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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

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

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

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

1.2 Report Purpose

In February 2009, Jacobs was commissioned by NYCC to undertake the Skipton 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 Skipton 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 Skipton 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 Skipton SCTS Study Area
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2 Key Stages in the Development of the Skipton 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 Area Highways Manager and Improvement Manager.

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

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

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

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

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

**First Officer Team Meeting:** Following the Member and stakeholder consultation process, a meeting was held with the Officer Team. The Officer Team was made up of the following personnel:
- Martin Parker (NYCC Special Projects Group)
- Ken Martin (NYCC Area Highways Manager)
- Steve Hill (NYCC Traffic Engineering)
- Andy Ryland (Yorkshire Dales National Park representative)
- Peter Broadhead (North Yorkshire Police)
- Martin Garner (Jacobs)
- Peter Hibbert (Jacobs)
- Michael Cammock (Jacobs)

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

### 2.3 Draft Strategy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Second Members Consultation
- Public Consultation

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

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

2.5 The Strategy (this stage)

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

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

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

Large scale improvement schemes which exceed the scope of the SCTS budget have still been included within the Strategy and Implementation Plan, but with an acknowledgement that they cannot be delivered within the SCTS budget. However, such improvement schemes may be progressed in line with alternative funding mechanisms available. These include, but are not limited to the following:

- Wider Local Transport Plan (Integrated Transport and Maintenance) Budgets
- Developer Contributions (Section 106 Agreements)
• Highways Agency Trunk Road Improvements

• Regional Transport Board / Department for Transport LTP Major Schemes (capital cost > £5 million)

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

3.1 Introduction

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

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

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

3.2 Prioritised Improvement schemes

Based on the results of the consultation process and the assessment score given by the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System a prioritised list of 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>A: Footway improvements on Broughton Road, Skipton adjacent to Ings Community Primary &amp; Nursery School</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>33.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Improvements to the junction of Ings Lane and the A629 near Low Bradley</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Provision of a missing section of footway on the access road to Aireville School and Craven College in order to improve pedestrian safety for students and those accessing the swimming pool</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Improvements to bus stop facilities along the Skipton to Embsay Bus Route</td>
<td>£47,500</td>
<td>24.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Improvements to bus stop facilities along the Skipton to Carleton-in-Craven Bus Route</td>
<td>£47,500</td>
<td>23.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Footway improvements on Grassington Road, Skipton</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Provision of a missing section of footway on Church Street to improve pedestrian access to Gargrave Railway Station</td>
<td>£47,500</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Provision of a safety barrier scheme at Niffany Bends, Skipton, in order to improve motorist safety</td>
<td>£260,000</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

Although it is recognised that such improvement schemes cannot be progressed in line with the SCTS budget, they have still been included within the Strategy to be considered for delivery by alternative funding / delivery mechanisms. 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 and Maintenance 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. These include both improvement schemes and maintenance schemes.

Improvement schemes identified as part of the SCTS process that are subject to alternative funding / delivery mechanisms are detailed in Table 4.1, whilst maintenance schemes are detailed in Table 4.2.

Table 4.1: Improvement Schemes Exceeding SCTS Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing of the canal towpath between Snaygill and Bradley Swing Bridge on Ings Lane</td>
<td>£290,000</td>
<td>11.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing of the canal towpath between Gargrave and Skipton</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
<td>18.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a roundabout at the A59 / Broughton Road junction</td>
<td>£380,000</td>
<td>23.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a shared use footway / cycleway on the canal towpath between Skipton and the</td>
<td>£225,000</td>
<td>19.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boundary with Bradford Metropolitan District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of road safety measures in the Middle Town Area Home Zone, Skipton</td>
<td>£245,000</td>
<td>13.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a roundabout at the A65 / Otley Road junction</td>
<td>£380,000</td>
<td>7.93</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.
Table 4.2: Maintenance Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme Description</th>
<th>Indicative Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Localised patching and resurfacing of the carriageway of Broughton Road, Skipton, including refurbishment of all road markings</td>
<td>£110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised patching and resurfacing of the carriageway of Raikes Road and Grassington Road, Skipton, including refurbishment of all road markings</td>
<td>£105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete reconstruction of the carriageway and footways at Vicars Row, George Street and Chapel Street, Carleton</td>
<td>£28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing of the carriageway at Low Lane Embsay</td>
<td>£65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised patching, reshaping and resurfacing of the carriageway at Sackville Street, Skipton</td>
<td>£54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NYCC Highways Area Manager will take ownership of these maintenance issues and consider their merits for possible inclusion within the forward programme of works for the area. As such there is no guarantee that these can be delivered within the available Maintenance Budget.

