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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

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

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

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

1.2 Report Purpose

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

1.3 Report Structure

The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- Chapter 2 – Key Stages in the Development of the Richmond & Swaledale SCTS
- Chapter 3 – Prioritised Improvement Schemes
- Chapter 4 – Improvements Subject to Alternative Funding / Delivery Mechanisms
- Chapter 5 – Monitoring and Evaluation
- Chapter 6 – Summary and Conclusions
Figure 1.1: Richmond and Swaledale SCTS Study Area
2.1 Introduction

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

Figure 2.1: SCTS Key Stages

- **STAGE 1: ISSUE IDENTIFICATION**
- **STAGE 2: DRAFT STRATEGY**
- **STAGE 3: CONSULTATION**
- **STAGE 4: ADOPTION / DELIVERY OF FINAL STRATEGY**

2.2 Issue Identification

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Mike Woodford (NYCC Area Highways Manager)
- Neil Linfoot (NYCC Area Improvement Manager)
- David Winter (NYCC Traffic Management)
- Pam Johnson (NYCC Transport & Development)
- Neil Strickland (NYCC Road Safety and Travel Awareness)
- Dianne Pottage (NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport)
- Penny Noake (NYCC Countryside Service)
- Michelle Johnson (NYCC LTP Representative)
- Martin Parker (NYCC Special Projects Group)
- Peter Broadhead (North Yorkshire Police)
- Andy Ryland (Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority)
- Charles Deuchars (Jacobs)
- Keith Barber (Jacobs)
- Jonathan Dowding (Jacobs)
The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the issues / potential schemes identified as part of the Members / stakeholder consultation process and to determine a shortlist of potential schemes to be taken forward to the next stage of the SCTS. Harnessing the local knowledge of the Officer Team at this early stage ensured that all aspects regarding the development of potential options were considered and understood. At this stage, if it was considered that potential schemes were unlikely to be physically or technically feasible, or fail to contribute sufficiently towards NYCC’s Priorities for Transport, such schemes were not considered further as part of the SCTS process.

2.3 Draft Strategy

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

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

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

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

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

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

A second meeting was then held with the Officer Team and their views sought regarding each of the proposals. As with the First Officer Team Meeting, harnessing local knowledge of the Officer Team at this stage ensured that all aspects were considered as part of the development of the individual schemes and that there were no known local conflicts which may prevent the schemes from being taken forward.
The Second Officer Team Meeting therefore assisted in the management of expectations and enabled an additional filter of options to be undertaken. A robust justification for any schemes discounted from the process at this stage was provided.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**: As part of the development of the ‘Draft’ Strategy, consideration was given to how each of the proposed improvement schemes would be monitored and evaluated within future years. This would ensure that, once implemented, they would meet their objectives and contribute to the NYCC LTP2 Key Targets and Indicators.

### 2.4 Consultation

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

- Second Members Consultation
- Public Consultation

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

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

### 2.5 The Strategy (this stage)

This document, the ‘final’ Strategy has been compiled following the Public Consultation exercise and incorporates all aspects of the SCTS development process, including the prioritised improvement schemes presented as an Implementation Plan. It also includes recommendations on how to take forward any wider strategic issues identified as part of the SCTS.

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

NYCC has a reserved budget set aside for the development of the SCTS and delivery of capital improvement schemes put forward within the Implementation Plan. This budget will be used to deliver those schemes identified by the priority given in this report. As such, not all schemes may be deliverable within the available budget. Those schemes which are not delivered within the available budget will join the NYCC Reserve List of Capital schemes.
Large scale improvement schemes which exceed the scope of the SCTS budget have still been included within the Strategy and Implementation Plan, but with an acknowledgement that they cannot be delivered within the SCTS budget. However, such improvement schemes may be progressed in line with alternative funding mechanisms available. These include, but are not limited to the following:

- Wider Local Transport Plan (Integrated Transport and Maintenance) Budgets
- Developer Contributions (Section 106 Agreements)
- Highways Agency Trunk Road Improvements
- Regional Transport Board / Department for Transport LTP Major Schemes (capital cost > £5 million)

Wider strategic issues identified by the Strategy will be taken forward for consideration by the relevant NYCC departments, as part of their annual programme of work.
3 Prioritised Improvement Schemes

