in these areas.

3.5.16 Scarborough
Scarborough is the second largest town in North Yorkshire and suffers from significant traffic congestion. Outside of the holiday season, congestion is mainly confined to the central core. However, congestion is significantly worse during the peak season and can often extend onto the main radial approaches to the town.

3.5.17 Many of the measures to address congestion in Scarborough are being taken forward as part of the £31.5 million Scarborough Integrated Transport Strategy (SITS) major scheme. Full details of progress on the new road, new park and ride sites and services, bus priority measures and upgraded signal control systems are included in section 3.9 of this report.

3.5.18 In addition to SITS working in partnership with Scarborough Borough Council as highways agent we have implemented a series of cycling schemes to encourage modal shift and improve accessibility. These schemes include the key link along the A64 between Scarborough and Eastfield (see section 3.3.25) and a £50k improvement in the Columbus Ravine area of the town which links the town centre to a number of large residential catchments, some commercial / industrial premises and a large number of hotels and guest houses. We have also made a £20k contribution towards the improvement of cycle routes as part of the Safe Ways Park project being promoted by Scarborough Borough Council and the Friends of Safe Ways Park (see section 3.10.8). This will significantly improve links between the large residential areas to the north of the town centre via a new town park to
a large Sainsburys supermarket and beyond to the town centre. These cycle route improvements provide another example of the multi functional aspects of LTP2 schemes (see section 3.0.2) as they improve both accessibility and road safety and help reduce the congestion and improve the environment in the town through encouraging cycling as an alternative to the private car.

3.5.19 Other Areas

In addition to the congestion areas identified in LTP2 there are a number of junctions on the network that experience congestion as a result of junction capacity issues. Wherever possible the County Council implements low cost improvement measures rather than major works. An example of this approach is the A6136 Scorton Crossroads at Brompton on Swale. This junction experienced long queues and delays associated with the Catterick Sunday Market at the weekend. Minor physical alterations to the junction together with the provision of a new traffic signal controller with optimised timings have eliminated most of the queuing problems for a cost of just £18,000.

3.5.20 As discussed earlier, to address congestion problems at Low Gates Level Crossing in Northallerton we are working with the local planning authority on their Local Development Framework to maximise the potential developer funding for a link road (see section 5.5) which includes a new bridge across the railway. While this route would primarily serve the LDF developments it would have an added benefit of providing an alternative route avoiding Low Gates. In addition to these longer term measures we have recently completed an investigation of short term, low cost traffic management measures.
which will help the town centre’s road network cope with the queues of traffic released when the level crossing opens.

### 3.6 Other LTP2 Objectives

3.6.1 The preceding sections give examples of transport improvement schemes and initiatives that the County Council has delivered which contribute to achieving the first four LTP2 objectives (the four shared priorities). There are however seven LTP2 objectives with the other three being quality of life, economy and efficiency. As is stated in LTP2, the contribution of schemes towards achieving these three objectives is intended to be integral to schemes targeted at addressing the shared priorities. A number of examples to illustrate this are given below.

3.6.2 The impact of congestion on the national and local economy is well documented with business identifying ‘lost time’ due to congestion as a major cost and a constraint on location choice. This is the case even in North Yorkshire, which has relatively low levels of congestion. Schemes to address congestion, such as those included in the Harrogate PIP, therefore indirectly contribute towards the Economy objective by reducing travel time and improving journey time reliability for all users. The potential for extra capacity for bus journeys can also assist and allow the growth of the local economy. Modal transfer to buses also contributes towards the Efficiency Objective in that the required road space per journey on a bus is significantly lower than for private cars, yet many more people can be carried. Additionally, signal improvement works at junctions improve the efficiency of operation by maximising the capacity of the junction without requiring extra road space. In principle schemes aimed at addressing congestion through encouraging modal shift generally provide for more journeys using the same infrastructure.
3.6.3 Achieving modal shift also contributes towards the Quality of Life objective. Active travel (such as cycling and walking) can make a significant contribution to personal health, which is an element of the Quality of Life objective. Schemes to facilitate cycling and walking, such as the Thornton-le-Dale footway / cycle track, targeted at improving accessibility, and the Columbus Ravine congestion reducing cycle routes in Scarborough therefore contribute towards achieving this objective. Additionally the potential mode transfer to walking and cycling in both these cases allows more journeys on essentially the same infrastructure hence improving the efficiency of the network and, being non-polluting modes, reduce local air pollution, noise and greenhouse gases.

3.7 Highway Maintenance

3.7.1 In order to maintain the highway network the County Council invests more than £40 million per year (revenue and capital funding). Much of this is spent on:
- Re-surfacing roads, footways and cycle tracks to improve ride comfort, skid resistance and reduce trip hazards for pedestrians.
- Reconstructing worn out roads.
- Keeping roads clear of snow and ice in winter.
- Carrying out year round routine maintenance such as gully cleaning and cutting verges.
- Maintaining bridges and other structures over rivers, roads and railways to allow them to carry cars, buses, pedestrians, cycles and, where appropriate, 40 tonne lorries.

3.7.2 The highway maintenance budget settlement is allocated to achieve improvements across the wider network, these budget headings are:
- Carriageway Surface Treatments
- Carriageway Resurfacing and Reconstruction (R and R) schemes
- Footway Surface Treatments
- Footway Resurfacing and Reconstruction (R and R) schemes
- Targeted programmes of minor carriageway and footway repairs
- Special Engineering Schemes (lands lips, drainage, cobbles etc.)

Some programme budgets will impact directly upon the various Network Condition Best Value Performance Indicators whilst also contributing to the shared priorities and other LTP objectives. Some typical examples of work carried out in 2006/07 and 2007/08 are given below.
3.7.3 Carriageway Surface Treatment - Pre-patching the carriageway surface improves the carriageway surfacing by removing localised areas of carriageway failure prior to surface dressing. Surface dressing is used to improve surface texture and skid resistance and to reduce the general rate of surface deterioration. As part of these types of schemes, road markings and signing requirements can be reviewed as part of the overall scheme brief.

3.7.4 Identified through inspections and condition surveys, in addition to addressing local safety issues, Blue Bank on the A169 near Whitby was resurfaced in early 2007. The resurfacing scheme included the use of high polished stone value aggregates within new surface course. In conjunction with the use of coloured surfacing to better highlight to road users the steep and sinuous alignment of the carriageway, this reduced the requirement for high friction surfacing whilst incorporating improvements in local signing and lining.

3.7.5 A171 Helredale Road, Whitby (Targeted Patching) - Identified as a consequence of the more detailed assessment of UKPMS condition data but too short to ‘qualify’ as a maintenance scheme in its own right, this busy urban location benefited from both the targeted patching budget and also formed a local safety scheme.

3.7.6 Footway Surface Treatment - Church St, Whitby, a category two footway near to the centre of Whitby, experiences large numbers of tourists. Following a local highway inspection, a slurry sealing process was used to repair minor defects leaving a uniform smooth surface for pedestrians.

3.8 Bridge Maintenance and Repair

3.8.1 Since 2006 the County Council have carried out 87 major bridge maintenance and repair schemes at a cost of £6.84m. Additionally we have undertaken numerous minor maintenance and repair works on road and public rights of way bridges.
3.8.2 Shaken Bridge in upper Ryedale on the North York Moors was damaged beyond repair in a violent short storm event in June 2005. The road over the bridge is the best route into the village of Hawnby from the main road. Other roads into the village were also damaged by the flood water and were impassable. As the reconstruction of the other routes out of the village would not be complete before the winter it was necessary to install a temporary bridge which gave access to the village allowing residents to go about their daily business and importantly to maintain access for emergency vehicles and contractors who needed to be able to get to the village to make repairs to the infrastructure.

3.8.3 Immediately after the flood had subsided the County Council commissioned a £350k contract to support the structure. The contract had two main aims, firstly to allow us to assess the damage to the structure safely and secondly to recover as much of the stone for re-use by dismantling the damaged arch.

3.8.4 Before the bridge could be supported, the damaged arch, built in 1907, collapsed but the older arch, built in 1625, was saved so that it could be dismantled allowing the stone to be reused in the rebuilding of the bridge. To open the road to traffic the temporary Bailey bridge was built upstream of the structure to maintain access until a permanent bridge could be built.

3.8.5 The reconstruction of the bridge started in June 2006 and was completed and the road fully reopened on the 24th May 2007. The bridge had to be totally dismantled and reconstructed costing approximately £1.3million. During the contact we have worked closely with our ecologists to minimise the damage to the environment, not only in the river but also the fields and woods surrounding the bridge.

3.8.6 The present Middleham Bridge was constructed in 1830. It was originally a suspension bridge with the deck supported by chains hung from the castellated towers. The suspension structure was badly damaged a few years after construction, allegedly by a herd of cattle.
crossing the bridge. It was repaired but eventually replaced in 1865 with the wrought iron through-girder deck that remains to this day. In 1985 the bridge was classified as a Grade II listed structure.

3.8.7 When the bridge was recently assessed it was found that due to the advanced state of corrosion in the steel beams supporting the deck, the bridge required strengthening and repair works in order to avoid the need to impose a weight restriction. As the A6108 is the main road through Wensleydale the imposition of a weight limit was not a realistic option. The scheme to strengthen the bridge had to be completed within a six week road closure to minimise disruption to the local community and had to be sympathetic to the existing structure. Early contractor involvement was used to gain opinions and confidence that the design was practical and possible.

3.8.8 We also carried out extensive consultation with the local people who would be affected by the closure of the road and this helped to determine the optimum time of the year for the works. To achieve such a short construction programme it was decided that the new deck would be constructed in sections on the approach to the bridge. The deck sections then were lifted into position between the two plate girders, and joined together forming a new deck independent of the original plate girders which is strong enough to carry all of today’s traffic. The works were completed one day early and the road was reopened within the six week road closure at a cost of £500,000.

3.8.9 An example of a smaller scale scheme, on a Public Right of Way, is at Ravensgill to the south west of Pateley Bridge in an area popular with walkers. The existing footbridge was inspected and found to be beyond repair in 2005. A planned replacement was carried out in
March 2007 at a cost of £17k. The location of the bridge at the bottom of a steep sided valley presented a challenge to the team rebuilding the bridge. A helicopter was used to ferry the bridge and the other construction materials into the valley from a farm track.

3.8.10 The bridge works were completed in eight working days and subsequent reports from site visits after the bridge was opened have suggested that the route is well used by walkers. These softwood timber bridges have a typical lifespan of 12 to 15 years. We balanced the cost of the different types of wood against the anticipated life and considered the weight of the structure. At this location softwood was chosen because of the access problems and the cost difference compared to the extended life a hardwood was likely to offer.

3.9 Major Schemes

3.9.1 Funding for schemes and initiatives costing in excess of £5 million is not provided from the Integrated Transport LTP allocations. The County Council has to make individual bids to Government for funding for each major scheme via the Regional Transport Board (RTB). In the latter part of LTP 1 and the early stages of LTP2 the County Council was successful in securing funding for two major schemes. These are the £31.5 million Scarborough Integrated Transport Strategy (SITS) and the £6.5 million Reighton Bypass. Both of these schemes make a major contribution to achieving the LTP2 Objectives in their local area.

3.9.2 Both of the major schemes were procured through a 2 phase process involving early contractor involvement. Phase 1 included financial incentives for the contractors and our partner consultants responsible for the detailed design of the scheme to work together on the design and value engineering of the scheme to help drive down the target costs. Having derived what was considered the optimum design Phase 2, based on an agreed target cost for the construction of works, was let.

