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1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

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

The Boroughbridge SCTS is one of 28 transportation strategies to be developed across North Yorkshire during the Local Transport Plan for period 2 (LTP2) which covers 2006 – 2011. The methodology focuses upon identifying the transport needs of ‘Service Centre’ market towns and their surrounding hinterlands and assisting in the creation of Improvement Schemes and initiatives aimed at providing safer, better connected and more accessible transport services linking people to key services, jobs, education and health facilities. This process builds upon the success of the Town Centre Traffic Management Studies (TMS) undertaken during the First Local Transport Plan (LTP1) period with the key focus of delivering improvements within the surrounding hinterlands as well as within town centres.

The Study Area focuses upon the town of Boroughbridge, but also extends north to include Asenby and Dishforth and includes Bickerton, Wighill and Long Marston to the south, as illustrated in Figure 1.1 below.

Figure 1.1: Boroughbridge SCTS – Study Area
1.2 Delivering the Strategy

Within the LTP 2, NYCC has an allocated budget set aside for the development and delivery of the Boroughbridge SCTS. This budget is allocated to the design and construction of Improvement Schemes put forward by the Strategy over a two year period. It will be used to deliver those schemes identified within the Strategy in order of priority. It should be noted that as this is a flexible but finite budget, not all of the schemes put forward as a result of technical investigation, public and stakeholder consultation will be deliverable within the available funds. Those schemes which are not deliverable within the available budget will join the NYCC Local Transport Plan Reserve List of Capital Schemes. This is discussed in more detail later in this document.

It should also be acknowledged that the SCTS process can identify large scale Improvement Schemes which exceed the scope of the SCTS allocated budget. The threshold for these schemes has been identified as those with a capital cost in excess of £100,000. In this instance these Improvement Schemes will still be included within the Strategy, but with an acknowledgement that they cannot be delivered within the limits of the SCTS budget. Such Improvement Schemes may however be progressed in line with alternative funding mechanisms available and where this is the case this has been identified within the Strategy. These alternative funding mechanisms include but are not limited to the following:

- NYCC Improvement Schemes already programmed for delivery within the Strategy period
- Wider Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport and Maintenance Budgets
  o Capital Reserve List
  o Public Transport Review Process
  o 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)

As the findings of this process are ‘strategic’ in nature all of the Improvement Schemes put forward by the Strategy will be subject to further analysis/feasibility testing and consultation as part of the NYCC scheme development process.

1.3 Report Structure

The following chapters provide details of the SCTS Process, the priority improvements schemes and schemes identified within the Strategy for delivery subject to alternative funding mechanisms. The structure of the remainder of the document is as follows:

- Chapter 2 – Strategy Development
- Chapter 3 – Prioritised Improvement Schemes
- Chapter 4 – Schemes Subject to Alternative Funding Mechanisms
- Chapter 5 – Monitoring and Evaluation
- Chapter 6 – Summary and Conclusions
- Appendix A – Improvement Scheme Location Plans
2 Strategy Development

2.1 Introduction

The key stages in the development of the Boroughbridge SCTS are illustrated in Figure 2.1 below along with the dates that each stage was completed. Full details of each of these key stages are provided in the remaining sections of this chapter.

Figure 2.1: Strategy Development – Key Stages

- **DATA COLLECTION**: JULY 2007
- **FIRST STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP**: JULY 2007
- **SAMPLE SURVEY OF LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS**: AUGUST 2007
- **ANALYSIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES**: DECEMBER 2007
- **SCHEME ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITISATION**: JANUARY 2008
- **SECOND STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP**: MARCH 2008
- **PUBLIC CONSULTATION**: APRIL 2008
- **ADOPTION OF STRATEGY**: 
- **DELIVERY OF STRATEGY**: 

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

Data Collection formed the first stage in the development of the Boroughbridge SCTS. The process involved the collation of information and familiarisation of the Study Area and provided an important evidence base for the development and evaluation of the improvement schemes. Full details of the data collection exercise can be found within the following report: Boroughbridge Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Base Data and Analysis Report (August 2007, Jacobs).

2.3 First Stakeholder Workshop

The next stage in the development of the SCTS was the First Stakeholder Workshop held at the Boroughbridge Community Resource Centre, (above Boroughbridge Library), Boroughbridge, on 25th July 2007. Key stakeholders ranging from Parish Councillors to Local Action Groups and emergency services were invited to attend the workshop and provide their insight into the current issues affecting transportation within the SCTS Study Area. The workshop was attended by 31 of 72 invited to the event. Views expressed during the workshop were used as one of the key means of driving the SCTS process forward. Full details of the First Stakeholder Workshop can be found within the following report: Boroughbridge Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Workshop 1 Notes (July 2007, Jacobs).

