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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

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

A total of 28 Service Centre study areas have been identified across North Yorkshire using the outcomes from the Regional Spatial Strategy Settlement Study, carried out by NYCC on behalf of the Regional Assembly. The SCTS process builds upon the success of the Town Centre Traffic Management Studies (TMS) developed for 14 of the 28 Service Centres as part of the First Local Transport Plan (LTP1) for the period 2001 – 2006. For the 14 areas where a TMS has been undertaken the aim of the SCTS approach is now to capture and report on the transportation and accessibility issues also affecting the rural hinterlands and develop potential improvements within these areas which complement the measures already identified within the town centre. For those study areas where a TMS has not been undertaken (of which Pateley Bridge 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 Pateley Bridge 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 Pateley Bridge 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 Pateley Bridge SCTS
- Chapter 3 – Prioritised Improvement Schemes
- Chapter 4 – Improvements Subject to Alternative Funding / Delivery Mechanisms
- Chapter 5 – Monitoring and Evaluation
- Chapter 6 – Summary and Conclusions
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

STAGE 1: ISSUE IDENTIFICATION
STAGE 2: DRAFT STRATEGY
STAGE 3: CONSULTATION
STAGE 4: ADOPTION / DELIVERY OF FINAL STRATEGY

2.2 Issue Identification

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**First Officer Team Meeting:** Following the Member and stakeholder consultation process, a meeting was held with the Officer Team. The Officer Team was made up of the following personnel:

- Colin Jackson – NYCC Area Highways Manager
- Ken Martin – Acting NYCC Area Improvement Manager
- Iain Burgess – NYCC Public Rights of Way (PROW) Officer
- Gary Stoneman-Roberts – NYCC Area Road Safety and Travel Awareness Officer
- Dianne Pottage – NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport Officer
- Simon Render – North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
- Peter Broadhead – North Yorkshire Police
- Gill Ritchie and John Dobinson – Harrogate Borough Council representative
- 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.

2.3 Draft Strategy

Based upon the local and strategic issues identified as part of the Issue Identification stage and those historic schemes identified to be taken forward for further consideration, the second stage in the process involved the production of the ‘Draft’ Strategy. This included the development of improvement schemes based upon the identified problems and issues and included further consideration of strategic issues and how best to take them forward.

The ‘Draft’ Strategy consisted of the sub-stages listed below, which are discussed in more detail within the following paragraphs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Second Officer Team Meeting therefore assisted in the management of expectations and enabled an additional filter of options to be undertaken. A robust justification for any schemes discounted from the process at this stage was provided.
**Monitoring and Evaluation:** As part of the development of the ‘Draft’ Strategy, consideration was given to how each of the proposed improvement schemes would be monitored and evaluated within future years. This would ensure that, once implemented, they would meet their objectives and contribute to the NYCC LTP2 key targets and indicators.

### 2.4 Consultation

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

- Second Members Consultation
- 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 prioritised 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 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 Scheme

Based on 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 has been put forward. These are detailed in Table 3.1 and illustrated on the location plan within Appendix A.

The SCTS process has ensured that these prioritised improvement schemes are focused upon meeting the needs of the people living and working within the SCTS study area whilst ultimately assisting in the delivery of the NYCC LTP2 objectives.

The cost estimates included within the table are based upon the information available at the time of investigation and as such may be subject to change due to the early stage of scheme development and future detailed investigations. Full details of each of the proposed improvement schemes are included within Appendix B.

Table 3.1: Prioritised Improvement Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Provision of a new footway adjacent to the B6165 between the villages of Wilsill and Low Laithe</td>
<td>£187,000</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Improved road markings and signs to warn motorists of pedestrians crossing Low Wath Road in Pateley Bridge, and the construction of a dropped kerb crossing point to formalise the existing pedestrian desire line</td>
<td>£6,700</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Provision of road safety measures including the introduction of advanced warning signs for vehicles approaching Stumps Lane / Menwith Hill Road crossroads</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Promotion of the Harrogate Borough Car Share Scheme within Pateley Bridge</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>No overall majority view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Provision of a new footway in the northern verge of Main Street between The Holme and Nidd Lane, Darley</td>
<td>£138,700</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>Lack of Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: Support ▶️ No overall majority view ▶️ Lack of Support
The improvement schemes identified and prioritised above are all subject to further detailed analysis / investigation as part of the future design process. This may necessitate further localised consultation and detailed physical / technical feasibility assessments undertaken by the NYCC Area Highway Teams to establish ultimate deliverability.
4 Improvements Subject to Alternative Funding / Delivery Mechanisms

4.1 Introduction

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

Although it is recognised that all such improvement schemes cannot be progressed in line with the SCTS budget, they have still been included within the Strategy to be considered as part of alternative funding / delivery mechanisms. This is an acknowledgement that in order to solve a number of the problems and issues identified by the SCTS process, access to all available NYCC funding streams and departments is required.