3.9.3 Scarborough Integrated Transport Scheme (SITS)
The SITS major scheme is intended to address road safety, congestion and environmental issues in Scarborough caused by the high
volumes of traffic, especially summer tourist traffic. The SITS package of schemes consists of:

- The construction of a new single carriageway diversion of the A165 between Scarborough and Lebberston replacing the existing sub-standard road which has a poor accident record.
- The construction of a new Park & Ride site adjacent to the A165 diversion and a new Park & Ride site adjacent to the A64.
- The provision of high quality, regular, year round Park & Ride services from these sites to the town centre and the South Bay seafront.
- The provision of bus priority measures (bus lanes, signal priority at junctions etc.) on the route of the Park & Ride services to ensure a reliable and quick service. These priority measures will also assist other bus services operating along the routes.
- The extension and upgrading of the existing Urban Traffic Control (UTC) signal control system to facilitate bus priority at junctions and assist with the efficient flow of all vehicles.
- Parking management measures in the town centre to encourage use of Park & Ride.

3.9.4 The Government confirmed funding for SITS in September 2006. The main contractor (Skanska) started construction of the A165 Diversion and Park & Ride site in October 2006. Construction of the A64 Park & Ride site started in 2007 along with the upgrade to the UTC system, and junction and link improvements to provide bus priority. The overall contract period for construction is 52 weeks and currently the Diversion and Park & Ride sites are on programme to be completed in November 2008. The provisional start date for the park and ride operation is February 2009. Parking management measures in the town centre to complement the introduction of park and ride have been in place for a number of years. The parking measures include resident parking controls and on street parking charges to discourage long stay on-street parking in the town centre. In July 2007 civil parking enforcement (CPE) became operational in the Scarborough District. The introduction of CPE saw responsibility for parking enforcement transfer from the police to the County Council. The CPE is enforced by Scarborough Borough Council and any surplus income from the
scheme will be used to provide revenue support for the Park and Ride operation. Many of the off-street car parking spaces are controlled by Scarborough Borough Council, who are working closely with the County Council to encourage the take-up of Park and Ride when the operation comes into effect.

3.9.5 The Park and Ride Service will be operated by East Yorkshire Motor Services (EYMS) using a fleet of seven, low emission, low floor easy access buses with real-time passenger information and intelligent bus pre-emption technology (providing buses with priority through traffic signals). The new buses, which have unique park and ride branding are on order for delivery in readiness for commencement of the operation. The award of the contract to operate the service was awarded to EYMS following a competitive tendering process. EYMS are a local company, with a depot in Scarborough. The company have chosen to purchase the new park and ride vehicles from the locally based bus and coach builder, Plaxtons, whose workshops are less than a mile from Scarborough town centre. Our investment therefore is bringing an additional direct benefit to the local economy.

3.9.6 A monitoring regime to assess the outcomes of the scheme is in place and the results will be reported in subsequent LTP related reports following implementation of the scheme.

3.9.7 **Reighton Bypass**
The village of Reighton is located approximately 12 km south of Scarborough on the A165. The A165 is the major link between Hull, Bridlington and Scarborough and passes through the centre of the village, causing severe severance within the community. Reighton Bypass is a single carriageway bypass of the village aimed at removing through traffic, addressing a poor accident record in the village, along with the environmental, severance and other impacts of traffic on residents and reducing delays to traffic using the A165. The Government granted full approval for the scheme in July 2005 with finance being available in 2006/07. Construction of the bypass started in July 2006.

3.9.8 The bypass was open to traffic in October 2007 and has been well received by the local community. The bypass has been successful in providing the predicted traffic relief with an 80+% reduction in traffic on the bypassed section of A165. The reduction in through traffic has had
the desired effects of improving the environment and reducing severance. Accident numbers on the new and bypassed section of the A165 will continue to be monitored over the coming years to assess the success of the scheme in terms of safety.

3.10 Contribution to Wider Objectives

3.10.1 The primary purpose of the Local Transport Plan is to deliver improved transport services to residents and visitors to North Yorkshire. Transport however can also have an indirect impact, both positive and negative, on other aspects of people’s lives. Examples of these impacts range from the individual health benefits of active travel (walking and cycling) to the contribution of transport to green house gases and global warming. Transport can also contribute towards much less tangible outcomes such as building a sense of community. For example, walking children to school rather than driving, can help with social interaction between both children and parents, which in turn helps to build the personal linkages which bind a community together.

3.10.2 Generally the County Council does not promote schemes and initiatives which are specifically aimed at addressing these wider objectives. However, consideration of these issues is an integral part of scheme identification and prioritisation in the LTP. The County Council will always aim to maximise the wider benefits of a scheme or initiative and to minimise any adverse impacts. These impacts are specifically included in the ‘added value’ criteria of the Scheme Prioritisation system (see section 2.4).

### Green Street Lights

There are approximately 47,000 street lights operated by the County Council in North Yorkshire. It costs the County Council approximately £1.2m per year to power them.

In 2004 the County Council started replacing the old 80w Mercury lamps with energy efficient 42w compact fluorescent lamps. The new lamps provide the same light output for only 50% of the power consumption.

In 2006 we also introduced energy efficient Philips iridium lanterns complete with new high pressure sodium lamps. This lantern and lamp arrangement is capable of providing up to 100% more illumination and reducing light pollution by around 70%. The 4 years replacement interval is double that of the standard fitting and is around 98% recyclable.

This year we introduced a new switching regime for street lighting. Street lights fitted with the new photo cells will switch on later and switch off earlier saving energy. Around 2,500 units will be installed each financial year.

Since 2005 we have also provided all our street lighting energy from renewable sources.

Together these initiatives all contribute to reducing the impact and especially the carbon footprint of street lighting on the environment.
3.10.3 The Council promotes equality and diversity through the schemes and policies it develops and ensures that equality and diversity issues are integral to all of our processes. The corporate equality plan sets out NYCC’s approach to mainstreaming equality and supports the Council’s vision. Although schemes tend to be multi-purpose, equality and diversity is an integral part of all schemes. This is even more so in the case of those schemes with a heavier bias toward improving accessibility. Specific examples of schemes include:

- at least £100,000 each year spent on installing dropped crossings
- public transport information available in formats such as audio and Braille and other languages
- road safety campaigns in minority ethnic languages targeted at specific cultural groups
- low floor buses specified wherever possible
- supporting technology advances to allow services to be taken the public and consequently reducing the need to travel.

3.10.4 In addition to ensuring that transport related schemes and initiatives contribute towards wider objectives the County Council will, where appropriate, contribute towards schemes promoted by other groups which have a limited transport element but which address a broad range of wider objectives. This section gives details of a number of examples of where County Council or schemes by other groups contribute to transport and other objectives. (The links between transport and land use planning are not covered in this section. Details of how the County Council and planning authorities are working together to integrate the LTP and Local Development Frameworks are included in section 5.5.)

3.10.5 Tourism is a vital part of the North Yorkshire economy and schemes to promote more tourism contribute towards the Economy Objective of LTP2. In North Yorkshire many sections of the National Cycle Network are aimed primarily at recreational and tourist trips. The County Council has worked with Sustrans for many years identifying, signing and where necessary constructing new sections of cycleway to deliver the National Cycle Network in North Yorkshire. Recently we have co-operated on the signing of two major new sections of recreational route through the County, Route 52 from Whitby to Tan Hill and Route 71 from Richmond to Northallerton. Both of these routes link into the National Park and build on an existing network of cycle routes in these major tourist areas.
3.10.6 During the period of LTP 1 the County Council, working with Harrogate Borough Council and the National Lottery, carried out extensive refurbishments of the Market Place and adjacent areas of the historic city of Ripon. The area west of the Market Place however remained under utilised with a number of poor quality semi – derelict buildings and rough car parking. Working alongside Harrogate Borough Council and developers, redevelopment proposals were drawn up for the area. The proposals included a new supermarket, 5 shop units and 36 residential units. The County Council was fully involved in the project to ensure that good pedestrian links to the Market Place make this development an integral part of the city centre and that the poor vehicular access to the development site was addressed by the provision of a new access road between Park Street and North Street.

3.10.7 This road will also provide an improved route between the west and north of Ripon allowing traffic to avoid the Market Place. The new £1.5m access road is being jointly funded by the developer and the County Council and is currently under construction. This joint development will boost the economy of the city and re-develop the semi-derelict land. It will also assist with traffic flow around the town centre and has the potential to reduce the impact of traffic on the historic Market Place and to remove some of the traffic from the High Skellgate / Westgate junction which has been identified in LTP2 as an area of concern for traffic related air quality.
3.10.8 Safe Ways Park is an important and popular open space and play area in a densely populated area of Scarborough with little other public open space. In 2007, Scarborough Borough Council began to draw up improvement proposals for the park in partnership with the local community, Friends of the Old Railway Line, Sustrans, local schools and various other organisations. The plans developed into an exciting mix of play area improvements, wildlife areas, teenage facilities and access improvements to the Old Railway Line. As part of this process, a new community group was established, the Friends of Safe Ways Park. The group helps to improve the park and involve the local community through events, activities, promotion and fund raising.

3.10.9 Amongst the improvement proposals for the park were a series of ideas to improve access and develop the route of the Old Railway Line which also forms part of Sustrans Route 1. The major element of this was a new ramped access from Candler Street to the Old Railway where there was previously an 8 feet high retaining wall and hazardous set of timber steps. The County Council contributed £20k to the Safe Ways Park project to help ensure that the access improvements could be delivered.

3.10.10 The ramp improves pedestrian and cyclist access to a huge residential area and is a key route to the park, the Old Railway Line,
Sainsbury’s (formerly Safeways) supermarket, Gladstone Road schools, and the town centre.

3.10.11 Since its installation it has been extremely well used and warmly welcomed by all sectors of the community; young and old, cyclists, walkers, wheelchair users and children in pushchairs. It has increased active travel opportunities for large segments of the population of Scarborough and has help strengthen the local community. Locally the Safe Ways Park project is seen as a huge success and the park is a transformed public open space, massively popular and greatly appreciated. The project is also providing impetus to further improvements on the Old Railway Line and is seen as the start of a long term and sizeable improvement of this important off-road route.

3.11 Use of Resources

3.11.1 The County Council is the main authority responsible for delivering local transport in North Yorkshire. Much of the funding for transport improvements is provided by Government through the LTP capital allocations (see Table 2.1.) This is provided to the County Council partly through capital grant and partly through an authorisation to borrow money. Whilst the DfT expect LTP funding to be spent on LTP related measures, the funding is not ring fenced. That is to say that the County Council also has the discretion to use the transport funding for the provision of other Council services. However, in 2006/07 and 2007/08 the County Council invested the total available capital allocation of £55.639m (grant and borrowing) in transport improvements and maintenance.

3.11.2 In addition to the capital grant the County Council also allocated £1.25m in 2006/07 and £1.41m in 2007/08 from other capital resources to allow the bulk replacement of potentially dangerous concrete street lighting columns. This

---

Use of Resources

The County Council has recently (October 2008) made provision for £6m of core central resources to be used to allow replacement of concrete lighting columns over the next 3 years. The funding, which is in addition to the existing street lighting pot, will allow the street lighting column replacement programme to be completed in 2011.

