



## Agenda

**Meeting held in public: Environment Directorate - Corporate Director and Executive Member - Highways and Transportation**

**To: Councillor Keane Duncan.**

**Date: Friday, 28 March 2025**

**Time: 9.30 am**

**Venue: Via Microsoft Teams**

### Business

#### Items for Executive Member decision

1. Parking Tariff Increase for April 2025 *(Pages 3 - 14)*

#### Items for Corporate Director decision

2. Active Travel Fund 5 - Submission of Schemes *(Pages 15 - 32)*

#### Future Decisions for Chief Finance Officer - For Consultation

3. Permission to apply for Yorkshire Regional Flood and Coastal Committee Local Levy for Flat Cliffs Coastal Adaptation Plan and wider Filey Bay Coastal Change Management Area *(Pages 33 - 40)*

Barry Khan  
Assistant Chief Executive  
(Legal and Democratic Services)

County Hall  
Northallerton

20 March 2025

This page is intentionally left blank

## North Yorkshire Council

### Environment Executive Members

28 March 2025

### Parking Tariff Increase for April 2025

#### Report of the Assistant Director - Highways and Infrastructure

#### 1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek authority from the Executive Member for Highways and Transportation and in consultation with the Corporate Director Environment to increase the current Parking tariffs both On and Off-Street, plus the parking permits by 10% across all tariff lines.

#### 2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 In the years prior to LGR, it was largely the former borough and districts who controlled tariff increases in Off-Street car parks and the County Council with the On-Street tariffs and permit prices. Except for one former district, charges had not increased for 10 years which was unsustainable. Last year, the council raised the tariff lines and permits by 20%, this was directly related to the fact that tariffs had not been increased in some cases for 10 years and the 20% increase reflected this in line with the previous three years CPI increases.

#### 3.0 DETAILED PRESENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIVE ISSUE

- 3.1 Having undergone a service restructure Parking Services has started a number of major projects in order to substantially improve the following parking provision:
- Machine Replacement Programme – A substantial commitment to install new parking machinery (430) in all the councils car parks and On-Street parking places. The aim of which is to substantially improve the customer journey and will cost in the region of £2,016,000. A business case is currently being prepared which will be considered through the usual North Yorkshire Council governance process. It is estimated that this investment will realise ongoing savings of £587k per annum from 26/27. The request for this funding has been through the Highways and Infrastructure and Corporate Capital Boards and is currently planned to be reported to the Executive on 15 April 2025 for a decision.
  - To renew lighting in car parks where there are still old sodium lights and rusting and ageing lamp columns to make the car parks safer whilst protecting the nearby residents privacy. The cost of this is approximately £400,000. The request for this funding has been through the Highways and Infrastructure and Corporate Capital Boards and is also planned to be reported to the Executive on 15 April 2025 for a decision.
  - To replace all the car park signage from the former borough and district council signage to new North Yorkshire branded signage. This is to comply with statute requirements, alter the look and feel of the car parks and ensure that the signs are inclusive for everybody. The cost of replacing 345 signs with fittings where necessary is £400,000. This has not yet been approved but an application has been made to apply for funding from the LGR reserve.
  - Raising the tariffs by 10% will help contribute to the 25/26 budget savings target.

#### 4.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

4.1 During the process of assessing the options the following percentage figures were considered.

	24/25 Budget	2.6%	6%	10%	15.00%
Off Street	£15,127,200.00	£393,307.20	£907,632.00	£1,512,720.00	£2,269,080.00
On Street	£4,372,900.00	£113,695.40	£262,374.00	£437,290.00	£655,935.00
Total	£19,500,100.00	£507,002.60	£1,170,006.00	£1,950,010.00	£2,925,015.00

#### 5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The 25/26 budget includes savings generated through the parking service totalling £2.8m and if the tariff is increased by 10% per tariff line from April 2025 this is forecast to generate additional income of £1.950m based on the financial work carried out. Further proposals will be the subject of a future report later this year.

	24/25 Budget	10.0% increase	Forecast Income 25/26
Off Street	£15,127,200.00	£1,512,720.00	£16,639,920.00
On Street	£4,372,900.00	£437,290.00	£4,810,190.00
Total	£19,500,100.00	£1,950,010.00	£21,450,110.00

5.2 The forecast at Q3 indicated an expected pressure from underachievement of income from parking charges and permits, final outturn will give a clearer view of the extent of this, however, should the pressure continue into 25/26 any % increase applied will be affected by this as a result with the expected value of up to £80k decrease.