4.2 Capital Improvement Schemes Subject to Alternative Funding

As part of the Issue Identification stage of the Pateley Bridge SCTS, concerns were raised regarding vehicle speeds along the B6452 between Low Lane and Darley Mill Centre, Darley. It is thought that excessive vehicle speeds at this location caused problems for vehicles attempting to turn right out of the Wellington Inn Public House / Darley Mill Centre and also caused difficulties for pedestrians crossing the road.

Site investigations revealed that this section of road is subject to a 40mph speed limit. However, speed limit repeater signs which are recommended for a 40mph speed limit are not present. The Traffic Advisory leaflet 1/95 recommends that speed limit repeater signs should be placed on alternative sides of the carriageway at distances of 350m apart within a 40mph speed limit so that drivers are well informed of the restrictions in place. As this is effectively a compliance issue the NYCC Area Highways Manager will take ownership of it and seek to introduce appropriate 40mph repeater signs as part of their annual highways budget. Once implemented, the situation will be monitored to see if safety issues persist and whether alternative measures need to be investigated.

4.3 Non-Capital Improvement Schemes Subject to Alternative Funding

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

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 identified as part of the SCTS will be considered by the NYCC Integrated Passenger Transport (IPT) team.

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

**Passenger Transport Issue 1:** Local bus services require higher subsidies.

*IPT Comments:* The acceptable range of subsidy per passenger journey is stated in the Bus Strategy as follows:

i) We will not fund journeys which carry fewer than three passengers on a regular basis

ii) We calculate the amount of subsidy per passenger journey. We are working towards a situation where the maximum amount of subsidy per passenger journey is £7.50. These services are operated on a commercial basis and therefore beyond the Authority’s direct control in the setting of fares.

**Passenger Transport Issue 2:** Lack of public transport facilities within the villages of Glasshouses, Bewerley, Felbeck and Smelthouses.

*IPT Comments:* A demand responsive service, the Little Red Bus (LRB) serves these villages. The LRB is able to provide transport between any two places in the study area at less than 24 hours notice.

**Passenger Transport Issue 3:** Lack of public transport services operating throughout the study area.

It was suggested that a trial bus service be introduced between Pateley Bridge and Harrogate which operates on Friday and Saturday evenings. The stakeholder believes that this was done successfully in the Bedale area. They also stated that a later service could also boost the economy by bringing more traffic to Nidderdale’s pubs / restaurants.

*IPT Comments:* The trial late evening bus service in Bedale was not successful and has been withdrawn. The County Council has a limited amount of resources at its disposal. As with all service teams there is a need to balance the provision of services with the need to secure value for money overall.

**Passenger Transport Issue 4:** Lack of public transport serving Nidderdale High School and the Leisure Centre in Pateley Bridge. One stakeholder suggested that the service 24 bus route could be extended to serve the Nidderdale High School rather than terminating at Pateley Bridge Bus Station. It was suggested that the provision of public transport to the School and the Leisure Centre would increase usage of their facilities.

*IPT Comments:* Service 24 is operated on a commercial basis and is therefore beyond the Authority’s direct control, however, the comments will be forwarded to the operator for their consideration.

**Passenger Transport Issue 5:** Lack of public transport to the three doctors surgeries in the study area. It was suggested that a small bus such as the LRB could be introduced to serve as a shuttle bus to the three doctor’s surgeries, in Dacre Banks, Pateley Bridge and Birstwith. It was suggested that this service would need to operate every weekday and collect / drop off patients at their front door.
**IPT Comments**: The LRB service can be used for this purpose if customers provide up to 24 hours notice. However, IPT will forward the comments to LRB for their consideration.

**Passenger Transport Issue 6**: Lack of bus service which leaves Pateley Bridge in time to arrive at Harrogate by 08.45 Saturday morning.

**IPT Comments**: Unfortunately, it is not always possible to operate high frequency services to many areas. The Service 24 is operated on a commercial basis and is therefore beyond the Authority’s direct control, however, these comments will be forwarded to the operator for their 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 which will be delivered as part of the SCTS budget as well as those which will be considered for funding from alternative sources.