3.1 Introduction

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

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

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

3.2 Prioritised Improvement Schemes

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

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

The cost estimates included within the table are based upon the information available at the time of investigation and as such may be subject to change due to the early stage of scheme development and future detailed investigations. Full details of each of the proposed improvement schemes are included within Appendix B.
### Table 3.1: Prioritised Improvement Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Provision of a footway along the western side of ‘The Porch’ in Barton, between the existing footway alongside Silver Street and the existing footway alongside Piper Hill Close</td>
<td>£21,500</td>
<td>32.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Provision of a shared use foot / cyclepath within the existing grass verge alongside the B6271, from Brompton Caravan Park eastwards past the Brompton Lakes Holiday Lodge to Parkgate Lane</td>
<td>£114,700</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Creation of advisory on-street cycle lanes along the B6274 Gilling Road, Richmond, from Fontenay Road to A6108 Darlington Road Cycleway</td>
<td>£70,600</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (i): Provision of new bus stops within Richmond Market Place</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J (i): Painted road markings and / or new signs on the approaches to Barton village</td>
<td>£8,500</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Widening of existing footway on Frenchgate (also known as The Channel) between Station Road and the Market Place, Richmond.</td>
<td>£77,000</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Reduction in the extent of the current 20mph speed limit within Richmond town centre</td>
<td>£25,100</td>
<td>Not Scored*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The letter of each scheme represent the identification letters as used within the Public Consultation Postal Questionnaires.

* It has not been possible to accurately score scheme A against the LTP Objectives. As the proposal is for a reduction in the size of the 20 mph zone the criteria used in making an assessment of the scheme would not be valid as the speed limit is already in place.

**KEY:**
- Green: Support
- Yellow: No overall majority view
- Red: Lack of Support

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

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides details of those improvement schemes identified as part of the SCTS process which are subject to alternative delivery and funding mechanisms. These include both capital and ‘non-capital’ improvement schemes and initiatives.

Although it is recognised that such improvement schemes cannot be progressed in line with the SCTS budget, they have still been included within the Strategy to be considered for delivery by alternative funding / delivery mechanisms. There is an acknowledgement that in order to solve a number of the problems and issues identified by the SCTS process, access to all available NYCC funding streams and departments is required.

4.2 Capital Improvement Schemes Subject to Alternative Funding

There are a number of capital improvement schemes and initiatives which have been identified / developed as part of the SCTS process which cannot be progressed within the available SCTS budget.

Improvement schemes identified as part of the SCTS process that are subject to alternative funding / delivery mechanisms are detailed in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Improvement Schemes Exceeding SCTS Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a new access road to/from Gallowfields Industrial/Trading Estate, Richmond</td>
<td>£1,500,000</td>
<td>24.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of existing shared cycleway/footway along the A6108 from Skeeby to Scurragh Lane End.</td>
<td>&gt;£100,000</td>
<td>Not scored**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of cycleway between Croft-on-Tees and the junction with the B1264, with links to Darlington and Northallerton</td>
<td>&gt;£100,000</td>
<td>Not Scored**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the A66 Moor Road / Hargill junction near Melsenby</td>
<td>&gt;£100,000</td>
<td>Not Scored**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footbridge over the A1 at Scurragh Lane, to provide pedestrian and cycle access to Moulton</td>
<td>&gt;£100,000</td>
<td>Not Scored**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** It has not been possible to score many of the above schemes against the LTP Objectives, as the schemes were not developed further during the Option Development stage of the SCTS.

KEY: Support | No overall majority view | Lack of Support

At this stage, potential funding mechanisms have not been identified for the delivery of these schemes. They will therefore join the County’s reserve list of capital schemes and be subject to available funding from the LTP Capital Pot and prioritisation against all other schemes on the list. This incorporates improvement schemes from across the County.

However, it is acknowledged that as part of the delivery of the SCTS, lower cost alternatives may be identified, which may then have the potential to merit inclusion within the prioritised list of schemes.
4.3 Non-Capital Improvement schemes Subject to Alternative Funding

4.3.1 Passenger Transport

The development of the Richmond and Swaledale SCTS has raised a number of issues with regard to Passenger Transport service provision within the study area.

As identified within the NYCC LTP2, such improvements are subject to co-operation between both the County Council and the Service Providers and thus deemed to be external to the SCTS process. The opportunity does however exist for these issues to be considered as part of the NYCC Passenger Transport Review process and ongoing investigations. As such, key issues identified as part of the SCTS will be considered by the NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport (IPT) team.

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

**Passenger Transport Issue 1:** The Richmond to Keld bus service is not frequent enough, especially on Sundays. More frequent buses would reduce the volume of traffic, improving safety for walkers and cyclists.

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

**Passenger Transport Issue 2:** Lack of a fully integrated public transport service including buses, taxis, dial a ride and community buses between Scorton and nearby service centres.

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

4.4 Summary

This chapter has provided details of those improvement schemes and initiatives which are considered to be external to the SCTS budget and as such are subject to alternative funding or delivery mechanisms.

The importance of these improvement schemes and initiatives has been acknowledged and as such they have been included within the Strategy along with recommendations, where relevant, on how they may be taken forward.
5 Monitoring and Evaluation

5.1 Introduction

This chapter details the process to be adopted in order to monitor and evaluate the improvement schemes which will be delivered as part of the SCTS budget, as well as those that could be funded from alternative sources, as discussed in Chapter 4.

