



## Agenda

**Notice of an informal meeting of the:** **Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**To:** **Councillors Stanley Lumley (Chairman), John McCartney (Vice-Chair), Karl Arthur, David Goode, Paul Haslam, Robert Heseltine, David Jeffels, Don MacKay, Andy Paraskos, Caroline Patmore, Clive Pearson and Roberta Swiers.**

**Date:** **Monday, 12th July, 2021**

**Time:** **10.00 am**

**Venue:** **Remote Meeting held via Microsoft Teams**

Under his delegated decision making powers in the Officers' Delegation Scheme in the Council's Constitution, the Chief Executive Officer has power, in cases of emergency, to take any decision which could be taken by the Council, the Executive or a committee. Following on from the expiry of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020, which allowed for committee meetings to be held remotely, the County Council resolved at its meeting on 5 May 2021 that, for the present time, in light of the continuing Covid-19 pandemic circumstances, remote live-broadcast committee meetings should continue (as informal meetings of the Committee Members), with any formal decisions required being taken by the Chief Executive Officer under his emergency decision making powers and after consultation with other Officers and Members as appropriate and after taking into account any views of the relevant Committee Members. This approach will be reviewed by full Council at its July meeting.

The meeting will be available to view once the meeting commences, via the following link - [www.northyorks.gov.uk/livemeetings](http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/livemeetings). Recording of previous live broadcast meetings are also available there.

### Business

- 1. Minutes of the meeting held on 14 April 2021** (Pages 3 - 12)
- 2. Declarations of Interest**
- 3. Public Questions or Statements**
- 4. Climate change impact assessment - progress to date** (Pages 13 - 32)
- 5. Implementation of Active Travel schemes in the county** (Pages 33 - 44)

Enquiries relating to this agenda please contact Daniel Harry Tel: 01609 533531  
or e-mail [daniel.harry@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:daniel.harry@northyorks.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.northyorks.gov.uk](http://www.northyorks.gov.uk)

- 6. Review of 20 mph Speed Limit Policy (Pages 45 - 48)**
- 7. Work Programme (Pages 49 - 54)**
- 8. Other business which the Chairman agrees should be considered as a matter of urgency because of special circumstances.**

Barry Khan  
Assistant Chief Executive  
(Legal and Democratic Services)

County Hall  
Northallerton

Tuesday, 6 July 2021

## North Yorkshire County Council

### Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 April 2021 remotely using MS Teams, commencing at 10.00 am.

This meeting was live broadcast on the North Yorkshire County Council YouTube site and a recording is available using the following link - <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/live-meetings>

#### **Present:**

County Councillor Stanley Lumley in the Chair.

County Councillors Karl Arthur, Paul Haslam, Don Mackay, John McCartney, Andy Paraskos, Caroline Patmore, Clive Pearson and Roberta Swiers.

NYCC Officers attending: Karl Battersby, Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services (BES), Michael Leah – Assistant Director Travel & Environment (BES), Simon Moss - Strategy and Performance Team Leader, Catherine Price - Contract and Commissioning Manager (BES) and Jonathan Spencer, Principal Scrutiny Officer (CSD).

County Councillor David Goode and County Councillors David Jeffels had sent their apologies for absence.

County Councillor Robert Heseltine was not in attendance.

---

**Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book**

---

#### **117. Tribute to County Councillor Richard Welch**

The Chairman paid tribute to County Councillor Richard Welch, who had died in January 2021. He had been a County Councillor for 12 years serving first on the Transport and Telecommunication Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee and then on the Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee from its inception.

#### **118. Minutes**

##### **Resolved -**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2021 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

#### **119. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest to note.

## 120. Public Questions or Statements

A statement had been received from a member of the public (Mr Breakell) which was taken at agenda item 6.

## 121. Corporate Director's update

Considered –

The verbal update of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services.

Karl Battersby provided the following update.

- NY Highways – the teckal company was on course to go live on 1 June 2021. Looking ahead there was a need to make sure that NY Highways not only ensured a smooth transition of service delivery from Ringway but looked at how things could be done better. Early on, an example of this would involve looking at the winter management programme to see what had worked well last winter and what could be done better in future years.
- Active travel – the County Council had been successful in securing just over £1 million for four active travel fund schemes: three in Harrogate and one in Whitby. Virtual meetings had been held on those schemes, with a good turnout for the Harrogate meetings but lower attendance at the Whitby meeting. The Harrogate scheme relating to Outlands Drive had proved controversial and so the County Council had sought to amend the scheme, particularly in terms of the one-way nature of that scheme, and was now into the detailed design stage.
- The County Council was also managing the Transforming Cities Fund schemes across North Yorkshire. Initial consultation had been carried out with many responses received back. Comments were currently being analysed to feed into the next stage of consultation before delivery of the schemes took place.
- Kex Gill (A59 realignment) – all planning issues had now been resolved and the County Council was about to commence the procurement process to secure a contractor. The side road orders would be published shortly and the acquisition of the land.
- A19 (Selby district) - the County Council was working with Balfour Beatty to finish the works as early as possible and the hope was to finalize the program in the next two to three weeks. Working days had been lost due to recent inclement weather but the County Council was confident that they would be clawed back as a result of introducing seven day working that had been carried out fairly recently on the scheme.
- Community renewal fund – the County Council was marshalling bids on behalf of all North Yorkshire districts for submission to government. The County Council was also looking at what it wanted to submit to the fund. Options included whether to group specific schemes together under one theme, particularly around transport, so that the county as a whole could get greater economies of scale. The bid would need to go through to the County Council's Executive to meet the deadline of 18 June 2021 for submissions to government.
- Joint Waste Authority – the County Council had entered into an agreement to formalise the informal partnership that it had with City of York Council in respect of

a Joint Waste Authority. Work was also underway to examine what the partnership should be doing in relation to responding to the government's waste strategy. The government had recently published three consultations in that regard and County Council officers were currently preparing responses for submission to BES Executive Members for approval.

- Planning function – a peer review had been carried out of the authority's planning service. External support had been provided and action plans were being developed. Changes to the service would include having a dedicated enforcement and monitoring resource.
- Budget – a small overspend of between £50,000 and £90,000 of the overall budget was predicted. This was mainly due to the increased cost of the winter programme due to the inclement weather.
- Flood resilience – the County Council had successfully secured flood resilience monies from the Environment Agency in a joint bid with City of York Council to respond to wider flooding and catchment issues.
- Bus Back Better – the government had issued its new national bus strategy. Local authorities were being asked to decide which option they should adopt – a partnership or franchise model. Local authorities were required to respond by 9 June, so the County Council was doing some work around scenario planning. Following the submission to government regarding which option to adopt, local authorities would need to produce action plans to be submitted to government by October. For the County Council this would include aspects relating to bus priority and reliability measures and the types of areas that we would want to address in terms of a new bus strategy going forward. Linked into that the County Council was also looking at a demand responsive pilot in the Ripon area.
- Highway maintenance – this remained a significant priority for the County Council; spending in the region of £50 million a year maintaining the largest road network in the country. However, the government had made some financial changes to the maintenance allocation, which meant a £7 million reduction on the maintenance budget. Members were being consulted on what this would mean for the highways maintenance programme in their local area and an agreed programme was now in place.
- Brierley Homes – 235 homes were in the process of development at present, including completed sites and ongoing developments. Brierley Homes was taking a cautious approach but was gaining momentum and increased interest as the brand and the quality of the product that it was producing was becoming better known. Some homes were starting to be sold off-plan.

Members made the following key comments:

- County Councillor John McCartney referred to the A19 repairs and asked how confident the directorate was in meeting the mid-June re-opening date. Karl Battersby replied that he was confident that this target would be met unless something untoward happened such as a freak weather event. Efforts were being made to re-open the relevant A19 section prior to mid-June.
- County Councillor Paul Haslam noted that highway maintenance obviously needed to be a priority but asked what the budget was for public rights of way or cycle routes. Karl Battersby confirmed that there was a separate budget for public rights of way. The county had the largest public rights of way in the county but despite

that did well in terms of management and maintenance because there was a strong network of volunteers who assisted. Without those volunteers, the County Council would struggle to maintain the network that it had. Cycle routes were part of the overall maintenance budget but one of the aspects that the directorate was currently looking at was whether it could create a dedicated revenue and capital budget in relation to active travel. At present, the directorate tended to add on existing schemes or use developer contributions or bid for external monies to improve the cycle network rather than having a specific dedicated capital pot for cycling schemes. This aspiration had however taken something of a backward step this year to being realised due to the significant reduction in the maintenance budget.