£1m funding has also been made available from central Council resources, to allow additional footway maintenance to be undertaken over the next two financial years. It is anticipated that the additional funding will allow 200km of category 3 and 4 urban footways to be resurfaced, primarily on residential estates.
significantly reduced the maintenance liability of the columns and additionally by installing energy efficient lamps, reduced electricity use and the carbon footprint of street lighting.

3.11.3 The County Council also allocated approximately £24m per year of its revenue budget to highway maintenance and approximately £5.5m per year to supporting bus services (see Table 2.2 in Part 2).

3.11.4 In total the County Council will invest over £50m per year in transport or over £250m during the period of LTP2 (excluding home to school transport). Clearly with this level of expenditure, careful management is required to ensure the efficient use of the available funds.

3.11.5 The County Council believe that the rigorous application of scheme prioritisation systems for both integrated transport and maintenance, (as described in sections 2.4 and 2.5 of this report) ensures that the available finance directly addresses the LTP objectives. These systems also ensure that priority is given to those schemes and initiatives that have the biggest impact on the objectives. The multi-objective nature of the integrated transport prioritisation system also ensures that all impacts of a proposal, whether positive or negative, are taken into account.

3.11.6 Additionally, in order to ensure that the value for money established by the prioritisation system is not compromised by scheme cost increases as the design progresses, we operate a rigorous system of cost control. Any significant cost increase for any scheme or initiative will only be approved after it has been subject to re-prioritisation to ensure that it still represents a value for money contribution to the LTP objectives. If this is not the case, alternative lower cost solutions to the specific issues will be investigated and ultimately the scheme may be discontinued.

3.11.7 We are also aiming to maximise the value for money contribution to LTP Objectives by adopting, as
and where appropriate, a ‘fit for purpose’ approach to scheme specification and design. For example, the recommended minimum width for a joint use un-segregated footway / cycle track is 2.5m. Whilst this is appropriate for relatively high use routes in and around towns it is excessive for routes between villages which may only have a few users each day. This approach allows the provision of cheaper routes, often in areas that could not justify the expenditure on a full standard route. It also allows the provision of routes that potentially could not be delivered to full standards because of land or space constraints. This approach can also be applied to safety schemes. For example the optimum solution to a safety problem at a junction may be the provision of a new roundabout with traffic management, yet traffic calming measures may address most of the safety issues at less than 10% of the cost. Whilst this fit for purpose scheme may be a compromise for this location, it must be remembered that it allows the investment of the 90% cost saving at other locations. The net result is that significantly more accidents can be saved per pound than if the optimum scheme is provided.

3.11.8 The County Council is also seeking to become more efficient through improved management practices and the use of technology. For example, the ongoing development of a Transport Asset Management Plan coupled with the development of a Highway Information Management System will lead to better targeting of maintenance works and through the use of GIS (Geographic Information Systems) will ensure easier and better integration of maintenance and integrated transport programmes.

3.11.9 As has been previously stated delivery of the LTP can only be achieved through partnership working. These partnerships include the ‘internal’ Highways North Yorkshire Partnership between the County Council, Jacobs (our partner consultants) and Balfour Beatty Infrastructure Services (our partner contractors) which together aim to improve delivery through reviewing working practices and schemes such as the ‘innovations register’ of good ideas. We also work in partnership with other bodies and agencies to achieve shared objectives. Key examples of this such as the ‘95 Alive’ road safety partnership, joint working with bus operators and strong links to community transport groups and operators are highlighted in this report. We ensure that we include all relevant stakeholders in coming to appropriate solutions to problems, such as ensuring that North Yorkshire Police are represented on our freight quality partnerships and that members of the local community are appropriately represented. By ensuring we work in partnership with others around us, we also are more likely to gain support from the public and our partners.
4.0 BACKGROUND

4.0.1 The County Council and its partners were very successful in delivering the aims, objectives and initiatives of LTP 1. This culminated in the ‘Excellent’ grading awarded by the Government for our LTP 1 Delivery Report. Building on the procedures and partnerships established through the first local transport plan period we have continued to effectively deliver the second LTP.

4.0.2 The Council however strives for continuous improvement in all aspects of LTP delivery. Therefore, as part of the mid term review of LTP2 we carried out the following exercises to identify where and how we could improve the delivery of LTP2 during the remainder of its life to 2011:

- Stakeholder Engagement
- SWOT Analysis
- Review of LTP Indicators and Targets
- Risk Assessment
- Integrated Transport Scheme Prioritisation Review.

4.0.3 Most importantly we used these techniques to consider how we could improve transport outcomes for the travelling public and residents of North Yorkshire. We also contrasted the information we gathered against information collected through other means such as the County Council’s Citizens Panel and the national Highway Works & Design Benchmarking Club. Results from the annual Citizens Panel surveys identify key areas of success and areas for improvement within the highways and transportation service. As a public service it is essential that we strive to meet the needs of the public and develop the service we provide whilst also ensuring the Council’s overall objectives and those identified by central government through the LTP framework are met. The Citizens Panel provides us with a year on year indication of what is important to people living in North Yorkshire and how well they think we are performing.

4.0.4 Whilst for clarity these are presented in this report as separate pieces of work, in reality they are all interlinked. Figure 4.1 below illustrates these linkages for the issue of underperformance against the road safety targets.
Figure 4.1 – Example of Performance Improvement Methodology

4.0.5 This section sets out brief details of these exercises and the main findings culminating in a concise action plan which identifies the most important improvements the County Council and its partners can implement. Further details are included in the appendices to this report.

4.1 Progress towards Targets and Commitments

4.1.1 The County Council operates a rigorous performance management regime to ensure successful delivery of LTP2. This operates from a corporate level responsible for monitoring the whole of the County
Council’s performance down to targets for delivering LTP commitments at a team or individual level. This provides a clear ‘line of sight’ for staff involved in delivering the service on the ground.

**Figure 4.2 - LTP2 Performance Management Hierarchy**

4.1.2 This regime includes the monitoring of 19 headline LTP2 indicators. Fourteen of these are mandatory indicators in that the Government requires them to be included in Local Transport Plans. The other five are local indicators and were selected by the County Council to monitor progress toward local priorities. For each of the indicators selected the County Council has set a target level to be reached by the end of the implementation of LTP2 and a trajectory to determine progress during
the plan. Table 4.4 below gives brief details of each of these indicators and progress to date (Dec 2007) towards achieving them. Further details are available in Appendix 3.

4.1.3 Table 4.3 indicates that at the end of 2007/08, of the nineteen key targets 13 were on track to be achieved by the end of 2010/2011, 4 were not on track and further analysis was required for 2. Whilst we must ensure that we maintain progress on the ‘on track’ targets we must ensure that we improve our delivery of schemes and initiatives that contribute to the targets that are not on track.

4.1.4 Road safety is the joint highest priority of the seven LTP2 objectives. It is therefore worrying that three of the four targets not on track are safety targets. Although early indications for 2008 are that these targets are back on track research into the possible causes of the slowing down of progress towards the targets, and the identification of remedial measures, is still a priority. This work has been carried out in conjunction with our ‘95 Alive’ Road Safety Partners, and therefore encompasses improvements in strategy across all of the three E’s – Education, Enforcement and Engineering. The result is a series of solutions that should bring about greater reductions in road casualty numbers over the short, medium and longer term and critically, in terms of our targets, get us back on track. These include:

- Investment in improved methods of communication across the partnership to further improve coordination of road safety activity;
- Introducing structural changes into the ‘95 Alive’ partnership arrangements to formally engage with the Crime and Disorder Reduction and Local Strategic Partnerships;
- Enhanced use of the high risk accident site list to identify engineering schemes;
- Greater focus on the use of route action studies;
- Tangible increase in technical assistance and support for police enforcement campaigns;
- Introduction of best practice initiatives from elsewhere in order to increase road casualty reduction rates, e.g. the erection of ‘Shiny Side Up’ posters on the B1222 between York and Selby, a route with high motorcycle casualty rates. These have been introduced in conjunction with the B1222
Route Action Study measures and alongside the fatal collision recommendations;

- Development of a formalised speed management protocol and research into the effectiveness and feasibility of safety cameras in North Yorkshire.

4.1.5 The work to further refine and improve the ‘95 Alive’ strategy continues, and it is worth noting that we have taken advantage of the DfT’s invitation to carry out a ‘Health Check’ on our road safety strategy.

4.1.6 The indications for 2008 are that there have been significant reductions in the numbers of Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI) casualties so far for this year compared to the last three years. If this current trend continues, we forecast being back on track for all road safety targets and meeting our NI 47 Local Area Agreement (LAA) indicator for 2008. For further information on progress against targets please see table 4.4 and Appendix 3.

4.1.7 The 19 key indicators included in the LTP do not cover the full range of transport issues and initiatives that need to be addressed. The County Council has therefore identified almost 40 specific commitments and actions noted in LTP2. These range from the commitment to prepare 28 Service Centre Transportation Strategies by 2011 to carrying out studies and identifying solutions to congestion problems in the National Parks as well as actions targeted at road safety, accessibility and travel awareness amongst others.