5.3 The financial implications of the recent Whitby Harbour legal judgment have not yet been accounted for in the figures above. Following the judgment, the allocation of harbour income, including car parking income, will be subject to review. The outcome of that review may impact the final value of the saving achieved.

#### 6.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Section 122 of Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) which imposes a statutory duty on Local Authorities to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic, including pedestrians and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.

6.2 Section 35C of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) provides that a Local Authority may vary the charges to be paid in connection with the use of its Off-Street parking places by notice.

6.3 Authorities are required under section 55 of the RTRA 1984 to keep an account of income and expenditure relating to their on-street parking places; as well as income from and expenditure relating to their functions as enforcement authorities. This includes all of their income and expenditure related to the issue of and income from PCNs in respect of off-street parking places, but not income from ordinary car park charges nor any other expenditure in car parks. Section 55 is modified by regulation 25 of The Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) General Regulations 2007. Section 55(4) outlines the purposes for which any surplus in the parking account can be used. It also provides for the making up of any deficit in the parking account from the general fund, and for surpluses to be used to repay the general fund for any charges to that fund in the previous four years or may be carried forward.

## **7.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 There are no equalities issues resulting from this report. See Appendix A

## **8.0 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 Any decision that affects driving behaviour will have an impact on the climate. This tariff increase is aimed at development of the car park infrastructure and supporting policies and Local transport plans to come in encouraging less car use in town centres and more use of other means of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport and this increase supports that. See Appendix B

## **9.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 Parking policy is still in production along with a Local Transport Plan (LTP) but these changes, whilst assisting with car park development, will help a shift in driving behaviour towards more sustainable travel.

## **10.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

10.1 In the coming financial year, subject to approval, North Yorkshire Council is undertaking the largest investment into parking infrastructure ever seen in the region with the possibility of new parking machines, improved lighting and better policies all aimed at improving the customer experience. This increase recognises this significant investment and will help maintain high standards in car parking for the next 5 years.

## **11.0 RECOMMENDATION**

11.1 To gain authority from the Executive Member for Highways and Transportation, in consultation with the Corporate Director Environment to increase the current Parking tariffs, both On and Off-Street, plus the parking permits by 10% across all tariff lines.

### **APPENDICES:**

Appendix A – Equalities Impact Assessment

Appendix B – Climate Change Impact Assessment

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:** None

Barrie Mason  
Assistant Director - Highways and Infrastructure  
County Hall  
Northallerton  
26 February 2025

Report Author – Steve Brown Head of Parking Services  
Presenter of Report – Steve Brown Head of Parking Services

<b>Initial equality impact assessment screening form</b>			
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.			
<b>Directorate</b>	Environment		
<b>Service area</b>	Parking Services		
<b>Proposal being screened</b>	Tariff Increase 2025		
<b>Officer(s) carrying out screening</b>	Steve Brown Head of Parking Services		
<b>What are you proposing to do?</b>	Raise Parking Tariffs and Permits by 10% in April		
<b>Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?</b>	Parking has a number of initiatives that are currently being considered. This 10% increase is designed to complement the investment into Parking infrastructure that is planned this year in conjunction with a tariff re-balancing programme later in the year.		
<b>Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.</b>	No		
<b>Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYC'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>			
<b>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 directorate representative for advice if you are in any doubt.</b>			
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	
People in rural areas		X	
People on a low income		X	
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		X	
Are from the Armed Forces Community		X	

<p><b>Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts</b> (for example, disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.</p>	<p>No</p>			
<p><b>Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate?</b> (for example, partners, funding criteria, etc.). <b>Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics?</b> Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.</p>	<p>No</p>			
<p><b>Decision (Please tick one option)</b></p>	<p>EIA not relevant or proportionate:</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>Continue to full EIA:</p>	
<p><b>Reason for decision</b></p>	<p>To increase the Parking and permit tariffs.</p>			
<p><b>Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)</b></p>	<p>Barrie Mason</p>			
<p><b>Date</b></p>	<p>10/03/2025</p>			

## 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)

### Version 2: amended 11 August 2021

**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>Parking Tariff and permit Increase 2025</b>
<b>Brief description of proposal</b>	<b>To increase the parking and permit tariffs by 10% in April 2025</b>
<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Environment</b>
<b>Service area</b>	<b>Parking Services</b>
<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Steve Brown</b>
<b>Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the impact assessment</b>	<b>Head of Parking Services</b>
<b>Date impact assessment started</b>	<b>03/03/2025</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.

One year ago, the prices were increased by 20%, this was because parking tariffs had not been increased in some case for 10 years and this percentage increase was considered fair to adjust the pricing allowing for CPI increases that haven't been applied. A figure of 10% in April this year is proposed in the interim and designed to support significant investment into the car parks in 2025 and 2026.