- County Councillor Karl Arthur asked in relation to Brierley Homes what level of income was it providing and asked for future projections. Karl Battersby replied that currently it provided an income stream because it was linked to the other Brierley group of companies. He said that he was not able to provide a precise figure but a business plan was in place, which included income projections. The aim was on each development site to return a profit of around 15%. A healthy return was predicted in going forward and if a unitary county authority was created this would open up a wider range of opportunities.
- County Councillor Don MacKay said that he wished to pay tribute to the quality of the houses being built by Brierley Homes, which in his view was far superior to any of the properties built by large housing developers. He said that he felt that the profit margin of 15% was reasonable and possibly not ambitious enough. Karl Battersby replied that there were some sites where it was estimated that Brierley Homes would be able to achieve a higher profit margin but profit was not the sole factor, social value also played its part. The surplus Brierley Homes made was being re-invested in services that the customer valued. Sustainability and future-proofing was being considered in the design of properties such as the installation of heat pumps and electric charging points for electric vehicles.
- County Councillor Karl Arthur queried, in respect of the Bus back better strategy, how the revenue would be raised if the local authority adopted a partnership approach or franchise approach. He had received reports about car parking charges increasing and congestion charges being applied in cities that had adopted a franchise model. Karl Battersby replied that the government would be encouraging local authorities to look at transport policy holistically, and if the local authority was trying to encourage more people to use public transport and put in place bus priority measures etc., that would be linked to wider policies around parking. However, North Yorkshire County Council had not formed any firm ideas of what they would look like and at present, it did not have full control of parking charges because the district councils were responsible for off-street parking. He went on to note that when local authorities developed their action plans, the document was effectively a bidding document so some of that would be bidding for monies for service improvement. Separate to this there was a national fund aimed at electric buses and related infrastructure, with an opportunity for local authorities to bid for any costs in terms of infrastructure changes. In terms of the operator costs, under the partnership option, the operator would still bear the revenue risk of running the services going forward. Under a franchising model, the local authority would take over the running of bus services in the county and would then take the revenue risk if the patronage fell.
- Councillor Paul Haslam said it was important not to discount a bus franchising option now and believed that in time all areas of the country would have bus

services running on a franchise model either by individual local authorities or on a national basis.

### **Resolved –**

That the Committee notes the Corporate Director's update.

### **122. Air Quality Strategy**

Considered –

The written report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental providing an overview of the Air Quality Strategy and responses received from the draft strategy public consultation.

Simon Moss presented the report.

Simon Moss explained about how the development of the Air Quality Strategy linked into the County Council's policy framework including the Local Transport Plan and the Council Plan.

He then went on to explain about the consultation process for the draft Air Quality Strategy for North Yorkshire. The aim of the strategy was to protect and where necessary improve air quality. In order to achieve that ambition there were four key objectives, which he went on to detail, as set out in the document.

The consultation had been undertaken in four phases each involving different respondents, including members of the public and external stakeholders such as the local planning authorities and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs). The consultation period had been extended due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

A number of technical responses had been provided including from members of the public who had in-depth knowledge.

Simon Moss noted that there had to be a balance of what was possible in achieving the best air quality against what was realistic to do so. Three quarters of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the County Council's ambition, and generally speaking, they felt that the current situation regarding air quality in the county was clearly explained and that the roles between the County Council and district councils was made clear.

In relation to the objectives, only 42% of respondents thought that they were realistic and achievable. A spectrum of responses had been received from people saying the strategy was over ambitious to others saying that it was not ambitious enough. The consultation had provided some useful suggestions for actions that had previously not been included such as tackling emissions from burning moorland heather and looking at domestic heating as a source of pollutants in detail.

The next steps would be to take the finalised document to Management Board and the Executive for final approval before publishing the document.

Members made the following key statements:

- County Councillor Karl Arthur referred to Appendix A of the report and to an air quality management area that was within his division. He asked what progress had

been made and if the only way to tackle the air pollution in that area was to pedestrianise the area or provide a roundabout to keep traffic moving. Simon Moss replied that he was not able to comment on the progress of individual areas because air quality was monitored by the district councils. However, a number of measures had been put in place in the areas listed in Appendix 1 to reduce pollution.

- County Councillor Paul Haslam said the draft strategy was a substantial document and he welcomed that. He said though that it was not sufficient for the strategy to be supporting other council policies but should in fact be leading them. The Air Quality Strategy clearly needed to be co-ordinated with all other de-carbonisation and climate change policies. The four key objectives needed to be extended or linked to other policies. In particular, he said there was a need to encourage district councils to measure in 'real time' pollution levels. There was also a need for the County Council to be encouraging the reduction of car usage and at the same time improving and promoting public transport and active travel. There was also a need to refer in the document to the circular economy and to promote buying local. Building better homes and refitting old housing stock should be referenced including retrofitting old buildings, with the County Council leading by example. There also needed to be more actions in relation to domestic heating and agricultural practices, looking at low intensive farming and the restoration of peat bogs. Whilst a number were mentioned in the action plan they did not have separate leads. He went on to state that his biggest concern was about the accurate measurement of air quality, and without that it would be very difficult for the County Council to act. He concluded by saying that the strategy lacked ambition in terms of the targets and timescales.
- County Councillor John McCartney said that air pollution was a huge issue for the county. However in relation to planning applications considered by the County Council, when residents raised issues about pollution from HGV's, the County Council's Planning Committee was advised by officers that this was not an issue to take into account and that the Council's strategies on climate change and the environment more generally were not an issue for planning. Consequently, the one area where the County Council could take real action was being stopped and residents' concerns being ignored. He went on to note that the Air Quality Strategy did not refer to planning. Planning however needed to be part of the answer in tackling air pollution and not part of the problem, as was currently the case. Simon Moss replied that he was not able to comment upon individual applications but the County Council had introduced environmental impact assessments so that was part of the decision making process and so should help some of the concerns. He agreed to discuss with colleagues how this element could be strengthened.
- County Councillor Caroline Patmore said that she needed to speak up for people who lived in the countryside. The Air Quality Strategy referred to getting people to use active travel including cycling and walking. When living in the countryside though, it was often not possible to walk directly from home for any great distance because there were no footpaths by the side of the roads to be able to access the wider public footpath network. Whilst there were many cyclists, it was very dangerous for cyclists to be riding two abreast on rural roads. She said she did not want to stop cyclists and walkers from being on or near to the road but in order to make the situation safer for all road users, it would mean committing many financial resources. In addition, any scheme needed to be sensitive to the surrounding area, for example, large swathes of tarmacked paths were not suitable. In rural areas, residents often were presented with urban solutions and there was an expectation that many of those urban solutions could be applied to rural North Yorkshire. The same could also apply in terms of the electrification of the bus



fleets. A lot of the substantial progress made in the use of those technologies applied to an urban model.

## **Resolved –**

That the Committee notes the summary of responses, subsequent updates to the strategy and the next steps in relation to approval of the strategy.

### **123. Rural Transport in North Yorkshire**

The Chairman invited Mr Bill Breakell to make a statement.

Mr Bill Breakell made the following statement.

“I realise that the report covers historic issues and some matters beyond the County Council’s control, nevertheless there are many points that require major change and urgent policy revision.

- Rural bus services must be better recognised by the county council as an essential part of rural life, and as a basic human right. Community Transport and Demand Responsive Transport cannot substitute for clear, timetabled bus services with the capacity to be accessible to all and to cope with volatile demand.
- There is no mention that public transport helps to meet environmental aims, only that it has social and economic benefits.
- There is no mention that NYCC should integrate policies and practices so that all highways schemes create greatly improved facilities for buses and their passengers. Infrastructure is urgently required (bus shelters, bus boarders, bus priority measures, longer bus laybys to encourage connectivity from one bus to another). In addition, there is no consistency in timetable information around North Yorkshire, so the county council should post integrated timetable information at bus stops, as do other authorities, in order to maintain accurate and timely information.
- Paragraph 3.2.4 [of the report] states three ‘service standards’ for Local Bus Service support. These seem to summarise the approach of the County Council towards bus services in that each service standard is a negative.
- Section 4.2 [of the report] on external funding fails to explain how the county council writes bids or allocates funding. This leads to poor support from others involved in providing, promoting or using public transport. The only positive section in the report is the statement from the York and North Yorkshire devolution proposal which would see a very different approach to supporting public transport in the area.
- Paragraph 4.3 reports a Demand Responsive Transport proposal, including the phrase ‘innovative solution.’ Research into Demand Responsive Transport [DRT] shows that almost all schemes have failed to fulfil their aims and most schemes do not last beyond their pilot phase. Highly acclaimed transport academics and transport practitioners almost all suggest that DRT is fundamentally flawed and DRT as envisaged for North Yorkshire would not serve those with wheelchairs, pushchairs or shopping trolleys, or visitors to rural areas. Independent costings for one of the North Yorkshire proposals put a figure of up to £29 as the subsidy required per passenger. What the public ‘demands’ is a frequent and reliable timetabled service with capacity for all types of users. This is fundamental to providing a step change to North Yorkshire: the CPRE report Every Village, Every Hour has won much praise and denounces DRT as not of meeting rural transport needs.

- The council must recognise the visitor economy which, in the two National Parks alone generates over £1.1 billion for the local economy, and 13 million visitors. These are important public transport and equality opportunities for North Yorkshire.
  - The section on the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (4.4) fails to acknowledge that low reimbursement rates to bus operators has led directly to several local operators ceasing to trade.
- In summary, the report suggests to me that there is still a lack of direction in how England's largest county can help its communities and visitors travel with confidence, equality and a clean environmental conscience. A basic human right?"

The Chairman thanked Mr Breakell for his statement.

Considered –

The written report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental providing an update report on road passenger related rural transport in the county including funding, policy and strategy.

Catherine Price and Michael Leah presented the report.