4.3 Non-Capital Improvement schemes Subject to Alternative Funding

4.3.1 Passenger Transport

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

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

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

**Passenger Transport Issue 1:** Prominent information signs are required in Skipton Bus Station for easy location of bus stands.

*IPT comments:* The IPT Team are aware of the need for appropriate signing within the bus station and options will be considered as part of ongoing improvements to the station.

**Passenger Transport Issue 2:** Increase bus frequency between Skipton and Gargrave

*IPT comments:* During the main part of the day there is an hourly bus service between Skipton and Gargrave. This is considered a suitable level for service for these communities.
The service is provided commercially and NYCC does not have direct control over the service level.

### 4.3.2 Parking Provision

As part of the SCTS consultation process a number of issues were raised with regard to parking provision within the study area. Parking on the whole has not been investigated in detail 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 Craven District Council for off-street parking.

Specific improvements suggested as part of the Stakeholder consultation process have therefore been included within the strategy as an acknowledgement of public concerns to be considered as part of future studies / proposals. These are detailed below with comments where specific investigations have been undertaken as part of the SCTS.

**Parking Improvement 1:** A request was made for the introduction of a Residents Parking Scheme for the core residential streets in Skipton.

Further investigations revealed that the introduction of a Residents Parking Scheme could cost in the region of £40,000. However, when this was assessed using the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System it only achieved an appraisal score of 11.32. As such this scheme was not taken forward as a priority within the SCTS.

**Parking Improvement 2:** The provision of additional car parking (or a Park & Ride) at Skipton Railway Station was suggested as part of the Member / stakeholder consultation process.

The SCTS acknowledges this desire and recommends that the provision of both additional parking at the train station and a Park and Ride site should be considered for testing using the Skipton Transport Model.

**Parking Improvement 3:** As part of the Member / stakeholder consultation process, it was reported that there is a lack of on-street parking enforcement in Skipton. It was suggested that transferring parking enforcement powers to Craven District Council would improve enforcement.

During the production of the Skipton SCTS, powers to enforce on-street parking have been transferred to Craven District Council.

### 4.3.3 Freight Issues

As part of the development of the SCTS one of the key issues raised by local stakeholders and residents was the concern over Heavy Commercial Vehicles (HCVs) ignoring weight restrictions on Coach Street in the centre of Skipton. The weight restriction on Coach Street was recently changed from a 7 tonne axle weight to 26 tonne max gross weight. Since then, it has been reported that more HCVs have been using Coach Street as an alternative through route to the High Street.

This issue was investigated in more detail as part of the SCTS Option Development stage. A HCV survey was undertaken on Coach Street on 2nd December 2009 using a video camera. Over a 12 hour period, 40 HCVs used Coach Street of which 10 could be seen to
stop for deliveries. Although the other 30 HCVs may not have delivered to premises on Coach Street, it was felt that they could have been using Coach Street to access other destinations within Skipton Town Centre.

Placing further restrictions on Coach Street was deemed inappropriate as the geometry of the humpback bridge restricts the size of vehicle which use it. In addition, restricting HCV access on Coach Street further could encourage HCVs to use Skipton High Street, which would be inappropriate.