4.1.8 All 19 indicators and 40 LTP2 commitments are monitored on a quarterly basis. This allows early remedial action to be taken if a target is not on track or there is any slippage in commitments. This continuous performance monitoring and robust performance management by the County Council has allowed the mid term review of LTP2 to be focussed at a strategic level rather than addressing everyday performance issues. Table 4.3 below sets out details of the key targets and indicators that will be monitored for the remainder of the LTP period until 2011 and shows our performance on a RAG basis, (blue - target exceeded, green – target on track, orange – data being collected and red - target not on track):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Original Target</th>
<th>Proposed Target</th>
<th>Change Y/N</th>
<th>Reason for change or no change</th>
<th>Actual in 07/08 (Trajectory in brackets)</th>
<th>On track?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI 168 (BVPI 223)</td>
<td>Principal Road Condition: % where structural maintenance should be considered</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4% by 2010/11</td>
<td>3% by 2010/11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Strategy developed to sustain condition at current 07/08 value of 3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 169 (BVPI 224a)</td>
<td>Non-Principal Classified Road Condition: % where structural maintenance should be considered</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>The DfT advised that we did not need to set a target due to a change in their methodology. Target to be set once data became available from the new survey methodology.</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Currently investigating network management and funding strategy options</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BVPI 224b)</td>
<td>Unclassified Road Condition: % where structural maintenance should be considered</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15% by 2010/11</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Currently investigating network management and funding strategy options</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 47 (BVPI 99a) LAA PI</td>
<td>Number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents 1994-98 average</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>622 Casualties by 2010</td>
<td>631 as a rolling 3 year average by 2010</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No change in target as such, change in method of calculating figure</td>
<td>716 (668)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 48 (BVPI 99b) LAA PI</td>
<td>Number of children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents 1994-98 average</td>
<td>108 casualties</td>
<td>43 Casualties by 2010</td>
<td>43 Casualties by 2010</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Already a stretched target, so additional stretch would not be appropriate.</td>
<td>51 (46)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BVPI 99c)</td>
<td>Number of people slightly injured in road traffic accidents 1994-98 average</td>
<td>2947</td>
<td>Maintain at baseline level despite traffic growth.</td>
<td>2585 by end of 2010</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Figure re-based using a 5 year average rather than four year average.</td>
<td>2465 (2947)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 177 (BVPI 102)</td>
<td>Public Transport Patronage: Total local public transport journeys per year by bus only/by bus &amp; other selected local public transport modes</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>16.1 million journeys</td>
<td>6% increase above the baseline by 2011 (17.06m)</td>
<td>17.9m</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This is to be increased to reflect growth anticipated from the free national concessionary fares scheme</td>
<td>16.91m (16.80m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BV 104)</td>
<td>Satisfaction with local bus services</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70% and upper quartile by 2009/10 (derived from triennially BVPI users survey)</td>
<td>70% and upper quartile by 2010/11 (different target year due to Place survey taking place biennially)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No longer a BV indicator, now contained in the National Indicator Set. Change to a local indicator and measure through Place Survey.</td>
<td>69% (*measured through 2008 Citizen Panel) (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BVPI 187)</td>
<td>Footway Condition: % where structural maintenance should be considered</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8% by 2010/11</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Detailed analysis of the application of the national condition assessment for footways has shown a significant disparity between the treatment of flagged and bituminous footways. This is particularly important in a large rural area. The current target for 2010/11 is being reviewed in light of this.</td>
<td>17% in 06/07 (22% in 06/07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 175</td>
<td>Number of Community Transport</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>124,706</td>
<td>With Future builders a 50%</td>
<td>62.5% increase by</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Stretched target (60%) to bring</td>
<td>171000 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LTP1</strong></td>
<td>Journeys</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Increase by 2011. Without Futurebuilders a 25% increase by 2011.</td>
<td>2010/11.</td>
<td>Indicator in line with the LAA target STR/3 plus additional 2.5% for final year of LTP2. Revised baseline figure to reflect revised definition of the indicator agreed in LAA.</td>
<td>2007 (169877 in 2007)</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LTP2</strong></td>
<td>Change in area wide road traffic Mileage.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6661 million vehicle km</td>
<td>1.5% growth per annum</td>
<td>1.5% growth per annum</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
<td>4839 in 2006 (2007 data not yet available from DfT) (4802 in 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LTP 3</strong></td>
<td>Number of cycling trips</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>100 index (1136 cycle trips)</td>
<td>1% growth per annum</td>
<td>3% growth per annum in 09/10 and 10/11 (111 by 2010/2011)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>To make target more stretching.</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LTP 4</strong></td>
<td>Modal share of journeys to school (Car, Bus, Cycle, Walk)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>30% of trips by car/taxi</td>
<td>29% by 2010/11</td>
<td>28% by car/taxi by 2010/11 (from baseline of 31% in 2007/08)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Some issues in terms of setting and establishing the baseline figure.</td>
<td>31% (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NI 178 (LTP 5)</strong></td>
<td>Bus Punctuality: Percentage of services one minute early to five minutes late.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>It was felt that current methodology was biased against good performance, so an alternative, more complete methodology being devised.</td>
<td>31% (31%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCAL INDICATORS**

| **L1** | Number of Fatal Casualties in York and North Yorkshire | 1999-2003 average | 85 | Reduce by one third by 2010 (56) | Reduce by one third by 2010 (56) | N | No change. | 81 (72) | No |
| **L2** | Patronage on Quality Bus Routes | 2003/04 | 100 (index) | 30% increase by 2010/2011 | 52% increase by 2011 | Y | Increase to 52 to reflect anticipated impact of free national concessionary fares and keep in line with BV 102. | 46% increase (25% increase) | Yes |
| **L3** | Patronage on Quality Contract Bus Routes | 2003/04 | 298,084 pax | 15% increase by 2010/2011 | 35% increase by 2011 | Y | Targets have been met | 27% increase (12% increase) | Yes |
| **L4** | Public Satisfaction with public transport information | 2003/04 | 73% | 75% | 75% by 2010/11 | N | No longer part of the national indicator set however retain as local indicator and record from the biennial place survey. | 75% (74%) (see BV104) | Yes |
| **L5** | Percentage increase in cycling journeys to work | 2008 | 2.7% of journeys to work by cycle made by cycle | 1% per annum | Target of 7.2% of all journeys to work by cycle set for 2016. | Y | Change in method of monitoring this indicator. Trajectories are currently being developed. Counts will be undertaken every 2 years; however permanent count sites in vicinity will be used to monitor trends. | 2.7% | Data being collected.. |
4.2 Review of LTP2 Indicators and Targets

4.2.1 Government guidance suggested that as well as reporting on progress towards achieving targets in their LTP mid term reviews Authorities should also take the opportunity to consider whether the targets as set out in LTP2 are still appropriate. A review of targets and indicators in the LTP was also felt to be necessary as a result of the national change in focus from Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPI) to Local Area Agreement (LAA) national indicators (see section 5.1). The introduction of Local Area Agreements has seen the development of a new National Indicators Set (NIS). This NIS partly replaces the BVPIs and mandatory indicators which formed part of the suite of targets and performance indicators (PIs) collected in LTP2.

4.2.2 The County Council commissioned a review to investigate whether or not the 19 targets included in LTP2 are still appropriate, relevant and achievable. This review included a comparison with other similar authorities. The authorities chosen were considered good comparators to NYCC because of either their similarity in terms of LTP performance management (‘excellent’ authorities) or being comparable geographically and demographically (nearest neighbours.)

The review of the indicators and targets was split into the following key areas:

- Road safety
- Highway maintenance
- Public transport
- Accessibility
- Road traffic
- Cycling
- School travel

4.2.3 Having reviewed all of the areas on which the County Council’s progress is monitored, it became clear that NYCC’s targets were variable in comparison with other authorities:

- Overall, the road safety targets were considered less stretching than those of other comparable authorities.
- The targets relating to highway maintenance are generally in line with those of other excellent rated authorities;
- In general the targets relating to public transport patronage and satisfaction are in line with comparable authorities. However, due to the good progress that has been made and the passenger increases that have occurred as a result of the introduction of free travel for over 60’s, the suggestion is that some of the indicators be revised upwards.
- Targets relating to road traffic growth are similar to and within the range of values being aimed for by comparable authorities. The
target is currently not being met, but this situation could change due to the impact of increasing fuel prices. Consequently, the target will remain unchanged.

- Cycling monitoring targets are to a degree comparable with other excellent authorities; they appear to be less stretching than those of other nearest neighbours, but this could be due to other authorities having lower baseline figures. In view of this, it is recommended that the target be increased for the last two years of LTP2. A new baseline and target has also been set for the cycle journeys to work indicator. A trajectory for this is currently being developed.

4.2.4 Following discussion with the Lead Officer for each target the following recommendations for change were made: Proposals to change targets are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase target</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTP/BVPI</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 99c</td>
<td>Total slight casualties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 102</td>
<td>Bus patronage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP1</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP3</td>
<td>Annualised index of cycling trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Bus patronage on quality commercial routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Bus patronage on quality contact bus routes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 – Summary of proposed changes to targets and indicator

4.2.6 The review also considered the relationship between funding and targets. As NYCC scored an excellent rating for both its LTP2 and the LTP1 Delivery Report, the authority received an additional 25% integrated transport funding on top of the planning guideline figure. The County Council therefore needs to demonstrate the additional value added by having additional funding at our disposal. In LTP2 the Council identified that any additional performance related funding would be used directly to fund more schemes and initiatives to contribute towards the LTP2 Objectives.

4.2.7 Integrated transport schemes and initiatives are selected for delivery using the County Council’s bespoke prioritisation methodology (see section 2.4). The funding increase we have received has allowed us to deliver additional outputs and outcomes by bringing forward schemes in our programme. In line with LTP2 the additional 25% performance related uplift has been used wholly to deliver extra integrated transport schemes that, through the prioritisation system, have been identified as making a significant contribution towards achieving our LTP2 objectives. As we implement integrated transport schemes in strict priority order it is not possible at this mid stage of LTP2 delivery to identify which are additional schemes as in effect we are only bringing scheme delivery forward by a year. However in the final delivery report
we will report on which additional schemes and initiatives we have delivered with our 25% uplift and make an assessment of the additional outcomes that the extra funding has allowed us to achieve.

4.2.8 The link between maintenance spend and delivery of outcomes is much easier to appreciate than for integrated transport schemes. An exercise has been undertaken which shows how much additional expenditure would be required to achieve an uplift of 1% on each indicator. This understanding allows the County Council to target funding to achieve the best outcomes. However, the reduction in the maintenance allocation from the anticipated guideline discussed in section 3.1.18 and table 3.4 and the change in monitoring methodology and technologies mean that the original targets are no longer appropriate and will be re-developed.

4.3 Stakeholder Engagement

4.3.1 The Local Transport Plan is all about improving transport for the people of North Yorkshire. It is therefore crucial that the County Council knows the views of stakeholders and the public, on what and how we are doing. This local opinion will help the County Council balance the local and national priorities for transport and allocate limited resources more appropriately. To inform the 2008 Progress Report the Council therefore carried out comprehensive stakeholder engagement in the spring of 2008. Brief details are given below with a fuller analysis forming Appendix 1.

![Figure 4.5 – Stakeholder priorities for transport](image)

Figure 4.5 – Stakeholder priorities for transport

4.3.2 In April of this year North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) invited key stakeholders to submit their opinions on transport issues across the County. A total of 944 postal surveys were issued to key stakeholders and parish councils. During the five week consultation period 26% of
the surveys were returned. On April 15th 2008 a forum was held in Northallerton at which key stakeholders were invited to discuss various transport issues in further detail. The forum was conducted in the form of workshop groups considering various issues. Participants elected to discuss ‘Accessibility’ and ‘Congestion and the Environment’ with the resulting views fed into the consultation exercise.

4.3.3 A key element of the stakeholder engagement was the need to establish whether the public’s view of the relative priorities given to the seven LTP2 objectives during the preparation of LTP2 had altered. During the preparation of LTP2 public consultation suggested that Countywide, safety and accessibility were considered to be the two most important objectives with congestion being rated as a slightly lower priority (though still important, especially in the urban areas). This response helped us to determine the relative weightings given to the objectives in the scheme prioritisation system (see section 2.5) and therefore the funding allocated to schemes to address each of the objectives. Survey responses to the 2008 stakeholder engagement exercise suggest that the priorities set out in the original LTP2 document are still valid and that NYCC’s main priorities, in terms of transport, should continue to be in priority order safety, accessibility and then congestion.

4.3.4 As previously stated Service Centre Transportation Strategies (SCTS’s) are the main method of scheme identification for LTP2. An important element of the process is the community involvement, through Stakeholder Engagement and Household Surveys. Survey responses show that 26% of those who responded were aware of an SCTS in their area. This coverage broadly reflects the current position of the programme of preparation since not all areas have yet been covered by an SCTS. Encouragingly, of those that were aware of an SCTS, 73% consider it an effective method of identifying and addressing local issues.

4.3.5 Determining whether stakeholders believe the transport measures being implemented in North Yorkshire are the right ones is key in ensuring effective delivery of LTP2. Overall, only 30% of stakeholders believed that the measures being implemented were the right ones. In comparison, 34% of stakeholders who were aware of an SCTS believed that the measures were the right ones. This suggests that the SCTS process does make a slight difference to the views of stakeholders. Because the majority of SCTS are still in the planning and design stage, it is envisaged that the acceptance level of the measures may increase as schemes and improvements from the SCTS process are implemented on site where their benefits can be fully appreciated by stakeholders. However, we recognise that this is an issue which needs further investigation and as a result we will be making it a priority to research this issue further and come up with improvement actions. Initially, in order to better inform Members and local stakeholders, we will introduce annual reports to the County
Councils Area Committees setting out progress on the implementation of the SCTS’s.