Catherine Price set out North Yorkshire County Council's strategic responsibilities in relation to securing the provision of public transport where appropriate and to have general policies in relation to how services were secured. In terms of policy and strategy, the council fulfilled its local bus service duties through a combination of strategy, policy and procedure and its Local Transport Plan set out what its strategic objectives were for public transport.

In 2015/16, the decision was taken by the council to reduce its level of bus subsidy. Since that time, the funding for public transport had largely remained the same. The council was no longer able to subsidise evening or Sunday services.

During 2020/21, the council had provided financial support to 85 local bus services through contractual arrangements with 18 operators, as detailed in Appendix One.

Catherine Price went on to note that throughout the last 12 months, staff in North Yorkshire County Council's Integrated Passenger Transport Unit team had worked with operators, in relation to school and public transport, to keep them afloat, arising from the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The county council had continued to provide bus operators with payments for both home to school transport and public transport providers. In addition to the contractual payments made, the council had continued to reimburse operators in relation to concessionary fares based upon pre-pandemic levels.

The COVID-19 Bus Support Grant provided by the Department for Transport (DfT), had allowed the county council to provide support payments to contractors in relation to lost revenue. As the recovery was going to take some time, the county council continued to hold discussions with the key operators. The county council had received a share of the DfT's Better Deal for Bus Users funding announced in February 2020. Following the pandemic, the DfT had subsequently advised local authorities to maintain the network rather than for the purpose that it was originally intended. The county council had not been successful in receiving funding in relation to the Rural Mobility fund, as detailed further in the report.

Catherine Price went on to refer to the devolution proposal submitted by North Yorkshire County Council for the creation of a unitary county local authority, and in

particular, the two elements relating to passenger transport. This included substantial funding for the transition to zero exhaust emissions on public transport and for pump priming new services.

She went on to refer to the demand responsive bus service to be put in place in the Ripon area on a trial basis for 12 months. This would involve sharing vehicles and varying their routes in response to demand, rather than having a fixed timetable. An overview would be provided to the committee at its mid-cycle briefing on 1 June 2021.

Catherine Price went on to refer to the concessionary fares scheme and noted that in North Yorkshire the county council went beyond the minimum requirements set out in the national scheme. This included using discretionary powers to allow concessionary bus passes to be used over a wider period during the day and to allow companion passes for people who required somebody to travel with them.

She went on to refer to community transport and the car schemes in operation in the county. They remained very important aspects of the transport network in terms of providing access to services. The county council provided funding for both, as detailed in the report.

Michael Leah said that he wished to respond to the points raised by Mr Breakell in his statement. He noted that Mr Breakell's statement acknowledged that the report was retrospective and that some of the points raised in the statement were for national consideration rather than local. Bus services in the county were now at the potential cusp of wholesale change in the way that they were funded and operated because of the national bus strategy. He added that staff in North Yorkshire County Council's Integrated Passenger Transport team would be happy to speak to individuals to better understand their local needs when considering the national bus strategy to see if they could work together with communities to help unlock any issues or remedy any problems that they have in those areas.

He said that in terms of the background, it was important to be aware of the fact that the county council's budget and spending power had reduced by over a third over the course of the last decade and that the bus subsidy had not been able to be immune from that. The role of officers had been to secure best value and provide the best possible transport service to all communities across North Yorkshire against the backdrop of reductions to the bus subsidy. Demand for services had outstripped the funding that was available, which inevitably meant that some communities felt like they did not get the service that they would like.

He underlined the county council's commitment shown over the last 12 months to providing financial support to bus operators to enable them to remain in business. He also referred to the demand responsive bus pilot in the Ripon area and clarified, in response to Mr Breakell's statement, that it was the county council's intention to ensure that the pilot would cater for wheelchair users.

Members made the following key statements:

- Councillor Paul Haslam said he welcomed Mr Breakell's comments and they would be useful in anything that the council looked at in terms of implementing the government's Bus Back Better strategy. It was important that the Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee had sight of the final submission to government about whether a partnership approach or a franchise model would be chosen. Michael Leah replied that the Executive would make the final decision but in advance Members would be engaged as far as possible to seek further input. Part of the requirements of the submission to government

included putting together a bus service improvement plan, with the aim being to increase patronage in transport in the county. He went on to provide an example and the work that had already been undertaken with commercial operators during the last few years about future planning of services.

- County Councillor Paul Haslam mentioned that one of the aspects of the North/South divide was that the same length of journey in London was in the region of three to four times cheaper than it was anywhere in the North of England. That was because bus passengers had to pay separate fares when changing services to complete a journey especially when it was with a different bus company. He asked for consideration to be made of introducing an Oyster card or its equivalent in North Yorkshire so that people could pay a single 'pay as you go' fare across a number of different bus services.

**Resolved –**

That the Committee notes the information in the report.

**124. Work Programme**

The report of the Principal Scrutiny Officer asking the Committee to confirm, amend or add to the areas of the work listed in the Work Programme schedule (Appendix 1 to the report).

Jonathan Spencer introduced the report.

A discussion followed.

**Resolved -**

- a) That the work programme be noted.
- b) That the Bus back better strategy and the county council's response be included as an item for discussion at the committee's mid-cycle briefing on 1 June 2021.
- c) That an update on the rollout of the Temporary Vehicle Activated Speed Signs project be included in the road safety report to be discussed at the meeting of the committee to be held on 21 October 2021.

The meeting concluded at 11.47 am.

JS

**North Yorkshire County Council**

**Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**12 July 2021**

**Report of the Chief Executive**

**Climate change impact assessment – progress to date**

**1.0 Purpose of report**

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to update the committee on the introduction of climate change impact assessment into the decision-making processes of the County Council.

**2.0 Background**

- 2.1 On 24 July 2019 North Yorkshire County Council passed a motion with an aspiration to achieve net carbon neutrality by 2030, or as near to that date as possible. It also committed to producing a carbon reduction plan. This is due to be agreed at Executive on 13 July 2021.
- 2.2 A Beyond Carbon programme within the Council's change management governance structure has been established to oversee the main strands of the plan and a one-off £1m fund for pump-priming and development of business cases has been committed in the Council's 2021-22 budget.

**3.0 Climate change impact assessment tool**

- 3.1 It was decided that an impact assessment tool, similar to the equality impact assessment tool, should be developed and introduced to ensure that climate impacts and other environmental considerations are taken into account when decisions are made. This is not intended to replace situations where more detailed statutory environmental assessments are required e.g. Environmental Impact Assessment, Strategic Environmental Assessment or where planning permission is sought.
- 3.2 Unlike equality impact assessment, there is currently no legal requirement for climate change impact assessment. However, research shows that most councils are at a similar stage to ourselves and have developed or are developing processes to assess impact. Following research into what other local authorities were using, a tool has been adapted from one in use at Devon County Council. Accompanying guidance has also been developed.
- 3.3 The climate change impact assessment tool is attached at appendix 1. The associated guidance is attached at appendix 2.

## **4.0 Implementation**

- 4.1 The impact assessment tool and accompanying guidance were trialled with a number of projects from different directorates in early 2020 and rolled out across the council from August.
- 4.2 Democratic services have incorporated environmental and climate change impacts into the executive report template.
- 4.3 An overview of 23 completed climate change impact assessment forms shows that adoption of the new approach has been most effective in business and environmental services and technology and change. Use of the impact assessment is less well developed in services for adults and children. This may be because staff find it easier to see the environmental impact of physical or digital infrastructure than that of a social care contract, for example.
- 4.4 Projects which are being progressed through the Council's change management programme also undergo climate change impact assessment. The 2020 programme management office have introduced climate change impact assessment into its required documentation for project management at both outline business case and full business case stages. Following feedback, an initial assessment form is being developed for use at outline business case. This is in line with the process followed for equality and data protection assessments and requires the project manager to work with the service to assess the likelihood of climate change impact at options appraisal stage. A full climate change impact assessment, where the initial assessment finds that this is necessary, will be completed as part of the full business case.
- 4.5 In order to improve understanding and uptake across the Council, we need to raise awareness of the need for climate change impact assessment. A communications programme for the Beyond Carbon programme is being developed incorporating opportunities to re-emphasise the agreed impact assessment process. We are also working with the York and North Yorkshire Local Enterprise Partnership, District Councils and City of York Council to develop a carbon literacy training programme for staff and Councillors. The training module development will be completed in July 2021, with local authority rollout likely to commence in the autumn.

## **5.0 Future development**

- 5.1 Climate change impact assessment is new to many staff across the Council and we will continue to learn and refine the process. We will continue to research best practice in other councils and organisations and incorporate this into our own processes. We will also reflect any national requirements or guidance if this is forthcoming.

## **6.0 Recommendation(s)**

- i) That the Committee note progress in implementing climate change impact assessments and make suggestions for further improvement of the process.

Richard Flinton  
Chief Executive  
North Yorkshire County Council  
**2 July 2021**

Report Author – Deborah Hugill, Senior Strategy and Performance Officer

Presenter of Report – Deborah Hugill, Senior Strategy and Performance Officer

**Appendices:**

Appendix 1: Climate change impact assessment tool

Appendix 2: Climate change impact assessment guidance



## Climate change impact assessment

The purpose of this assessment is to help us understand the likely impacts of our decisions on the environment of North Yorkshire and on our aspiration to achieve net carbon neutrality by 2030, or as close to that date as possible. The intention is to mitigate negative effects and identify projects which will have positive effects.

