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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 already been undertaken the aim of the SCTS approach is now to capture and report on the transportation and accessibility issues also affecting the rural hinterlands and develop potential improvements within these areas which complement the measures already identified within the town centre. For those study areas where a TMS has not been undertaken (of which Grassington is one) 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 April 2008, Jacobs was commissioned by NYCC to undertake the Grassington 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 Grassington 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 Grassington SCTS
- Chapter 3 – Prioritised Improvement Schemes
- Chapter 4 – Monitoring and Evaluation
- Chapter 5 – Summary and Conclusions
Figure 1.1 Grassington SCTS Study Area
2 Key Stages in the Development of the Grassington 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**: 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 North Yorkshire 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:

- Chris Craven - North Yorkshire Area Highways Manager
- Ken Martin - North Yorkshire Area Highways Improvement Manager
- Iain Burgess - NYCC Public Rights of Way (PROW) Officer
- Rod Marshall - NYCC Area Road Safety and Travel Awareness Officer
- Dianne Pottage - NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport Officer
- Ben Cairns - North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
- Peter Broadhead - North Yorkshire Police
- Andy Ryland - Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority (YDNPA)
- Colin Walker - Craven District Council
- Heather Woolgar - Jacobs
- Michael Cammock - Jacobs
- Melisa Burnham – NYCC Special Projects Group

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.

**Issues Report:** The Issue Identification stage culminated in the production of the Issues Report, which summarised the findings of the above investigations and consultation. The conclusion of the Issues Report focused upon identifying the key issues and potential improvement schemes to be considered further as part of the development of the SCTS, as well as identifying the historic proposals to be taken forward for further consideration. The report also identified the wider strategic issues within the study area, to be considered as part of the SCTS.

### 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 could 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 was taken forward to consultation. The consultation process involved the sub-stages identified below, which are discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

- Second Members Consultation
- Stakeholder Workshop
- Public Consultation

**Second Members Consultation:** The prioritised list of potential improvement schemes was circulated to the Members in advance of the Stakeholder Workshop and Public Consultation exercises. 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.

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

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

**Public Consultation:** Following the Second Member Consultation and the Stakeholder Workshop, 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.
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 Grassington SCTS study area.

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

This chapter 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 upon the results of the consultation process and the assessment score determined by the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System, a prioritised list of five capital improvement schemes have 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 Table 3.1 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: Provision of a pedestrian crossing in Cracoe</td>
<td>£53,600</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Provision of Road Safety Measures on the B6265 through Cracoe</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Provision of Road Safety Measures on the B6265 through Rylstone</td>
<td>£29,175</td>
<td>20.76</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Provision of road safety measures on the B6265 through Threshfield</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Provision of a bus shelter on the B6265 Station Road, Threshfield.</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: Support, No overall majority view, Lack of Support
As part of the public consultation process, the YDNPA and other stakeholders raised concerns regarding scheme A. The YDNPA had concerns regarding the impact of the pedestrian crossing on the landscape of the National Park and some stakeholders questioned the number of pedestrians which would use the facility.

As this scheme was originally raised by Cracoe Primary School, the Headteacher was contacted to establish the likely level of usage by pedestrians accessing the school. The headteacher’s view was that the crossing is required and would be used by 20-25 children and their parents each day.

Furthermore, discussions with local stakeholders at the workshop suggested that a pedestrian crossing in the village would benefit the whole community and not just those accessing the school. Based upon discussion with the headteacher from Cracoe Primary School and local stakeholders, scheme A has still been included within the strategy with acknowledgement that any concerns raised by the YDNPA will need to be resolved as part of the detailed designed process.

As part of the development of the Grassington SCTS stakeholders also raised concerns over the lack of bus service in Littondale village. It was suggested by a stakeholder that consideration needs to be given to providing a bus service which links the village to the 72 bus service between Buckden, Grassington and Skipton. 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. However, this issue has still been included within the Strategy as an acknowledgement of the concerns raised and an item to be considered further by the NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport team as part of their Passenger Transport Review process and ongoing investigations.
4 Monitoring and Evaluation

4.1 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 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.