2.4 Community Engagement

Community Engagement is a key driver of the LTP and SCST process. Thus, stakeholders have been consulted throughout the Boroughbridge SCTS process, as illustrated in Figure 2.1 on the previous page. In Phase 1, in order to identify the issues in the Study Area, a stakeholder workshop was held and a sample survey questionnaire was distributed to a random sample of postal addresses. In Phase 2, the local stakeholders who were invited to the First Stakeholder Workshop were once again given the opportunity to provide feedback on each of the Improvement Schemes before they were taken forward to the Public Consultation stage, to which everybody in the Study Area were invited. Details of these events are detailed below.

2.5 Sample Survey

Following the First Stakeholder Workshop, a Sample Survey Questionnaire was distributed to a random sample of 20% of postal addresses with the Study Area (2250 properties). A total of 453 households (approximately 20%) responded. This survey gave a representative sample of the people living / working within the SCTS Study Area an opportunity to air their views and opinions on local transportation issues. Analysis of the responses to the questionnaire showed that issues were identified by the public which were not raised at the First Stakeholder Workshop.

2.6 Hard to Reach Groups

The largest ethnic group in the Study Area is White, with over 99% of the population regarding themselves as belonging to this category. Thus, there are very few ethnic minority groups within the area to consult with. However, quite a high percentage (15%) of the population is aged 65 years and over, and 11.1% of the respondents consider themselves to be disabled. These groups can be considered to be Hard to Reach groups as they may
experience problems with getting out of their house to access local services or being captured by media campaigns. Thus, Boroughbridge and District Community Care or Communicare were contacted and individuals from the organisations were interviewed in order to gain their views on transport issues affecting them in the Study Area.

### 2.7 Analysis and Development of Improvement Schemes

Information provided by the key stakeholders and the responses received from members of the public by way of the Sample Survey, together with data analysis, was used as part of this stage of the SCTS process to develop a range of Improvement Schemes for potential delivery as part of the SCTS. Full details of the Options can be found within the following report: *Boroughbridge Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Options Report (June 2008, Jacobs)*.

### 2.8 Scheme Assessment and Prioritisation

Since the SCTS process is driven by the LTP process, it is essential that the Improvement Schemes put forward by the Strategy are focused upon meeting the objectives of the Government’s Shared Priorities for Transport.

As part of this stage of the SCTS process each of the proposed Improvement Schemes have therefore been appraised using NYCC’s Objective Based Scheme Prioritisation System which assesses each scheme against the 4 Shared Priorities for Transport.

This appraisal determined an overall assessment score which has been used as one of the means of identifying the order of priority of the Improvement Schemes which can be delivered. It also ensured consistency within the decision making process across the County.

### 2.9 Second Stakeholder Workshop

The purpose of the Second Stakeholder Workshop was to report back to stakeholders on the Improvement Schemes which were developed following the issues raised at the First Stakeholder Workshop and the Sample Survey. The local stakeholders who were invited to the First Stakeholder Workshop were once again given the opportunity to provide comments and feedback on each of the Improvement Schemes before they were taken forward to the Public Consultation stage. The workshop was attended by 16 of 72 invited to the event. The Second Stakeholder Workshop also gave NYCC the opportunity to provide feedback on Improvement Schemes which were deemed to be unfeasible due to lack of justification, physical constraints or funding issues. A review of the 2nd Workshop is contained within: *Boroughbridge Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Second Stakeholder Workshop Report (March 2008, Jacobs)*.

### 2.10 Public Consultation

Following the Second Stakeholder Workshop, a full Public Consultation exercise was undertaken. This process consisted of two elements:

- Postal Survey of all postal addresses in the Study Area
- Public Exhibitions
A Postal Survey of all the households and businesses within the Ripon SCTS Study Area was undertaken. This postal survey gave everybody within the area the opportunity to comment on the Improvement Schemes and yielded 1432 responses (approximately 21% of total households.) Full details of the Public Consultation Exercise can be found in: Boroughbridge Service Centre Transportation Strategy: Public Consultation Report (May 2008, Jacobs).

The Public Exhibitions were held at Boroughbridge Library, St James Square, Boroughbridge on Tuesday 22\textsuperscript{nd} and Saturday 26\textsuperscript{th} April 2008. They were attended by a total of 28 people over the two days and provided details of the SCTS process to date and each of the proposed Improvement Schemes put forward. These exhibitions also provided an opportunity for the public and local stakeholders to give their views and discuss in detail, with a representative of NYCC, any of the schemes proposed.

2.11 The Strategy

Analysis of the views expressed during the Public Consultation exercise have been used to assess the level of public desire / acceptance for each of the Improvement Schemes put forward. This analysis along with the assessment score produced using the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System, have subsequently been used to inform the list of Improvement Schemes to be prioritised for delivery. The Improvement Schemes which have been prioritised for delivery as part of the SCTS are detailed within the following chapter.
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 transportation issues currently affecting people living and working within the Study Area.