This document should be completed in consultation with the supporting guidance. The final document will be published as part of the decision making process and should be written in Plain English.

If you have any additional queries which are not covered by the guidance please email [climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk)

**Please note: You may not need to undertake this assessment if your proposal will be subject to any of the following:**

Planning Permission  
Environmental Impact Assessment  
Strategic Environmental Assessment

However, you will still need to summarise your findings in the summary section of the form below.

Please contact [climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk) for advice.

<b>Title of proposal</b>	
<b>Brief description of proposal</b>	
<b>Directorate</b>	
<b>Service area</b>	
<b>Lead officer</b>	
<b>Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the impact assessment</b>	
<b>Date impact assessment started</b>	



**Options appraisal**

Were any other options considered in trying to achieve the aim of this project? If so, please give brief details and explain why alternative options were not progressed.

**What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?**

Please explain briefly why this will be the result, detailing estimated savings or costs where this is possible.

<p><b>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</b></p> <p>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</p>	<p><b>Positive impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p><b>No impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p><b>Negative impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p><b>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</b></p> <p><b>Where possible/relevant please include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes over and above business as usual</li> <li>• Evidence or measurement of effect</li> <li>• Figures for CO<sub>2</sub>e</li> <li>• Links to relevant documents</li> </ul>	<p><b>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</b></p>	<p><b>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</b></p>	
<p>Minimise <b>greenhouse gas emissions</b> e.g. reducing emissions from travel, increasing energy efficiencies etc.</p>	Emissions from travel						
	Emissions from construction						
	Emissions from running of buildings						
	Other						
<p>Minimise <b>waste</b>: Reduce, reuse, recycle and compost e.g. reducing use of single use plastic</p>							
<p>Reduce <b>water</b> consumption</p>							
<p>Minimise <b>pollution</b> (including air, land, water, light and noise)</p>							

<p><b>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</b></p> <p>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</p>	<p><b>Positive impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p><b>No impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p><b>Negative impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p><b>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</b></p> <p><b>Where possible/relevant please include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes over and above business as usual</li> <li>• Evidence or measurement of effect</li> <li>• Figures for CO<sub>2</sub>e</li> <li>• Links to relevant documents</li> </ul>	<p><b>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</b></p>	<p><b>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</b></p>
<p>Ensure <b>resilience</b> to the effects of climate change e.g. reducing flood risk, mitigating effects of drier, hotter summers</p>						
<p>Enhance <b>conservation</b> and wildlife</p>						
<p>Safeguard the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of <b>North Yorkshire's landscape</b></p>						
<p>Other (please state below)</p>						

**Are there any recognised good practice environmental standards in relation to this proposal?** If so, please detail how this proposal meets those standards.

**Summary** Summarise the findings of your impact assessment, including impacts, the recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

Page 20

Sign off section

This climate change impact assessment was completed by:

<b>Name</b>	
<b>Job title</b>	
<b>Service area</b>	
<b>Directorate</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	
<b>Completion date</b>	

**Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature):**

**Date:**



## Climate change impact assessment – supporting guidance (Based on Devon County Council assessment and guidance documentation)

This guidance should be used in conjunction with the climate change impact assessment form.

**Date:** December 2019 updated June 2020

**Version:** V4 – July 2020

### Introduction

#### Purpose

This guidance and the impact assessment document should be used at the outset of the development of your proposal. The process will help you understand the potential environmental effects of your options and demonstrate how your proposal minimises or mitigates climate change impacts and maximises any potential environmental opportunities.

**Please note: You may not need to undertake this assessment if your proposal will be subject to any of the following:**

Planning Permission  
Environmental Impact Assessment  
Strategic Environmental Assessment

However, you will still need to summarise your findings in in the summary section of the form below.

Please contact [climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk) for advice.

#### Why carry out an impact assessment?

North Yorkshire is England's largest county, and one of its most rural, containing a diverse range of landscapes and historic assets including two National Parks and three Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Our natural environment makes a considerable contribution to the county's economy and it is in our interest to protect it for a number of reasons.

Concern about climate change and the need to reduce carbon emissions has also led the Council to pass the following motion on 24 July 2019:

*'This Council now commits to produce its own carbon reduction plan. As part of this plan, the Council will invite the relevant representatives from the district councils to discuss how working together, we can aspire to achieve net carbon neutrality by, or as close to, 2030.'*

In order to meet this aspiration we need to ensure that we consider the effect that all proposals are likely to have on carbon emissions and other environmental factors, and work hard to mitigate any detrimental effects.

Our climate is already changing – for example flood events in North Yorkshire are increasingly a fact of life – and an important part of the assessment highlights the need to improve the resilience of the county and its communities.

## How to use this guidance

The impact assessment document lists a number of areas which may be impacted by your proposal. These are listed below.

The impact assessment document asks you to consider whether your proposal will have no impact, make things better or make things worse.

Click on each heading to find out more and for help filling in that section of the form, including hints and tips to help reduce these impacts.

The climate change impact assessment also asks you about timescale. Please think about impact over the lifetime of the project. The intention is to enable decision makers to understand the full impact of a project over time, particularly where there will be positive impacts in the longer term. For example, a project might be very expensive in the short term if capital investment is required but this could pay back over time in energy savings, and reductions of emissions, over a longer period. Please provide details where this is the case.

For further support and advice on taking account of environmental effects please contact [climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk)

### Impact areas

[Greenhouse gas emissions](#)

[Reduce, reuse, recycle and compost](#)

[Water consumption](#)

[Pollution \(including air, land, water, light and noise\)](#)

[Resilience to the effects of climate change \(e.g. increased flood events, drier and hotter summers, rising sea levels\).](#)

[Conservation and enhancement of wildlife](#)

[Safeguarding the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of North Yorkshire's landscape](#)

## Greenhouse gas emissions

The UK Government has committed to a target net carbon neutrality by 2050 levels and NYCC has an aspiration of net carbon neutrality by 2030, or as near as possible to that date.

### Will your proposal affect the consumption of fossil fuels or electricity in buildings or vehicles?

The burning of fossil fuel directly or to produce electricity emits greenhouse gases.

Examples of how your proposal could affect fossil fuel or electricity consumption include:

- Constructing or demolishing a building, or changing the occupancy or opening hours
- Changing the technology (e.g. heating, ventilation, lighting, IT) in a building
- Altering the amount of travel required by staff or service users
- Changing the mode of travel or vehicle type

You can use the energy hierarchy to help identify opportunities to minimise consumption:

1. **Reduce demand for energy.** Is there a way of doing less of these things? e.g. schedule heating to match building occupancy; redesign a process to need less travel; make use of flexible working; enable residents to access services digitally.
- **Improve energy efficiency.** Could the proposal achieve the same outcome with less energy input? e.g. Add insulation; use more efficient vehicles; buy low-energy appliances. Could you use different models of ownership, for example rental or sharing models? e.g. Philips' new model of selling [light as a service](#)
2. **Use renewable sources of energy.** Could the proposal use or promote the development of wind, solar, biomass and hydro energy?

### **Will your proposal produce waste?**

Waste of any type contributes to greenhouse gas emissions due to its 'embodied energy' – the energy that has been used to produce the item. Specifying recycled materials when making purchasing decisions, not over-ordering and ensuring unwanted resources are reused and recycled will minimise wasted energy. Biodegradable waste, such as food, garden waste, paper, and wood, produces methane (a greenhouse gas 21 times more powerful than carbon dioxide at causing global warming) if it is allowed to degrade in a landfill site.

For further guidance see the [Reduce, Reuse, Recycle and Compost](#) section.

### **Will your proposal contribute to land-use change?**

Generally, permanently removing vegetation such as trees and hedgerows and replacing them with grass or hard surfaces is treated as an emission of greenhouse gases because the carbon stored in the vegetation is released to the air when it is burned or biodegrades. This emission can be avoided by designing your proposal not to remove the vegetation or ensure that replanting takes place.

If you answered 'no' to the above questions then your proposal will not significantly affect greenhouse gas emissions.

### [Back to impact areas](#)

#### **Reduce, reuse, recycle and compost**

#### **Does your proposal affect waste management?**

Your proposal will affect waste management if it:

- Needs new materials or supplies
- Generates waste materials

#### **How you can minimise waste**

#### **Reduce, for example:**

- Could the quantity of waste produced by your proposal be minimised?
- Could perishable materials be stored or transported more intelligently to minimise the potential for them to become unfit for purpose before they're required?
- Has the proposal been designed to minimise the quantity of any packaging materials?



## Reuse

- Is the proposal going to cause items or materials to be disposed of before the end of their useful life? Could the proposal be altered to ensure these are used again before disposal or could they be sold on for use elsewhere?
- Could items or materials that have been initially thought of as waste be given a new life as something else?
- Can you use a rental or sharing model for items?

## Recycle and Compost

- Can the waste be recycled?
- If the waste products are not currently recyclable, can the process that produces the waste products be altered to use materials that are recyclable?
- Items such as food waste and garden/arboriculture waste should be composted.