4.3.6 Whilst in the past the Government has rated the County Council’s LTP Delivery as ‘Excellent’ we also needed to determine how local people thought we were performing. The results of the stakeholder postal surveys suggest public perception is that good progress is being made in the areas of road safety, road maintenance and community transport provision whilst more progress needs to be made on public transport services, access to services, facilities for cyclists’, facilities for pedestrians and reducing congestion.

4.3.7 A final element of the stakeholder engagement was to help us determine what action stakeholders thought we needed to take to meet our objectives. A significant number of the responses indicated that more emphasis should be given to improving public transport services and maintaining roads and pavements.

Figure 4.6 – Stakeholder views on future actions for transport

4.3.7 Although the stakeholder engagement specifically included many of the member organisations involved in the Local Strategic Partnership (North Yorkshire Strategic Partnership – NYSP) the County Council directly consulted the NYSP Executive. Their views and guidance were sought on the relative priorities of LTP2 Objectives. The NYSP Executive agreed that accessibility (especially to healthcare services) was a high priority and had a long discussion on how partnership working between the different organisations could be improved.
4.4 SWOT Analysis

4.4.1 Guidance issued by DfT on LTP2 progress reports suggested that authorities should complete a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses Opportunities and Threats) analysis in relation to their current and future delivery up until the end of LTP2. The County Council therefore held a number of SWOT workshop sessions with all key stakeholders from within the Highways North Yorkshire Partnership including our partner organisations Jacobs and Balfour Beatty Infrastructure Services (BBIS) and with Harrogate and Scarborough Borough Councils who currently act as Highways Agents in their respective urban areas. An internal SWOT session was held with a wide range of employees responsible for the delivery of the LTP.

4.4.2 The aim of these sessions was to identify those areas of LTP delivery that need to be improved, the areas we are performing well in, so we can continue to improve and to identify the key external influences that may influence our delivery of LTP2. In some cases proposals for actions to address the issues were put forward and these helped form the basis of an improvement action plan.

4.4.3 Throughout the SWOT sessions, several key themes emerged. These themes formed the bulk of discussion although the range of issues to be addressed is not limited to those within the key themes.

4.4.4 SCTS Process
The SCTS process, a fundamental part of the council’s delivery of LTP2, was identified as being an area for improvement. Whilst it was believed that the principles behind the whole process were fundamentally sound and helped the Council in meeting the shared and local priorities in LTP2, several concerns existed about the actual delivery of the SCTS process. These included the level and relevance of stakeholder and public engagement, the quality and suitability of proposed schemes, the use of available technical expertise within the Highways North Yorkshire Partnership and the lack of development of existing scheme proposals within the SCTS area.

4.4.5 As the SCTS process is continually evolving, and is such an important element of LTP2, delivery reviews are regularly held and have been aided by a separate SCTS SWOT analysis. As a result a revised development process is to be employed for the SCTS in the 2008/09 programme. The new process contains a more structured and simplified consultation process in order to encourage more relevant proposals and suggestions from stakeholders. A greater level of technical expertise is to be utilised by all the HNY partners to guide the process towards meeting LTP2 objectives whilst at the same time addressing the concerns of the public. This will be done by incorporating selected schemes from the Council’s list of possible future capital schemes within the SCTS process for consideration by stakeholders at an earlier stage.
4.4.6 Management and Performance of the Highways North Yorkshire Partnership

How we work alongside our Highways North Yorkshire Partnership (HNY) partners in delivering LTP2 was identified as being key theme. Across the HNY a significant level of knowledge and expertise exists, however it was felt that this is not used as effectively as it could be. It was felt that this was due to two core points, how well the partners perform, but also how the County Council manages and works with the partners to ensure LTP2 objectives are met.

4.4.7 The need to develop a more rigid framework for monitoring partner performance was identified, as was improving employee and key stakeholder knowledge of the contracts and agreements within the Partnership which affect delivery. These actions need to be targeted both on a local level (individual project based) and on a more Partnership wide, strategic level. To help to achieve this, training and development has been planned for all members of the Partnership.

4.4.8 Communication

Linked closely to the management and performance of external partners is the role of effective communication both across the partnership and outside of the partnership with the public. Many examples of effective communication were identified through the SWOT analysis, such as the way in which our local road safety and travel awareness officers actively engage with the local community. Another positive form of communication can be demonstrated in the co-location of Jacobs, BBIS and County Council staff at area offices. This has enabled improved partnership working and the further development of local knowledge and expertise.

4.4.9 Improving communication links with key external bodies such as other local authorities, regional bodies, the commercial sector and the voluntary sector was identified as being essential to ensure effective delivery of our LTP2 objectives. This type of communication is two-way and requires other bodies to engage with the County Council, and we will continue to promote the benefits of effective external communication.

4.4.10 Engaging with the public so that they are aware of what we are aiming to do, managing their expectations of what can realistically be achieved and being aware of their desires, needs and requirements is also important to the successful delivery of LTP2. Improving awareness of our planned programme of works is an important element of this, as is communication through the SCTS process. The Council is continuing our drive to improve customer service and communication using both online information and through the NY Times free newspaper which is distributed monthly to every household in the County.
4.4.11 The Highways North Yorkshire Partnership has recently completed a review of external communication and consultation and a newly formed Communication and Consultation (C&C) group will be responsible for driving forward the review action plan. Communication issues are not limited to external communication; internal communication plays a major role in effective LTP2 delivery. Understanding the roles of other areas of the Partnership and the effect that each area has on another was identified as being an area of weakness. To rectify this, improved liaison is now taking place between different teams in the form of workshops and attendance at dedicated forum meetings. Building improved working relationships should ultimately assist in improving performance. This will be supported through the Council’s continued commitment to embracing new forms of technology such as video conferencing and web based technology to allow information to be shared. The C&C group will help push forward improvements in internal communication.

4.4.12 Distributing information and policy at a strategic level within the partnership and to the general public was identified as an area for improvement. Highways North Yorkshire has implemented a revised communication process to improve the information flow through the partnership. Leaflets are also being developed which will explain various aspects of the LTP, such as the roles of the different partners in HNY and the way in which schemes are prioritised. It is hoped that this will further assist in LTP2 being understood and embraced by all members of the public and staff across the Council and partner organisations.

4.4.13 Additionally further devolving responsibility down throughout the partnership through increased empowerment was identified as having a major role in improving communication links, enabling more decisions to be made locally throughout the county.

4.4.14 Management of Resources
As is the case with all organisations, the County Council must effectively manage and maintain suitable resource levels in order to fully meet the needs of the LTP and the public of North Yorkshire. Currently the Council alongside its key partners has developed a highly skilled workforce. The public rightly expect to receive a high level of service from the Council. Therefore it is essential that the Council is able to effectively prioritise workloads to ensure that key objectives are met.

4.4.15 Improving the flexibility of staff resources across the County was identified as being a major area for development and would assist in addressing any short term staff shortage issues. This is likely to take the form of employees moving between Area Offices dependent upon the workloads in respective areas.
4.4.16 Developing the current workforce through training and development was identified as a major opportunity for improving the service provided. Through continued appraisal and training plans the Partnership aims to continue developing its staff.

4.4.17 Whilst developing internal staff is important, equally important is recruiting new members of staff to fill vacancies. Across the civil engineering and transport planning sectors there is a shortage of skilled applicants for vacancies. This poses a considerable threat to the Council and therefore a new recruitment strategy for Highways and Transportation has been developed to try to encourage suitably qualified and skilled applicants to take up employment with NYCC. The strategy also considers ways in which the recruitment process could be streamlined and simplified.

4.4.18 The current agency agreements with both Scarborough and Harrogate Borough Council are due to terminate at the end of LTP2 and appropriate measures are being implemented to ensure that the transfer of responsibility for the highways service in the respective urban areas is managed effectively and does not result in a disruption to the service. Alongside this, maintaining a strong working relationship with both agent authorities throughout the transfer is important and strategy and working groups have been formed to take forward the work associated with this.

4.4.19 Programming and Delivery of Works

It has been recognised that the two year rolling programme that the Council operates to programme work is a significant strength because

---

Co location - working together

As part of the ongoing programme of improving frontline delivery of services to the public the County Council has invested in developing new premises in the seven Highway Areas within the County. These new modern, environmentally-friendly premises enable all three parties (NYCC, Jacobs and BBIS) within the Highways North Yorkshire Partnership to be located on the same site. This will assist in improving service delivery and efficiency.

A major benefit of this new way of operation is the ability to move resource between areas to cope with increases in workload at each office, improving flexibility and the ability of the County Council to respond to the needs of the public. So far new offices in Selby, Thirsk and Kirby Misperton are operational with offices in the other four areas planned for implementation through the remainder of LTP2.
it allows a degree of flexibility and forward planning for future schemes. However, it was identified that at times the programme is not adhered to as strictly as it should be. Slippage in the program can affect not just the delivery of the specific schemes but can also have a knock on effect on other schemes, which may be delayed as a result.

4.4.20 To resolve this we are looking at ways of improving our programme monitoring. This would be in the form of building on and improving the existing regular programme reviews involving all partners throughout the design and implementation process. Performance measures have been put in place to provide clear information on the relative performance of the various areas of the highways service.

4.4.21 Improving the design process so that more schemes are ready to be delivered and are not delayed in the design phase is also important and was recognised as being an area for improvement. We are continually looking at ways to improve scheme delivery such as the development of early contactor involvement.

4.4.22 Scheme Prioritisation
The scheme prioritisation system was recognised as providing a strong objective-based, auditable process for comparing proposed schemes against one another across the County, in order to achieve best value for money. It is felt however that there is a lack of full understanding both across the Partnership and externally of how the process works. In response to this a training and briefing programme is to be extended across the partnership and an information leaflet is to be produced for wider circulation. Details of other potential improvements to the Integrated Transport Scheme Prioritisation System are included in section 4.7 below.

4.5 Review of the Bus Strategy and the Bus Information Strategies

4.5.1 Bus Information Strategy – Work is currently underway to develop a regional proposal to consider the current strengths and weaknesses in public transport information across the Yorkshire and Humber region. Ultimately it is hoped that the review will illustrate whether a better standard of information, plus economic efficiencies might be achieved through closer working with other Authorities in the region.

4.5.2 Bus Strategy – As North Yorkshire is a two tier authority, some transport services are provided by the County Council, and some are provided by the district councils, with both levels of Authority having their own vehicles in operation. There is potential for enhancements to the working relationship between the two tiers of local government and a review is underway that will consider whether the fleets operated by all of the Authorities in North Yorkshire, whether transporting people or goods, or providing a public service, could operate more efficiently.
4.6 Risk Assessment

4.6.1 During the preparation of LTP2 key partners and County Council staff carried out a formal assessment of the risks to the future delivery of the LTP. This was done using the ‘RISGEN’ assessment system and identified the scope, impact and likelihood of the main risks to future delivery. This information was used to identify a series of ‘control measures’ and risk reduction actions to minimise the likelihood of risks occurring and to mitigate their impact should they happen.

4.6.2 The County Council reviewed and updated the LTP2 Risk Assessment as part of the mid term review of delivery. Revised control measures and risk reduction actions will be implemented for the remainder of the LTP2 period to 2011.

4.7 Integrated Transport Scheme Prioritisation Review

4.7.1 As described in section 2.4, the Integrated Transport Scheme Prioritisation System allocates funding to schemes based on their contribution to the LTP2 objectives. These objectives are weighted to take account of their relative priorities as established during the preparation of LTP2.