4.2 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 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 4.1 with definitions provided within the subsequent sections.
Table 4.1: Improvement Scheme Local Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme</th>
<th>Local Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Provision of a pedestrian crossing in Cracoe</td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicators (Improved Pedestrian Safety) Observational Surveys Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Provision of Road Safety Measures on the B6265 through Cracoe</td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator Observational Surveys Accident Reduction Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Provision of Road Safety Measures on the B6265 through Rylstone</td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator Observational Surveys Accident Reduction Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Provision of road safety measures on the B6265 through Threshfield</td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator Observational Surveys Accident Reduction Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Provision of a bus shelter on the B6265 Station Road, Threshfield.</td>
<td>Patronage Numbers Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Letters A – 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. Each case will be assessed in detail on a site by site basis by the North Yorkshire Area Highway Manager in order to determine whether the local indicators will clearly demonstrate the level of 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.

**Speed Reduction** – 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. Trends will be analysed over an extended period of time to ensure initial benefits do not fall away over time.

**Attitudinal Indicator (Improved Pedestrian Safety)** – 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 North Yorkshire Area Highways 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 which an improvement scheme aims to address are those which are not easily measured and tend to be derived from local experience and perception.
**Increased Pedestrian Use** – Before and after footfall surveys will be used to assess whether the introduction of improvement schemes have assisted in encouraging pedestrians usage.

**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. As with the Speed Reduction indicator, trends will be monitored over a period of years to ensure that short term improvements do not fall away over time.

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

### 4.3 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 Area Highways 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 Local Transport Plan process. An annual report will be produced by the Area Highways Manager 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.
5 Summary and Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

This final chapter of the document presents the Strategy for the Grassington 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.

5.2 The Strategy

Table 5.1 outlines the prioritised improvement schemes recommended for delivery as part of the Grassington SCTS. 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.

Table 5.1: Recommended Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme</th>
<th>Contribution to Shared Priorities and LTP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Provision of a pedestrian crossing in Cracoe</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Provision of Road Safety Measures on the B6265 through Cracoe</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Provision of Road Safety Measures on the B6265 through Rylstone</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Provision of road safety measures on the B6265 through Threshfield</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Provision of a bus shelter on the B6265 Station Road, Threshfield.</td>
<td>Accessibility</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 8th February 2010. Prior to the Area Committee it became apparent that there was an urgent need to maximise the funds available to repair the extensive damage caused by the cold winter to the fabric of the road network. To achieve this, the Executive Members for NYCC Business and Environmental Services reviewed the criteria for the inclusion of schemes in the SCTS Implementation Plans. This review resulted in the introduction of the following ‘revised’ guidelines for the inclusion of the schemes within an SCTS implementation plan:

1) Safety schemes should achieve an assessment score of 15 or above 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.
Council Members at the Area Committee were therefore requested that consideration be given to the revised guidelines as part of their recommendations. In light of this, scheme E was rejected from the process due its assessment score of 17.04 falling below the advised threshold. Scheme D was also removed from the Implementation Plan for reasons which are discussed in more detail in the supporting text below.

**Scheme D: Provision of Road Safety Measures on the B6265 through Threshfield**

Site investigations revealed that a combination of measures could be provided in order to improve road safety through the village. Proposed measures included the introduction of a mini-roundabout at the B6265 / B6160 junction and village gateway features at the speed limit entries on the approach to village from Kilnsey and Cracoe. Additional features to be considered included road narrowings, new signs and buff coloured surfacing across the road.

As detailed within Table 5.2, scheme D received only marginal overall support from respondents to the Public Consultation Questionnaire. 48.1% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed and 40.8% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. 6.8% had no opinion about the scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.2: Scheme D Consultation Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the high number of respondents who strongly disagreed to this proposal it was felt that this scheme did not receive strong enough support from the public to be included in the Implementation Plan.