## Can you buy recycled products?

If your proposal needs new materials or supplies, before purchasing those from virgin sources, consider whether there is an alternative available that contains recycled material. All sorts of materials and products are available with recycled content, from office stationery to construction materials. Ask your suppliers whether they can provide a similar product with recycled content.

## Can you specify alternatives to single-use plastics?

Could you specify reusable products instead or use paper or bioplastic alternatives? Note that biodegradable alternatives, such as paper or bioplastic, need to be recycled or sent to an energy-from-waste facility rather than landfill.

## [Back to impact areas](#)

### Water consumption

Parts of the UK already suffer from water stress. The expected impacts of climate change, as well as population and household growth, will make this an increasing problem for the UK. The Water Act (2003) requires local authorities to “take into account the desirability of conserving water”.

### Does your proposal affect water consumption?

Will your proposal...

- Make use of water directly?
- Change the way the county council, households or businesses use water?

If you can answer ‘yes’ to either of the above questions, then your proposal does have implications for water consumption.

### How can your proposal minimise water consumption?

There are three ways to reduce water consumption:

#### 1. Reduce demand for water

- Is any of the water to be used by the proposal unnecessary? Examples to help reduce water include:
  - Install a water meter to help change behaviour.
  - Use push-taps, low-flow shower fittings and put a Hippo in single-flush toilet cisterns.
  - Specify drought tolerant plants for landscaping.

## 2. Improve water-use efficiency

- Could the proposal achieve the same outcome with less water? Examples include:
  - Specify appliances that use less water – the EU Energy Label includes water consumption for dishwashers and washing machines
  - Use dishwashers (full) rather than hand-washing.
  - Specify dual-flush toilet cisterns

## 3. Reuse and recycle water

- Could the proposal reuse water? Examples include:
  - Harvest rainwater in water butts for irrigation and outdoor cleaning (e.g. vehicles, hard standing).
  - Use greywater (e.g. water from basins, baths, showers, vehicle cleaning processes) for irrigation and toilet flushing.

[Back to impact areas](#)

## Pollution (including air, land, water, light and noise)

Pollution has negative environmental impacts which in turn affect our health.

### Air Pollution

**Transport** - Your proposal could affect air quality if it will make significant changes to transport patterns or vehicle types. If so, you should check whether your proposal will affect an Air Quality Management Area – find out [here](#)

If your proposal will affect one of these areas, you need to contact the relevant highway area team to discuss your proposal.

Mitigation options include:

- Is the transport necessary? Could technology be used to avoid the need to travel?
- Transport mode – buses, coaches and heavy goods vehicles are less clean than trains but are cleaner than cars and vans on a per tonne of freight or per passenger basis.
- Could you use an electric vehicle?

**Other sources** – Your proposal could affect air quality if it includes a significant use of combustion of any kind, or increases agricultural emissions. See the section on [greenhouse gas emissions](#).

## Water pollution

Water pollution arises from a variety of sources. These examples may apply to your proposal:

- Soil erosion will wash sediment and soil pollutants into watercourses. Maintaining ground cover (i.e. vegetation) will help reduce soil erosion.
- Substance spills – oil, fuel, chemicals, paint etc. Store and use hazardous substances appropriately and have a clean-up plan in place to deal with spills immediately.
- Cleaning products contain chemicals that can harm the environment, such as phosphoric acid and bleach. Could you reduce the frequency of cleaning? Or could you use natural/ecological cleaning products instead?
- Use of pesticides and herbicides. Could the use of these products be minimised or natural/ecological products be used instead?

## Noise pollution

Will your proposal significantly affect noise associated with these activities, or ones like them?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road, air and rail transport | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction work    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Events                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Entertainment venues |

## Light Pollution

Will your proposal increase night-time, external lighting?

- Is the lighting necessary?
- Could it be timed to switch off part-way during the night?
- Could you specify a light fitting that shines downwards and therefore minimises the amount of light that leaks away into the night sky?

[Back to impact areas](#)

## Resilience to the effects of climate change (e.g. increased flood events, drier and hotter summers, rising sea levels).

Enhancing the resilience of your proposal to extreme weather and climate change will save time and money by avoiding future impacts, such as service interruptions or damage to property. It's useful to think of weather as what is going on outside right now, whereas climate is weather averaged over 30 years.

### Is your proposal sensitive to weather or climate change? Does it:

- Include aspects that are affected by the current weather and climate? For example:
  - Buildings, structures, roads
  - Green spaces and landscaping
  - The **need** to travel
  - A location vulnerable to flooding. Check the vulnerability of the location [here](#) and long term flood risk information [here](#)
  - Vulnerable groups – e.g. the elderly or people with sensory impairment

- Have a lifetime or legacy that extends beyond a few years?
- Provide or support critical infrastructure? For example:
  - Highways, bridges, drainage
  - Waste management
  - Health and community support
  - Education
  - Utilities
  - Digital / communications
- Provide contingency planning or business continuity needs?

### What are the potential impacts of climate change on the proposal?

Consider how climate change effects could impact the business aspects of your proposal.

Ask yourself what the effects would be on your proposal if a heat wave, flood or extreme tide became the 'normal weather'. To help you, an example proposal is provided in Table 1.

Positive or negative impact on...	Change in climate						
		Hotter summers	Drier summers	Wetter winters	Warmer winters	Intense storms (rain, wind and snow)	Higher sea level
	Logistics/travel			Staff and other care professionals travel affected by potential flooding.		Staff and other care professionals travel affected by potential snow or storms.	
	People	Older people adversely affected by high temperatures					
Premises/location	Maintenance of garden areas will require more water.	Maintenance of garden areas will require more water.	May be affected by flooding, dependent upon siting		Higher maintenance costs of building.	May be vulnerable to coastal flooding.	

<b>Commercial opportunity</b>						
<b>Financial</b>	More costly if air conditioning is run during hot summers			Reduction in heating bills over winter.		
<b>Infrastructure</b>			Food medicines			
<b>Environment</b>			Avoid siting of new facility in flood risk areas			

Table 1: Example climate impacts for a hypothetical project to build an extra care facility in a coastal area.

### How can you adapt your proposal to minimise the impacts and maximise any opportunities from climate change?

Think about how you could mitigate each impact you have identified. Mitigating measures should increase the resilience of your proposal so that it can tolerate a wider range of extreme weather before serious impacts occur. They should also be flexible so that adjustments can be made easily in the future as new information about climate change and its effects emerges.

Consider low cost measures that could be incorporated now and also higher cost measures, needing more research.

To help you, examples have been provided in Table 2 based on the same hypothetical project.

Make sure you incorporate the appropriate mitigating measures into your proposal.

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Low cost, no regret measures</b>	<b>Higher cost measures needing research</b>
Older people adversely affected by high temperatures due to hotter, drier summers	Design building to ensure it can be kept cool in the summer and warm in the winter.	
Maintenance of garden areas will require more water in hotter, drier summers	Specific plant species that withstand summer drought and winter deluges	Investigate the cost and practicality of installing rainwater harvesting equipment.
Staff and other care professionals' travel affected by potential flooding, snow or other extreme weather.	Doctors' appointments by skype to avoid inclement weather	Provide some staff accommodation within the premises to allow staff to stay overnight if necessary.

Table 2 – Example mitigating measures for some of the climate impacts identified for a hypothetical project to build an extra care facility in a coastal area.

[Back to impact areas](#)

### Conservation and enhancement of wildlife

Our outstanding environment underpins our wellbeing and economic prosperity. It provides products such as fuel, water and timber; services such as pollination, flood control, water purification and climate regulation; and with recreational and cultural opportunities.

NYCC has a duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising its functions. This duty was introduced by the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act in 2006.

### **Will your proposal affect wildlife?**

Your proposal will affect wildlife if it is likely to cause the following types of changes:

- Gains or losses in the amount of area covered by habitat
- Gains or losses in the connections between habitats – e.g. hedgerows and lanes
- Gains or losses in the variety of species
- Gains or losses in the abundance of species
- Change land and/or water management
- Alter wildlife management
- Introduce or remove elements from habitats, such as pesticides, water supply or forestry activities
- Cause disturbance to ecosystems through infrastructure, tourism or recreation

These changes are important to consider even if they occur in environments which are already managed, such as farms, parks and greenspace within urban areas.

If your proposal has a specific location, you should check if it is in or near a site designated for its wildlife or geological value. You can check [here](#)

### **How to maximise the opportunity:**

Redesign your proposal to:

- Increase the area of habitat
- Provide additional connections between habitats
- Avoid disturbing species but provide additional shelter
- Avoid affecting a site designated for its wildlife or geological value

If you think that your proposal could have significant implications for wildlife, contact [climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk)

[Back to impact areas](#)

## **Safeguarding the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of North Yorkshire's landscape**

North Yorkshire's landscape underpins our economy, offering superb natural and cultural resources that sustain agriculture, attract inward investment and support a vibrant tourism industry. It improves our health and wellbeing by encouraging physical outdoor activity and is an antidote to stress.

### **What are ‘distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities’?**

Landscape characteristics are the distinct, recognisable and consistent patterns of features that make one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse. In many parts of North Yorkshire valued characteristics include tranquillity and the darkness of night skies.