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

5.2 Monitoring Improvement Schemes

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

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

The local indicators which have been derived to measure the performance of each of the improvement schemes are detailed in Table 5.1 with definitions provided within the subsequent sections.
### Table 5.1: Improvement Scheme Local Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme</th>
<th>Local Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCTS Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: Provision of a footway along the western side of ‘The Porch’ in Barton, between the existing footway alongside Silver Street and the existing footway alongside Piper Hill Close</td>
<td>Accident Reduction Increased Pedestrian Use Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Provision of a shared use foot / cyclepath within the existing grass verge alongside the B6271, from Brompton Caravan Park eastwards past the Brompton Lakes Holiday Lodge to Parkgate Lane</td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator Observational Surveys Increased Pedestrian Use Increased Bicycle Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Creation of advisory on-street cycle lanes along the B6274 Gilling Road, Richmond, from Fontenay Road to A6108 Darlington Road Cycleway</td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator Increased Bicycle Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (i): Provision of new bus stops within Richmond Market Place</td>
<td>Patronage Numbers Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J (i): Painted road markings and / or new signs on the approaches to Barton village</td>
<td>Speed Reduction Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Widening of existing footway on Frenchgate (also known as The Channel) between Station Road and the Market Place, Richmond</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Reduction in the extent of the current 20mph speed limit within Richmond town centre</td>
<td>Speed Reduction Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wider Local Transport Plan and Maintenance Budget Improvement Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a new access road to/from Gallowfields Industrial/Trading Estate, Richmond</td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of existing shared cycleway/footway along the A6108 from Skeeby to Scurragh Lane End</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use Increased Bicycle Use Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of cycleway between Croft-on-Tees and the junction with the B1264, with links to Darlington and Northallerton</td>
<td>Increased Bicycle Use Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the A66 Moor Road / Hargill junction near Melsonby</td>
<td>Speed Reduction Accident Reduction Attitudinal Indicator Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footbridge over the A1 at Scurragh Lane, to provide pedestrian and cycle access to Moulton</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use Attitudinal Indicator Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

**Increased Bicycle Use** – Before and after cycle counts will be used to assess whether the introduction of an improvement scheme has assisted in encouraging cycling.

**Patronage Numbers** – Any change in patronage numbers will be used to assess whether the introduction of a particular improvement scheme is having a positive contribution to encouraging people to move away from private transport towards public transport.

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

### 5.3 Monitoring the Strategy

The implementation of the improvement schemes within the Strategy will be monitored over the next 2 years. This element of the monitoring process will be ‘owned’ by the NYCC Highways Area Manager who is responsible for the design and implementation of the improvement schemes contained within this Strategy. As above, this will be reported through the NYCC Local Transport Plan process. An annual report will be produced by the Area Manager for the Service Centre for consideration by the County Council’s Area Committee. This will report progress on improvement scheme implementation, forthcoming projects and any new projects suggested for inclusion within the Strategy.

In addition, this Strategy will be treated as a ‘live’ document which is flexible in nature and able to accommodate changes in local, regional and national policy as well as available funding and third party influences such as developer contributions. Significant changes in these areas may trigger the need to revisit the Strategy and update the findings to accommodate changes.
6 Summary and Conclusions

6.1 Introduction

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

6.2 The Strategy

Table 6.1 outlines the prioritised improvement schemes recommended for delivery as part of the Richmond and Swaledale SCTS. The improvement schemes have been categorised by the anticipated funding source which will be used to secure their delivery. As indicated within chapter 2 these include but are not limited to the following:

- SCTS Budget
- NYCC improvement schemes already programmed for delivery within the Strategy period
- Wider Local Transport Plan (Integrated Transport and Maintenance Budgets)
- Public Transport Review Process
- Kickstart Grants
- Developer Contributions (Section 106 Agreements)
- Highways Agency Trunk Road Improvements
- Regional Transport Board / Department for Transport LTP Major Schemes (capital cost > £5 million)

In order to determine the anticipated benefits of the Strategy as a whole, the anticipated contribution of each of the improvement schemes to the Shared Priorities for Transport, and hence the aspirations contained within the NYCC LTP2, has also been provided within Table 6.1.
Each of the schemes identified within the Implementation Plan were presented for consideration by Council Members at the Richmondshire Area Committee Meeting on 31st March 2010. Prior to the Area Committee it became apparent that there was an urgent need to maximise the funds available to repair the extensive damage caused by the cold winter to the fabric of the road network. To achieve this, the Executive Members for NYCC Business and Environmental Services reviewed the criteria for the inclusion of schemes in the SCTS Implementation Plans. This review resulted in the introduction of the following ‘revised’ guidelines for the inclusion of the schemes within an SCTS Implementation Plan:

