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Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This document represents the final stage in the development of the Selby Service Centre Transportation Strategy (SCTS) as prepared by North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) and their partner consultants Jacobs. It summarises the key stages in the development of the SCTS and concludes with the findings and recommendations of the strategy.

The Selby SCTS is one of 28 transportation strategies programmed for completion over the course of the Second Local Transport Plan period (LTP2) which covers 2006 – 2011. The SCTS methodology focuses on identifying the transport needs of ‘service centre’ market towns, and their surrounding hinterlands, and assisting in the creation of improvement schemes and initiatives aimed at providing safer, better connected and more accessible transport services linking people to key services, jobs, education and health facilities. The SCTS process builds upon the success of the Town Centre Traffic Management Studies (TMS) undertaken during the First Local Transport Plan (LTP1) period, with the focus being amended to include improvements to the surrounding hinterlands in addition to the town centres.

The study area incorporates Selby itself along with towns and villages including Hambleton, Hemingborough, Camblesforth and Thorpe Willoughby. The full study area is illustrated in Figure 1.1, overleaf.
Figure 1.1: Selby SCTS Study Area
1.2 Delivering the Strategy

As part of LTP2 NYCC has an allocated budget for the development and delivery of the Selby SCTS. This budget covers the design and construction of improvement schemes identified by the strategy over a two year period; it will be used to deliver those schemes identified within the strategy in order of priority. It should be noted that as this is a flexible, but finite, budget not all of the schemes put forward as a result of technical investigation and public and stakeholder consultation will be deliverable within the available funds. Those schemes which are not delivered within the available budget will join the NYCC Local Transport Plan Capital Reserve List of schemes which is discussed in more detail later in this document.

The SCTS process can identify large scale improvement schemes which exceed the scope of the SCTS allocated budget. The monetary threshold for these schemes has been identified as those with a capital cost in excess of £100,000; these improvement schemes will be included in the strategy with an acknowledgement that they cannot be delivered within the limits of the SCTS budget but may be progressed in line with alternative, available, funding. These alternative funding mechanisms include, but are not limited to, the following:

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

The results of this process are ‘strategic’ in nature and, as such, all improvement schemes put forward by the strategy will be subject to further analysis, feasibility testing and consultation as part of the NYCC scheme development process.

1.3 Report Structure

The structure of the remainder of the document is as follows:

- Chapter 2 – Strategy Development
- Chapter 3 – Prioritised Improvement Schemes
- Chapter 4 – Schemes Subject to Alternative Funding Mechanisms
- Chapter 5 – Monitoring and Evaluation
- Chapter 6 – Summary and Conclusions
2.1 Introduction

The key stages in the development of the Selby Service Centre Transportation Strategy are illustrated in Figure 2.1, below. Full details of these key stages are provided in this chapter.

Figure 2.1: Strategy Development – Key Stages

- **DATA COLLECTION**: July 2007
- **FIRST STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP**: September 2007
- **SAMPLE SURVEY OF LOCAL HOUSEHOLDS**: December 2007
- **ANALYSIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES**: March 2008
- **SCHEME ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISATION**: April 2008
- **SECOND STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP**: April 2008
- **PUBLIC CONSULTATION**: July 2008
- **ADOPTION OF STRATEGY**
- **DELIVERY OF STRATEGY**

Colors:
- Light green: Phase 1: Identification of Issues
- Light blue: Phase 2: Scheme Development
- Light orange: Phase 3: Final Strategy
2.2 Data Collection

Data collection formed the first stage in the development of the Selby SCTS. The process involved the collation of information and familiarisation with the Study Area and provided an important evidence base for the development and evaluation of the improvement schemes.

Full details of the data collection exercise can be found within the following report: Selby Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Base Data Analysis Report (September 2007, Jacobs).