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

5.2 Monitoring Improvement Schemes

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

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

The local indicators which have been derived to measure the performance of each of the improvement schemes are detailed in Table 5.1.
### Table 5.1: Improvement Scheme Local Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme</th>
<th>Local Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCTS Budget Improvement Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong>: Provision of a new footway adjacent to the B6165 between the villages of Wilsill and Low Laithe</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong>: Improved road markings and signs to warn motorists of pedestrians crossing Low Wath Road in Pateley Bridge, and the construction of a dropped kerb crossing point to formalise the existing pedestrian desire line</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong>: Provision of road safety measures including the introduction of advanced warning signs for vehicles approaching Stumps Lane / Menwith Hill Road crossroads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator, Accident Reduction, Speed Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong>: Promotion of the Harrogate Borough Car Share Scheme within Pateley Bridge</td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong>: Provision of a new footway in the northern verge of Main Street between The Holme and Nidd Lane, Darley</td>
<td>Increased Pedestrian Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudinal Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways North Yorkshire Area 6 Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of 40mph speed limit repeater signs on the B6452 between Low Lane and Darley Mill Centre, Darley</td>
<td>Speed Reduction, Accident Reduction, Attitudinal Indicator, Observational Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

**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 which an improvement scheme aims to address are those which are not easily measured and tend to be derived from local experience and perception.

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

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

**Increased Members** – The membership details of the Harrogate Borough Council car share scheme shall be monitored regularly to assess whether there is an increase in the number of members which live within the Pateley Bridge study area.

### 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 Local Transport Plan process. An annual report will be produced by the Area Manager for the Service Centre for consideration by the County Council’s Area Committee. This will report progress on improvement scheme implementation, forthcoming projects and any new projects suggested for inclusion within the Strategy.

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

6.1 Introduction

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

6.2 The Strategy

Table 6.1 outlines the prioritised improvement schemes recommended for delivery as part of the Pateley Bridge 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 of Transport and hence the aspirations within the NYCC LTP2 has also been provided.

Table 6.1: Recommended Implementation Plan (the Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Scheme</th>
<th>Contribution to Shared Priorities and LTP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCTS Budget Improvement Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Provision of a new footway adjacent to the B6165 between the villages of Wilsill</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Low Laithe</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Improved road markings and signs to warn motorists of pedestrians crossing</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Wath Road in Pateley Bridge, and the construction of a dropped kerb crossing</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point to formalise the existing pedestrian desire line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Provision of road safety measures including the introduction of advanced</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warning signs for vehicles approaching Stumps Lane / Menwith Hill Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crossroads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Promotion of the Harrogate Borough Car Share Scheme within Pateley Bridge</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tackling Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Provision of a new footway in the northern verge of Main Street between The</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme and Nidd Lane, Darley</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways North Yorkshire Area 6 Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of 40mph speed limit repeater signs on the B6451 between Low Lane and</td>
<td>Safer Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darley Mill Centre, Darley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the schemes identified within the Implementation Plan were presented for consideration by Council Members at the Harrogate Area Committee on the 14th January 2010. Prior to the Area Committee it had become apparent that there was a 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 schemes within an Implementation Plan.
1) Safety schemes should achieve an assessment score of 15 or more when appraised using the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System

2) All non-safety schemes should achieve an assessment score of 25 or above when appraised using the NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System

3) Schemes which do not meet criteria 1 or 2 above can still be included in the SCTS Implementation Plan if there is considerable Member support for the scheme to be retained

As such, Council Members were requested to consider the revised guidelines as part of their recommendations.

6.3 Final Implementation Plan

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

Table 6.2 details the final Implementation Plan following the recommendations / decision of the Harrogate Area Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: Provision of road markings and signage to warn motorists of pedestrians crossing Low Wath Road, Pateley Bridge, and the construction of a dropped kerb crossing point to formalise the pedestrian desire line</td>
<td>£6,700</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Provision of road safety measures including the introduction of advanced warning signs for vehicles approaching Stumps Lane / Menwith Hill Road crossroads</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The schemes prioritised for delivery within the final Implementation Plan have a total estimated capital cost of £21,700. This resulted in approximately £187,200 to target repairs to the highway needed as a result of the adverse winter weather. Schemes A, D and E will therefore be subject to the identification of alternative funding sources and prioritisation against the schemes in the NYCC Capital Reserve List of Improvement Schemes.