1) Safety schemes should achieve an assessment score of 15 or more when appraised using the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System

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

Table 6.1: Recommended Implementation Plan (the Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme</th>
<th>SCTS Budget</th>
<th>Local Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I:</strong> Provision of a footway along the western side of ‘The Porch’ in Barton, between the existing footway alongside Silver Street and the existing footway alongside Piper Hill Close</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G:</strong> Provision of a shared use foot / cyclepath within the existing grass verge alongside the B6271, from Brompton Caravan Park eastwards past the Brompton Lakes Holiday Lodge to Parkgate Lane</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C:</strong> Creation of advisory on-street cycle lanes along the B6274 Gilling Road, Richmond, from Fontenay Road and linking to the new A6108 Darlington Road Cycleway in the south</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D (i):</strong> New bus stops within Richmond Market Place</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J (i):</strong> Painted road markings and / or new signs on the approaches to Barton village</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E:</strong> Widening of existing footway on Frenchgate (The Channel) between Station Road and the Market Place, Richmond</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A:</strong> Reduction in the extent of the current 20mph speed limit within Richmond town centre</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wider Local Transport Plan and Maintenance Budget Improvement Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a new access road to/from Gallowfields Industrial/Trading Estate, Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of existing shared cycleway/footway along the A6108 from Skeebey to Scurragh Lane End. May require provision of new bridge over Skeebey Beck</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of cycleway between Croft-on-Tees and the junction with the B1264, with links to Darlington and Northallerton</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road safety improvements to the A66 junction with Moor Road and Hargill near Melsonby</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a footbridge over the A1 at Scurragh</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) Schemes which do not meet criteria 1 or 2 above can still be included in the SCTS Implementation Plan if there is considerable Member support for the scheme to be retained.

As such, Council Members were requested to consider the revised guidelines as part of their recommendations.

6.2.1 Outcome of Area Committee Meeting

At that Area Committee on 31\textsuperscript{st} March 2010, a letter which had been received from Green Howards Regiment was read out to the Members. It stated that the Regiment objected to the siting of scheme D (i). Lieutenant Colonel Barry Smeeton, a Trustee of the Green Howards Museum and Chairman of the Green Howards Association, attended the Area Committee Meeting and stated that they were not in support of the implementation of the scheme for the following reasons:

- Potential damage to the Green Howards Museum collection
- Detrimental effect on Museum business
- Blocking of site access and view of Museum sign
- The Museum collection was at risk to airborne pollution
- Pollution / vandalism threat from passengers waiting at the bus stop
- The provision of bus stops would be detrimental to the overall appeal of Trinity Church (a listed building and significant landmark in the town)
- The proposal was not right for enhancing the town, its square or the museum

Councillors Steckles and Les agreed with Lieutenant Colonel Barry Smeeton that the proposed location would hinder the Green Howards Museum. Councillor Steckles requested that the location be altered to take account of the issues raised both by Members and by the Green Howards Museum.

Councillor Parsons stated that unless changes were made to the bus stops in the Market Place, bus services would be reduced as the operator had stated that they cannot function appropriately from their current location. Councillor Parsons emphasised that this would be a great loss to Richmond and he could not support the loss of bus transport.

In light of the above, it was considered that the Richmond & Swaledale SCTS could not be approved until further detailed consideration was undertaken regarding proposals for the bus stops in Richmond Market Place.

Councillor Blackie requested therefore that the Area Committee Meeting Report be deferred to the next Area Committee Meeting to allow further discussion on the concerns raised.

It was then resolved that consideration of the Richmond & Swaledale SCTS be deferred to the next meeting of the Richmondshire Area Committee.
Following the First Area Committee Meeting, an alternative bus stop layout, which was supported by the Green Howards Museum, was designed and sent to Councillor S Parsons, English Heritage, Richmondshire DC and NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport.

The IPT team considered this arrangement but concluded that it would be unlikely to be acceptable to the bus operators on safety grounds and that it was not Disability Discrimination Act compliant. The proposal did not address any of the problems that NYCC and the bus operators had identified i.e it had no raised kerb access to the buses, which is compulsory for all new designs. In addition, the design did not solve the existing pedestrian safety problem. Arriva’s Health and Safety Department have stated, following a fatality several years ago, that they may withdraw from using the Market Place unless a new solution is designed.

English Heritage acknowledged the strong local support for the retention of bus stops within the Market Place but was of the view that the stops are best located outside the Market Place.

In light of these responses it is clear that there were concerns about the deliverability of the alternative arrangement. Consequently, it was proposed that a Working Group be established to examine the various solutions. See Paragraph 6.2.3 for details.