2.3 First Stakeholder Workshop

The first stakeholder workshop was held at Selby Town Hall on 20th September 2007. Key stakeholders including Parish Councillors, Local Action Groups and emergency services were invited to attend and provide insight into the issues affecting transportation within the SCTS Study Area. The workshop was attended by 28 of the 104 stakeholders invited to the event. Views expressed during the workshop were used as one of the key means of driving the SCTS process forward.

Full details of the first stakeholder workshop can be found within the following report: Selby Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Workshop 1 Summary Note (November 2007, Jacobs).

2.4 Sample Survey

Following the first stakeholder workshop, a sample survey was distributed to 4400 households within the study area; a total of 817 households responded giving a response rate of 19%.

The aim of the survey was to give a representative sample of the people, living and working in the SCTS study area, an opportunity to express their views and opinions on local transportation issues.

2.5 Analysis and Development of Improvement schemes

Stakeholder input, responses received by way of the sample survey and data analysis were reviewed in order to develop a range of potential improvement schemes.

Site visits were undertaken to assess scheme feasibility before being submitted to the next stage of assessment.

2.6 Scheme Assessment and Prioritisation

As the SCTS process is driven by the LTP process, it is essential that the improvement schemes put forward by the strategy are focused on meeting the objectives of the Government’s ‘Shared Priorities for Transport’.

Each of the proposed improvement schemes has therefore been appraised using NYCC’s Scheme Prioritisation System which assesses each scheme against the four shared priorities.
This appraisal resulted in an overall assessment score for each scheme which has been used as a means of identifying the improvement schemes to be prioritised and delivered. This method ensured consistency in the decision making process across the County.

2.7 Second Stakeholder Workshop

The purpose of the second stakeholder workshop was to report back to stakeholders on the improvement schemes which were developed resulting from the issues raised at the first stakeholder workshop and the sample survey.

The 104 stakeholders who were invited to the first stakeholder workshop were once again given the opportunity to provide comments and feedback on each of the improvement schemes before they were taken forward to the public consultation stage; a total of 24 stakeholders attended.

The second stakeholder workshop also gave NYCC the opportunity to provide feedback on improvement schemes deemed to be unfeasible due to lack of justification, physical constraints or funding issues.


2.8 Public Consultation

Following the second stakeholder workshop, a full public consultation exercise was undertaken. This process consisted of two elements:

- Public Exhibitions
- Postal Survey of all households and businesses

The public exhibitions were held at Selby Town Hall on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> June and Saturday 5<sup>th</sup> July.

The public exhibitions outlined the SCTS process to date and provided details of each of the proposed improvement schemes. The exhibitions also provided an opportunity for the public and local stakeholders to express their views and discuss in detail, with a representative of NYCC, any of the schemes put forward. A total of 9 people attended the exhibitions across the two dates.

In addition to the public exhibitions a full postal survey of all households and businesses in the Selby SCTS Study Area was undertaken. The survey gave every household and business the opportunity to comment on the improvement schemes and yielded 4109 responses (approximately 17.7% of total households). Full details of the public consultation exercise can be found in: Selby Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Consultation Results (July 2008, Jacobs).

2.9 Final Strategy

Analysis of the views expressed during the public consultation have been used to assess the level of public desire and acceptance for each of the proposed improvement schemes. This analysis, along with the assessment score produced using the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation
System, has subsequently been used to create the list of improvement schemes to be prioritised for delivery. These are detailed in the following chapter.
3 Prioritised Improvement schemes

3.1 Introduction

The SCTS process has resulted in the development of a range of improvement schemes and associated options aimed at resolving transportation issues currently affecting people living and working in the Selby SCTS area.

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

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

3.2 Methodology

Using the scheme assessment score, determined by the NYCC Prioritisation Framework, and the views expressed as part of the public consultation exercise a prioritised list of 16 improvement schemes has been developed. These improvement schemes are detailed in Section 3.3.

The SCTS process aims to ensure that these prioritised improvement schemes are focused on meeting the needs of the people living and working within the SCTS study area whilst demonstrating a positive contribution to the aspirations of the Shared Priorities for Transport and ultimately assisting in the delivery of the LTP2 objectives.