4.4 Summary

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

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

5.1 Introduction

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

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

5.2 Monitoring Improvement Schemes

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme</th>
<th>Local Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCTS Budget Improvement Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Footway improvements on Broughton Road, Skipton adjacent to Ings Community Primary &amp; Nursery School</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Improvements to the junction of Ings Lane and the A629 near Low Bradley</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Provision of a missing section of footway on the access road to Aireville School and Craven College in order to improve pedestrian safety for students and those accessing the swimming pool</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Improvements to bus stop facilities along the Skipton to Embsay Bus Route</td>
<td>Patronage Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Improvements to bus stop facilities along the Skipton to Carleton-in-Craven Bus Route</td>
<td>Patronage Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Footway improvements on Grassington Road, Skipton</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Provision of a missing section of footway on Church Street to improve pedestrian access to Gargrave Railway Station</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Provision of a safety barrier scheme at Niffany Bends, Skipton, in order to improve motorist safety</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wider Local Transport Plan and Maintenance Budget Improvement Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing of the canal towpath between Snaygill and Bradley Swing Bridge on Ings Lane</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Bicycle Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing of the canal towpath between Gargrave and Skipton</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Bicycle Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a roundabout at the A59 / Broughton Road junction</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a shared use footway / cycleway on the canal towpath between Skipton and the boundary with Bradford Metropolitan District Council</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Bicycle Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of road safety measures in the Middle Town Area Home Zone, Skipton</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a roundabout at the A65 / Otley Road junction</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised patching and resurfacing of the carriageway of Broughton Road, Skipton, including refurbishment of all road markings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised patching and resurfacing of the carriageway of Raikes Road and Grassington Road, Skipton, including refurbishment of all road markings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete reconstruction of the carriageway and footways at Vicars Row, George Street and Chapel Street, Carleton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing of the carriageway at Low Lane Embsay</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised patching, reshaping and resurfacing of the carriageway at Sackville Street, Skipton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 5.3 Monitoring the Strategy

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

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

6.1 Introduction

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

6.2 The Strategy

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

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

In order to determine the anticipated benefits of the Strategy as a whole, the anticipated contribution of each of the improvement schemes to the Shared Priorities for Transport, and hence the aspirations contained within the NYCC LTP2, has also been provided within Table 6.1.
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>A: Footway improvements on Broughton Road, Skipton adjacent to Ings Community Primary &amp; Nursery School</td>
<td>Accessibility, Air Quality, Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Improvements to the junction of Ings Lane and the A629 near Low Bradley</td>
<td>Safer Roads, Accessibility, Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Provision of a missing section of footway on the access road to Aireville School and Craven College in order to improve pedestrian safety for students and those accessing the swimming pool</td>
<td>Accessibility, Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Improvements to bus stop facilities along the Skipton to Embsay Bus Route</td>
<td>Accessibility, Congestion, Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Improvements to bus stop facilities along the Skipton to Carleton-in-Craven Bus Route</td>
<td>Accessibility, Congestion, Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Footway improvements on Grassington Road, Skipton</td>
<td>Accessibility, Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Provision of a missing section of footway on Church Street to improve pedestrian access to Gargrave Railway Station</td>
<td>Accessibility, Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Provision of a safety barrier scheme at Niffany Bends, Skipton, in order to improve motorist safety</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wider Local Transport Plan and Maintenance Budget Improvement Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing of the canal towpath between Snaygill and Bradley Swing Bridge on Ings Lane</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing of the canal towpath between Gargrave and Skipton</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a roundabout at the A59 / Broughton Road junction</td>
<td>Congestion, Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a shared use footway / cycleway on the canal towpath between Skipton and the boundary with Bradford Metropolitan District Council</td>
<td>Accessibility, Congestion, Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of road safety measures in the Middle Town Area Home Zone, Skipton</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a roundabout at the A65 / Otley Road junction</td>
<td>Congestion, Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised patching and resurfacing of the carriageway of Broughton Road, Skipton, including refurbishment of all road markings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised patching and resurfacing of the carriageway of Raikes Road and Grassington Road, Skipton, including refurbishment of all road markings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete reconstruction of the carriageway and footways at Vicars Row, George Street and Chapel Street, Carleton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing of the carriageway at Low Lane Embsay</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised patching, reshaping and resurfacing of the carriageway at Sackville Street, Skipton</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the schemes identified within the Implementation Plan were presented for consideration by Council Members at the Craven Area Committee on the 29th April 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. In light of this reduction in funding, the Executive Members for NYCC Business and Environmental Services reviewed the criteria for the inclusion of schemes in the SCTS Implementation Plans. This review resulted in the introduction of the following ‘revised’ guidelines for the inclusion of 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. Of the eight SCTS budget improvement schemes detailed within Table 6.1, schemes A, B, D and G meet the revised guidelines for inclusion within the SCTS Implementation Plan. Although Scheme B only achieves an assessment score of 11.50, it received considerable public support, with nearly 50% of respondents strongly agreeing with the implementation of the scheme. In addition, it is believed that there is a petition containing 9,418 signatures in support of the provision of a safety barrier at this location.