4.7.2 The system has so far been very successful in prioritising a range of schemes and initiatives that deliver against all LTP2 objectives and across all geographical areas in North Yorkshire. However, a number of issues have been raised through the stakeholder engagement and from the review of indicators and targets which require further investigation including a review of the weightings afforded to the objectives in the Prioritisation System.

4.7.3 There are currently 2 years of the Integrated Transport block allocation not yet firmly programmed (09/10 and 10/11). Of the £17m allocation for the remaining 2 years approximately £12m will be allocated through the scheme prioritisation system (the remainder is used to fund countywide initiatives and those that cannot be prioritised using the system). Table 4.7 below shows the percentage of the £12m spent on schemes which primarily contribute to each of the top three priorities for a variety of different weightings. It must however be noted that many of the schemes are multi-purpose and contribute to more than one of the objectives. The percentages are based on which objective they make the biggest contribution towards. All schemes are drawn from the County Council’s current list of integrated transport schemes competing for entry into the programme. This analysis cannot take into account schemes that are yet to be identified and included in the list. The results may therefore identify a lack of schemes contributing to a specific priority rather than a characteristic of the prioritisation methodology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Number</th>
<th>Accessibility Weighting</th>
<th>Safety Weighting</th>
<th>Congestion Weighting</th>
<th>% Accessibility Schemes</th>
<th>% Safety Schemes</th>
<th>% Congestion Schemes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Current weightings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Increase in congestion weighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increase in accessibility and safety weighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Increase in safety weighting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.7 – Scheme Prioritisation Sensitivity Testing

**4.7.4** Each of the options shown in table 4.7 above was carried out to investigate a specific issue. Brief details of these issues together with an analysis of the results are given below.

**4.7.5** As stated above the stakeholder engagement identified that Countywide, safety and accessibility remain the highest priorities. However some stakeholders have suggested that not enough is being done to address congestion issues in the urban areas and that congestion should be given a higher priority than accessibility. Option 2 tests an increase in the weighting of congestion to be the same as the weightings for accessibility and safety. The results show that compared to the current weightings (option 1) there would be a minor increase in the percentage of funding allocated to congestion schemes at the expense primarily of safety schemes. Further investigation revealed that the small scale of this increase is due to there being fewer schemes aimed at addressing congestion on the current list of integrated transport schemes competing for entry into the programme. To increase the funding for congestion it is necessary to identify more schemes to address congestion rather than at this stage amending the prioritisation weightings.

**4.7.6** Analysis of the stakeholder responses also proposed conversely that there was some support for a further increase in the priority given to accessibility and safety as compared to congestion. This seems to be based on the opinion that congestion is not a significant issue for most areas of the County. Option 3 tests this proposal. Results indicate an increase in the percentage of funding that would be allocated to accessibility and safety at the expense of congestion schemes though the scale of the changes, especially for safety schemes, is relatively small. As was identified in the Indicators and Targets Review (see section 4.2) the main reason for the small increase in safety schemes
is due to the smaller number of primarily safety schemes contained on the list of possible future schemes, compared to those aimed primarily at accessibility.

4.7.7 The final option was used to test whether a change in the safety weighting would significantly increase the number of safety schemes delivered and therefore contribute towards bringing the Road Safety targets back onto trajectory (see section 4.1.4). The stakeholder engagement also indicates some support for increased priority being given to the safety objective. The results of this test indicate very little change in the percentage funding allocated to safety schemes. As stated above further analysis indicated that this is primarily due to the need to increase the number of safety schemes currently on the list of integrated transport schemes competing for entry into the programme. Measures have now been implemented to address this issue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>Public perception is that more progress needs to be made on public transport services, access to local services, developing pedestrian and cyclist facilities and developing measures to reduce congestion.</td>
<td>NYCC to develop new schemes and proposals to address these issues using the SCTS process alongside more traditional methods of scheme identification.</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public belief that more emphasis should be focussed on improving public transport services and on maintaining the network.</td>
<td>NYCC to look at further developing passenger transport services across the county and ensuring that the maintenance work is carried out as efficiently and effectively as possible.</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient focus on environmental and climate change issues.</td>
<td>NYCC has set up a corporate climate change group to coordinate and boost the County’s actions to address Climate Change and Carbon reduction.</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT Analysis</td>
<td>Ensuring successful delivery of planned SCTS processes across the county.</td>
<td>Introduction of revised development process and continually review its effectiveness and amend as required.</td>
<td>Underway and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective management and control of partners within the HNY Partnership by the County Council.</td>
<td>Fully utilise skill base within the HNY Partnership (NYCC, Jacobs &amp; BBIS) to enhance the technical input to the process.</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of public awareness of planned programme of transport works and overall transport policy.</td>
<td>Develop an improved framework for monitoring performance of the partnership at both a local and a more strategic level.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve all members of HNY Partnership knowledge of contracts and agreements through training.</td>
<td>Commence Training Dec 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved dissemination of information through online information and use of the NY Times free newspaper. Implement the new Highways and Transportation Communications and Consultation Strategy.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level and quality of internal communication was identified as requiring improvement.</td>
<td>Improved dissemination of information from senior management to rest of partnership. Improved liaison and information sharing throughout the partnership, to develop better understanding of the roles of others within the Partnership through the formation of the HNY Communication and Consultation Working Group.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective and efficient management of resources to ensure delivery of service to transport users within the County.</td>
<td>Improve workforce flexibility through training and mobile workforce as part of transformation agenda.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shortage of suitable candidates within the industry affecting the number of applicants for vacancies within the council.</td>
<td>Develop a new recruitment strategy to try to encourage suitable applicants to apply to work for NYCC.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition of responsibility for transport issues within Scarborough and Harrogate urban areas from agency partners to County Council control.</td>
<td>Develop and implement an effective transitional plan and ensure regular communication is maintained prior to and through the handover process.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delays in delivering schemes and resultant impacts on planned programme.</td>
<td>Improve programme monitoring to ensure that potential delays are identified earlier. Increase advance scheme designs, so that schemes are available to cover any slippage in the programme.</td>
<td>Commence April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low level of understanding of scheme prioritisation system by many people within the HNY Partnership.</td>
<td>Extend training and briefing programme across all members of the partnership to develop understanding.</td>
<td>Commenced March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets Review &amp; Prioritisation Review</td>
<td>Road safety targets identified as being behind trajectory for 2007</td>
<td>95 Alive Partnership to undertake enhanced education and training activities utilising Road Safety Grant. 95 Alive Partnership to scope for enhanced enforcement activities.</td>
<td>Underway and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in monitoring for highway maintenance targets combined with changes in funding mechanism</td>
<td>Potential for introduction of safety cameras in North Yorkshire) &lt;br&gt; NYCC to identify more road safety engineering schemes through detailed analysis of the high risk accident sites and route analysis. &lt;br&gt; Adapt targets to reflect the changes in funding and review how resources and budgets are prioritised to ensure that best value for money is achieved and that maintenance is targeted at parts of the network most in need &lt;br&gt; Review monitoring of cycling levels and install new cycle monitoring in appropriate locations if required &lt;br&gt; Set a baseline target for this indicator and begin monitoring. &lt;br&gt; In conjunction with Target Lead Officers, NYCC has increased targets.</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect of new cycling schemes on the overall growth of cycling across the county is not being fully identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No target in place for monitoring number of cycling trips to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scope identified to further stretch the following indicators: &lt;br&gt; • BVPI 99c Total Slight Casualties &lt;br&gt; • BVPI 102 Bus Patronage &lt;br&gt; • LTP1 Accessibility &lt;br&gt; • LTP3 Annualised Index of cycling trips &lt;br&gt; • L2 Bus patronage on quality commercial routes &lt;br&gt; • L3 Bus patronage on premier specification routes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | Targets for the following indicators were identified as being too stretching | • BVPI 104 Satisfaction with Public Transport Information  
• L4 Satisfaction with public transport Information  
In conjunction with Target Lead Officers targets have been reduced                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Underway  |
|        | Rising costs of Construction materials which may lead to a reduction of the number of schemes being able to be delivered. | Increase level of value engineering and ensure fit for purpose design through development of County Council Construction Manual.  
NYCC to look at promoting modal shift and more sustainable forms of travel, through initiatives such as developing a Sustainable Transport for Tourism Strategy; SCTS and congestion action plans. Full implementation of SITS and HAKITS  
Effective management of maintenance budgets to ensure that the highway and footway network is maintained to the highest possible standard.  
Continued development of TAMP and development of inventory works programme to promote allocation of funding on a needs basis. Increase the level of proactive maintenance.  
Severe adverse Weather Conditions resulting in accelerated deterioration of the Highway Network  
Increased level of drainage maintenance to ensure that drainage works as effectively as possible. Additionally identify if the bridge maintenance regime can be improved. | Ongoing   |
PART 5 – FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES AND EMERGING ISSUES

5.0 Background

5.0.1 The LTP2 was prepared in 2005 / 06, came into effect in April 2006 and is intended to remain in force until March 2011. However the LTP cannot be a static document. Since April 2006 there have been a number of changes in circumstances and government policy. This section identifies the main changes that impact on transport and the LTP and gives details of how the County Council and partner organisations have and will continue to integrate them into transport policies and practices.

5.1 Links to the Second Local Area Agreement (LAA 2)

5.1.1 Local Area Agreements (LAA’s) are a negotiated agreement between Local Strategic Partnerships (a partnership of local delivery organisations such as Local Authorities, Police, Fire Service, Health Services) and central government which set the priorities for delivery of local services. The government’s 2007 comprehensive spending review released details of a new set of National Indicators for inclusion in LAA’s. This reduced the number of indicators for assessing performance from an estimated 1200 to 198. Of these 198, ten relate directly to transport. These are:

| NI 47     | People killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents |
| NI 48     | Children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents |
| NI 167    | Congestion – average journey time per mile during the morning peak |
| NI 168    | Principal roads where maintenance should be considered |
| NI 169    | Non-principal roads where maintenance should be considered |
| NI 175    | Access to services and facilities by public transport, walking and cycling |
| NI 176    | Working age people with access to employment by public transport (and other specified modes) |
| NI 177    | Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area |
| NI 178    | Bus services running on time |
| NI 198    | Children travelling to school – mode of travel usually used |

Table 5.1 Second LAA Performance indicators

5.1.2 The North Yorkshire Strategic Partnership (NYSP) is required by the government to monitor and report on all 198 indicators, including the 10 transport indicators. Of the 10 transport indicators only two, NI 167 and NI 176, are not included in the LTP Targets and Indicators. The review of LTP2 targets and indicators did not find any justification for including these indicators as headline LTP2 indicators because they are considered to be of less relevance in terms of NYCC’s LTP2 than the
other indicators. They will therefore be monitored and reported to
government through the Local Area Agreement.

5.1.3. The second round of LAA’s are required to include up to 35
performance indicators selected from the set of 198 National Indicators. Following
negotiations between the NYSP and Government on LAA 2
for North Yorkshire, the agreement was approved in June 2008. The
North Yorkshire LAA 2 includes two transport indicators in the 35 LAA
performance indicators. These are NI 47 (killed and seriously injured
casualties) and NI 175 (access to services). The County Council as
transport authority requested that these be included in the LAA to
reflect the original (and now confirmed following public consultation
during the preparation of this report) highest priority objectives of LTP2
(road safety and accessibility).