Features are the elements that appear in the landscape, such as hills, dry stone walls, trees, woodlands, hedgerows, fields, buildings, valleys, archaeology etc.

Special qualities are characteristics that might be highly valued, individually rare, outstanding, extraordinary or dramatic.

### **Will your proposal affect North Yorkshire’s landscape?**

Your proposal will have the potential to affect landscape if it results in changes to the landscape’s distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities. These would include:

- New structures or features, such as buildings, signage, transport infrastructure, drainage systems, overhead cables, masts, kiosks or landscaping
- Removal or repair of an existing feature
- Changes in land use
- Changes to the management of land. This includes proposals not to carry out maintenance operations that have been done in the past.
- Changes in noise, lighting levels or odour

You should also check whether your proposal is in or near a World Heritage Site, National Park, or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty using this [link](#) . These areas are designated for their cultural heritage, natural beauty and wildlife.

If your proposal results in any of the above changes, particularly in a designated area, then it is likely that your proposal will affect landscape.

### **Will your proposal result in visual impacts for people?**

Could residents or walkers enjoying the scenery from viewpoints, public rights of way, picnic sites or parks be negatively affected by your proposal?

If so, what could you do to reduce these impacts to acceptable levels? Could you...

- Alter the location?
- Select materials or colours that blend into the landscape?
- Plant indigenous shrubs and trees to act as screening?

If you think your proposal could harm one or more of the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of the landscape, or cause adverse visual impacts, contact

[climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk)

[Back to impact areas](#)

This page is intentionally left blank



**North Yorkshire County Council**

**Transport, Economy and Environmental Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**12 July 2021**

**Implementation of Active Travel schemes in the County**

**Report of the Corporate Director – Business & Environmental Services**

**1.0 Purpose of Report:**

- 1.1. To update Members of the Transport, Economy and Environmental Overview and Scrutiny Committee of the delivery of active travel schemes across North Yorkshire.

**2.0 Background**

- 2.1 Walking and cycling are the cheapest, healthiest and least polluting forms of travel. Most journeys involve some element of walking, whether it is a walk from home to work, walking to the bus stop or even walking from the car park to the shops. Good walking and cycling links to public transport facilities can integrate different transport modes and further encourage sustainable travel and ultimately reduce car use.
- 2.2 For many people cycling is also a healthy and environmentally friendly mode of travel. Compared to walking, the extra speed of cycling makes longer trips feasible and can offer a suitable means of travel for those who cannot or choose not to drive (e.g. children and those on low incomes). Providing for and encouraging more walking and cycling as an alternative to driving can also make a significant contribution to boosting social inclusion and to reducing congestion and its environmental and economic impacts.
- 2.3 The County Council is therefore committed to continuing to provide for and promote walking and cycling as a mode of travel for 'utility' trips to access local services.

**3.0 Active Travel Fund**

- 3.1 In February 2020 the Department for Transport (DfT) announced that it would be committing £5bn to walking, cycling and public transport over a period of 5 years. The funding was split into two pots, £2bn for walking and cycling and £3bn for public transport.
- 3.2 Following the Covid-19 lockdown in March 2020, the DfT made some of this funding available through the Emergency Active Travel Fund (EATF) to provide temporary infrastructure to aid social distancing. As a result, schemes were rolled out across the country.
- 3.3 In Tranche 1 the total indicative allocation from the DfT to North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) was £266,000 but only 50% funding was awarded following their assessment of our Tranche 1 bid. The County Council added match funding of £133,000 to complete all of the schemes set out in the Tranche 1 bid given the importance of the proposed measures to the Covid-19 recovery strategy.

- 3.4 Further to this the DfT announced a second round of funding known as the Active Travel Fund (ATF). The fund was renamed with the removal of the word ‘emergency’ due to the longer timescales involved in approving the fund and for the subsequent delivery. Active Travel funding is available to spend in 2021/22, and is intended to enhance streets, while providing space to enable non-motorised users to observe social distancing.
- 3.5 Tranche 2 funding is to be used to support both temporary, low-cost schemes, and permanent schemes with a short lead-time, so long as they meet the criteria outlined below.
- Can it be delivered in 20/21? (this subsequently changed to 21/22 because of a delay in announcing the funding allocations)
  - Does it replace a well-used bus route?
  - Does it provide a segregated cycle /pedestrian route or close roads to traffic?
  - Does it cater for BOTH cycling AND walking?
  - Can it be delivered for less than our indicative allocation of £1.065m?
- 3.6 This was a challenging set of criteria and a significant number of potential schemes had to be ruled out because of deliverability or cost. The schemes put forward to be funded were those that best fit the EATF criteria.
- 3.7 NYCC made an ambitious bid for £1.465m of funding for five schemes, requesting more than our £1.065m indicative allocation, after assessing 300 schemes across the county, including some received from the public, interest groups and county councillors. The final amount awarded to NYCC was £1,011,750, which is £53k less than our indicative allocation or 95%. The letter from the DfT set out that the amount awarded is split 80/20 between capital and revenue; £809,400 capital, £202,350 revenue.
- 3.8 The schemes in the Tranche 2 bid were:
- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| • Oatlands Drive, Harrogate                     | £215k |
| • A59 (Maple Close, Harrogate to Knaresborough) | £250k |
| • Victoria Avenue, Harrogate                    | £250k |
| • Guisborough Road. Whitby                      | £250k |
| • Market Place, Helmsley to Kirkdale Lane       | £500k |
- 3.9 Following a report to BES Executive Members on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2020 the route from Helmsley to Kirkdale Lane was removed as it was an additional scheme, which was over and above the allocation. This left four remaining schemes to be taken forward to consultation.
- 3.10 Two phases of consultation were carried out in February and March 2021 and following some public opposition to the proposed Oatlands Drive scheme it was removed from the programme for delivery in 2021/22 and instead more detailed feasibility work will be carried out into the options available for this area. The remaining three schemes will be delivered by March 2022.
- 3.11 A further round of the Active Travel Fund was announced in mid-June 2021 with bid submissions due in early August 2021. The details of the bid are currently being developed and will be the subject of a report to BES Executive Members later this month. Once submitted to the DfT we expect to receive confirmation of the amount of funding allocated in the autumn.

3.12 DfT has not set an indicative allocation for this latest round of the Active Travel Fund but has indicated that authorities should bid for a similar amount as they received in previous rounds.

#### **4.0 Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans**

4.1 In 2017 the government released its first Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, the strategy outlines the government's ambition to make cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys. Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) were identified in the strategy as a new strategic approach to identifying cycling and walking improvements at a local level. The LCWIP is designed to facilitate a long term approach to developing networks, but also designed so that the document can be updated and revisited throughout the 10 year period of their lifespan.

4.2 The key outputs of an LCWIP are:

- A cycle and walking network plan identifying preferred routes
- A prioritised programme of infrastructure improvements of future investment
- A report setting out the narrative behind the prioritisation of routes

4.3 NYCC intends to develop and adopt an LCWIP for each of the principal towns in the county. The aim of these is to identify the main cycle and walking improvements in a town to enable the county council to bid for government funding and/or to secure funding contributions from developers.

4.4 At the present time the following LCWIPs have been developed or are in the process of being developed:

- Harrogate and Knaresborough
- Scarborough
- Skipton
- Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet (in partnership with Selby district council)
- Malton and Norton (in progress)
- Northallerton
- Catterick and Catterick Garrison (to be commissioned in 21/22)
- Ripon (funded through developer S106 contributions)

4.5 There is no direct funding available to deliver the LCWIP priorities but it is becoming increasingly clear that the DfT expect Local Authorities to be developing them and that future funding pots will be available for schemes that have been identified through this process. Additionally, having the LCWIP in place with network plans for each area allows NYCC to be in a much better position to request S106 funding from developers towards new infrastructure.

#### **5.0 Conclusion**

5.1 Walking and cycling are increasingly becoming the focus of DfT funding pots and with a number of LCWIPs in place or in development NYCC will be in a good position to access this funding. With a strong national focus on decarbonisation and the move away from traditional petrol / diesel vehicles, walking and cycling will also play a part in removing short trips from the highway network.

## 6.0 Finance

6.1 There are no finance issues arising from this report.

## 7.0 Legal

7.1 There are no legal issues arising from this report.

## 8.0 Equalities

8.1 Consideration has been given to the potential for any equality impacts arising from the recommendations. It is the view of officers that at this stage the recommendations do not have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010. A copy of the Equality Impact Assessment screening form is attached as Appendix A.

## 9.0 Climate Change

9.1 There are no climate change issues arising from this report. A copy of the Climate Change Impact Assessment screening form is attached as Appendix B.

## 10.0 Recommendations

10.1. That Members of the Transport, Economy and Environmental Overview and Scrutiny Committee note the delivery of active travel schemes across North Yorkshire.