3.3 Prioritised Improvement schemes

Table 3.1, overleaf, details the improvement schemes which have been prioritised for delivery as part of the available SCTS budget. These schemes are those which demonstrate a significant contribution to the Shared Priorities for Transport and show a high level of support from the people living and working within the study area.

The cost estimates included within the table are based upon the information available at the time of investigation and, as such, are subject to change due to the early stage of scheme development.

It is acknowledged that the allocated budget is not sufficient to deliver all of the improvement schemes identified based upon their cost estimates. In this instance the schemes which are not delivered will join the NYCC Reserve List of Capital Schemes and will be delivered using the wider LTP Integrated Transport and Maintenance Budget subject to prioritisation against the existing schemes on the list.

Where improvement schemes have demonstrated similar levels of public support the assessment score has been used as the primary tool to establish overall priority. In cases of improvement schemes demonstrating differing levels of public support it is this criteria which has been used as the primary tool for prioritisation. This results in some schemes with higher assessment scores being prioritised lower in the list on the basis of high levels of public support.
### Table 3.1: Prioritised Improvement Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Burn to Chapel Haddlesey section of the Selby to County Boundary Cycle Route.</td>
<td>£37,000</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a zebra crossing on Selby Road, Whitley.</td>
<td>£27,000</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puffin crossing near Hut Green roundabout on Weeland Road, Eggborough.</td>
<td>£42,000</td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of speed reduction measures on Leeds Road (A63) through Thorpe Willoughby.</td>
<td>£21,000</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway extension on Selby Road, Whitley.</td>
<td>£19,000</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a zebra crossing on Flaxley Road.</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a footway on B1223, Wistow.</td>
<td>£21,000</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway widening and drop-kerb crossing on A1041, Camblesforth.</td>
<td>£58,000</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a footway from Mount Pleasant to Little Smeaton</td>
<td>£17,000</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of existing footway, Hirst Courtney</td>
<td>£22,000</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Whitley section of the Selby to County Boundary Cycle Route.</td>
<td>£22,000</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A19 Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escrick – A19 / Skipwith Road Junction</td>
<td>Option A: Traffic signals and right turn lane  A - £158,000  A – 29.28</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option B: Vehicle Activated Sign</td>
<td>B - £15,000</td>
<td>B – 26.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barlby – A19 / A163 Junction</td>
<td>Option A: Traffic signals</td>
<td>A - £179,000</td>
<td>A – 23.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option B: Enhanced signing and lining</td>
<td>B - £84,000</td>
<td>B – 21.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M62 to Balne Moor Crossroads – speed, signing and lining review and implementation of a Vehicle Activated Sign.</td>
<td>£42,000</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womersley - Highfield Lane to Doncaster MBC Boundary: speed, signing and lining review and implementation of a Vehicle Activated Sign.</td>
<td>£84,000</td>
<td>31.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic sign and road marking improvements and vehicle activated sign at Balne Moor Crossroads.</td>
<td>£27,000</td>
<td>26.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- **S** Strong Support
- **Support**
- **No Opinion**
- **Lack of Support**
The improvement schemes within Table 3.1 are all subject to further detailed analysis as part of the future design and build process. This may necessitate further localised consultation and detailed physical and technical feasibility assessments, undertaken by the NYCC Area Highway Teams, to establish their ultimate deliverability.

Those schemes shaded in the left hand columns were approved by the Corporate Director: Business and Environmental Services as part of the Implementation Plan for the Strategy as far as the Integrated Transport Capital Programme will provide the funds for their implementation.
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 development process, which exceed the scope of the SCTS budget and are therefore 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 in the strategy to be progressed under alternative funding and delivery mechanisms. This acknowledges that in order to address the issues, identified by the SCTS process, access to all available NYCC funding streams and departments is required.

Those ‘capital’ improvement schemes which cannot be delivered within the SCTS budget and, as such, are subject to alternative funding are detailed in Section 4.2.