**5.3 Final Implementation Plan**

**Table 5.3** details the final implementation plan following the recommendations / decision of the Craven Area Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.3: Final Implementation Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheme Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Provision of a pedestrian crossing in Cracoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Provision of Road Safety Measures on the B6265 through Cracoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Provision of Road Safety Measures on the B6265 through Rylstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.4 Anticipated Benefits of the Strategy**

Following the decision made at the Craven Area Committee, consideration has been given to the anticipated benefits of the final implementation plan in achieving NYCC’s aims and objectives.
When considered against the aims and objectives of the NYCC Local Transport Plan for period 2 (2006 – 2011) and the Shared Priorities for Transport, the strategy can be viewed as:

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

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

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

5.5 **Next Steps**

The next stage in the process will be for the strategy to be adopted by the NYCC Highway Manager for the Grassington SCTS study area. Following its adoption the improvement schemes will be taken forward for implementation by the NYCC Area Highway Manager and the success of the Strategy monitored against the approach identified within Chapter 4.
Prioritised Improvement Schemes

A. Provision of a pedestrian crossing in Cracoe
B. Provision of Road Safety Measures on the B6265 through Cracoe
C. Provision of Road Safety Measures on the B6265 through Rylstone
D. Provision of road safety measures on the B6265 through Threshfield
E. Provision of a new bus shelter on Station Road between Piece Croft and a point west of the entrance to Threshfield Court

Anticipated Contribution to Shared Priorities:
- Helping to deliver Safer Roads within the Service Centre
- Improving Accessibility within the Service Centre

Appendix A: Prioritised Improvements Schemes – Location Plan

JACOBS
NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
Grassington SCTS

This drawing is not to be used in whole or part other than for the intended project, without the written consent of the Council. Please see the Consent for Use Notice and Conditions for full details and conditions.
Improvement Scheme A: Provision of a pedestrian crossing in Cracoe

Background

The B6265 through Cracoe is subject to a 40mph speed limit. It is the main route between Grassington and Skipton and can experience relatively high traffic flows in the morning and evening peaks. There are no facilities in the village for pedestrians to cross the road and it has been reported that pedestrians, especially school children, can experience difficulties when attempting to do so. This is most apparent at school opening and closing times, when children and their parents are walking to/from Cracoe and Rylstone Primary School.

Options

The following options were investigated:

Option A: Provision of a pedestrian crossing on the B6265, outside Ramshill House.

Option B: Provision of a pedestrian island on the B6265, close to the junction with Back Lane

**Option A: Provision of a pedestrian crossing on the B6265, outside Ramshill House.**

This would involve the introduction of a puffin crossing on the B6265 in Cracoe, as shown in Figure 1. This would provide pedestrians with a specific location in the village with which they could safely cross the road. The crossing would be demand responsive with signals only showing red when called by pedestrians. A puffin crossing was selected due to the 40mph speed limit. Best Practice guidance recommends that where average traffic speeds are higher than 30mph, a puffin crossing is the most appropriate type of crossing, as opposed to uncontrolled crossings such as zebra crossings.

Due to the presence of residential frontages, driveways and side streets the most appropriate location to site a puffin crossing has been identified as being adjacent to Ramshill House.

**Figure 1: Improvement Scheme A, Option A**
Estimated cost: £53,600

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 23.16

Option B: Provision of a pedestrian island on the B6265, close to the junction with Back Lane

Option B (as illustrated in Figure 2) was identified as an alternative option to the provision of a puffin crossing adjacent to Ramshill House. Due to physical constraints option B is limited to the introduction of a central pedestrian island.

Figure 2: Improvement Scheme A, Option B

Estimated cost: £32,160

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 22.29

Summary

Both options were discussed at the Grassington SCTS Stakeholder Workshop on the 21st July 2009. Discussions revealed that local stakeholders preferred option A for the following reasons:

- A crossing in the centre of the village would be more beneficial for the whole community.

- In the past, drivers have been known to lose control of their vehicle in wet weather conditions at the junction of the B6265 and Back Lane in Cracoe. Thus, it was considered that placing a pedestrian refuge at this location would be unsafe.
Improvement Scheme B: Provision of road safety measures on the B6265 through Cracoe

Background

Local stakeholders have raised safety concerns regarding the B6165 through Cracoe as illustrated in Figure 3. There have been eight recorded accidents in Cracoe in the past five years involving vehicles travelling on the B6265 colliding with vehicles turning out of side roads. Records show that the common cause of the accidents is vehicles turning out of side streets misjudging the speed of the vehicles on the B6265.

