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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, the aim of the SCTS approach is now to capture and report on the transportation and accessibility issues also affecting the rural hinterlands and develop potential improvements within these areas which complement the measures already identified within the town centre. For those study areas where a TMS has not been undertaken (of which the Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford area is one), the aim is to capture and report on 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 2007, Jacobs was commissioned by NYCC to undertake the Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford 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 Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford 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 Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford 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: Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford SCTS study area
2 Key Stages in the Development of the SCTS

2.1 Introduction

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

Figure 2.1: SCTS Key Stages

2.2 Issue Identification

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

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

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

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

*First Member and Stakeholder Consultation*: The views of NYCC Members and key stakeholders were then 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:

- Paul Sheppard – NYCC Area Highways Manager
- James Malcolm – NYCC Area Improvement Manager
- Gary Lumb – NYCC Area Highways Traffic Management
- Tina Orme – NYCC Road Safety and Travel Awareness Officer
- Chris Roberts – NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport Officer
- James Gilroy – NYCC LTP Representative
- Tim Coyne – NYCC Transport & Development
- Iain Burgess – NYCC Public Rights of Way (PROW) Officer
- Paul Greenaway – NYCC Special Projects Group
- Cecil Pugh – North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
- Steve Burrell – North Yorkshire Police
- Debbie Swatman – 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 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 priorities 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
- Stakeholder Workshop
- Public Consultation

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

**Stakeholder Workshop:** Following the Second Members Consultation exercise, a Stakeholder Workshop was held. Key stakeholders involved in the first round of consultation were invited to the workshop to provide feedback on the proposals put forward prior to the wider public consultation exercise.

A key aim of the workshop was to discuss the proposals in the ‘Draft’ Strategy and to relate them to the initial issues raised as part of the first Member and stakeholder consultation exercises.

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

### 2.5 The Strategy (this stage)

This document, the ‘final’ Strategy, has been compiled following the Public Consultation exercise and incorporates all aspects of the SCTS development process, including the prioritised improvement schemes presented as an Implementation Plan. 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 identified 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 Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford SCTS study area.

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

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

3.2 Prioritised Improvement Schemes

Based on the results of the consultation process and the assessment score determined by the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System a prioritised list of eight 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>D: Provision of road safety measures along the A63 Main Street through Monk Fryston</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>33.77</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Provision of a short section of footway between Old London Road and The Meadows, in South Milford</td>
<td>£6,500</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>No overall majority view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Conversion of an existing narrow footway to a joint use footway / cycleway adjacent to the B1222 Bishopdike Road, Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>£87,000</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>Lack of Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Improvements to traffic flow along Garden Lane, Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>£40,500</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Improvements to the existing pedestrian crossing point on the A162 in Byram (between Byram Park Road and Sutton Lane)</td>
<td>£67,500</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Letters A-E represent the scheme identification letters as used within the Public Consultation Postal Questionnaires.

KEY:  
- Support  
- No overall majority view  
- 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 all 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. This 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>Improvement Scheme Description</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of the road side barrier in the vicinity of the former Half Moon Public House, Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>£161,000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the existing street lighting along the B1222 Moor Lane in Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>£107,000</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a new HGV access road from the B1222 Church Hill to the Mill Cross Quarry</td>
<td>&gt;£5m</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a footpath between Wain Gap and Steeton Hall Gateway along Whitecote Lane, South Milford</td>
<td>&gt;£100,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of traffic lights or a roundabout at the junction of Low Street, A162 and A1246 in Brotherton</td>
<td>&gt;£100,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a new access road from the roundabout at the northern end of the A162 bypass (A162 / Finkle Hill / Stream Lane Roundabout)</td>
<td>&gt;£5m</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a bypass around Monk Fryston and Hambleton</td>
<td>&gt;£5m</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford SCTS has raised 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 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 process and ongoing investigations. As such a number of key issues have been 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 along 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:** Infrequent bus services between Monk Fryston, Leeds and Selby.

*IPT Comments:* The 492/493 and 402/403 services operate between Monk Fryston, Leeds and Selby and is a commercially operated service. The operator, Arriva, sets the fares, the route and the timetable. If there is a compelling commercial reason for changing the times, i.e. potentially more passengers by doing so, the operator may do this on that basis.

**Passenger Transport Issue 2:** Lack of integration between trains at Church Fenton station and buses to Barkston Ash.

*IPT Comments:* It is very unlikely that train times are to be amended, however, IPT will look into the amendment of bus times to improve connectivity with the trains. If IPT can provide the operator with evidence that amending their service times would create a higher demand, then they may amend their time accordingly.