### 6.2.2 Second Area Committee Meeting

The Richmond and Swaledale SCTS was then presented again at the Area Committee Meeting held on 16th June 2010 at the Middleham Key Centre, Middleham. At the Second Area Committee Meeting, Members were asked to consider the following four motions and recommend to the Corporate Director which they would like to see approved:

**Motion A:** £100,000 be reserved for the possible resolution of the Market Place bus stops scheme (Scheme D) at a later date and that Schemes G and I (as the two highest scoring schemes) be recommended for inclusion in the Implementation Plan. This would allow £67,800 to be made available for addressing maintenance.

**Motion B:** £93,200 be reserved for the possible resolution of Scheme D and recommend that Schemes C, G and I be implemented with no funds being made available for addressing maintenance.

**Motion C:** Implement schemes A, G and I, which would leave £138,700 for addressing maintenance.

**Motion D:** All the funds are used to implement the schemes in Table 6.2 in order, except E due to its low contribution to the LTP Objectives. This would allow £59,600 to be made available for maintenance.

Members agreed to recommend Motion A and stated that the remaining £67,800 of the SCTS budget should be spent on the maintenance priorities shown in Table 6.2 first.
Table 6.2: Maintenance schemes identified by Highways North Yorkshire for possible implementation from the SCTS Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkengarthdale Road, Reeth</td>
<td>Footway reconstruction</td>
<td>£18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Road, Swaledale</td>
<td>Carriageway resurfacing</td>
<td>£24,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This would leave £25,000 to be spent on other maintenance priorities throughout the district.

### 6.2.3 Richmond Market Place Bus Stops Working Group

As stated in a previous paragraph, a Working Group is to be formed to examine various possible solutions to replace the existing bus bays in the Market Place.

It was suggested that the following organisations be invited to join the Working Group:

- NYCC Area Committee County Councillors (one Member only)
- NYCC Special Projects Group
- Highways North Yorkshire Area Manager
- NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport
- Richmond DC Conservation Officer
- English Heritage
- Green Howards Museum
- Bus Operators:
  - ARRIVA North East
  - Dales and District Town & Country Motor Services
  - Little Red Bus
- Richmond Chamber of Trade
- Richmond Town Council
- Richmond Town Centre Forum – Traffic & Access Group
- Richmond & District Civic Society
- Disability Action in Richmondshire
- Richmondshire DC Hackney Carriageway Licensing Officer

To ensure that any acceptable solution can be implemented, it has been suggested that £100,000 from the SCTS Implementation Budget remain unallocated at this time. This will allow Members of the Area Committee to recommend to the Corporate Director the inclusion
of a scheme for the Market Place bus stops within the SCTS Implementation Plan. If no acceptable solution was identified, this allocation would then be made available for further maintenance schemes to be undertaken instead.

### 6.3 Final Implementation Plan

**Table 6.3** details the final Implementation Plan following the recommendations / decision of the Richmondshire Area Committee.

**Table 6.3: Final Implementation Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Provision of a footway along the western side of ‘The Porch’ in Barton, between the existing footway alongside Silver Street and the existing footway alongside Piper Hill Close</td>
<td>£21,500</td>
<td>32.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Provision of a shared use footway and cycleway within the existing grass verge alongside the B6271, from Brompton Caravan Park eastwards past the Brompton Lakes Holiday Lodge to Parkgate Lane</td>
<td>£114,700</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (i): New bus stops within Richmond Market Place</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4 Anticipated Benefits of the Strategy

Following the decision made at the Richmondshire Area Committee on 16th June 2010, consideration has been given to the anticipated benefits the final Implementation Plan would have in achieving the NYCC’s aims and objectives.

When considered against the aims and objectives of the NYCC Local Transport Plan for period 2 (2006-2011) and the Shared Priorities for Transport, the strategy can be viewed as:

- Helping to deliver **Safer Roads** within the Service Centre
- Helping to improve **Accessibility** within the Service Centre

The strategy can also be seen as supporting the overarching aims of NYCC’s Local Transport Plan for period 2 of making North Yorkshire a better place by:

- Providing equality of opportunity for all
- Improving the safety and health of residents and visitors

### 6.5 Next Steps

The next stage in the process will be for the strategy to be adopted by the NYCC Highway Manager for the Richmond and Swaledale SCTS study area. Following its adoption the improvement schemes will be taken forward for implementation by the NYCC Highways Area Manager and the success of the Strategy will be monitored against the approach identified within **Chapter 5**.
Those improvement schemes which lie outside the scope of the SCTS budget and the remit of the SCTS will be allocated to the relevant part of the County Council for further investigation and, as appropriate, delivery. These improvement schemes will also be monitored in line with the approach identified within Chapter 5.
Anticipated Contribution to Shared Priorities:

Prioritised Improvement Schemes

- **A**: Reduction in the extent of the current 20mph speed limit within Richmond town centre
- **C**: Creation of advisory on-street cycle lanes along the B6274 Gilting Road, Richmond, from Fontenay Road to A6108 Darlington Road Cycleway
- **D (i)**: Provision of new bus stops within Richmond Market Place
- **E**: Widening of existing footway on Frenchgate (also known as The Channel) between Station Road and the Market Place, Richmond
- **G**: Provision of a shared use foot / cyclepath within the existing grass verge alongside the B6271, from Brompton Caravan Park eastwards past the Brompton Lakes Holiday Lodge to Parkgate Lane
- **I**: Provision of a footway along the western side of 'The Porch' in Barton, between the existing footway alongside Silver Street and the existing footway alongside Piper Hill Close
- **J (i)**: Painted road markings and / or new signs on the approaches to Barton village

Helping to deliver Safer Roads within the Service Centre
Improving Accessibility within the Service Centre
Tackling Congestion within the Service Centre

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
Richmond & Swaledale SCTS
Appendix A: Prioritised Improvement Schemes – Location Plan
Improvement Scheme A: Reduction in the extent of the current 20mph speed limit within Richmond town centre

Background

As part of the Member and Stakeholder Consultation, concerns were raised with regard to the current 20mph speed limit restrictions in Richmond, introduced in Richmond as part of the Traffic Management Strategy. The current 20mph speed limit encompasses the following roads in the town centre, and is shown in Figure 1:

- Quakers Lane
- Wellington Place
- Hurgill Road
- Victoria Road
- King Street
- Queens Road
- Bargate

There are concerns that the area which the 20mph speed limit covers is too large and drivers are not adhering to the new speed limit. It has been widely publicised that the scheme has not been well received by the public.

Options

It is proposed that the area which is subject to a 20mph speed limit be revised so that it becomes a 20mph zone which is more focused on the historic core as shown in Figure 1. This would involve increasing the speed limit to 30mph on roads which are no longer within the 20mph speed limit boundary, such as Hurgill Road, Cravengate and Station Road. In order to introduce changes to speed limits, Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) would need to be processed and advertised for a fixed length of time to allow any objections to be made. Once approved, the relevant speed limit signs would be re-located to appropriate locations.

Estimated Cost: £25,000

It was determined by NYCC that this scheme did not need to be scored against NYCC’s Scheme Prioritisation System. Instead, any proposals to amend the existing scheme should be taken forward automatically to the SCTS Implementation Plan.
Figure 1: Location of Improvement Scheme A

Key:
- Current boundary of existing 20mph speed limit
- Proposed boundary of revised 20mph zone

- Hurgill Road
- Victoria Road
- Cravengate
- Station Road
Improvement Scheme C: Creation of advisory on-street cycle lanes along the B6274 Gilling Road, Richmond, from Fontenay Road to A6108 Darlington Road Cycleway

Background

The NYCC LTP2 states that the SCTS should seek to address the existing congestion concerns outside the Richmond C of E Primary School on Darlington Road to the south of Gilling Road, Richmond. At school opening / closing times parents tend to park their vehicles outside of the school to wait for their children. However this causes congestion issues for other road users and safety concerns for pedestrians wishing to cross the road. A cycle lane has recently been introduced along Darlington Road and it was considered by the Officer Team that it could be extended to include the Primary School on Gilling Road. This would encourage school children and their parents to cycle to school instead of taking the car. This would reduce the number of parked cars outside the school, reduce congestion and improve safety for pedestrians.

Options

This scheme would involve providing an on-street cycle lane along the B6274 Gilling Road from the junction with Fontenay Road to the new A6108 Darlington Road. In order to link this section of the cycle lane to the cycle lanes on Darlington Road an off-street section of the Gilling Road cycle route would need to be provided close to the roundabout, as shown by the blue line in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2: Location of Improvement Scheme B

Estimated Cost: £71,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 25.66
Improvement Scheme D (i): Provision of new bus stops within Richmond Market Place

Background

It was reported during the First Member and Stakeholder Consultation that, at present, there is no 'accessible to all' Disability Discrimination Act (DDA)-compliant bus stops in Richmond Market Place, which results in disabled passengers in wheelchairs not being able to alight the buses at this location. Due to historic issues, recent Health and Safety legislation and the requirements of the DDA, it has now become essential that improvements are made to current bus passenger waiting facilities in the Market Place.

It was suggested by a stakeholder that the existing bus stops outside the town hall should be relocated to the north of the Market Place, with improved paving provided so that disabled passengers can alight easier and that shelters and seating be erected for passengers.

In April 2008, NYCC’s Integrated Passenger Transport team commissioned Jacobs to carry out a feasibility design study and report outlining options for improvement to the bus stop facilities, taking into consideration previous design works and comments received about that design.