NYCC recognised the considerable public support for the implementation of a safety barrier scheme at Niffany Bends and as such have placed high priority on its implementation. However, the estimated cost of the implementation of Scheme B is £260,000 accounting for a significant proportion of the SCTS implementation budget. In light of the above the following motions were presented for consideration at the Craven Area Committee on the 29th April 2010.

Motion 1: Includes schemes A, D and G leaving approximately £245,000 to address additional highway maintenance issues within the SCTS area.

Motion 2: Includes scheme B, leaving approximately £40,000 to address additional highway maintenance issues within the SCTS area.

Motion 3: Includes schemes A, B and D leaving approximately £25,000 to address additional maintenance issues in the SCTS area.

Motion 4: Include schemes B and G in the Implementation Plan at a total cost of approximately £300,000.

Following consideration of the options presented at the Craven Area Committee, the NYCC Members voted to implement Motion 3. This would allow the safety barrier to be installed at Niffany Bends, the provision of footway improvements to be undertaken on Broughton Road and the provision of a missing section of footway on the access road to Aireville School and Craven College leaving approximately £25,000 to address additional maintenance issues resulting from the severe winter weather.
6.3 Final Implementation Plan

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

Table 6.3: Final Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Footway improvements on Broughton Road, Skipton adjacent to Ings Community Primary &amp; Nursery School</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>33.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Provision of a safety barrier scheme at Niffany Bends, Skipton, in order to improve motorist safety</td>
<td>£260,000</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Provision of a missing section of footway on the access road to Aireville School and Craven College in order to improve pedestrian safety for students and those accessing the swimming pool</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Anticipated Benefits of the Strategy

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

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

- Helping to deliver **Safer Roads** within the Service Centre
- Helping to improve **Accessibility** within the Service Centre
- 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 of making North Yorkshire a better place by:

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

6.5 Next Steps

The next stage in the process will be for the Strategy to be adopted by the NYCC Highway Manager for the Skipton 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.
Appendix A1: Prioritised Improvement Schemes – Location Plan Skipton

A

Footway improvements on Broughton Road, Skipton adjacent to Ings Community Primary & Nursery School

B

Provision of a safety barrier at Niffany Bends, Skipton in order to improve motorist safety

C

Footway improvements on Grassington Road, Skipton

D

Provision of missing section of footway on the access road to Aireville School and Craven College in order to improve pedestrian safety for students and those accessing the swimming pool

- Helping to deliver Safer Roads within the Service Centre
- Improving Accessibility within the Service Centre
- Assisting in improving Air Quality within the Service Centre
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Appendix A1: Prioritised Improvement Schemes – Location Plan Skipton
Prioritised Improvement Schemes