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

This chapter focuses on those Improvement Schemes to be taken forward using the reserved SCTS budget from the LTP as well as providing an explanation as to why some have been discounted from the process. This is discussed in more detail below.

3.2 Methodology

Using the Scheme Assessment score determined by the Objective Based NYCC Prioritisation System and the views expressed as part of the Public Consultation exercise, a prioritised list of 14 Improvement Schemes is being put forward for implementation using the Allocated Budget. These Improvement Schemes are detailed within Section 3.3 below and illustrated in the location plan within Appendix A1.

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 also demonstrating a positive contribution to the aspirations of the LTP2 objectives and ultimately assisting in the delivery of the Shared Priorities for Transport.

3.3 Prioritised Improvement Schemes

Table 3.1 overleaf details the Improvement Schemes which have been prioritised for delivery as part of the available SCTS budget. These schemes are those which demonstrate a contribution to the Shared Priorities for Transport and are supported by the people living and working within the Study Area.

Those schemes shaded in the left hand columns were approved by the Corporate Director: Business and Environmental Services as part of the Implementation Plan for the Strategy as far as the Integrated Transport Capital Programme will provide the funds for their implementation.

The costs estimates included within the table are based upon the information available at the time of investigation and as such are subject to change due to circumstances not known at this early stage of scheme development. It is acknowledged that the allocated budget is not sufficient to deliver all of the Improvement Schemes identified based upon their cost estimates. In this instance the schemes which are not delivered will join the NYCC Reserve List of Capital Schemes and will be delivered using the wider LTP Integrated Transport and Maintenance Budget subject to prioritisation against the existing schemes on the list.
<p>| Scheme Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Cost  | Score | Support |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------                                                                                    |       |       |         |
| *The introduction of speed reducing measures and improved line markings on the approach to the junction of A59 York Road/Cattal Street and Station Road, at Providence Green. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).                                                                                                                                         | £18,000 | 34.63 | S       |
| **The introduction of a pedestrian crossing to the north of the junction between Horsefair and Fishergate in Boroughbridge. The most ideal place is outside the Crown Hotel. However, this would be subject to discussions with the owners of the Hotel. If this is not possible, alternative locations would be investigated.                                                                                                                      | £40,000 | 29.00 | S       |
| *The introduction of speed reducing measures and advanced warning signs on the approach to the entry/exit points for the fuel station/farm shop at the A59 York Road/Pool Lane junction, Nun Monkton to increased drivers awareness and thus improve safety. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).                                                                                               | £18,000 | 27.24 | S       |
| The introduction of a missing section of footway connecting York Road, Green Hammerton to the A59 and the upgrading of the existing central traffic island on the A59 to a pedestrian refuge. In addition, the introduction of a footway connecting the A59 with Kirk Hammerton Station, thus providing a continuous footway between Green Hammerton and Kirk Hammerton Station.                                                                                                                      | £58,000 | 26.50 |         |
| The introduction of speed reducing measures along Wetherby Road between the roundabout with the A1(M) and the A168 and Ponderosa Roundabout. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine the exact nature of measures. These are likely to include SLOW markings, 30mph roundels, red anti-skid patches on Wetherby Road).                                                                                                         | £23,900 | 15.84 |         |
| The provision of speed reducing measures on Boroughbridge Road, Dishforth on the approach to the junction with North Hill Road and Sandgate Road. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | £15,600 | 15.55 |         |
| The introduction of speed reducing measures on the B1224 on the approach to its junction with Angram Road/Tockwith Road in Long Marston. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).                                                                                                                                                                                      | £40,530 | 15.14 |         |
| The introduction of a footway along Station Road between the crossroads with the A59 York Road and Cattal Street and the termination of the existing footway, to provide a continuous footway between Whixley village and Cattal.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | £89,000 | 14.26 |         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures on the B6265 on the approach to its junction with Score Ray Lane to reduce vehicle speeds and increase safety for vehicles exiting Score Ray Lane. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures within the 40 mph zone on Cattal Street and Oxmoor Lane, and Cattal Moor Lane north of Cattal Bridge. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td>£20,800</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of advanced warning weight restriction signs at the junction of Cattal Moor Lane/ Tockwith Road/Rudgate/Fleet Lane, warning HGV drivers of the weight limit which applies at Cattal Bridge.</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a footway along Back Lane, between York Road and Meadow Vale in Green Hammerton.</td>
<td>£8,500</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures within the 30 mph zone on Main Street in Minskip. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td>£20,300</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures on the B6265 on the approach to its junction with Main Street Little Ouseburn, to reduce vehicle speeds and thus improve safety for vehicles exiting Main Street. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td>£48,000</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- S: Strong Support
- : Support
- : Mixed Response
- : Lack of Support

As detailed previously, the Improvement Schemes identified and prioritised within Table 3.1 are all subject to further detailed analysis as part of the future design / build process. This may necessitate further localised consultation and detailed physical / technical feasibility assessments undertaken by the NYCC Area Highway Teams to establish their ultimate deliverability.