Section 4.3 provides details of the issues raised as part of the development of the SCTS which are external to, or cannot be directly resolved by, the SCTS delivery process. These have been included within the strategy as recognition of their importance and to ensure joined up thinking between NYCC departments. These are predominantly ‘non capital’ improvement schemes and initiatives that will need to be taken forward and delivered by a number of NYCC departments.

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 SCTS budget. These include:

- NYCC improvement schemes already programmed for delivery;
- Improvement schemes with a capital cost in excess of £100,000;
- Area wide Drop Kerb Crossings; and
- Maintenance budget improvements.
4.2.1 Improvement schemes with a Capital Cost in Excess of £100,000

Those improvement schemes, identified as part of the SCTS process, with a capital cost in excess of £100,000 are deemed to be beyond the scope of the SCTS budget and, as such, their delivery is dependent upon alternative funding mechanisms. These are detailed below.

Stillingfleet / Escrick Cycle Route / Footway: Residents of Stillingfleet currently have no safe footpath or cycle route to the Sustrans National Cycle Route and Trans-Pennine Trail nearby. The proposal is for a continuous shared use footway / cycleway between Stillingfleet and the Sustrans route. The cost varies between £450,000 and £600,000 due to the need for carriageway drainage in the majority of the footway and the fact that an existing drainage ditch running through a substantial section of the verge may present difficulties.

Chapel Haddlesey / Burn Cycle Route / Footway: There is currently a lack of a safe footpath and cycle route between the villages of Burn and Chapel Haddlesey. At present NMU's use the A19 to travel between the settlements resulting in issues of safety. Due to the length of the proposed scheme the estimated cost is £450,000 although this may change significantly due to drainage requirements.

Eggborough / Kellington Cycle Route: A proposal was put forward to upgrade the existing footway, on the A645, between Kellington and Eggborough to a 2m wide cycleway. The length of the proposed route, and associated works, result in a cost estimate of approximately £150,000.

Camblesforth / Drax Cycleway: In order to address the lack of cycle facilities between Camblesforth and Drax an unsegregated cycleway was proposed for the A645 to be constructed as an upgrade to the existing footpath. The estimated cost was £160,000 however there are also issues of the potential to widen the existing footway.

Burn Towpath: It was noted, during workshop discussions, that the existing tow path between Burn and Chapel Haddlesey is poorly maintained. It was proposed to remove obstructions from the path and resurface it with a cycle friendly surface. Further investigation of the proposal noted that sections of the land are currently owned and maintained by British Waterways and any works would have to be carried out in conjunction with them. The cost of the scheme is estimated to be £450,000.

Snaith Footway / Cycle Path: Local stakeholders feel that the lack of a bridge crossing the River Aire is an obstacle to NMU accessibility between Eggborough and Snaith and a proposal has been put forward for construction of a cycle path between the two villages. Approximately 75% of the existing verge could potentially accommodate the proposed scheme but the additional 25% would require land purchase and as such the estimated cost is in excess of £1 million.

Brayton / Barlow Footpath: Workshop group consultation raised the issue of the lack of a footpath between Barlow Common and Brayton Lane. The proposal is to introduce a shared use footpath / cycleway to include crossing facilities. The estimated cost of the scheme is £650,000 due to areas where land purchase may be necessary. This cost could potentially escalate dependent on drainage requirements.
Whitley to Doncaster Metropolitan Council Boundary Cycle Route: Attention was brought to the lack of cycle facilities between Whitley and the Doncaster City Council Boundary, and along the A19 in general. Approximately 80% of the existing verge could potentially accommodate the cycle path but land purchase would have to be a consideration for the remainder of the route. The cost estimate, subject to drainage costs, is approximately £1 million.

4.2.2 Programmed Schemes

A number of initially proposed schemes have been discounted from the SCTS process as they are being addressed through other measures.