**Passenger Transport Issue 3:** Lack of car parking spaces at railway stations within the study area.

*IPT Comments:* IPT have agreed to try to address the issue of poor connections between buses and trains and parking issues at the railway stations within the study area.

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 are still 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 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 recommended 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 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 below with definitions provided within the following sections.
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 Highways North Yorkshire 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...
implementation 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.

**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.

**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 Highways North Yorkshire 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 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.

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

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

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

6.1 Introduction

This final chapter of the document presents the Strategy for the Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford 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 overleaf outlines the prioritised Improvement Schemes to be taken forward for delivery as part of the Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford SCTS. The improvement schemes have been categorised by the anticipated funding source which will be used to secure their delivery. As indicated within the introduction 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)

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 the table.
Table 6.1: Recommended Implementation Plan (the Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme</th>
<th>Contribution to Shared Priorities and LTP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCTS Budget Improvement Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Provision of road safety measures along the A63 Main Street through Monk Fryston</td>
<td>Safer Roads Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Provision of a short section of footway between Old London Road and The Meadows, in South Milford</td>
<td>Safer Roads Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Conversion of an existing narrow footway to a joint use footway / cycleway adjacent to the B1222 Bishopdike Road, Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>Safer Roads Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Improvements to traffic flow along Garden Lane, Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>Congestion Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Improvements to the existing pedestrian crossing point on the A162 in Byram (between Byram Park Road and Sutton Lane)</td>
<td>Accessibility Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wider Local Transport Plan Integrated Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of the road side barrier in the vicinity of the former Half Moon Public House, Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the existing street lighting along the B1222 Moor Lane in Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a new HGV access road from the B1222 Church Hill to the Mill Cross Quarry</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a footpath between Wain Gap and Steeton Hall Gateway along Whitecote Lane, South Milford</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the junction between Low Street, A162 and A1246 in Brotherton</td>
<td>Congestion Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a new access road from the roundabout at the northern end of the A162 bypass (A162 / Finkle Hill / Stream Lane Roundabout)</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a bypass around Monk Fryston and Hambleton</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the schemes identified within the Implementation Plan were presented for consideration by Council Members at the Selby Area Committee on the 7th June 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

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.
6.3 Final Implementation Plan

Based on the above revised criteria for inclusion of schemes in the Implementation Plan, the Council Members voted to take forward improvement schemes A, B, C and D only.

Table 6.2 details the final Implementation Plan following the recommendations / decisions of the Selby Area Committee.

Table 6.2: 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>A: Conversion of an existing narrow footway to a joint use footway / cycleway adjacent to the B1222 Bishoptike Road, Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>£87,000</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Improvements to traffic flow along Garden Lane, Sherburn in Elmet</td>
<td>£40,500</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Provision of a short section of footway between Old London Road and The Meadows, in South Milford</td>
<td>£6,500</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Provision of road safety measures along the A63 Main Street through Monk Fryston</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>33.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The schemes prioritised for delivery within the final Implementation Plan have a total estimated capital cost of £184,000. This resulted in approximately £16,000 to target repairs to the highway needed as a result of the adverse winter weather. Scheme E will therefore be subject to the identification of alternative funding sources and prioritisation against the schemes in the NYCC Capital Reserve List of Improvement Schemes.

6.4 Anticipated Benefits of the Strategy

Following the decision made at the Selby Area Committee, consideration has been given to the anticipated benefits that the final Implementation Plan would have in achieving NYCC’s aims and objectives.

When considered against the aims and objectives of the NYCC Local Transport Plan for period 2 (2001-2011) and the Shared Priorities for Transport, the strategy can be viewed as:

- Helping to deliver Safer Roads within the Service Centre
- Improving Accessibility within the Service Centre
- Helping to tackle Congestion within the Service Centre
- Assisting in improving Air Quality within the Service Centre

The Strategy can also be seen as supporting the overarching aims of NYCC’s Local Transport Plan for period 2 (2006-2011) of making North Yorkshire a better place by:

- Providing equality of opportunity for all
- Improving the safety and health of residents and visitors
- Building Sustainable Communities
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 Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford 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.
Prioritised Improvement Schemes

A
Conversion of an existing narrow footway to a joint use footway / cycleway adjacent to the B1222 Bishopdike Road, Sherburn in Elmet

B
Improvements to traffic flow along Garden Lane, Sherburn in Elmet

C
Provision of a short section of footway between Old London Road and The Meadows, in South Milford

D
Improvements to existing pedestrian crossing point on the A162 in Byram (between Byram Park Road and Sutton Lane)