*The proposals to introduce speed reducing measures and improved line markings on the approach to the junction of A59 York Road/Cattal Street and Station Road, at Providence Green and speed reducing measures and advanced warning signs on the approach to the entry/exit points for the fuel station/farm shop at the A59 York Road/Pool Lane junction, Nun Monkton have been developed with the aim of improving safety at these two locations.*
These two junctions are ranked 24th and 238th in the list of High Risk Accident sites in North Yorkshire. In response to Stakeholder requests, roundabout proposals have been investigated at these two locations, as described in Section 4.2.1. However the estimated cost of providing roundabouts at these locations is beyond the scope of the SCTS budget. These two proposals have therefore been developed as lower cost alternatives in an attempt to improve safety of these two locations. It is however, recognised that roundabouts at these two locations may be progressed in the future subject to available funding as detailed within Chapter 4.

**As detailed in Table 3.1 the land needed to locate a pedestrian crossing at this location is not adopted public highway; it is owned by the Crown Hotel. Therefore, further discussions are required with the land owners in order to take this proposal forward.

It is therefore acknowledged that the introduction of a pedestrian crossing at this location may not be deliverable due to the ownership of land required to accommodate the crossing. For this reason, the introduction of a speed table to reduce vehicle speeds and increase pedestrian safety has also been investigated as a potential option. Results from the public consultation exercise have shown that there is general support across the study area for the introduction of a speed table at this location.

If this is to be taken as a potential alternative to the introduction of a pedestrian crossing then further localised consultation would be required.
4 Improvements Subject to Alternative Funding / Delivery Mechanisms

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides details of those Improvement Schemes identified as part of the SCTS development process which exceed the scope of the SCTS budget and are therefore subject to alternative delivery and funding mechanisms. These include both Capital and ‘Non’ Capital Improvement Schemes and Initiatives.

Although it is recognised that such Improvement Schemes cannot be progressed in line with the SCTS budget they have still been included within the Strategy to be progressed under 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.

Those 'Capital' Improvement Schemes which cannot be delivered within the SCTS budget and thus are subject to alternative funding are detailed within Section 4.2 of this chapter.

Section 4.3 of this chapter provides details of the issues raised as part of the development of the SCTS which are external to, or cannot be directly resolved by, the SCTS delivery process. These have however still been included within the Strategy as recognition of their importance and to ensure joined up thinking between other departments within NYCC. These are predominantly Non Capital Improvement Schemes and Initiatives that will need to be taken forward and delivered by a number of NYCC departments.

4.2 Capital Improvement Schemes Subject to Alternative Funding

As detailed within the introduction there are a number of Capital Improvement Schemes and Initiatives which have been identified / developed as part of the SCTS process which cannot be progressed within the SCTS budget. These include:

- Improvement Schemes with a high Capital Cost
- Maintenance Budget Improvements

Full details of these schemes are provided in Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 overleaf.

4.2.1 Improvement Schemes with a High Capital Cost

As detailed previously, due to the finite budget available for the delivery of schemes identified as part of the SCTS process and to make best use of available funds, those schemes with a high capital cost have been deemed to be beyond the scope of the SCTS funding. As such the delivery of the schemes is dependent upon alternative funding mechanisms available.

Seven such improvement schemes have been identified as part of the development of the Boroughbridge SCTS. These are detailed within Table 4.1 and the supporting text below, and shown on the location plan in Appendix A2.
Table 4.1: Schemes with a High Capital Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool Lane, (Nun Monkton) road widening</td>
<td>£750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a shared use footway/cycleway along the length of Pool Lane, Nun Monkton</td>
<td>£460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footbridge over the River Ure near Westwick</td>
<td>£750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of an ‘off road’ cycle lane along the A59 between the A1(M) and Monkton Moor</td>
<td>£1.375m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of an ‘off road’ cycle lane along the B6265 between the A1(M) and Green Hammerton</td>
<td>£1.110m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a roundabout at the A59 York Road/Cattal Street/Station Road junction, at Providence Green</td>
<td>£450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a roundabout at the A59 York Road/Pool Lane junction at Nun Monkton</td>
<td>£450,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this stage, no alternative funding mechanisms have been identified for the delivery of these schemes. They will therefore join the County’s reserve list of capital schemes and be subject to prioritisation against those already included within the list. This incorporates Improvement Schemes from across the County.

Due to the significant estimated costs associated with the introduction of the above schemes any progress would be subject to further detailed consultation/analysis of justification prior to the development of any detailed proposals. These are detailed below and illustrated on the location plan in Appendix A2.