- The signalised crossing facility, identified as a priority for Carlton-in-Snaith, has been discounted as an SCTS scheme as it is already under construction;
- A full signing audit is to be undertaken across the SCTS area which will encompass the proposed schemes in Selby, Temple Hirst, Carlton / Snaith and Cawood. This will address whether the existing signs are suitable, if they are clear and visible, whether they can be rationalised and if there are any signs missing;
- Congestion problems and pedestrian issues, in the vicinity of Gowthorpe, are being addressed through the Selby TMS and Selby Living Streets Renaissance Project.

4.2.3 Area Wide Drop Kerb Crossings

Through the SCTS process, fourteen locations were identified where drop kerb crossings would aid accessibility and promote pedestrian safety with examples being two crossing points in the vicinity of Riccall Community Primary School and the A19 through Burn.

These crossings will not be funded through the SCTS but will go ahead as an area wide initiative funded by other sources.

4.2.4 Maintenance

Although not yet developed as a specific improvement option issues of footway maintenance have been raised, for Thorpe Willoughby, Brayton and Cawood, which could potentially be taken forward in line with the NYCC maintenance budget. In this instance the NYCC Highways Area Manager will take ownership of these issues and consider their merit for inclusion within the forward programme of works for the area. As such there is no guarantee that they will be delivered within the available maintenance budget.

4.3 Non Capital Schemes and Initiatives

A number of additional issues have been raised, during engagement with stakeholders and the public, which have not been investigated, and subsequently developed, as part of the SCTS. These issues are considered to be outside of the scope of the SCTS budget; however, their importance is recognised and as such they are included within the strategy for further consideration under alternative funding and delivery mechanisms.
‘Non Capital’ schemes and initiatives are discussed under the following headings:

- Passenger Transport
- Parking

### 4.3.1 Passenger Transport

The development of the Selby SCTS has raised a number of issues with regard to passenger transport within the study area and in particular stakeholders have expressed concerns relating to the existing bus services in the form of a general lack of services and poor transport information at major interchanges.

As identified within LTP2, such improvements are subject to cooperation between both the County Council and the service providers and, as such, are 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 or the development and execution of the NYCC Bus Strategy. As such, all comments have been forwarded to the NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport Unit for further consideration.

Particular concerns raised as part of the stakeholder and public consultation exercises are detailed below. The views expressed are those of the stakeholders and the public and have been included for further consideration by the NYCC Passenger Transport Team. As such they have not undergone detailed analysis as part of the SCTS process.

- Great Heck is currently not served by any bus routes;
- The frequency of buses calling at Hensall is too low;
- There is a lack of bus services between Selby and York;
- There is a lack of bus services in Temple Hirst;
- A bus shelter is required in Thorpe Willoughby;
- A bus shelter is required in Cawood;
- Some people are confused as to where they can use their North Yorkshire bus passes;
- It was suggested that a manned information point would be helpful to provide information on bus times etc;
- There was concern that some buses don’t have wheelchair access;
- A suggestion was made that bus drivers be trained in awareness of problems for people with learning and other difficulties;
- There are no direct bus services from Tadcaster to Selby;
• Residents in settlements near the M62 argued that a better bus service was needed to
  get into Selby. Similarly residents of these settlements and others further to the south
  west of the study area would like to see better public transport connections to Pontefract;

• The lack of a direct bus service from Whitley and Womersly to Knottingley results in long
  journey times for this route. Stakeholders suggest that neighbouring authorities need to
  work together to provide direct bus services to more destinations;

• Stakeholders feel that within the Selby district there is poor bus interchange between the
  main settlements of Selby, Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster and that public transport
  links between these areas need to be established;

• Some residents have called for the re-opening of railway stations, for example in Cliffe.
  Although this would provide locals with improved transport options the cost of such a
  scheme is likely to be high;

• Issues were raised over the Senior Citizens Bus Pass and the times of use. The
  example given was that holders of the pass cannot travel before 9am or after 5pm to get
  to Doncaster. This was also noted to be a problem for residents of outlying villages in the
  study area, such as Hemingbrough. It was argued further that a change in times of use
  for the pass alone would not solve the problem as some villages do not have buses
  running outside of these times. Residents suggested that using smaller buses that arrive
  more often would give better travel options;