5.1.4 It is anticipated that the high priority afforded to these objectives
through the LAA will help to improve cooperative working between
agencies to deliver the LAA (and LTP) transport targets. It should be
noted that the targets set for Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI) road
casualties and accessibility in the LTP were stretched to fall in line with
those included in the LAA.

5.2 North Yorkshire Transport Board and 14 – 19 schools agenda

5.2.1 It is recognised that there is a need to enhance engagement on
transport issues between County Council Directorates particularly for
those areas impacting upon public transport (e.g. extended schools, 14
– 19, youth activity, and personalised adult care).

5.2.2 To provide a structure for this cross directorate working, a Transport
Board has been established comprising Director and Assistant Director,
representation from Business and Environmental Services (BES),
Children and Young People’s Services (CYPS) and Adult and
Community Services (ACS).

5.2.3 An Action Plan has been developed with two early initiatives; these
being the Selby Area Review and a pilot transport approach to the
extended curricular availability through the 14-19 schools agenda.

5.2.4 Selby Area Review would be regarded as a type of pilot where wider engagement of CYPS and ACS (and other parties where necessary) is
sought with a view to ensuring emerging needs are identified and changes to the transport network can be made, within resource
constraints, to meet these. It was recognised that this approach to
transport planning requires a pro-active approach from Integrated
Passenger Transport with CYPS and ACS staff being available to
provide the intelligence required to inform the Area Review process.

5.2.5 For a group of secondary schools in Ryedale, pilot transport
arrangements have been introduced which utilise ‘down time’ from the
local Community Transport Provider and from our in house ACS fleet operations to provide shuttle services for students between different courses at various schools. The joint planning of these services ensures the most efficient transport arrangements are made to the benefit of young people wanting to study a wider range of course choices.

5.3 Sustainability and Climate Change

5.3.1 Reducing carbon emissions has assumed an increasing level of importance since the beginning of LTP2. The Eddington and Stern Reports published in late 2006 outlined both the need for sustainable economic growth and the need to reduce carbon emissions.

5.3.2 The Stern Review Report identified that a reduction in excess of 60% in CO$_2$ emissions is required by 2050 and that both an economic and a moral case existed for this. Eddington stated that transport is vital to the economy and that the level of basic connectivity across the country was good. However localised congestion and national overcrowding were leading to unreliability in the transport network. Ultimately, this has an impact upon the performance of the economy. Key urban areas, inter urban corridors and international gateways were identified as being priorities for improvement and development.

5.3.3 What both reports demonstrated is that it is possible to develop a sustainable and prosperous economy whilst at the same time reducing CO$_2$ and that transport can make a significant contribution to both objectives. A difficult balancing act exists between reducing the amount of unsustainable transport movements and meeting all of the shared priorities for transport.

5.3.4 Land transport accounts for approximately 22% of all UK CO$_2$ emissions$^1$. As part of the wider objectives set out within LTP2 the County Council is committed to reducing the carbon footprint of transport within the county. Encouraging the public of North Yorkshire to make smarter, more sustainable travel choices remains a key priority of the Council. This commitment is illustrated within the LTP shared priorities toolkit related to improving the environment, reducing the need to travel and reducing congestion.

5.3.5 Many of the key priorities identified in the Eddington report differ from many of the transport issues within North Yorkshire due to North Yorkshire’s predominantly rural nature. Although the population of the County, and consequently the numbers of people travelling, may be smaller often the distances that people have to travel to access basic essential services within the county are greater than those travelled by those in larger, urban centres. An example of this is the 72 mile round trip that residents of Hawes need to take to visit their nearest hospital in

---

$^1$ Source 2005 Data NETCEN
Northallerton. Encouraging sustainable travel choices in situations such as this through community transport and public transport provision is essential to ensure that accessibility issues are addressed.

5.3.6 Whilst North Yorkshire does not include any major urban centres, in comparison to other LTP areas, it is still essential that local level action is taken to ensure sustainability and climate change issues are given a similar level of focus as within larger urban areas. Within urban areas such as Harrogate and Scarborough, action is being taken to promote more sustainable travel choices through the SITS and HAKITS programmes of work. These strategies include measures to reduce reliance on the private car such as improvements to bus services and bus punctuality and encouraging walking and cycling.

5.3.7 Developing smarter, more sustainable travel choices and reducing reliance on the private car is not solely limited to urban areas. Rolling out these principles further in to our rural areas is a key challenge that the Council faces and which NYCC is addressing and will continue to address until the end of LTP2 and beyond. Measures such as the Craven Hub community transport provision assist in not only improving the level of accessibility to services for users but also contribute to reducing the number of car journeys in rural areas.

5.3.8 Looking at ways of encouraging more sustainable movement of goods within the County is another way of reducing emissions. Working alongside partner authorities and organisations within the region the Council is committed to assisting in developing more sustainable options for freight, including promoting modal shift and improved efficiency where appropriate. The County Council is a key stakeholder in the development of the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Freight Strategy, which aims to look at ways of promoting more sustainable freight transport through promoting best practice. This will be achieved in a variety of ways, including through driver training and encouraging and exploring opportunities for modal shift to more sustainable transport options such as rail freight.

5.3.9 North Yorkshire County Council has recently set up a Corporate Climate Change Group. This group involves representatives from all areas of the Council and is responsible for developing the County Council’s Climate Change Strategy. This strategy will look at ways in which the County Council can reduce its carbon footprint from its own operations but will also consider how the county as a whole can reduce
its carbon footprint. The strategy will also consider how the County Council and the County as a whole can manage the effects of climate change.

5.3.10 The County Council recognises the increasing importance of addressing climate change and improving sustainability and as such is beginning to actively encourage that these issues are given a greater consideration during scheme identification, design and prioritisation. It is hoped that through this level of increased consideration, more schemes will be developed to help to improve sustainability and reduce transport emissions across the county.

5.3.11 Schemes to address these issues may not always be infrastructure or engineering based. Increasing education and promotion of sustainable travel options individually and in tandem with physical schemes (e.g. SITS and the redevelopment of Skipton bus station) will be necessary. Informing the public of the available travel options that these new schemes will provide is essential to enable their fullest and most effective use.

5.3.12 Improving the links to the Regional Spatial Strategy and the 9 LDF’s being developed across the county by the district councils and national parks (see section 5.5) is important for the future development of transport across the county. This linkage is especially important in terms of addressing climate change and developing more sustainable travel options as part of sustainable communities. LDF’s can play an important role in ensuring that the need to travel is reduced by ensuring local delivery of services and employment close to areas of housing. Additionally, the planning process helps to ensure good links to more sustainable forms of transport (e.g. passenger transport and cycling and walking) are in place to meet the needs of LDF proposals.

5.4 City Regions and the Local Transport Bill

5.4.1 The Eddington Review highlighted the growing influence of the City Regions as key economic drivers for the country. Parts of North Yorkshire fall within the sphere of influence of two City Regions. The Leeds City Region (LCR) incorporates parts of the Craven, Harrogate and Selby districts of North Yorkshire and the Tees Valley City Region (TVCR) has strong linkages to parts of the Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough districts of North Yorkshire.

5.4.2 The Local Transport Bill, which is expected to become legislation in the near future, changes the role of the metropolitan Passenger Transport Authorities (PTAs) to become Integrated Transport Authorities (ITAs) and take on more strategic transport functions for their areas. The Bill enables parts of the country not currently covered by a PTA to undertake a review of transport governance and allows the setting up of new ITAs. The review also allows the boundaries of the new ITAs to be changed to better reflect travel patterns.
5.4.3 The following section sets out how the County Council will contribute to achieving the transport objectives of the City Regions through effective and enhanced partnership working with the respective neighbouring authorities. Fuller details of the partnership working on the City Regions are included in Appendix 4.

5.4.4 **Leeds City Region (LCR)**

Over 26,000 people commute to work in West Yorkshire from North Yorkshire every day and over 13,000 commute from West Yorkshire into North Yorkshire. Additionally, over 11,000 people commute to work in York from North Yorkshire every day and over 6,000 commute from York into North Yorkshire. These cross boundary trips represent a significant minority of the work trips undertaken in North Yorkshire, yet they bring about a number of issues. The main issues are high traffic flows on commuter roads into Leeds and Bradford, peak hour capacity issues on the rail routes into Leeds and parking problems at stations on these routes. The County Council identified a number of actions in LTP2 to support the LCR. These included working with adjacent authorities and the rail and bus industries to improve public transport capacity and quality on routes into the LCR especially Leeds, Bradford and York. In the longer term LTP2 sought to influence planning decisions through the Regional Spatial Strategy and Local Development Frameworks to ensure that new development minimises the need to travel and is sustainable in transport terms.

5.4.5 Following a LCR Summit in 2004, the Leaders of the eleven partner Councils (including NYCC) made a collective commitment to work together for the benefit of the City Region. A key part of this commitment was the adoption of a City Region Transport Vision (CRTV) which set out the key transport priorities across the City Region. Since 2005, work has been undertaken around developing an implementation plan, prioritising activities into achievable outcomes, and preparing a Multi Area Agreement (MAA) to deliver specific outcomes.

5.4.6 The County Council is fully committed to the delivery of the aims of the Transport Vision and believes that closer partnership working with adjacent authorities and other partners is the way in which to deliver these aims. In response to the Local Transport Bill, the Council is working closely with the LCR Partners in determining governance arrangements to support the future Integrated Transport Authority. The Council firmly believes that the newly formed Integrated Transport Authority should not extend to include the Districts within North Yorkshire. NYCC has proposed a partnership approach linking York, North Yorkshire and the West Yorkshire ITA, that will better reflect the communities served and ensure commitment at all levels in the relevant authorities.
5.4.7 In addition to the Governance review the LCR partners have completed the development of a Leeds City Region Multiple Area Agreement (MAA). The MAA, of which improved transport is a key aim, is considered to have potential to create added value as a mechanism for implementing key City Region Development Plan priorities and is in line with PSA7 which is the Government’s framework for making sustainable improvements in relative regional economic performance.

5.4.8 We remain committed to improving partnership working within the Leeds City Region. Throughout the remainder of LTP2 and beyond North Yorkshire County Council will, through its membership of the Leeds City Region Leaders Board and Transport Panel continue to play an active role in achieving the transport objectives of the City Region.

5.4.9 **Tees Valley City Region (TVCR)**

LTP2 highlighted that over 8,000 people commute to work in Teesside from North Yorkshire every day and approximately 6,000 commute from Teesside into North Yorkshire. This cross boundary commuter traffic contributes to peak hour traffic congestion in Teesside and impacts on the sustainability of village communities in North Yorkshire. Constrained public transport and capacity issues limit the alternatives that exist to making journeys by private car. The County Council believes that it is vital that local and regional bodies work together to ensure that economic development in the Tees Valley City Region does not adversely impact on North Yorkshire. With this in mind, the County Council welcomed the opportunity to become a member of the Transport for Tees Valley Board.

5.4.10 The Transport for Tees Valley Board, was set up in 2007 to facilitate closer joint working between the Tees Valley Authorities and neighbouring authorities. The Board is a public-private partnership that involves both transport providers and representatives of transport users. The aim of the Board is to co-ordinate resources in order to support the wider economic regeneration proposals for the City Region. Through its membership of the Board the County Council seeks to ensure that its work recognises, and takes account of, the impact of developments in the Tees Valley upon travel patterns in North Yorkshire.