**Pool Lane (Nun Monkton), road widening:** This proposal would involve widening the entire 3 km length of Pool Lane, between it’s junction with the A59 and its termination in Nun Monkton to provide sufficient width for large vehicles to pass one another without impacting upon the flow of traffic. Due to the length of the route, this has been estimated as costing approximately £750,000.

**Provision of a shared use footway/cycleway along the length of Pool Lane, Nun Monkton:** This proposal would involve the provision of a continuous shared use footway/cycleway along Pool Lane, between the A59 and it’s termination in Nun Monkton. Due to the length of the route, this has been estimated as costing approximately £460,000.

**New footbridge over the River Ure near Westwick:** This proposal would involve the construction of a footbridge over the River Ure at the Lock House near Westwick. The villages of Westwick and Skelton-on-Ure are divided by the river. A public footpath runs from Westwick, in the south and terminates at the river at the Lock House, and a footpath runs from Skelton-on-Ure in the north, and terminates at the river. The construction of a footbridge would connect the two footpaths, providing one continuous footpath between the two villages. Costs have been estimated at £750,000 for this proposal.

**Provision of an ‘off road’ cycleway along the A59:** This proposal would involve the construction of a 2 metre wide cycle track along the length of the A59, between the junction
with the A1(M) and the village of Moor Monkton. Due to the length of the route (9.5 miles) this scheme has been estimated as costing £1.4m.

**Provision of an ‘off road’ cycleway along the B6265:** Similar to the scheme described above, this proposal would involve the construction of a 2 metre wide cycle track along the length of the B6265 between the villages of Kirby Hill and Green Hammerton. Due to the length of the route (7.5 miles) this scheme has been estimated as costing £1.1m.

**Introduction of a roundabout at the A59 York Road/Cattal Street/Station Road junction, at Providence Green:** This proposal would involve the construction of a roundabout at this junction, with associated road markings and warning signs in order to improve driver safety. Due to the complexity of the works involved, this scheme has been estimating as costing £450,000

**Introduction of a roundabout at the A59 York Road/Pool Lane junction at Nun Monkton:** Similar to the scheme above, this proposal would involve the construction of a roundabout at this junction, with associated road markings and warning signs in order to improve driver safety. Due to the complexity of the works involved, this scheme has been estimating as costing £450,000.

### 4.2.2 Maintenance

Although not yet developed as specific Improvement Options, four particular issues have been raised as part of the development of the SCTS process which could potentially be taken forward in line with the NYCC Maintenance Budget. In this instance the NYCC Highways Area Manager will take ownership of these issues and consider their merits for inclusion within the forward programme of works for the area and as such there in no guarantee that it will be delivered within the available Maintenance Budget. These are detailed below:

- A general problem identified in the Boroughbridge area was that because of the rural location, many signs are obscured by vegetation.

- Stakeholders have identified that the footways in Little Ouseburn are in a bad state of repair and need to be re-surfaced.

  *In response to this issue, a footway resurfacing scheme has been approved, and is currently programmed for September 2008. The most critical areas will be repaired by NYCC as a priority within the available budget.*

- Stakeholders have identified that the footway running along the northern edge of B1224 York Road between Bickerton and Bilton are in a bad state of repair.

  *At present, funding is not available to completely re-surface this footpath. It should also be noted that a bid for capital funding was made in 2007 but failed to achieve priority.*

- Footway improvements along Rathmell Lane and Crooked Lane between the school and the train station have been requested as part of Kirk Hammerton Primary School’s Safe Routes to School Plan.
4.3 Non Capital Schemes and Initiatives

This section provides details of additional issues / concerns raised through engagement with stakeholders and the public which have not been investigated / developed as part of the SCTS. These issues are considered to be outside of the scope of the SCTS budget; however, their importance is recognised and as such they are included within the Strategy for further consideration under alternative funding / delivery mechanisms within the County Council.

These include issues relating to ‘Non’ Capital Schemes and Initiatives and are discussed under the following headings:

- Passenger Transport
- Parking
- Speed Enforcement

4.3.1 Passenger Transport

The development of the Boroughbridge SCTS has raised a number of issues with regard to Passenger Transport within the Study Area and in particular Stakeholders have expressed concerns relating to the existing bus services.

As identified within LTP2, such improvements are subject to cooperation 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 have been forwarded to the NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport Unit for further consideration.

The consultation period for the Passenger Transport Review in the Boroughbridge Area is to be undertaken between April 2010 and April 2011.

The key concerns raised as part of the stakeholder / public consultation exercises are summarised below with responses provided by NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport (IPT) 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 Passenger Transport Team. As such they have not undergone detailed analysis as part of the SCTS process.

- Lack of frequent bus services in the following areas:
  - Skelton village at peak times
  - Between Dishforth and Boroughbridge
  - Between Tockwith, Flaxby and Wetherby
  - Cowthorpe
  - Cundall
  - Nun Monkton
  - Marton-le-Moor
Stakeholders also commented that although Flaxby is served by buses travelling between Harrogate and York, it is relatively under serviced by more localised community transport. It has been argued that community transport will be a more suitable mode of transport for residents of Flaxby, as it would be less disruptive than local buses and will improve accessibility to local services for those who need it the most.