**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.

Increasing the parking charges by 10% will have a positive effect on the budget and if there are the same amount of transaction after the increase then the income to the parking budget is forecasted to be £1,950,000.

How will this proposal impact on the environment?  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.		Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where	No impact (Place a X in the box below where	Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where	Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?  Where possible/relevant please include: <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>	Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.	Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.
Minimise <b>greenhouse gas emissions</b> e.g. reducing emissions from travel, increasing energy efficiencies etc.	Emissions from travel	X			It is unlikely that driving behaviour will not change significantly because of this change.	N/A	Tariff re-balancing will occur in Sept 25 and it has more traffic management objectives
	Emissions from construction		X				
	Emissions from running of buildings		X				
	Emissions from data storage		X				
	Other		X				
Minimise <b>waste</b> : Reduce, reuse, recycle and compost e.g. reducing use of single use plastic			X				
Reduce <b>water</b> consumption			X				

<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><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>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>	X			<p>The aim of tariff setting is to support the LTP and the council plan. Tariffs are designed to encourage drivers to park long stay or use public transport. The adoption of parking principles will define this aim.</p>		
<p>Ensure <b>resilience</b> to the effects of climate change e.g. reducing flood risk, mitigating effects of drier, hotter summers</p>		X				
<p>Enhance <b>conservation</b> and wildlife</p>		X				
<p>Safeguard the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of <b>North Yorkshire's landscape</b></p>		X				

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</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</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>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.

It is good environmental practice to raise tariffs to support Local Transport Plans (LTP) and Council Policy in order to change driver behaviour and encourage more sustainable methods of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport use which this increase does.

**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.

This 10% increase in tariffs does have a positive impact on the budget and the climate objectives. The council are seeking to increase the tariffs to cover significant investment planned in the coming year and adopt a set of parking principles that are linked to the council plan. These principles provide a framework and encourages policies to be created that benefit all of our customers, be they residents, businesses or tourists and the idea that tariff charging will then be linked directly to policy and strategy with the aim to encourage more sustainable forms of transport by changing driver behaviour through price.

**Sign off section**

This climate change impact assessment was completed by:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Steve Brown</b>
<b>Job title</b>	<b>Head of Parking Services</b>
<b>Service area</b>	<b>Parking</b>
<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Environment</b>
<b>Signature</b>	
<b>Completion date</b>	<b>04/03/2025</b>

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

Date: **10/03/2025**

This page is intentionally left blank

## North Yorkshire Council

### Environment Executive Members

28 March 2025

### Active Travel Fund 5 – Submission of Schemes

#### Report of the Assistant Director – Highways and Infrastructure

#### 1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To request approval from the Corporate Director of Environment in consultation with the Executive Member for Highways and Transportation to submit five schemes to Active Travel England's assurance process as part of the Active Travel Fund tranche 5 submission process.

#### 2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Active Travel Fund 5 (ATF5) represents the fifth tranche of active travel funding for Local Authorities, following five rounds of funding over the past five years.
- 2.2 North Yorkshire Council (NYC) was awarded £133,000 from Emergency Active Travel Fund (EATF) and £1,011,750 from Active Travel Fund tranche 2 (ATF2). Bids to Active Travel Fund 3 (ATF3) and Active Travel Fund tranche 4 (ATF4) were both unsuccessful. NYC was ineligible for Active Travel Fund tranche 4 extension (ATF4e).

Table 1: Active Travel Funding summary from 2020-2024

Year	Tranche	Bid amount	Funding awarded
2020	Emergency Active Travel Fund	£266,000	£133,000
2021/22	ATF2	£1,465,000	£1,011,750
2021/22	ATF3	£1,550,000	£0
2023/24	ATF4	£2,735,270	£0
2023/24	ATF4e	N/A	N/A
<b>Total:</b>		<b>£6,016,270</b>	<b>£1,144,750</b>

- 2.3 Since ATF4, capital funding allocations have been based on Local Authority Active Travel Capability Ratings from ATE. The ratings are used to calculate funding allocations for local authorities, with higher rated authorities eligible to access more funding. Authorities are rated from 0 to 4, with four being the highest. NYC is currently a level one rated authority, alongside over half of the local transport authorities in England.