BARRIE MASON  
Assistant Director - Highways and Transportation

Author of Report: Louise Neale

Background Documents: None

For further information contact the author of the report

### Appendices:

- A Equality Impact Assessment
- B Climate Change Impact Assessment

### Key Implications

#### Local Member

All

Human Resources - None

Initial equality impact assessment screening form			
This form records an equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether or not a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.			
Directorate	BES		
Service area	H&T		
Proposal being screened	Active Travel Fund Tranche 2		
Officer(s) carrying out screening	Louise Neale		
What are you proposing to do?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deliver Active Travel interventions across the county</li> </ul>		
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To enable more people to choose to walk and cycle for short trips</li> </ul>		
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.	The Initiatives within the report are already funded		
<b>Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYCC's additional agreed characteristics</b> As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics?</li> <li>Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important?</li> <li>Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to?</li> </ul> <p>If for any characteristic it is considered that there is likely to be an adverse impact or you have ticked 'Don't know/no info available', then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your <a href="#">Equality rep</a> for advice if you are in any doubt.</p>			
Protected characteristic	Potential for adverse impact		Don't know/No info available
	Yes	No	
Age		X	
Disability		X	
Sex		X	
Race		X	
Sexual orientation		X	
Gender reassignment		X	
Religion or belief		X	
Pregnancy or maternity		X	
Marriage or civil partnership		X	
<b>NYCC additional characteristics</b>			
People in rural areas		X	
People on a low income		X	
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		X	
Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known	No.		

<b>inequalities/probable impacts</b> (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.					
<b>Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate?</b> (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). <b>Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics?</b> Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.	No				
<b>Decision (Please tick one option)</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>EIA not relevant or proportionate:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td>Continue to full EIA:</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	EIA not relevant or proportionate:	✓	Continue to full EIA:	
EIA not relevant or proportionate:	✓	Continue to full EIA:			
<b>Reason for decision</b>	In all cases, the schemes being developed should enhance, not inhibit, people's ability to access travel options and opportunities. This includes people with reduced mobility.				
<b>Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)</b>	Barrie Mason				
<b>Date</b>	30/06/21				

## Climate change impact assessment

The purpose of this assessment is to help us understand the likely impacts of our decisions on the environment of North Yorkshire and on our aspiration to achieve net carbon neutrality by 2030, or as close to that date as possible. The intention is to mitigate negative effects and identify projects which will have positive effects.

This document should be completed in consultation with the supporting guidance. The final document will be published as part of the decision making process and should be written in Plain English.

If you have any additional queries which are not covered by the guidance please email [climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk)

**Please note: You may not need to undertake this assessment if your proposal will be subject to any of the following:**

Planning Permission  
 Environmental Impact Assessment  
 Strategic Environmental Assessment

However, you will still need to summarise your findings in in the summary section of the form below.

Please contact [climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk) for advice.

<b>Title of proposal</b>	<b>Active Travel</b>
<b>Brief description of proposal</b>	<b>Deliver Active Travel interventions across the county</b>
<b>Directorate</b>	<b>BES</b>
<b>Service area</b>	<b>Highways and Transportation</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Louise Neale</b>
<b>Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the impact assessment</b>	
<b>Date impact assessment started</b>	<b>28/06/2021</b>

**Options appraisal**

Were any other options considered in trying to achieve the aim of this project? If so, please give brief details and explain why alternative options were not progressed.

Active Travel is a focus of the Department for Transport. When delivering schemes consultation is carried out with residents and stakeholders to ensure that they are the correct schemes

**What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?**

Please explain briefly why this will be the result, detailing estimated savings or costs where this is possible.

It is intended that all schemes will be delivered within the funding that has been offered by the DfT and so will be cost neutral.

Page 40



<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p><b>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</b></p>	<p><b>Positive impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p><b>No impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p><b>Negative impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes over and above business as usual</li> <li>• Evidence or measurement of effect</li> <li>• Figures for CO<sub>2</sub>e</li> <li>• Links to relevant documents</li> </ul>	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>	
<p>Minimise <b>greenhouse gas emissions</b> e.g. reducing emissions from travel, increasing energy efficiencies etc.</p>	Emissions from travel		*				
<p>reducing emissions from travel, increasing energy efficiencies etc.</p>	Emissions from construction		*		Phase 2 is the further appraisal of a short list of schemes for a walking and cycling network, and does not involve physical construction at this point.		
	Emissions from running of buildings		*				
	Other		*				
<p>Minimise <b>waste</b>: Reduce, reuse, recycle and compost e.g. reducing use of single use plastic</p>			*				
<p>Reduce <b>water</b> consumption</p>			*				

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p><b>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</b></p>	<p><b>Positive impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p><b>No impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p><b>Negative impact</b> (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes over and above business as usual</li> <li>• Evidence or measurement of effect</li> <li>• Figures for CO<sub>2</sub>e</li> <li>• Links to relevant documents</li> </ul>	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>
<p>Minimise <b>pollution</b> (including air, land, water, light and noise)</p>		*				
<p>Ensure <b>resilience</b> to the effects of climate change e.g. reducing flood risk, mitigating effects of drier, hotter summers</p>		*				
<p>Enhance <b>conservation</b> and wildlife</p>		*				
<p>Safeguard the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of <b>North Yorkshire's landscape</b></p>		*				
<p>Other (please state below)</p>		*				

**Are there any recognised good practice environmental standards in relation to this proposal?** If so, please detail how this proposal meets those standards.

N/A

**Summary** Summarise the findings of your impact assessment, including impacts, the recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

Accepting the recommendation to carry out further appraisal of a small number of schemes will have no climate change impact. Prior to construction of any route, a report will be written and an associated climate change impact assessment completed.

Page 43

**Sign off section**

This climate change impact assessment was completed by:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Louise Neale</b>
<b>Job title</b>	<b>Team Leader Transport Planning</b>
<b>Service area</b>	<b>Highways and Transportation</b>
<b>Directorate</b>	<b>BES</b>
<b>Signature</b>	<b>L Neale</b>
<b>Completion date</b>	<b>28/06/2021</b>

**Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature):** Barrie Mason

**Date:** 30/06/21

This page is intentionally left blank

## Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

12 July 2021

### Report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services

#### Review of 20mph Speed Limit Policy

##### 1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide the Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee (TEE O&S) with an update on the preparation of a revised 20mph Speed Limit policy.

##### 2.0 Key Background Information

- 2.1 In November 2020, the Executive approved the TEE O&S Committee's report setting out the findings of its review of the County Council's 20mph speed limit policy and its recommendations.
- 2.2 During the course of 2021, the Traffic Engineering Team has been tasked with preparing a new policy taking into account the findings and recommendations.

##### 3.0 Update on Recommendations

###### 3.1 Recommendation 1

*The policy should be more explicit in considering 20mph speed limits around schools and consideration given to extending the distance traditionally considered around schools in order to encourage greater use of active modes of transport.*

###### Update

Full consideration is being given as to how this can be incorporated within the new policy. However, it remains the case that all sites must be assessed on appropriateness and the TEE O&S Committee review did indeed conclude that it was not appropriate to have a standard application e.g. outside every school or community amenity or that the extent of the limit or zone will be greater. The use and performance of that part of the highway network in terms of safety must support the need for a 20mph speed limit or zone.

- 3.1.1 Department for Transport (DfT) circular 01 13 is clear in its guidance as to the benefits that can be achieved from implementing 20 mph speed limits and zones around schools etc. The purpose of the policy is not to rewrite that, but acknowledge 20mph speed limits and zones will be considered in accordance with that document and in support of wider county council policies for healthy and sustainable travel modes.
- 3.1.2 Nevertheless, the policy will acknowledge how greater application can be applied in conjunction with the wider policy remit around modal shift to

sustainable travel options and healthier lifestyles and will also be more explicit in discussing the considerations around schools.

3.3 Recommendation 2

*With reference to KSI figures, work is undertaken by the County Council's highways department to ascertain the percentage of 30mph speed limits against the percentage of 50mph or 60mph speed limits in the county.*

Update

It has been arranged for the Road Casualties - North Yorkshire annual report to now include a section on the number of collisions by speed limit, showing the respective percentages.

3.4 Recommendation 3

*The County Council's highways department draws up a list of high risk collision areas using three years' worth of data to examine whether an area would benefit from a 20mph speed limit, taking into account the function of the road and the road environment.*

Update

The County Council's Traffic Engineering Team maintains a list of high-risk sites and routes in both urban and rural settings. This forms the basis for the annual Accident Investigation and Prevention programme of capital works – i.e. road safety engineering schemes to reduce the number and severity of collisions on the local road network.

This work will continue, and should any subsequent investigations reveal that there are locations with a history of speed related collisions that would benefit from a reduced limit, including 20mph speed limits, then such measures would be taken forward.

3.5 Recommendation 4

*An examination be undertaken of the consistency of how the 20mph Speed Limit Policy is applied by each Area Highways Offices.*

Update

Consideration has been given as to how the existing 20mph Speed Limit Policy (2006) has been applied by Area Teams. Substantially the policy provides a sufficiently clear steer as to the circumstances which support the implementation of speed limits and zones. It allows for the use of DfT Circular 01/13 to provide the primary guidance for engineers to determine site suitability. There is no evidence to suggest there has been inconsistent application as it sets out only advice contained in previous DfT documents. On that basis, there is no reason for any different approach to be taken by area teams or a more robust methodology built into the new policy.