NYCC undertake a review of contracted bus services every four years and are continually monitoring existing contracts. It is important that the Council is able to strike an appropriate balance between the need to address social exclusion by improving access and the need to secure value for money overall.

- Stakeholders representing Green Hammerton noted that there is a lack of adequate bus services to Harrogate from the village. Thus, groups without access to a car such as the elderly and young people are isolated and lacking access to key services.

NYCC are pleased to announce that in April 2008, Harrogate and District Travel started to operate a Harrogate-York service which stops in Green Hammerton. This is being undertaken on a commercial basis by the company to assess demand.

- A concern was raised regarding the need for more low floor buses to help elderly, disabled and parents with young children.

The County Council is working to improve the standard of vehicles on contracted journeys through the contract renewal process. However, many of the buses within the study area are already provided with low floor vehicles, including all buses along the Harrogate-Boroughbridge-Roecliffe corridor and the York-Wetherby corridor. Also, most of the journeys along the York-Boroughbridge-Ripon corridor are also low floor.

- Stakeholders are concerned that there is a lack of adequate bus services in the region and the facilities are poor with regard to bus stops, timetable information and shelters.

Improvements to bus infrastructure is undertaken on a corridor basis. Within the study area, the Ripon-Boroughbridge-York corridor was addressed in 2007 and the Harrogate-Boroughbridge-Roecliffe corridor is due to be addressed this year (2008). The York-Wetherby corridor will follow later in the LTP programme.

4.3.2 Parking

As part of the SCTS consultation process stakeholders expressed that the lack of secure motorcycle parking within Boroughbridge is currently an issue. Discussions with Harrogate Borough Council have, however, revealed that they are proposing to introduce a motorcycle rack in Back Lane car park in May/June 2008. In addition stakeholders also raised concerns over the lack of disabled Blue Badge parking spaces. This is an issue which Harrogate Borough Council has agreed to consider.

Stakeholders have identified that there is a lack of parking at Cattal train station. There is a nearby car park associated with a public house, but only four spaces are provided for the
use of train passengers. This limits the total available parking, especially when the public house is busy. Stakeholders have therefore suggested that land around the station be purchased, so that a car park serving the station can be built.

There is a private agreement between the landlord of the public house and Network Rail to provide a section of the public house car park for use for train passengers. Any improvements to Train Station Car Parks are responsibility of the train operators and Network Rail. NYCC will continue to facilitate discussions between the relevant parties.

4.3.3 Speed Enforcement

One particular issue, which has been subject of debate, as part of the development of the Boroughbridge SCTS has been speed enforcement across the study area. Where specific concerns were identified as part of the process then potential solutions have been investigated. There are however a number of generic issues which concern the study area as a whole and as such are subject to further liaison between NYCC and the Police / Fire and Rescue Services and as such have not been investigated in detail as part of the SCTS. These issues are detailed below:

- Stakeholders felt that there is a need to review and assess speed limits and speed signage throughout the County. This is something that NYCC have recognised and are due to undertake a speed limit review on all A, B and C roads within the County.

- Stakeholders also identified a number of sites across the study area where they felt the use of speed cameras was necessary.

Although it is current policy of the York and North Yorkshire Community Safety Partnership (Y&NYCSP) not to use speed cameras, they are presently undertaking a detailed study into speed camera criteria, feasibility and justification. All locations where their use has been requested as part of the SCTS process have therefore been forwarded on to Y&NYCSP, for consideration.

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 and/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 on how they may be taken forward.
5 Monitoring and Evaluation

5.1 Introduction

This chapter details the process to be adopted in order to monitor and evaluate the Improvement Schemes delivered as part of the Boroughbridge SCTS.

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 to be effectively measured.

5.2 Monitoring Improvement Schemes

In this context, monitoring and evaluation is about objectively monitoring and assessing the impacts of implementing individual Improvement Schemes recommended within the Strategy. This will provide NYCC with valuable information to inform future decision making in the locality and also for Improvement Schemes throughout the County of 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. 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.