Table 2: 2024 breakdown of Capability Ratings from all 80 Local Transport Authorities in England

Level	Number of LTAs	Percentage
Level 0	0	0%
Level 1	42	52.5%
Level 2	32	40%
Level 3	6	7.5%
Level 4	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **3.0 ACTIVE TRAVEL FUND TRANCHE FIVE**

- 3.1 Following confirmation of funding for 2024/25 Budget, Active Travel England (ATE) has awarded a total of £54.2m to authorities under Active Travel Fund tranche 5 (ATF5). Funding was awarded on the basis that ATF5 schemes will be submitted for assurance by ATE.
- 3.2 Funding allocations were announced 12 February 2025 and calculated on population size and capability rating. NYC has been allocated £369,709 and schemes must be submitted for assurance by 31 March 2025.
- 3.3 The focus of ATF5 funding is:
- New construction schemes, particularly schemes that can be delivered quickly, such as less complex, high impact schemes e.g. road crossings and school streets. Schemes that test new approaches such as retrofitting routes to existing housing developments with poor provision are also encouraged;
  - Change control funding to unblock existing ATF schemes to secure timely delivery and improve scheme quality;
  - Essential maintenance funding to address safety or accessibility concerns on existing routes;
  - Early development of future active travel schemes to be funded in the next spending round period.
- 3.4 Authorities are free to decide on an appropriate mix of funding types in line with local need. Essential maintenance funding is limited to 20% of an authority's funding allocation (£73,942) and is not intended to be focused on regular, periodic maintenance activities, but instead targeted activities that address accessibility or safety concerns.
- 3.5 All schemes will be checked for eligibility against the agreed scheme types for ATF5 and will then be assured against a set of agreed criteria including:
- Compliance with key ATF5 funding principles and eligibility requirements.
  - Alignment with relevant guidance on design quality and safety as defined by the ATE design assurance tools.
  - Value for money
  - Deliverability of schemes within funding window.
- 3.6 Funding is expected to be committed by March 2026, and construction schemes completed by 31 March 2027.

### **4.0 SCHEME IDENTIFICATION, LONGLISTING AND PRIORITISATION**

- 4.1 Officers revisited the long list of schemes from tranche two, three and four of previous funding rounds and added additional schemes that had been requested over the last 12 months from members of the public, Councillors and other interest groups. Officers sifted schemes against the criteria for both construction and essential maintenance. These two themes were given priority as development funding is available through the Capability Fund and existing ATF schemes would not benefit from a change control of this funding amount.
- 4.2 During the sifting process a number of schemes were immediately ruled out due to cost within the funding envelope, deliverability within the funding window and other ATF5 assurance criteria.



- 4.3 Additionally officers reviewed the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs), the list of current development schemes and spoke with officers at each of the local area highways teams to come up with a long list of schemes for evaluation. Again, the schemes were reviewed against the criteria of the bid and schemes that could be constructed within the funding budget and timeframes were prioritised. Appendix A shows the longlist of schemes considered.
- 4.4 Given the modest amount of funding, the focus has been on identifying several low complexity schemes which can be delivered quickly. Given our capability rating (level 1) we are encouraged by ATE to look at low complexity schemes such as new crossings and school streets.

## 5.0 ATF5 SCHEMES FOR SUBMISSION TO ATE ASSURANCE

- 5.1 Following the input from stakeholders and analysis of potential schemes against the tranche five criteria the following capital schemes have been identified as appropriate to take forward:

### Allocated funding: £369,709

Scheme name	Description	Scheme type	ATF5 ask
A661 Wetherby Road/ Railway Road (Sainsburys junction)	<p>This junction in Harrogate is the largest signalised junction in the county without a pedestrian phase and has been a collision cluster site in the past. NYC intends to deliver a scheme to improve pedestrian safety at the junction of Wetherby Road and Railway Road in Harrogate. NYC plans to replace and upgrade the current traffic signals to incorporate controlled pedestrian crossing facilities which will increase pedestrian safety and encourage active travel.</p> <p>The upgrade of the signals will also include enhanced detection utilising the latest technology and adding MOVA control to the current operation which will improve the efficiency of the current junction for all road users. The new LED signals will replace the current halogen lamp signals which will also contribute to the Authorities carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>The proposed scheme is expected to cost in the region of £300k-£400k. Additional funding required over and above the ATF5 contribution will be funded from the North Yorkshire Traffic Signals Maintenance budget for the 2025/26 financial year.</p>	Construction	<b>£180,919</b>
Bilton Lane, Harrogate, Parallel crossing	The proposed scheme will introduce a parallel crossing (also known as a Tiger Crossing) across Bilton Lane. The new crossing will give priority to those walking, wheeling and cycling and provides a safe crossing point for those using the Nidderdale Greenway to access Starbeck/Harrogate and Ripley. The indicative cost is based on similar schemes.	Construction	<b>£110,700</b>
School Streets x 4	Following the success of the School Street pilot in Harrogate, NYC will introduce four school streets (Pedestrian and Cycle Zone) across the county. Using learning from the two school street pilots (Harrogate	Construction	<b>£22,140</b>