E
Improving Air Quality within the Service Centre

Anticipated Contribution to Shared Priorities:
- Helping to deliver Safer Roads within the Service Centre
- Improving Accessibility within the Service Centre
- Tackling Congestion within the Service Centre
- Improving Air Quality within the Service Centre
Improvement Scheme A: Conversion of an existing narrow footway to a joint use footway / cycleway adjacent to the B1222 Bishopdike Road, Sherburn in Elmet

Background

As part of the Member and Stakeholder Consultation process, concerns were raised regarding pedestrian safety and security on the B1222 Bishopdike Road, between the two entrances to Sherburn in Elmet Industrial Estate. Either side of both entrances a footway of sufficient width is present. However, between them, the footway narrows to approximately 0.5 metre in width, and is bounded by a stream one side and a grass verge on the other. There are concerns that when two or more pedestrians meet along this section, they are required to step on to the grass verge adjacent to the carriageway. In addition, the width of the footway results in difficulties for those with pushchairs and wheelchairs. There is also an absence of street lighting along this section, which causes insecurity amongst pedestrians.

Options

In order to improve conditions for pedestrians along this section of road, this option involves widening the existing footway to create a 2 metre wide shared use footway / cycleway between the two entrances to the industrial estate (a distance of 350m), as shown in Figure 1. In order to protect pedestrians and cyclists from the adjacent stream, a fence or barrier would be required along the 350m length. Tactile paving would also be provided where the footway / cycleway meets the two entrances to the industrial estate. In order to keep the implementation cost within the SCTS budget, this scheme does not include any improvements to lighting.

Figure 1: Location of Improvement Scheme A

Estimated Cost: £87,000
NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 20.80
Improvement Scheme B: Improvements to traffic flow along Garden Lane, Sherburn in Elmet

Background

As part of the Member and Stakeholder Consultation exercise, stakeholders raised concerns regarding Garden Lane in Sherburn in Elmet. Garden Lane is a single carriageway road with an average width of just 4.8 metres. Residents of Garden Lane have no off-street parking facilities, thus they currently park their vehicles along both sides of the carriageway. This narrows the carriageway sufficiently to prevent two vehicles from being able to pass each other and causes difficulties for through traffic wishing to travel to destinations such as Sherburn High School to the south or the town centre to the north. Garden Lane provides access to Mytum and Selby Waste Recycling Centre, thus HGVs travel along it on a regular basis, adding to the difficulties. Due to the number of properties which front the road, the carriageway cannot be significantly widened.

Options

Three proposals have been identified for progression as part of the SCTS as detailed below:

Option A: Provision of parking bays to form chicanes / priority systems

Option B: Provision of build-outs to form chicanes / priority systems

Option C: Provision of lay-bys where footway width permits

Each option is detailed below.

Option 1: Provision of parking bays to form chicanes / priority systems

This option involves providing formalised parking bays for residents to park their cars on one side of Garden Lane. This would narrow the carriageway sufficiently so that only one direction of traffic would be able to travel down the road at any one time. The bays would be positioned so that their start / end would form a chicane / priority system. Drivers would be informed which direction of travel would have the right of way, while the other direction would wait for them to pass. This system would create a formalised vehicle priority system along the length of Garden Lane enabling easier passage of two way traffic, whilst retaining on-street parking to residents.

Estimated Cost: £40,500

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 15.09

Option 2: Provision of build-outs to form chicanes / priority systems containing parking provision

As above, this option involves forming a priority system, but with the use of build out features. Parking would be allowed between the build outs but the spaces would not be formally lined. This option would require drainage works at each of the five proposed build-out locations, for which an assessment would be needed to assess whether this is feasible.

Estimated Cost: £17,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 15.09
Option 3: Provision of lay-bys

This option would involve the provision of parking lay-bys along Garden Lane, so that parking would be more formalised. However, due to the limited space available, only eight bays could be created when designed to the relevant highway standards.

The parking bays would encroach slightly onto the existing carriageway, meaning that it would only be able to accommodate traffic from one direction in these areas

**Estimated Cost:** £26,500

**NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score:** 15.09

Summary

All of the above options were discussed at the Second Officer Team Meeting. It was concluded that further investigations were needed to assess whether the carriageway could be widened to increase the amount of road space available, whilst maintaining a 1.5 metre wide footway. After further investigations, it was concluded that there are small sections of Garden Lane which could be widened, allowing more space for vehicles to pass. Thus, it was decided to progress Option 1 above, with additional carriageway widening, as shown in Figure 2.