Options

The following option was investigated:

- Provide road safety measures along the B6265 through Cracoe.

This option is discussed in more detail below.

Stakeholders have suggested that the 40mph speed limit through the village and the straight carriageway lend itself to inappropriate vehicles speeds and overtaking through the village. However, the Department for Transport Guidelines (Circular 01/2006, ‘Setting Local Speed Limits’) suggests that due to the number of property frontages and highway geometry a 40mph limit is appropriate. A reduction in speed limit is therefore not considered to be an appropriate solution to the issues raised. The proposed option is therefore to provide road safety measures such as the provision of village gateways, new signs, road narrowings, buff coloured rumble strips at the two entries to the village and widening and emphasising the central hatching on the B6265.

Figure 3: Improvement Scheme B

Estimated cost: £35,000
NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 20.49
Improvement Scheme C: Provision of road safety measures on the B6265 in Rylstone

Background

As part of the SCTS consultation process stakeholders raised safety concerns regarding the B6265 to the north east of Rylstone village as illustrated in Figure 4. In the past five years there have been seven recorded accidents, including one serious, due to vehicles losing control at the sharp bend in the carriageway.

Figure 4: Location of Improvement Scheme C

Options

The speed limit on the B6165 is the national speed limit (60mph). On the approach to the bend there is an advisory 30mph speed limit sign warning drivers of the need to reduce their speed as they negotiate the bend. However, the number of accidents occurring at this location due to loss of control of vehicle indicates that vehicles travel in excess of the advisory 30mph limit. It is therefore recommended that additional safety measures be introduced to improve safety at this location. Proposed measures include buff coloured anti-skid patches and rumble strips at both approached to the sharp ends.

Estimated cost: £29,175

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 20.76
Improvement Scheme D: Provision of road safety measures on the B6265 in Threshfield

Background

As part of the SCTS consultation process stakeholders have raised safety concerns regarding the B6265 through Threshfield village. In the past five years there have been eight recorded accidents, including one serious, due to vehicles colliding into the rear of vehicles in front. Records show that the common cause of accidents is vehicles not able to stop in sufficient time when the vehicle in front has stopped to turn into a side street.

Options

The speed limit on this section of road is 30mph however, there are reports that drivers exceed this limit regularly. It is therefore recommended that additional measures be introduced to improve safety at this location. Proposed measures include prominent village gateways on the approach into the village, road narrowings, buff coloured surfacing rumble strips and painted road markings.

Figure 5: Improvement Scheme D

Estimated cost: £60,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 18.65
Improvement Scheme E: Provision of a bus shelter on the B6265 Station Road, Threshfield.

Background

There is currently a bus stop on the B6265 Station Road, close to the junction with Doctors Laithe in Threshfield, as shown in Figure 6 below. The bus stop is served by the popular bus routes 72 and 74 which connect Grassington to Skipton and Ilkley. The bus stop is reported to be well used, due to its proximity to the Upper Wharfedale County Secondary School. However, local stakeholders have raised concerns over the lack of a shelter resulting in passengers being exposed to cold and wet weather conditions.

Figure 6: Improvement Scheme E

Options

This scheme is located within the Yorkshire Dales National Park boundary and as such there is a preference for a traditional style bus shelter made of stone. However, a stone built bus stop at this location would limit visibility for vehicles exiting Doctors Laithe. In order to maintain visibility for drivers exiting Doctors Laithe a cantilever type bus shelter with toughened glass panels is proposed.

Based upon the issues raised by the stakeholders the following options were investigated:

Option A: Steel frame cantilever bus shelter in the grass verge adjacent to the footway at the existing bus stop

Option B: Steel frame cantilever bus shelter in the grass verge adjacent to the footway to the west of Doctors Laithe

Option A: Steel frame cantilever bus shelter in the grass verge adjacent to the footway of the existing bus stop

Site investigations show that the existing facilities (as shown in Figure 7) include raised kerbs, a bus stop flag and a timetable case. In addition there is a zebra crossing close to the