E  Improvements to bus stop facilities along the Skipton to Embassy Bus Route
F  Improvements to bus stop facilities along the Skipton to Carleton-in-Craven Bus Route
G  Improvements to the junction of Ings Lane and the A629 near Low Bradley
H  Provision of missing section of footway on Church Street to improve pedestrian access to Gargrave Railway Station
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Appendix A2: Prioritised Improvement Schemes – Location Plan Skipton Area
Appendix B – Details of Prioritised Schemes
Improvement Scheme A: Footway improvements on Broughton Road, Skipton adjacent to Ings Community Primary & Nursery School

Background

The existing footway on Broughton Road passes in front of the Pennine Bus Depot. The footway crosses over the vehicle access and there is no clear distinction between the vehicle access and the footway. This causes pedestrian and vehicles conflict. This is especially apparent during school opening / closing times due to the close proximity of Ings Community Primary and Nursery School, shown in Figure 1. Although Pennine Buses have minimised their use of the entrance during school opening and closing times and have organised school visits to the depot to educate children of the danger, the school continue to raise the pedestrian / vehicle conflict as an issue.

Options

In order to maintain both vehicle access to the Pennine Bus Depot and reduce vehicle / pedestrian conflict this scheme proposes to formalise the footway in front of the bus depot so that it is clearly distinguishable from the vehicle access. This should in theory emphasise to drivers that they are crossing over a footway and need to exercise caution. This will be achieved using a coloured surfacing which will clearly delineate the footway from the vehicle access.

Figure 1: Improvement Scheme A

Estimated Cost: £5,360

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 33.13
Improvement Scheme B: Provision of a safety barrier scheme at Niffany Bends, Skipton, in order to improve motorist safety

Background

To the west of Skipton, near Niffany Farm, the A6069 runs alongside the Leeds - Liverpool canal. In recent years there have been two fatal accidents involving drivers losing control of their vehicles, leaving the carriageway and entering the canal. Although safety measures such as additional signing, road markings and anti-skid surfacing were provided in 2009, accidents have continued to occur.

Options

In order to prevent vehicles entering the canal, it is proposed to install a 200m long vehicle safety barrier along the eastbound side of the A6069 near Niffany Farm, as shown in Figure 2. The provision of the barrier would result in the loss of an informal pedestrian / towpath route.

Figure 2: Improvement Scheme B

Estimated Cost: £260,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 11.50
Improvement Scheme C: Footway improvements on Grassington Road, Skipton

Background

The B6265 Grassington Road is a key route into and out of Skipton from the north. The route experiences a mix of private vehicles, buses and HGVs. Residential properties line the northbound carriageway for the length of Grassington Road and both sides of the carriageway on the northern section. A footway runs the length of Grassington Road adjacent to the northbound carriageway however, pedestrian access in to the town centre is limited due to the narrow width of the pavement, particularly along the southern section. The narrow footway alongside walled gardens and fast moving traffic causes safety concerns for pedestrians using the route.

Options

This scheme proposes to widen the existing footway on Grassington Road to a constant 1.2 metres in width for a length of 295 metres. This will involve reducing the carriageway width to a minimum of 5.9 metres.

A location plan of scheme C is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Improvement Scheme C

Estimated Cost: £40,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 20.44
Improvement Scheme D: Provision of a missing section of footway on the access road to Aireville School and Craven College in order to improve pedestrian safety for students and those accessing the swimming pool

Background

Craven College and Aireville School are both accessed from Gargrave Road. The existing footway from Gargrave Road terminates short of the school thus forcing pedestrians to walk in the road. This causes obvious safety concerns with both pedestrians and vehicles sharing the same space.