6.4 Anticipated Benefits of the Strategy

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

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

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

And the strategy can also be seen as supporting the overarching aims of NYCC’s Local Transport Plan for period 2 of making North Yorkshire a better place by:
- Providing equality of opportunity for all
- Improving the safety and health of residents and visitors

6.5 Next Steps

The next stage in the process will be for the strategy to be adopted by the NYCC Area Highway Manager for the Pateley Bridge SCTS study area. Following its adoption the improvement schemes will be taken forward for implementation by the NYCC Highways Area Manager and the success of the strategy will be monitored against the approach identified within Chapter 5.
Prioritised Improvement Schemes

A
The introduction of a new footway adjacent to the B6165 between the villages of Wilsill and Low Laithe

B
Improved road markings and signs to warn motorists of pedestrians crossing Low Wath Road in Pateley Bridge, and the construction of a dropped kerb crossing point to formalise the existing pedestrian desire line

C
Road safety measures including the introduction of advanced warning signs for vehicles approaching Stumps Lane / Menwith Hill crossroads

D
Promotion of the Harrogate Borough Car Share Scheme within Pateley Bridge*

E
The introduction of a new footway in the northern verge of Main Street between The Holme and Nidd Lane, Darley

* Covers entire study area

Helping to deliver Safer Roads within the Service Centre
Improving Accessibility within the Service Centre
Appendix B – Details of Prioritised Schemes
Improvement Scheme A: The introduction of a new footway adjacent to the B6165 between the villages of Wilsill and Low Laithe

Background

Stakeholders have raised concern regarding the lack of footway adjacent to the B6165 between Wilsill and Low Laithe. At present, any pedestrians who walk along the B6165 between Wilsill and Low Laithe (a distance of approximately 835m) are forced to walk on either the verge or in the road thus causing safety concerns.

Investigations have shown that this is the only section of road between Summerbridge and Pateley Bridge (a distance of 5.4 kilometres) which does not have a footway adjacent to the highway. There is also a bus stop between Low Laithe and Wilsill. Pedestrians using this stop are therefore forced to walk in the carriageway.

Options

Site investigations show that the verge on the south side of the carriageway is 1.6 metres at its maximum width (as shown in Image 1), and is deemed to be of sufficient width to accommodate a footway along the full length between Wilsill and Low Laithe as illustrated in Figure 1. There are 2 locations however, where the width of the southern verge will need to be maintained through the removal of trees.

Figure 1: Improvement Scheme A
Providing this ‘missing link’ of footway between Wilsill and Low Laithe would provide an uninterrupted segregated pedestrian route between Summerbridge and Pateley Bridge, thus improving pedestrian access into the service centre.

**Estimated Cost:** £187,000.

**NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score:** 22.79
Improvement Scheme B: Improved road markings and signs to warn motorists of pedestrians crossing Low Wath Road in Pateley Bridge, and the construction of a dropped kerb crossing point to formalise the existing pedestrian desire line

**Background**

The footway adjacent to the south-east bound carriageway of Low Wath Road, in Pateley Bridge terminates north of the Riverside Caravan Park. Pedestrians crossing the road at this point to access the footway to Nidderdale High School and Community Centre adjacent to the north-east bound carriageway have poor visibility due to the bend in the road. The poor visibility at this location is an issue for both pedestrians and motorists.

**Options**

This proposal aims to formalise the crossing point north of Riverside Caravan Park by installing a dropped kerb crossing and installing appropriate warning signs and road markings to warn drivers of the presence of pedestrians, as shown in Figure 2. There are two other dropped crossings points on Low Wath Road which are considered to be appropriately signed and lined. However, an additional school and sharp bend sign is also proposed in the vicinity of Riverside Caravan Park. The proposed improvements are illustrated in Image 2 and Figure 2.

**Image 2: Terminus of footway on eastern side of Low Wath Road**

![Image 2: Terminus of footway on eastern side of Low Wath Road](image)

**Estimated cost:** £6,715

**NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score:** 19.39
Figure 2: Location of Improvement Scheme B
**Improvement Scheme C: Provision of road safety measures including the introduction of advanced warning signs for vehicles approaching Stumps Lane / Menwith Hill Road crossroads**

**Background**

Stakeholders have raised safety concerns regarding the Stumps Lane / Menwith Hill Road junction near RAF Menwith Hill. In the past five years there have been five recorded accidents, including one serious. Records show that three of these accidents were due to vehicles travelling on Slack Lane (also known as Cold Cote Road) and Stumps Lane failing to stop at the junction and hitting vehicles on Menwith Hill Road. Two accidents were due to vehicles pulling out of Slack Lane and Stumps Lane and failing to see vehicles on Menwith Hill Road.