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>
</tbody>
</table>
| *The introduction of speed reducing measures and improved line markings on the approach to the junction of A59 York Road/Cattal Street and Station Road, at Providence Green. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures). | **Observational Surveys**  
**Accident Reduction**  
**Speed Reduction** |
| **The introduction of a pedestrian crossing to the north of the junction between Horsefair and Fishergate in Boroughbridge. The most ideal place is outside the Crown Hotel. However, this would be subject to discussions with the owners of the Hotel. If this is not possible, alternative locations would be investigated.** | **Attitudinal Indicator**  
**Observational Surveys**  
**Increased Pedestrian Use** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observational Surveys</th>
<th>Accident Reduction</th>
<th>Speed Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures and advanced warning signs on the approach to the entry/exit points for the fuel station/farm shop at the A59 York Road/Pool Lane junction, Nun Monkton to increased drivers awareness and thus improve safety.  (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of a missing section of footway connecting York Road, Green Hammerton to the A59 and the upgrading of the existing central traffic island on the A59 to a pedestrian refuge. In addition, the introduction of a footway connecting the A59 with Kirk Hammerton Station, thus providing a continuous footway between Green Hammerton and Kirk Hammerton Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures along Wetherby Road between the roundabout with the A1(M) and the A168 and Ponderosa Roundabout.  (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine the exact nature of measures. These are likely to include SLOW markings, 30mph roundels, red anti-skid patches on Wetherby Road).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of speed reducing measures on Boroughbridge Road, Dishforth on the approach to the junction with North Hill Road and Sandgate Road.  (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures on the B1224 on the approach to its junction with Angram Road/Tockwith Road in Long Marston.  (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of physical speed reducing measures).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of a footway along Station Road between the crossroads with the A59 York Road and Cattal Street and the termination of the existing footway, to provide a continuous footway between Whixley village and Cattal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures on the B6265 on the approach to its junction with Score Ray Lane to reduce vehicle speeds and increase safety for vehicles exiting Score Ray Lane.  (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td>Accident Reduction</td>
<td>Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures within the 40 mph zone on Cattal Street and Oxmoor Lane, and Cattal Moor Lane north of Cattal Bridge.  (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of advanced warning weight restriction signs at the junction of Cattal Moor Lane/ Tockwith Road/Rudgate/Fleet Lane, warning HGV drivers of the weight limit which applies at Cattal Bridge.</td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a footway along Back Lane, between York Road and Meadow Vale in Green Hammerton.</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The introduction of speed reducing measures within the 30 mph zone on Main Street in Minskip. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).

The introduction of speed reducing measures on the B6265 on the approach to its junction with Main Street Little Ouseburn, to reduce vehicle speeds and thus improve safety for vehicles exiting Main Street. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).

### Wider Local Transport Plan and Maintenance Budgets Improvement Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool Lane, (Nun Monkton) road widening</td>
<td>Observational Surveys, Traffic Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a shared use footway/cycleway along the length of Pool Lane, Nun Monkton</td>
<td>Increased Bicycle Use, Increased Pedestrian Use, Attitudinal Indicator, Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footbridge over the River Ure near Westwick</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use, Attitudinal Indicator, Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of an ‘off road’ cycle lane along the A59 between the A1(M) and Monkton Moor</td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator, Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of an ‘off road’ cycle lane along the B6265 between the A1(M) and Green Hammerton</td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator, Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a roundabout at the A59 York Road/Cattal Street/Station Road junction, at Providence Green</td>
<td>Traffic Surveys, Observational Surveys, Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a roundabout at the A59 York Road/Pool Lane junction at Nun Monkton.</td>
<td>Traffic Surveys, Observational Surveys, Accident Reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**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.

**Increased Pedestrian Use** – Before and after footfall surveys will be used to assess whether the introduction of Improvement Schemes have assisted in encouraging Pedestrians 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.

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 overleaf, 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 NYCC Highways Area Manager. Possible methodologies include face-to-face interviews and leaflet / questionnaire drops.

Observational Surveys – The greatest understanding of a situation is often gained through observation. This is particularly true of 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.

Traffic Surveys – Pre and post implementation traffic count surveys will be used in order to assess how the introduction of an improvement scheme has affected both traffic numbers and routeing in order to establish whether the desired objectives are being achieved.

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 the Strategy. As above, this will be reported through the NYCC LTP process. An annual report will be produced by the Area Manager for the Service Centre for consideration by the County Council’s Area Committee. This will report progress on Improvement Scheme implementation, forthcoming projects and any new 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 its findings to accommodate changes.
6 Summary and Conclusions

6.1 Introduction

This final chapter of the document presents the Strategy for the Boroughbridge Service Centre, it provides a qualitative comment on the perceived benefits of the Strategy in the context of the Government's Shared Priorities for transport and finally outlines the next stages in the process and how the Strategy will be adopted and then delivered.

6.2 Final Strategy

Table 6.1 overleaf outlines the prioritised list of Improvement Schemes to be taken forward as part of the Ripon 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)

Again it should be noted that as there is a flexible but finite budget available for the delivery of the SCTS, not all of the Improvement Schemes put forward in the Table 6.1 overleaf will be deliverable within the available funds. In addition, as the Improvement Schemes are further developed / designed by NYCC it may be determined that some Improvement Schemes should be omitted from the process as they are not deemed to be technically feasible or have sufficient local public support.