**Figure 2: Location of Improvement Scheme B**

![Figure 2: Location of Improvement Scheme B](image)

**Key**

- Blue: 1.8 metre wide parking bay
- Red: Wider carriageway
Improvement Scheme C: Provision of a short section of footway between Old London Road and The Meadows, in South Milford

Background

Historically, South Milford Parish Council raised concerns regarding pedestrian safety when walking between Old London Road / Low Street and The Meadows in South Milford. Since the A162 was diverted to form a bypass around South Milford, Old London Road is no longer a through route, and is only used as a vehicular access to a restaurant. The lack of traffic has resulted in the road becoming a popular walking route. However, in order to access Old London Road from South Milford village, it’s junction with Low Street must be negotiated and the footway on Low Street terminates just to the north of the junction. Thus, pedestrians are required to walk on a grassed area to the rear of the junction, on the carriageway or cross the road to the eastern side of Low Street.

Figure 3: Location of Improvement Scheme

Options

In order to improve safety and accessibility for pedestrians, it is proposed to provide a footway through the grassed area to connect Old London Road to the existing footway on Low Street, as shown in Figure 3

Figure 3: Location of Improvement Scheme C

Estimated Cost: £6,500

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 29.12
Improvement Scheme D: Provision of road safety measures along the A63 Main Street through Monk Fryston

Background

As part of the Member and Stakeholder Consultation exercise, an issue was raised regarding the speed of traffic on the A63 Main Street through Monk Fryston village. Speed surveys were undertaken at both ends of the village in May 2009, within the existing 30mph speed limit area. The survey showed that at the east end of the village, 85% of drivers travel at speeds of less than 37.2 mph on the eastbound carriageway and on the westbound carriageway 85% of drivers travel at speeds of less than 40.5 mph. To the west of the village 85% of drivers travel at speeds of less than 40.1 mph on the eastbound carriageway and 40.6 mph westbound. This is evidence that many vehicles do travel at speeds in excess of 10mph above the speed limit.

In addition, stakeholders were also concerned with pedestrian safety on the A63 through Monk Fryston. Between 79 and 85 Main Street footway on the south side of Main Street becomes very narrow, as shown in Figure 4. There is also a missing section of footway on the north side of the carriageway, outside of the cemetery. In these two locations pedestrians are forced to walk on the carriageway.

Figure 4: Main Street, Monk Fryston

Options

In order to reduce vehicle speeds through the village of Monk Fryston the provision of the following measures have been proposed:

- Additional anti-skid patches and speed limit roundels on the entrance to the village
- Speed reducing measures such as road narrowings and / or chicanes at the entrance to the village

Due to a number of residences fronting the road, it is not possible to widen the footway outside of numbers 79 to 85 Main Street. However, the footway on the northern side of the road at this location is of sufficient width (1.5 metres). Thus it is proposed to provide a dropped crossing point using tactile paving outside of number 79 and 85 Main Street so that
pedestrians can cross to the northern footway for this short section. In addition, it is also proposed to provide the missing link of footway outside of the cemetery.

See **Figure 5** for a location plan of the improvement scheme.

**Figure 5: Location of Improvement Scheme D**

![Map of N63 Main Street with planned improvements]

**Key:**
- Additional anti-skid and speed limit roundels
- Provision of missing section of footway
- Provision of informal crossing point

**Estimated Cost:** £50,000

**NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score:** 33.77
Improvement Scheme E: Improvements to the existing pedestrian crossing point on the A162 in Byram (between Byram Park Road and Sutton Lane)

Background

Historically, concern has been raised regarding the pedestrian crossing point on the A162 Old Great North Road, in Byram, shown in Figure 6. The A162 is heavily trafficked and within the village of Byram drivers are subject to a speed limit of 30mph. Between its junction with Sutton Lane and Byram Park Road, there is a pedestrian crossing point. It is made up of a dropped kerb with tactile paving on the footway either side of the carriageway, a pedestrian refuge in the centre and coloured surfacing to emphasise its presence. However, stakeholders feel that the crossing point is not prominent enough to drivers and there is not long enough gaps in the traffic for pedestrians to cross safely.

Options

A scheme which aims to replace the crossing point with a zebra crossing appears on NYCC’s List of Reserve Schemes, thus it has assumed that the scheme had been developed and its feasibility and cost adequately investigated by the NYCC Area Highway Team. Thus, no further investigation of the issue has been undertaken as part of the SCTS process.

Estimated Cost: £68,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 14.46

Figure 6: Location of Improvement Scheme E