3.6 Recommendation 5

*A list of schools be drawn up that have a 20mph speed limit in the county.*

Update

A list of schools has been drawn up and will be referenced within the policy to provide a context of number and distribution. As part of the policy, this will be kept up to date for future review and monitoring purposes.

### 3.7 Recommendation 6

*Communications should be improved in relation to North Yorkshire County Council's Policy for 20mph Speed Limits by:*

- *The document appearing as a stand-alone document on North Yorkshire County Council's Speed limits, speeding and road safety concerns webpage so that it is easier to search for and be known to members of the public;*
- *Reference to the policy inserted in the 'Safer Roads, Healthier Places, York and North Yorkshire Road Safety Strategy' and vice versa;*
- *All references to DfT Circular 01/2006 be removed and replaced with references to DfT Circular 01/2013;*
- *Making it clear that the policy does not relate to 20mph zones.*

#### Update

The new policy will be added to the county council website as a stand-alone document that is easily accessible.

The policy, once approved, will be referenced in the York and North Yorkshire Road Safety Strategy which is currently being reviewed by the York and North Yorkshire Road Safety Partnership.

The new draft policy has replaced or updated all references to DfT and other supporting documents.

With regard to the final point of the recommendation, i.e. the policy to apply to speed limits only, not zones; officers have looked at this aspect in considerable detail and are of the view that the revised policy should still apply to both speed limits and zones, as this would provide a single comprehensive document covering all situations. There is also no difference in the assessment process.

### 3.8 Recommendation 7

*The 95 Alive Partnership actively promotes North Yorkshire Police's 'Operation Spartan' initiative, in order to raise awareness that dash cam footage can be used to capture dangerous driving and potentially lead to a conviction.*

#### Update

The partnership continues to promote Operation Spartan as business as usual via its website, social media and in face to face events and training.

### 3.9 Recommendation 8

*When considering planning applications for new housing or commercial development, North Yorkshire County Council, in its capacity as the lead Highways Authority and as statutory consultee to the planning process, needs to continue to ensure it makes recommendations to local planning authorities based on written national policy indicating the appropriate best practice and guidelines for the implementation of measures. This is in order to design out speed as part of the condition of approval and to put in place infrastructure to create safe walking and cycling routes.*

Update

As informed during the task group review, this is established standard practice and will continue to be the case. The County Council's Development Management Team apply the principles of Manual for Streets 2 in their assessment of applications and continue to consider ways of ensuring that appropriate designs are delivered through the planning process.

3.10 Recommendation 9

*More broadly, in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, for North Yorkshire County Council in partnership with a range of stakeholder interests to consider how our highways network can be used in the future to create a greener economy, taking into account the full range of road users and its use for leisure and work purposes*

Update

The new policy will acknowledge its links to benefits which can be brought about through other policy and strategy commitments and provide a mechanism to allow the county council to support and deliver the implementation of new 20mph speed limits.

**4.0 Next Steps**

- 4.1 Work is continuing to gather and rationalise a range of information regarding existing 20mph speed limits and zones in the county and speed limits in general. In addition to this, the new policy document is nearing completion and will be the subject of a future report to the TEE O&S Committee for comments.

**5.0 Recommendation(s)**

- i. The Committee acknowledges the progress to date.

David Kirkpatrick – Traffic Engineering Team Leader

Name and job title of person presenting the report – David Kirkpatrick  
Date 12 July 2021

Background papers relied upon in the preparation of this report:-

For further information contact the author of the report

**Appendices:** None





## North Yorkshire County Council

### Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

12 July 2021

#### Work Programme

#### 1 Purpose of Report

1.1 This report asks the Committee to:

- a. Note the information in this report.
- b. Confirm, amend or add to the areas of work shown in the work programme schedule (**Appendix 1**).

#### 2 Background

2.1 The scope of this Committee is defined as:

- *Transport and communications infrastructure of all kinds, however owned or provided, and how the transport needs of the community are met.*
- *Supporting business, helping people develop their skills, including lifelong learning.*
- *Sustainable development, climate change strategy, countryside management, waste management, environmental conservation and enhancement flooding and cultural issues.*

#### 3 Updates

##### • Mid Cycle Briefing – 1 June 2021

3.1 Members were appraised about the planned launch in July 2021 of the Demand Responsive Bus Service (DRS) in the Ripon area. Members sought clarification that the service would not be in direct competition with commercial services and were informed that where a direct journey could be made on a commercial bus service, people would not be allowed to use the DRS. Various suggestions were made by Members about how the DRS could be publicised. Council staff will undertake a communications review four weeks after the launch of the services.

3.2 Members were also appraised about the government's national bus strategy ('Bus back better'). The franchising and enhanced partnership options were discussed. It was noted that an enhanced partnership option, as well as the franchising option, would help to reduce the number of instances of commercial bus services competing against each other in an inefficient way of running buses

on the same route as each other at the same time. The common goal with operators would be to increase patronage across services. It was noted that the challenge would be to change people's mindsets about buses not being fashionable to use.

#### **4 Recommendations**

##### **4.1 That the Committee:**

- a. Notes the information in this report.
- b. Confirms, amends or adds to the areas of work shown in the work programme schedule (**Appendix 1**).

Jonathan Spencer,  
Principal Scrutiny Officer

Tel: (01609) 780780

Email: [jonathan.spencer@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:jonathan.spencer@northyorks.gov.uk)

28 June 2021

#### **Appendices:**

- Appendix 1 – Work Programme Schedule 2021/22

#### **Background documents:**

North Yorkshire County Council Forward Plan

<https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/council-forward-plan>

## Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Work Programme Schedule 2021/22

### Scope

‘Transport and communications infrastructure of all kinds, however owned or provided, and how the transport needs of the community are met.

Supporting business, helping people develop their skills, including lifelong learning.

Sustainable development, climate change strategy, countryside management, waste management, environmental conservation and enhancement flooding and cultural issues.’

### Meeting dates

Scheduled Committee Meetings	12 July 2021 10am	21 Oct 2021 10am	20 Jan 2022 10am	13 April 2022 10am
Scheduled Mid Cycle Briefings Attended by Group Spokespersons only	9 Sept 2021 10am	9 Dec 2021 10am	24 Feb 2022 10am	

### Reports

Meeting	Subject	Aims/Terms of Reference
<b>Consultation, progress and performance monitoring reports</b>		
Each meeting as available	Corporate Director and / or Executive Member update	Regular update report as available each meeting.
	Work Programme	Regular report where the Committee reviews its work programme.

## Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Work Programme Schedule 2021/22

Meeting	Subject	Aims/Terms of Reference
<b>12 July 2021</b>	Climate Change Assessments	To receive a report on the climate change assessment requirements for inclusion in reports and progress to date.
	Active Travel Schemes	To discuss the implementation of Active Travel schemes in the county including the impacts on managing traffic congestion and promoting healthier lifestyles.
	Review of North Yorkshire County Council's 20mph Speed Limit Policy	To receive an update on the progress of implementing the Committee's recommendations arising from its review of North Yorkshire County Council's 20mph speed limit policy.
<b>21 October 2021</b>	North Yorkshire Rural Commission	To discuss the findings and recommendations of the North Yorkshire Rural Commission in relation to transport, the economy and the environment and the role of the overview and scrutiny committee in monitoring progress.
	Allerton Waste Recovery Park	To receive an update on the performance of Allerton Waste Recovery Park.
	Rail update	Update report on rail developments in the region.

Page 52

## Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Work Programme Schedule 2021/22

	Road casualties	<p>To advise Members of the 2020 road casualty figures in North Yorkshire and initiatives undertaken by the 95Alive Partnership.</p> <p>To discuss the changing methodology and risk assessment relating to the scheme identification process and how that might affect future investment in road safety improvements.</p> <p>To receive an update on the rollout of the purchase of Temporary Vehicle-Activated Speed Signs by local communities in North Yorkshire.</p>
<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Aims/Terms of Reference</b>
<b>20 January 2022</b>	York and North Yorkshire LEP	Annual update on the work of the York and North Yorkshire Local Enterprise Partnership and the impacts of Brexit on the local economy now that UK has left the EU.
	North Yorkshire County Council's Plan for Economic Growth	To receive an annual update on progress.
	Highways England	Regular annual update on maintenance and improvement activity on Highways England's roads in North Yorkshire (A1 (M), M62, A66, A64 and A19).
<b>13 April 2022</b>	Local Flood Risk Management Strategy	Update on the implementation of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy including flood risk/coastal erosion alleviation measures put in place/scheduled to be put in place; funding; issues.
	Civil Parking Enforcement	To provide an update on countywide Civil Parking Enforcement in the county.
<b>Items where dates have yet to be</b>	NY Highways	To receive an annual report on the progress and performance of NY Highways. - July or October 2022

Page 53

## Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Work Programme Schedule 2021/22

<b>confirmed</b>	Carbon reduction plan	To receive an update on the progress of North Yorkshire County Council's Carbon Reduction Plan.	
	Single-use plastics	To receive an update on North Yorkshire County Council's progress of implementing the Committee's recommendations in respect of its review of single-use plastics.	
	Tourism in North Yorkshire	Overview of the work and plans of Welcome to Yorkshire.	
	Countryside access	Overview of the County Council's countryside service and priorities (including unclassified roads, prioritisation of the public rights of way network and improving the definitive map processes).	