Options

As part of the SCTS, the four options generated by the Jacobs feasibility design study and report, have been re-considered (Options A to D below), and has resulted in the development of a number of new options (Options E to I) to improve passenger waiting facilities as outlined below. The accompanying figures for each of the scheme options are provided at end of this appendix.

Option Descriptions

Option A: This option would include providing the following:

- Provision of raised kerbs at each bus stop
- Provision of a tactile dropped crossing from the Town Hall to the new bus stop build-out,
- Provision of a shelter serving the bus facilities
- Creation of a one-way system flowing past the proposed bus stop area
- Provision of a build-out to the footway at the southern end of the Market Place accommodating an uncontrolled tactile dropped crossing over the main thoroughfare to the west of the Market Place

Estimated Cost: £85,500

Option B: This option would include providing the following:

- Provision of changes to the existing footway in order to prevent water flowing back to properties
- Provision of raised kerbs at each stop
- Re-alignment of existing parking bays adjacent to the Obelisk
Separation of bus and car parking facilities. Cars would be restricted to entering and departing from parking bays directly from/to the High Street, which should prevent conflicts between cars and buses/coaches using the facilities

Estimated Cost: £49,500

Option C: This option would include providing the following:

- Provision of raised kerbs at each stop
- Separation of bus and car parking facilities. Cars would be restricted to entering and departing from parking bays directly from/to the High Street, which should prevent conflicts between cars and buses/coaches using the facilities
- Car parking opposite the Town Hall to be changed from being perpendicular to the kerbline to being a forty-five degree angle to the kerbline. This would allow safe manoeuvring for cars reversing between the car parking bays and bus bays along the opposite kerbline.

Estimated Cost: £53,000

Option D: Provision of a build-out adjacent to the church to accommodate a passenger waiting shelter and the provision of three bus stops.

Each stop would have:

- A raised island with raised kerbs for passengers boarding/departing the buses and tactile dropped crossings to the rear of each island
- Blocked paving crossing the cobbled surface

Estimated Cost: £53,500

Option E: Replacement of the existing bus bays in the Market Place and the provision of five new bus stops. Two of these would be positioned adjacent to the Golden Lion Hotel, and three would be positioned in the north of the Market Place.

Existing car parking would need to be reconfigured to accommodate for the lost spaces on the eastern side of Queens Road, but to maintain existing provision, new parking bays would be provided where the existing bus stops are located, to the south east of the obelisk. Provision for the monthly Farmers Market would be made within the revised parking arrangements.

Estimated Cost: £100,000

Option F (i): Replacement of the existing bus bays in Richmond Market Place with three new bus stops on the north side of the Market Place outside the Green Howards Regimental Museum, one new bus stop on the east side of the Market Place outside Jacobs Take Away and 1 new bus stop and bus shelter outside and adjacent to the Golden Lion Hotel.

Existing car parking would need to be reconfigured to accommodate for the lost spaces on the eastern side of Queens Road, but to maintain existing provision, new parking bays would be provided where the existing bus stops are located, to the south east of the obelisk. Provision for
the monthly Farmers Market would be made within the revised parking arrangements.

**Estimated Cost:** £100,000

**Option F(ii):** Replacement of the existing bus bays in Richmond Market Place with three new bus stops outside the Green Howards Museum, and two new bus stops and a bus shelter outside and adjacent to the Golden Lion Hotel. The new bus stops would offer improved safety for pedestrians by providing passenger shelters, improved passenger timetable information and raised bus boarding kerbs for easier access.

**Estimated Cost:** £100,000

**Option F (iii):** Replacement of the existing bus bays in Richmond Market Place with three new bus stops outside the Green Howards Museum, and two new bus stops on the east side of the Market Place.

**Estimated Cost:** £100,000

All Option F proposals would require existing car parking to be reconfigured to accommodate the re-sited taxi rank, which would result in a loss of 10 spaces situation. Provision for the monthly Farmers Market would be made within the revised parking arrangements.

**Option G:** This proposal is similar to Option F above, and would replace the existing bus bays in the Market Place with three new bus stops outside the Green Howards Museum, and two new bus stops to the north of the Market Place, along Queens Road between Dundas Street and Ryders Wynd.

Existing car parking would need to be reconfigured to accommodate for the lost spaces on the eastern side of Queens Road and to accommodate the re-sited taxi rank. To maintain existing provision, new parking bays would be provided on the east side of the Market Place, which would result in a gain of 2 spaces, leading to a net parking provision of 135 spaces. Provision for the monthly Farmers Market would be made within the revised parking arrangements.