**Options**

Site investigations show that the main causation factors for the accidents are:

- Lack of awareness of the junction for drivers approaching from Slack Lane / Cold Cote Lane as shown in Image 3.

**Image 3: Approach to the junction from Slack Lane (Cold Cote Lane)**

- Poor visibility of vehicles approaching from the west on Menwith Hill Road (approx 50m) due to a crest in the road (Image 4).

**Image 4: View looking west from Slack Lane (Cold Cote Lane) to Menwith Hill Road**

- When approaching the junction from the west (eastbound) on Menwith Hill Road the junction and any emerging vehicles are obscured by a crest in the road alignment as shown in Image 5.
The ideal solution would be to improve the vertical alignment of the road at this location to improve visibility for drivers on Menwith Hill Road and vehicles exiting Slack Lane and Stumps Lane. However due to the substantial costs involved, this is not considered to be a cost effective solution to the identified problem. The identified solution involves the introduction of additional signing and lining to improve drivers advanced warning of the junction. The proposed measures are summarised below and illustrated in Figure 3.

**Improvements on Menwith Hill Road eastbound**

The following improvements are proposed on Menwith Hill Road for traffic travelling eastbound towards the junction:

- Increasing the height of the existing ‘150 yards to crossroads’ sign to improve visibility to drivers
- Provision of a sign warning of danger ahead with the words “Hidden Dip” mounted on high-visibility yellow backed sign
- Provision of additional SLOW road markings on the surface of the road
- Rumble strips on the approach to the junction
- High friction buff coloured surfacing to highlight the approach

**Improvements on Slack Lane (Cold Cote Lane)**

- Provision of rumble strips to act as a countdown on the approach to the junction

**Stumps Lane**

- Provision of rumble strips to act as a countdown on the approach to the junction

**Improvements on Menwith Hill Road eastbound**

Site investigations revealed that when approaching the junction from the east (westbound traffic) on Menwith Hill Road, no additional measures were required.
Figure 3: Improvement Scheme C

Estimated cost: £15,000

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 17.77
Improvement Scheme D: Promotion of the Harrogate Borough Car Share Scheme within Pateley Bridge

Background

The NYCC LTP2 suggests that within the study area there is significant reliance upon the private car for travel to and from work. Harrogate Borough Council have made significant efforts to promote a car share scheme within the district in an attempt to reduce the number of to / from work trips made by the private car. Although the rurality of the study area limits the opportunity for significant reduction in car trips through modal shift and the use of such schemes it is still considered that more can be done in an attempt to reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles travelling to and from work.

Options

Following discussions with members of the NYCC Road Safety & Travel Awareness Team and Harrogate Borough Council, it became apparent that the Pateley Bridge study area is actually included within the area covered by Harrogate Borough Council Car Share Scheme. The Manager of Harrogate Borough Car Share scheme reported that the number of members from within the study area are low, and that the SCTS may be able to help fund the marketing of this scheme.

Experience of marketing the car share scheme in Harrogate has shown that the most effective method is to place road signs on the approaches to the town advertising the Car Share scheme. Therefore, it was suggested that the SCTS fund the purchase and installation of three road signs for Pateley Bridge to market the Car Share Scheme. Examples of these signs are shown below:

Estimated Cost: £1,350.

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 15.80
Improvement Scheme E: Provision of a new footway on the northern verge of Main Street between The Holme and Nidd Lane, Darley

Background

The existing footway on Main Street through the centre of Darley terminates at the junction with Nidd Lane, to the east of the village. This results in pedestrians having to walk on the carriageway or the verges in order to travel between Darley and ‘The Holme’ as shown in Figure 4. Local stakeholders have raised safety concerns, especially for school children, due to the lack of footway (most of the length is subject to a national speed limit).

Figure 4: Improvement Scheme E

Options

Site investigations have concluded that the width of Main Street’s southern verge is not sufficient to accommodate a footway, however the northern verge is on average 1.5 metres wide and is protected with carriageway edge kerbing. A 1.5 metre footway is therefore proposed in the northern verge between Nidd Lane and The Holme. However, the existing speed limit signs would need to be mounted higher to accommodate the required headroom for pedestrians.

Estimated Cost: £138,700

NYCC Scheme Prioritisation System Assessment Score: 14.44