5.4.11 The Tees Valley Regional Transport Strategy was produced in 2007/08 and there are three main issues identified in the strategy which have a significant impact on North Yorkshire. These are:

- Travel to work patterns and the importance of improved public transport links from North Yorkshire.
- Access to services (particularly health services at James Cook University Hospital)
- Connectivity to other regions and its impact on transport networks in North Yorkshire (particularly Low Gates Level Crossing).
5.4.12 North Yorkshire County Council will, through its membership of the Transport for Tees Valley Board, continue to play an active role in achieving the transport objectives of the TVCR through effective and enhanced partnership working. A key role will be to ensure co-ordination of County Council initiatives with those of the City Region to achieve maximum outcomes in the following projects:

- The Tees Valley bus network.
- City Region road and rail-based solutions to assist regeneration.
- “Smarter Choices” at a City Region level.

5.5 Links to Local Development Frameworks

5.5.1 In the respective guidance for the preparation of the LTP2 and the Local Development Frameworks (LDF) it is a requirement that each document should recognise and account for the contents of the other. The LTP was adopted in 2006 and therefore it is for the County Council to ensure that LDF proposals accord with the objectives of the Plan. This is being achieved in North Yorkshire through regular liaison and consultation with the relevant officers in the Planning Authorities (7 Local Planning Authorities and 2 National Park Authorities, plus NYCC as the Planning Authority for minerals and waste).

5.5.2 With ten LDFs being prepared across the County – including the National Parks’ and the County Council’s own Minerals and Waste LDF – it was to be expected that the documents would be prepared at different speeds and in slightly different ways. Some Authorities are still to approve a Core Strategy while others are progressing towards the adoption of a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

5.5.3 Throughout the development of the LDFs the respective Planning Officers have engaged with the County Council on planning, highway and transportation matters relating to the assessment of proposals. So far, this has been facilitated in districts by the development of traffic models to examine the impact of proposals across the road network of a whole settlement.

5.5.4 **Hambleton D.C. Northallerton Northern Link Road**

As part of its allocations for the town of Northallerton, Hambleton D.C. proposed the construction of a road linking the two northern approach roads and serving mixed developments on the northern extremity of the town. A traffic model was built jointly funded by Hambleton D.C. and the County Council to consider the implications of the construction of the road in terms of the network in Northallerton. The network becomes congested in the evening peak which is compounded by the operation of the Low Gates level crossing on one of the northern approach roads. As the proposed road is to be financed through developer contributions it was important to understand the respective impact of each development on the road network of the town. The model showed that the link road would bring additional capacity to cater for associated traffic from the development and would bring some
minimal relief to congestion at the junctions at the northern end of the town compared with the current situation. The link road also has the added benefit of providing an alternative route avoiding Low Gates.

5.5.5 Selby D.C. Development Proposals
Prior to the preparation of the LDF in Selby, with the associated housing quotas set through the Regional Spatial Strategy, there were already a significant number of proposals either approved or in preparation for the development of land around the town of Selby. It was clear that if the LDF was to include any further allocations, an assessment of the impact of all the proposals on the highway network in Selby would be required. In a project jointly funded by the County Council, Selby District Council and the Highways Agency, a traffic model is currently being built which will allow assessments of the relative impact of all the proposals across the Selby District.

5.5.6 Ryedale (Malton), Scarborough, Harrogate and Knaresborough
As part of the development of transport strategies in the past, the County Council had already built traffic models for Harrogate and Knaresborough (HAKITS) and Malton. The Harrogate model is now being used to assess development proposals currently under consideration for inclusion in their LDF. Scarborough Borough Council is not currently in a position to consider development proposals as their core strategy is not yet fully developed.

5.5.7 A good working relationship has been developed with each of the Planning Authorities through a mutual understanding and respect for each Authority's roles and requirements. It is anticipated that this will continue through to the adoption of the last LDF document and into the preparation of the next Local Transport Plan.

5.6 New Major Schemes

5.6.1 A684 Bedale Aiskew Leeming Bar Bypass
The A684 Bedale Aiskew Leeming Bar Bypass (BALB) scheme aims to address the environmental and road safety problems in and on the approaches to the communities of Leeming Bar, Aiskew, and Bedale and to provide improved access from the proposed A1 (M) to communities and areas west of the A1 and the county town of Northallerton.

5.6.2 Following consultation in March 1995 the County Council adopted a preferred route for the bypass running north of the communities connecting the A684 near Bedale Golf club to the west of Bedale, and Spring House to the east of Leeming Bar. The scheme is designed to connect with the proposed interchange with the A1 (M) motorway located to the north of the Leeming Bar. The Council has worked closely with the Highways Agency with regard to the proposed interchange junction to ensure compatibility between the A1 upgrade to motorway, and the BALB scheme.
5.6.3 Following the announcement by the Government in March 2008 to proceed with the construction of the A1 upgrade to motorway standard, the County Council submitted the BALB scheme to the Regional Transport Board (RTB) for consideration. The submission demonstrated the scheme’s good value for money, good policy fit with the regional priorities, and the ability to deliver subject to funding being made available. The RTB endorsed the proposals and have recommended the scheme to the DfT. The County Council is currently advancing the Major Scheme Business Case for submission to DfT.

5.7 Eco-Towns

5.7.1 The Housing Green Paper published in July 2007 set out a new agenda for the Government and its partners for the delivery of new housing. It identified the need to increase housing supply to meet growing demand and to address affordability issues as a major challenge. New eco-towns were promoted in the Green Paper as one element of a package of measures aimed at increasing housing supply above current planned levels.

5.7.2 The Government proposes that eco-towns will be of 5,000-20,000 homes, intended to exploit the potential to create a complete new settlement to achieve zero carbon development and more sustainable living, using the best in new design and architecture.
5.7.3 In April this year, the Government announced a shortlist of 15 potential eco towns to be built, which will ultimately be reduced to 10. One of the potential locations has been identified as being within the Leeds City Region (LCR). The LCR commissioned a study of 4 possible locations; Gascoigne Wood, Burn Airfield, Church Fenton and Willow Green (between Eggborough and Kellington).

5.7.4 Whilst the Leeds City Region Leaders Board has recently (June 2008) expressed their opposition to any new eco-town in the Leeds City Region the final decision has yet to be announced by Government. Should the final decision be in favour of an eco-town within or close to North Yorkshire the County Council will need to invest considerable time and effort to ensure that both local and strategic transport links will be appropriate and contribute to the sustainable aspirations of these new developments. This will require working not only with partners from the transport field but also with service providers (such as health and education) in order to minimise the need to travel.

5.7.5 The development of a new eco-town would have major implications for transport and the County Council. There are also likely to be implications for the strategic highway network and on neighbouring Local Authority areas. Substantial new or improved off site infrastructure works would be required for both road and rail. Close partnership working would be required with bus and rail operators, the Highways Agency and neighbouring Authorities to ensure the infrastructure was in place to mitigate the effect of an eco-town on the existing transport network.

5.8 Transport Asset Management Plan and Asset Valuation

5.8.1 Following publication by the County Surveyors’ Society of a ‘framework for Highway Asset Management’ and ‘Highway Asset Management Worldwide Experience and Practice’ in April 2004, the County Council began work during 2005 on the valuation of the Authority’s highway asset.
5.8.2 **Transport Asset Management Plan**  
Collaborative arrangements with Durham and Northumberland County Councils resulted in the organisation of seven facilitation and training workshops covering the full range of TAMP activities:  
- Background/ Overview  
- Structure of Document and Data Needs  
- Levels of Service and Performance Monitoring  
- Whole Life Costing and Lifecycle Plans  
- Process Evaluation and Risk Management  
- Forward Work Programme and Valuation  
- Overall Review and Improvement Action Plan.

5.8.3 Following on from this initial development work the Council has produced a draft TAMP during 2006/07 and 2007/08. An action plan is included within the draft document that identifies areas for improvement in documentation and management systems. It is acknowledged that this first draft is incomplete in several areas and requires further development to produce a document and management processes that fully apply the principles of asset management.

Further details of the TAMP are included in Appendix 6 of this report.

5.9 **Highway Asset Valuation**  
Asset valuation is the calculation of the current monetary value of the Authority’s highway assets. Government requires Authorities to report this value annually in the organisation’s balance sheet to comply with one of the key components supporting the ‘Whole of Government Accounts’ process and associated public sector financial management requirements. The implementation timescale has been delayed pending the outcome of a very recently concluded review by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) of the accounting, management and finance mechanisms for local roads and local authority transport assets.

5.9.1 The Yorkshire and Humber Region’s highway authorities formed a Highway Asset Valuation Group. Reference has been provided by the ‘Guidance Document for Highway Infrastructure Asset Valuation 2’ published in July 2005 by the Roads Liaison Group. The Transport Asset has been broadly divided into the following asset groups: -
  - Roads  
  - Structures  
  - Street lighting  
  - Traffic signals.

5.9.2 Initial work focussed on the agreement of a standardised template for the valuation of the asset group followed by the sharing of current rates
for the construction of the asset. This process has enabled a gross replacement cost to be calculated for each of the primary asset groups.

5.9.3 Work has now commenced on developing a methodology for the calculation of depreciated replacement cost. Progress continues to develop the protocols and condition assessment regimes to be employed to align with Performance Indicators and other condition assessment processes.

5.9.4 The Council has assisted its other TAMP development partners (Durham and Northumberland County Councils) along with Cumbria County Council by sharing the preparatory work and model templates developed by the Yorkshire and Humber group.

5.9.5 Appendix 6 contains an extract from the current draft TAMP and is representative of the scope and extent of the work already undertaken whilst containing directions for its improvement and enhancement.

5.10 Network Management Duty

5.11.1 The County Council participates in two regional organisations associated with streetworks management and coordination; the North of England Highway and Utility Council and the Yorkshire Highway and Utility Council (NE and Y HAUC’s). We are also part of two regional organisations associated with delivering the Network Management Duty; the North of England Traffic Managers Group and the Yorkshire Traffic Managers Group (NE and Y TMG’s). Less formal arrangements exist on the western boundary with both Lancashire and Cumbria County Councils where cross boundary activities are managed and coordinated by the Skipton Highways and Transportation Area Office.

5.11.2 Preparation of the County Council’s Network Management Plan (NMP) commenced prior to the publication of the Secretary of State’s intervention criteria. The publication of these criteria has necessitated a redrafting of the NMP format so that it better reflects both the criteria and the Council’s work to evidence that it is fulfilling the Network Management Duty.

5.11.3 In addition to working closely with the adjacent local transport authorities the County Council is working with the Highways Agency (HA) to identify appropriate diversion routes from the motorway and trunk road network. This work has to date identified the use of some unsuitable diversion routes, the need for improved signing on others and the need for localised improvements to the NYCC network. In order to fulfil these requirements, the County Council will pursue provision additional funding from the HA.

5.11.4 One of the key issues associated with the Network Management Duty is the need to manage traffic flows associated with ‘events’ that temporarily affect the movement of all traffic on the network. The
County Council, in conjunction with North Yorkshire Police, is currently developing a protocol for managing traffic where these events have an effect on the public highway.

5.11.5 The County Council, in partnership with the two regional Traffic Manager Groups is progressing the development of its NMP and in particular is identifying initiatives and evidence to support the objectives contained within the intervention criteria.

5.11.6 Appendix 7 includes examples which are representative of the approach being taken by the County Council to document current processes and to identify areas for improvement and development.
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