Options

This scheme proposes to extend the existing footway to provide a continuous safe pedestrian route between Gargrave Road and Aireville School. The extent of the proposed measure is illustrated in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Improvement Scheme D

Estimated Cost: £10,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 23.82
Improvement Scheme E: Improvements to bus stop facilities along the Skipton to Embsay Bus Route

Background

The existing passenger waiting facilities along the Skipton to Embsay bus corridor vary considerably. The NYCC Passenger Transport team have identified a number of improvements to facilities in order to encourage patronage numbers and improve the overall quality of the service provided. The Skipton to Embsay bus route is illustrated in Figure 5.

Options

Two levels of improvement have been considered. These are summarised in Table 1.

- Option A - Small scale improvements to bus stop facilities
  (Estimated Cost: £10,650, NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 28.04)

- Option B - Larger scale improvements to bus stop facilities
  (Estimated Cost: £46,700 NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 24.18)

Figure 5: Improvement Scheme E
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stop Location</th>
<th>Proposed Works</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) High Street Skipton, adjacent to Red Lion, Southbound</td>
<td>Option A: Replace existing post and flag</td>
<td>£400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) High Street Skipton, adjacent to Black Horse, Northbound</td>
<td>Option A: Replace existing flag. It is not feasible to provide a shelter due to building restrictions in the centre of Skipton and the absence of a kerb.</td>
<td>£150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) A6131 / Embsay Road junction, Northbound</td>
<td>Option A: Replace flag and timetable case</td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) A6131 / Embsay Road junction, Southbound</td>
<td>Option A: Replace flag and timetable case</td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Skipton Road, Embsay, close to junction with Brackenley Lane, Northbound</td>
<td>Option A: Provision of a 1.2m wide footway, 13m in length. Replace bus stop post. Option B: As Option A with the provision of new raised kerbs (can only be constructed if the same is introduced to the stop location 6)</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6) Skipton Road, Embsay, close to junction with Brackenley Lane, Southbound  | Option A: Provision of a new bus stop post, flag and timetable  
Option B: As Option A with the provision of new raised kerbs (raised kerbs can only be constructed if the same is introduced to stop location 5) | £400  | £5,000 |
| 7) Skipton Road / Brackenley Lane junction, Embsay, Northbound               | Option A: Reposition existing sign post, flag and timetable further south. Mount the new flag sign and existing timetable on the new post  
Option B: As Option A with the provision of new raised kerbs (can only be constructed if the same is introduced to the stop location 8) | £400  | £5,000 |
| 8) Skipton Road / Brackenley Lane junction, Embsay, Southbound               | Option A: Install a new bus stop post, flag and timetable in footway between 13 and 15 Skipton Road to avoid nuisance to home owners. These works would be subject to homeowner permission  
Option B: As Option A with the provision of a raised kerb (can only be constructed if the same is introduced to the stop location 7) | £400  | £5,000 |
| 9) Skipton Road / Embsay Station entrance, Northbound                       | Option A: Provision of a new flag and timetable to be mounted on the existing light column  
Option B: Extension of existing footway into grassed area in order to allow for raised kerbs to be placed. Provision of a new bus sign post with flag and timetable (this would only be possible if option B of stop no. 10 was constructed) | £250  | £5,000 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stop Location</th>
<th>Proposed Works</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10) Skipton Road / Embsay Station entrance, Southbound</td>
<td>Option A: In order to provide improved access and visibility a 1.2m wide footway with a dropped crossing could be provided which tapers from the existing wall. A new bus stop post, flag and timetable would be required</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option B: As Option A, with the provision of raised kerbs, demolition of existing concrete shelter and replacement with a 3 bay enclosed shelter. A new bus stop post, flag and timetable would be required</td>
<td>£18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Main Street/Laurel Croft junction, Embsay</td>
<td>Option A: Place a new flag at right angles to the road at a mounting height of 2.1m to provide clearance for pedestrians</td>
<td>£150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Following discussions at the second officer team meeting, Option B was prioritised for delivery over Option A. The Officer Team were of the opinion that Option B would provide much more comprehensive improvements to the route as a whole and potentially justify the Quality Bus Corridor status of the route.
Improvement Scheme F: Improvements to bus stop facilities along the Skipton to Carleton-in-Craven Bus Route

Background

The existing passenger waiting facilities along the Skipton to Carleton-in-Craven bus corridor vary considerably. The NYCC Passenger Transport team have identified a number of improvements to facilities in order to encourage patronage numbers and improve the overall quality of the service provided. The Skipton to Carleton-in-Craven bus route is illustrated in Figure 6.