• Residents of outlying villages expressed a desire for specific timetabled bus services
  rather than the ‘Dial-a-Ride’ services currently available. It was noted that ‘Dial-a-Ride’
  services often need to be booked days in advance and a set bus service, even if
  infrequent, would be preferable;

• School children travelling to Selby from Drax often miss their first lesson as the timetable
  does not allow sufficient time. Residents suggest that the timetable needs to be altered
  to allow for this;

• Transport interchange throughout the study area was considered to be inadequate for
  many people. Coordinating bus and train timetables and improving car parking in the
  vicinity of these services would help residents of the study area make best use of public
  transport;

• Selby Train Station is not always manned;

• The gap that is sometimes left between trains and the platform is sometimes too wide for
  people with mobility problems;

• It was felt that information at the train station could be made clearer.
4.3.2 Parking

Parking has not been investigated as part of the SCTS process as it is largely dependent upon Revenue Funding and responsibility is split between the County Council for on-street parking and the District Council for off-street parking.

A number of parking issues have been raised throughout the SCTS consultation process; these are listed below and will be passed onto NYCC and Selby District Council for investigation:

- Stakeholders expressed concern over the future demand of parking at Selby Train Station. Currently at full capacity (150 spaces) it is predicted that future demand will be in the region of 450 spaces. First TransPennine Express have commissioned Pell Frischmann to investigate options for additional car parking at the station: initial ideas have been circulated and comments from NYCC and Selby District Council passed onto the consultants;

- There is insufficient parking near the school in Brayton;

- Motorists parking on the blind bend near the post office in Camblesforth causes a hazard;

- Vehicles parked on Carlton High Street cause dangerous conditions for all road users and pedestrians;

- Inappropriate parking on Thorpe Lane, Rythergate, Ryther Road and Wistowgate in Cawood results in dangerous conditions for all road users and pedestrians;

- Inappropriate parking on Main Street in North Duffield causes regular obstruction which is made worse in emergencies;

- Parking on Brook Street, near the railway crossing, in Selby causes obstruction;

- An excess of vehicles parked on Fox Lane in Thorpe Willoughby results in dangerous conditions for road users and pedestrians; and

- Cars parked inappropriately on the A19 through Whitley cause a hazard especially on a Sunday during the hours of the car boot sale.

4.4 Summary

This chapter provides 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 and delivery mechanisms.

The importance of these improvement schemes and initiatives has been acknowledged and, as such, they are included within the strategy along with recommendations 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 delivered as part of the Selby SCTS.

As stated in 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 strategy’s contribution to the shared priorities, to be effectively measured.