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 and hence the aspirations contained within the NYCC LTP2 has also been provided within Table 6.1 overleaf.
Table 6.1: 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><em>The introduction of speed reducing measures and improved line markings at the junction of A59 York Road/Cattal Street and Station Road, at Providence Green.</em> (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td>• Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The introduction of a pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of the junction between Horsefair and Fishergate in Boroughbridge. The most ideal place is outside the Crown Hotel. However, this would be subject to discussions with the owners of the Hotel. If this is not possible, alternative locations would be investigated.</em></td>
<td>• Safer Roads • Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The introduction of speed reducing measures and advanced warning signs at the entry/exit points for the fuel station/farm shop at the A59 York Road/Pool Lane junction, Nun Monkton to increased drivers awareness and thus improve safety.</em> (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td>• Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of a missing section of footway connecting York Road, Green Hammerton to the A59 and the upgrading of the existing central traffic island on the A59 to a pedestrian refuge. In addition to this, the introduction of a footway connecting the A59 with Kirk Hammerton Station thus providing a continuous footway between Green Hammerton and Kirk Hammerton Station.</td>
<td>• Safer Roads • Accessibility • Air Quality • Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures along Wetherby Road between the roundabout with the A1(M) and the A168 and Ponderosa Roundabout. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine the exact nature of measures. These are likely to include SLOW markings, 30mph roundels, red anti-skid patches on Wetherby Road).</td>
<td>• Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of speed reducing measures on Boroughbridge Road, Dishforth at the junction with North Hill Road and Sandgate Road. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of physical speed reducing measures).</td>
<td>• Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures on the B1224 on the approach to its junction with Angram Road/Tockwith Road in Long Marston. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td>• Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of a footway along Station Road between the crossroads with the A59 York Road and Cattal Street and the termination of the existing footway, to provide a continuous footway between Whixley village and Cattal.</td>
<td>• Accessibility • Air Quality • Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of speed reducing measures on the B6265 on the approach to its junction with Score Ray Lane to reduce vehicle speeds and increase safety for vehicles exiting Score Ray Lane. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures).</td>
<td>• Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improvement Scheme | Contribution to Shared Priorities and LTP2
---|---
The introduction of speed reducing measures within the 40 mph zone on Cattal Street and Oxmoor Lane and Cattal Moor Lane north of Cattal Bridge. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures). | • Safer Roads
The introduction of advanced warning weight restriction signs at the junction of Cattal Moor Lane/ Tockwith Road/Rudgate/Fleet Lane, warning HGV drivers of the weight limit which applies at Cattal Bridge. | • Accessibility • Congestion • Air Quality
Introduction of a footway along Back Lane, between York Road and Meadow Vale in Green Hammerton. | • Accessibility • Air Quality
The introduction of speed reducing measures within the 30 mph zone on Main Street in Minskip. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures). | • Safer Roads
The introduction of speed reducing measures on the B6265 on the approach to its junction with Main Street Little Ouseburn, to reduce vehicle speeds and thus improve safety for vehicles exiting Main Street. (Further localised consultation/investigation required to determine exact nature of speed reducing measures). | • Safer Roads

### Wider Local Transport Plan and Maintenance Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Contribution to Shared Priorities and LTP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool Lane, (Nun Monkton) road widening</td>
<td>• Safer Roads • Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a shared use footway/cycleway along the length of Pool Lane, Nun Monkton</td>
<td>• Accessibility • Safer Roads • Congestion • Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footbridge over the River Ure near Westwick</td>
<td>• Accessibility • Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of an ‘off road’ cycle lane along the A59 between the A1(M) and Monkton Moor</td>
<td>• Accessibility • Safer Roads • Congestion • Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of an ‘off road’ cycle lane along the B6265 between the A1(M) and Green Hammerton</td>
<td>• Accessibility • Safer Roads • Congestion • Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a roundabout at the A59 York Road/Cattal Street/Station Road junction, at Providence Green</td>
<td>• Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a roundabout at the A59 York Road/Pool Lane junction at Nun Monkton.</td>
<td>• Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Anticipated Benefits of the Strategy

Reference to the above table reveals that the Strategy will, in accordance with the aims and aspirations contained within NYCC’s Local Transport Plan for period 2, deliver anticipated benefits for the Boroughbridge Study Area against the following Governments 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 avoid **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 of making North Yorkshire a better place by:

• Providing equality of opportunity for all

• Protecting and enhancing the environment

• Improving the safety and health of residents and visitors

• Increasing economic prosperity

• Building sustainable communities

• Reducing the need and demand for travel

6.4 **Next Steps**

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

For those Improvement Schemes which lie outside the remit of the NYCC Highways Area Manager, for example revenue dependent public transport improvements, these Improvement Schemes will be allocated to the relevant part of the County Council for further investigation and, as appropriate, delivery.
Appendix A

Appendix A1 – Reserved Allocation Schemes Location Plan

Appendix A2 – Wider LTP Integrated Transport and Maintenance Budgets Schemes Location Plan