**Estimated Cost:** £100,000

**Option H:** This proposal is a revision to Option D above, and would enhance the bus bays in a similar location to where they are currently, by providing a new footway area formed from natural Yorkshire paving blocks in an extended herring bone pattern bounded by conservation stone kerbs. These kerbs would be flush with the existing cobbles.

**Estimated Cost:** £100,000

**NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score for all options:** 21.43
Improvement Scheme E: Widening of existing footway on Frenchgate (also known as The Channel) between Station Road and the Market Place, Richmond

Background

Given Frenchgate’s location close to the Market Place, in Richmond, it experiences a high amount of footfall. However, between the junction with Market Place and Station Road the width of the footway along its south side becomes narrow due to the proximity of adjacent buildings. Thus, when two or more pedestrians meet, one has to walk on the carriageway and share the same space as vehicles. This has been raised as a safety concern, especially for those with pushchairs and wheelchairs.

Options

A scheme which proposes to widen the footway adjacent to Frenchgate has been developed historically and appears on the NYCC’s Reserve List of Capital Schemes. Thus, no further investigation was undertaken as part of the SCTS.

Estimated Cost: £77,000

Figure 3: Location of Improvement Scheme E

Estimated Cost: £77,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 12.26
Improvement Scheme G: Provision of a shared use foot / cycle path within the existing grass verge alongside the B6271, from Brompton Caravan Park eastwards past the Brompton Lakes Holiday Lodge to Parkgate Lane

Background

Concerns have been raised regarding the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on the B6271 Richmond Road between Brompton on Swale and the entrance to Brompton Caravan Park. This section of the road is popular with pedestrians and cyclists travelling between the Caravan Park, Holiday Lodges and Brompton on Swale village but there are no pedestrian or cycling facilities thus they are required to walk on the verge or share the carriageway with vehicles.

Options

This scheme involves the provision of a shared use foot / cycle path in the existing grass verge adjacent to the B6271 between the junction with Parkgate Lane and the entrance to the Brompton Caravan Park, as shown on Figure 4.

The foot / cycle path would be set back from the carriageway using a grass ‘buffer’ between the carriageway. The path would start in the verge opposite the caravan park entrance and continue towards Brompton on Swale for a distance of approximately 1.4km and join up with the existing footway leading into the town.

There is currently a narrow bridge on the outskirts of Brompton on Swale with no verge. In order to provide a foot way on this section, the carriageway would need to be narrowed down to one way, requiring a priority working system to be set up over the narrow bridge.

Figure 4: Location of Improvement Scheme G

Estimated Cost: £115,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 26.66
Improvement Scheme I: Provision of a footway along the western side of ‘The Porch’ in Barton, between the existing footway alongside Silver Street and the existing footway alongside Piper Hill Close

Background

At present, a grass verge exists on the western side of The Porch in the village of Barton, close to Barton Church of England Primary School. It is used by drivers to park their cars whilst waiting for school to open and close. Existing footways to the north and south of this verge end abruptly, and the school have raised concerns with regard to pedestrian safety when walking along this verge, particularly for school children. Thus, they have requested the provision of a continuous footway as part of their School Travel Plan.

Scheme Options

A scheme which aims at providing a footway along the western side of The Porch between the junctions with Silver Street and Piper Hill Close, as shown in Figure 5 has been developed historically and appears on the NYCC’s Reserve List of Capital Schemes. Thus, no further investigation was undertaken as part of the SCTS.

Figure 5: Location of Improvement Scheme I

Estimated Cost: £22,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 32.52
Improvement Scheme J (i): Painted road markings and/or new signs on the approaches to Barton village

Background

The head teacher of Barton Church of England Primary School has raised concerns relating to the speed at which vehicles travel along Silver Street in the village, which is currently subject to a 30mph speed limit. When approaching Barton village on Silver Street, the speed limit changes from the national speed limit to a 30mph speed limit. However, the change in speed limit is not very apparent as the 30mph speed limit signs are small and are not visible from a distance. On the western approach to the village there are bar markings warning motorists of the 30mph speed limit ahead but on the eastern approach to the village, due to recent carriageway works, the bar markings are worn and need refreshing. A speed survey was undertaken between 20th April 2009 and 3rd May 2009 and showed that 85% of the traffic travelled at 34.1mph on the eastbound carriageway and 36.6mph on the westbound carriageway.

Options

It is proposed to replace the current 30mph signs, which are 600mm in diameter, with larger signs 900mm in diameter. These would be placed on yellow backing boards making them more visible from a distance. The bar markings would also be refreshed on both entrances to the village. This would involve providing 2m wide red anti-skid strips on the carriageway, either side of the 30mph roundel at the start of the 30mph limit and a 200mm wide white line at either side of the anti-skid to make the carriageway appear narrower. See Figure 6 for a location plan.

Figure 6: Location of Improvement Scheme J(i)

Estimated Cost: £8,500

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 18.79