5.2 Monitoring Improvement schemes

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

As part of the SCTS process improvement schemes will be monitored, post construction, to assess their impact on the issues which drove their development and their contribution to the shared priorities. This will be undertaken as part of the LTP2 process with the level of assessment influenced by the size and scale of the individual improvement scheme. 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Local Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Completion of Burn to Chapel Haddlesey section of the Selby to County Boundary Cycle Route. | • Attitudinal Indicator  
  • Observational Surveys                                                             |
| Provision of a zebra crossing on Selby Road, Whitley.                              | • Increased Pedestrian Use  
  • Speed Reduction  
  • Attitudinal Indicator  
  • Observational Surveys                                                              |
| Puffin crossing near Hut Green roundabout on Weeland Road, Eggborough.              | • Increased Pedestrian Use  
  • Speed Reduction  
  • Attitudinal Indicator  
  • Observational Surveys                                                              |
| Introduction of speed reduction measures on Leeds Road (A63) through Thorpe Willoughby. | • Speed Reduction  
  • Attitudinal Indicator                                                              |
| Footway extension on Selby Road, Whitley.                                          | • Increased Pedestrian Use  
  • Attitudinal Indicator  
  • Observational Surveys                                                              |
| Provision of a zebra crossing on Flaxley Road, Selby.                              | • Increased Pedestrian Use  
  • Speed Reduction  
  • Attitudinal Indicator  
  • Observational Surveys                                                              |
| Provision of a footway on B1223, Wistow.                                           | • Increased Pedestrian Use  
  • Attitudinal Indicator  
  • Observational Surveys                                                              |
| Footway widening and drop-kerb crossing on A1041, Camblesforth.                    | • Increased Pedestrian Use  
  • Attitudinal Indicator  
  • Observational Surveys                                                              |
| Extension of existing footway, Hirst Courtney.                                     | • Increased Pedestrian Use  
  • Attitudinal Indicator  
  • Observational Surveys                                                              |
| Completion of Whitley section of the Selby to County Boundary Cycle Route.         | • Attitudinal Indicator  
  • Observational Surveys                                                              |
| Provision of a footway from Mount Pleasant to Little Smeaton.                      | • Increased Pedestrian Use  
  • Attitudinal Indicator  
  • Observational Surveys                                                              |
### A19 Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escrick – A19 / Skipwith Road Junction</td>
<td>Traffic signals and right turn lane</td>
<td>Vehicle Activated Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option A:</strong> Traffic signals and right turn lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B:</strong> Vehicle Activated Sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barby – A19 / A163 Junction</td>
<td>Traffic signals</td>
<td>Enhanced signing and lining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option A:</strong> Traffic signals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B:</strong> Enhanced signing and lining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M62 to Balne Moor Crossroads – speed, signing and lining review and implementation of a Vehicle Activated Sign.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womersley - Highfield Lane to Doncaster MBC Boundary: speed, signing and lining review and implementation of a Vehicle Activated Sign.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic sign and road marking improvements and vehicle activated sign at Balne Moor Crossroads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of each of the local indicators are provided below. It is noted that these should be treated as a guide and each case will be assessed on a site by site basis. In accordance with LTP2, monitoring of performance against these local indicators, and their contribution to the shared priorities, will be a key part of the annual review process carried out by the Steering Group once the strategy is adopted.

**Accident Reduction** – To assess the impact an improvement scheme has had upon accident numbers at a specific location historical accident figures, supplied by North Yorkshire Police, from the ‘Stats 19’ database will be compared to those post implementation from the same source. It is recognised that the implementation of some improvement schemes 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 improvement schemes have assisted in encouraging Pedestrian use.

**Speed Reduction** – Traffic speed will be recorded prior to, and post, implementation in order to assess the level of impact improvement schemes have had on overall vehicle speeds. As in the case of the accident reduction indicator trends will be analysed over an extended period of time to ensure initial benefits do not fall away over time.

**Attitudinal Indicator** – As the SCTS process has been driven by the needs and 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.

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

### 5.3 Monitoring the Strategy

The implementation of the improvement schemes within the Strategy will be monitored over the next two years. This element of the monitoring process will be ‘owned’ by the NYCC Highways Area Manager, who is responsible for the design and implementation of the Improvement schemes contained within the strategy, and will be reported through the NYCC LTP 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 schemes suggested for inclusion within the strategy.

The strategy will be treated as a ‘live’ document which is flexible in nature and able to accommodate changes in local, regional and national policy as well as available funding and third party influences such as developer contributions. Significant changes in any of these areas may trigger the need to revisit the strategy and update its findings to accommodate changes.

The strategy will be revisited in its entirety and updated as part of the LTP for period 3 which covers 2012 to 2017.
6 Summary and Conclusions

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the strategy for the Selby service centre and provides qualitative comment on the perceived benefits of the strategy in the context of the Government's Shared Priorities. Finally, the next stages in the process, and how the strategy will be adopted and then delivered, will be outlined.