Options

Two levels of improvement have been considered. These are summarised in Table 2.

- Option A - Small scale improvements to bus stop facilities
  (Estimated Cost: £10,600, NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 27.15)

- Option B - Larger scale improvements to bus stop facilities
  (Estimated Cost: £46,300 NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 23.74)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stop Location</th>
<th>Proposed Works</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td><strong>Option A:</strong> Replace flag and timetable case</td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td><strong>Option A:</strong> Replace flag and timetable case</td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) <strong>Option A:</strong> To improve visibility, remove existing hedges to the north and south of the shelter</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B1:</strong> Construct a 20m long footway with dropped crossings to provide access to shelter from the existing footway on the opposite side of the road. Also replace the existing flag (only possible if hedges are removed)</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B2:</strong> In addition to Option A and B1, replace current shelter with a new 2 bay shelter, and provide raised kerbs</td>
<td>£23,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) <strong>Option A:</strong> Provision of a new metal bus stop post, flag and timetable case</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B :</strong> As Option A, with provision of new raised kerbs (this would only be provided if raised kerbs were provided at stop number 3)</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) <strong>Option A:</strong> Replace bus stop post, flag and timetable</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B :</strong> As Option A with the provision of new raised kerbs (this would only be provided if raised kerbs were provided at stop number 6)</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) <strong>Option A:</strong> To improve visibility, remove 50m of existing hedges to the north and south of the bus stop and provide a new hard standing footway with dropped crossings in the verge. Replace bus stop post, flag and timetable</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B :</strong> As Option A, with the provision of raised kerbs (this can only be provided if raised kerbs were provided at bus stop number 5)</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) <strong>Option A:</strong> Replace bus stop post, flag and timetable</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>Due to the width of the road and the proximity of the junction it is not feasible to provide any improvements at this location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary

Following discussions at the second Officer Team Meeting, Option B was prioritised for delivery over Option A. The Officer Team were of the opinion that Option B would provide much more comprehensive improvements to the route as a whole and potentially justify the Quality Bus Corridor status of the route.
Improvement Scheme G: Improvements to the junction of Ings Lane and the A629 near Low Bradley

Background

Many pedestrian / vehicle conflicts occur at the junction between the A629 and Ings Lane near Low Bradley. The A629 is heavily trafficked and is one the main roads into and out of Skipton. Many vehicles turn right into and out of the junction with Ings Lane close to Low Bradley. As Figure 7 shows, there is a central right turning lane for vehicles travelling northbound on the A629 who wish to turn right into Ings Lane. Figure 7 also shows there is a bus shelter on the northbound carriageway and footways on both sides of the A629 at the junction.

As part of the Member / stakeholder consultation, it was identified that bus passengers who have alighted a bus at this junction experience difficulties when attempting to cross the road due to lack of gaps in the traffic.

Options

The following options were investigated:

- Option A – Improvements to the Ings Lane / A629 junction
- Option B – Improvements to the Ings Lane / A629 junction improvements and provision of street lighting

These two options are discussed in more detail below.