6.2 Final Strategy

Table 6.1, overleaf, outlines the improvement schemes to be taken forward for delivery as part of the Selby SCTS. The schemes have been categorised by the anticipated funding source which will be used to secure their delivery. 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
  - Capital Reserve List
  - 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)

It should be noted that, as there is a flexible but finite budget available for the delivery of the SCTS, not all of the improvement schemes put forward in Table 6.1 will be deliverable within the available funds. In addition, as the improvement schemes are further developed and designed by NYCC, it may be determined that some schemes be omitted from the process due to technical unfeasibility or lack of public support. Those schemes shaded in the left-hand columns were approved by the Corporate Director: Business and Environmental Services as part of the Implementation Plan for the Strategy as far as the Integrated Transport Capital Programme will provide the funds for their implementation.

In order to determine the anticipated benefits of the strategy as a whole, the contribution of each of the improvement schemes to the shared priorities, and hence the aspirations contained within LTP2, have been provided in Table 6.1.
### Table 6.1: The Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Contribution to Shared Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCTS Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Completion of Burn to Chapel Haddlesey section of the Selby to County Boundary Cycle Route. | • Accessibility  
• Safer Roads |
| Provision of a zebra crossing on Selby Road, Whitley.                              | • Safer Roads  
• Accessibility |
| Puffin crossing near Hut Green roundabout on Weeland Road, Eggborough.              | • Safer Roads  
• Accessibility |
| Introduction of speed reduction measures on Leeds Road (A63) through Thorpe Willoughby. | • Safer Roads  
• Accessibility |
| Footway extension on Selby Road, Whitley.                                          | • Safer Roads  
• Accessibility |
| Provision of a zebra crossing on Flaxley Road, Selby.                              | • Safer Roads  
• Accessibility |
| Provision of a footway on B1223, Wistow.                                           | • Safer Roads  
• Accessibility |
| Footway widening and drop-kerb crossing on A1041, Camblesforth.                    | • Safer Roads  
• Accessibility |
| Extension of existing footway, Hirst Courtney.                                     | • Safer Roads  
• Accessibility |
| Completion of Whitley section of the Selby to County Boundary Cycle Route.         | • Accessibility  
• Safer Roads |
| Provision of a footway from Mount Pleasant to Little Smeaton.                      | • Safer Roads  
• Accessibility |
### A19 Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Schemes</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escrick – A19 / Skipwith Road Junction</td>
<td><strong>Option A</strong>: Traffic signals and right turn lane  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Option B</strong>: Vehicle Activated Sign</td>
<td>• Safer Roads  &lt;br&gt; • Tackling Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barby – A19 / A163 Junction</td>
<td><strong>Option A</strong>: Traffic signals  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Option B</strong>: Enhanced signing and lining</td>
<td>• Safer Roads  &lt;br&gt; • Tackling Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M62 to Balne Moor Crossroads – speed, signing and lining review and implementation of a Vehicle Activated Sign.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womersley - Highfield Lane to Doncaster MBC Boundary: speed, signing and lining review and implementation of a Vehicle Activated Sign.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic sign and road marking improvements and vehicle activated sign at Balne Moor Crossroads.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Anticipated Benefits of the Strategy

The above table suggests that the strategy will, in accordance with the aims and aspirations of NYCC’s Local Transport Plan for period 2, deliver benefits for the Selby study area against the following Governments Shared Priorities for Transport:

- Tackling **Congestion** within the service centre
- Improving **Accessibility** within the service centre
- Helping to deliver **Safer Roads** within the service centre

The strategy can also be seen as supporting the overarching aims of LTP2 of making North Yorkshire a better place by:

- Providing equality of opportunity for all
- Protecting and enhancing the environment
- Improving the safety and health of residents and visitors
- Increasing economic prosperity
- Building sustainable communities
- Reducing the need and demand for travel
6.4 Next Steps

The next stage in the process will be for the above strategy to be submitted to the Area Committee for approval. Following its adoption the improvement schemes will be taken forward for implementation by the NYCC Highways Area Manager and the success of the strategy monitored against the approach identified within Chapter 5.

For those improvement schemes which lie outside the remit of the NYCC Highways Area Manager, for example revenue dependent public transport improvements, these 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.