Option A: Improvements to the Ings Lane / A629 junction improvements

This option includes the following package of measures to improve pedestrian and motorist safety at the junction (as shown in Figure 8):

- Provision of two short lengths of new footway along the existing verge on the A629, north of the junction, to form a pedestrian route between Ings Lane and the northbound bus shelter
- Provision of a pedestrian refuge on the A629 to the north of the junction
- Provision of a traffic island on the A629 to the south of the junction.
- Provision of high friction surfacing to highlight the approach to the junction
- Provision of rumble strips and slow markings
Figure 7: A629 / Ings Lane Junction (looking north)

Estimated Cost: £40,000

Score: 29.73
Option B Improvements to the Ings Lane / A629 junction improvements and provision of street lighting

This option includes the package of measures as in Option A, but also includes the provision of street lighting in order to improve security for pedestrians at night.

**Estimated Cost:** £69,000

**NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score:** 28.74

**Summary**

At the Second Officer Team Meeting, concern was raised about the impact street lighting may have on the visibility of the proposed traffic island. Therefore, the decision was made to progress with Option A.
Improvement Scheme H: Provision of a missing section of footway on Church Street to improve pedestrian access to Gargrave Railway Station

Background

The footway between Gargrave village and Gargrave railway station, on the eastern side of Church Street terminates adjacent to the railway station car park entrance and only provides level access to platform 1 (trains bound for Skipton & Leeds). At present there is no footway link between the platforms and pedestrians are forced to walk on the carriageway of Church Street to transfer between platforms. This causes pedestrian / vehicle conflict and potential safety concern.

Scheme Options

The following options were investigated:

- Option A – Provision of a new footway on the eastern side of the bridge
- Option B – Provision of steps to link Platform 1 to a new footway on the western side of Church Street
- Option C – In addition to the measures described in Option B, a footway on the western verge between the car park entrance and the proposed steps would be provided

These three options are discussed in more detail below.

Option A – Provision of a new footway on the eastern side of the bridge

The verge on the eastern side of Church Street is of sufficient width to provide a footway. Thus, this option proposes to provide a 95 metre long footway on the eastern side of Church Street from the entrance to the car park to the steps which provide access to platform 2 as shown in Figure 8. This would provide a safer link between platforms 1 and 2 of Gargrave Station. However, pedestrians would be required to cross the road between the car park entrance and the new footway.

Estimated Cost: £20,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 20.86
**Option B: Provision of steps to link Platform 1 to a new footway on the western side of Church Street**

This option involves the provision of steps from the railway station car park up to the railway bridge to then link with a short length of footway which would be constructed on the western side of the bridge, as shown in Figure 8.

The provision of these new steps would provide a direct pedestrian route between Platforms 1 and 2. However, it would not meet the needs of any disabled passengers.

**Estimated Cost:** £20,000

**Score:** 17.38

**Option C: In addition to the measures described in Option B, a footway on the western verge between the car park entrance and the proposed steps would be provided**

This option involves providing the measures as detailed in Option B and extending the footway over the bridge on the western verge to the car park entrance.

Currently the road width along this section of road is approximately 5.3 - 5.5 metres. It is therefore not possible to use any of the current road width to construct a footway. At the entrance to the station car park there is a section of level verge on the western side of Church Street which could be used to accommodate the footway. However, the verge becomes narrower and steeper towards the bridge due to the increasing difference in level between the road and the car park. Therefore, to construct a footway on this verge, some form of retaining structure would be required. In addition, within the area of the proposed footway an existing lighting column is present and also a BT telegraph pole. Both of these items would require relocating if the proposed footway was to be constructed.

Currently the steep verge is protected from the road by a hedge. If the footway was to be constructed most of this hedge would have to be removed. This would leave a steep drop at the back of the proposed footway. Thus, a fence would need to be erected to ensure the safety of pedestrians when using the footway. As with Options A and B, Option C does not provide wheelchair access to platform 2.

**Estimated Cost:** £46,000

**Score:** 20.18
Summary

Following discussions at the Second Officer Team Meeting, it was decided that Option C would cater for a wider range of pedestrian movements. Option C therefore was taken forward for progression through the SCTS process.