	and Scarborough) officers are currently working through a list to determine the locations and consult with the schools that fit the characteristics of a successful School Street. The indicative costs are based on previous school street schemes.		
School Streets monitoring	4 x intelligent sensors to capture baseline and impact of school street (Pedestrian and Cycle Zone) schemes via ped, cycle and motor vehicle counts. 4 will be installed to monitor the new school street schemes.	M&E	<b>£37,500</b>
East Ayton, Racecourse Road, new road crossing	The proposed scheme will introduce dropped kerbs, patrol signs and flashing amber lights in order to establish a school crossing patrol site. The crossing will serve the existing residents and will also benefit the new housing estate too. The scheme is subject to internal recruitment approval, following ATE assurance and approval of scheme.	Construction	<b>£18,450</b>
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>369,709</b>

- 5.2 The schemes listed above are all classed as low complexity within the ATF5 guidance. They are currently being developed to a bid ready stage and as such the costs are indicative but based on industry benchmarks and where possible similar schemes within the county. To add some confidence to the costs, benchmark costs have been uplifted to include preliminary fees (20%) and optimism bias (23%).
- 5.3 Optimism bias level is set at 23% which is the level suggested for schemes at an Outline Business Case stage and the default rate within the Active Mode Appraisal Tool. Whilst these schemes are not going through a formal business case route, this seems a sensible rate to include to ensure delivery is protected by any rising delivery costs. Given the low costs/complexity of schemes generally across the submission, we do not anticipate rising delivery costs to be a significant risk.
- 5.4 Value for money of schemes needs to be assessed for the submission. As each scheme is below £750,000 in value NYC is required to use cost effectiveness analysis. Cost effectiveness analysis is a variant of cost benefit analysis which compares the differences in Present Value Cost between options. Within the submission NYC will demonstrate that the proposed approach to delivering outputs is cheaper than a set of alternative options that we have considered. It is also important that NYC considers non-quantified differences between options in terms of risk, feasibility and timescales etc.
- 5.5 All schemes will meet the eligibility criteria in terms of compliance with key ATF5 funding principles, alignment with design quality and safety guidance, value for money and deliverability by March 2027.
- 5.6 Revenue expenditure such as the School Streets Monitoring can be used from the ATF5 allocation to support ATF5 scheme management, development and monitoring.
- 5.7 All schemes will go through an appropriate consultation exercise following the ATE design assurance process when schemes have been approved for delivery.
- 5.8 The wider longlist of schemes not taken forward in this bid will form a pipeline of future schemes that can be prioritised and taken forward for any other future funding opportunities.

## 6.0 CONTRIBUTION TO COUNCIL PRIORITIES

- 6.1 The 'North Yorkshire Council 'Council Plan 2024-2028' sets out the priorities for the next four years. One such priority is to 'promote and encourage active travel including walking, wheeling and cycling'. The schemes within this bid align with this priority and are expected to increase walking, wheeling and cycling.
- 6.2 The York and North Yorkshire Combined Authority's Strategic Transport Framework commits to ensuring that active travel is a core part of an integrated transport network. In the long term this means a comprehensive network of lit, well-maintained walking, wheeling and cycle routes across the Combined Authority. The schemes within this bid will improve walking, wheeling and cycling routes across North Yorkshire.

## 7.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 7.1 A sifting exercise was undertaken to assess potential schemes against the fund criteria as mentioned in 4.0. All schemes that are proposed to be taken forward for submission are of low complexity and can be delivered within the funding window. Alternative options such as essential maintenance and early development of schemes were discounted in order to focus on construction delivery. Improving delivery of active travel schemes is a key element of NYC's Capability Rating and is something that would go toward increasing our capability rating in the future which would have a positive impact on future active travel funding.

## 8.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The proposal is for NYC to submit five schemes to ATE's assurance process totalling £369,709 of capital funding, which is the full allocation given to NYC for ATF5. Costs include 20% preliminary fees and 23% optimism bias.

Scheme	Design & Construction	Prelims 20%	Optimism Bias 23%	Total cost	ATF5 ask	Match funding
A661 Wetherby Road/Railway Road (Sainsburys junction)	237,500	47,500	65,550	350,550	180,919	169,631
Bilton Lane, Harrogate, Parallel crossing	75,000	15,000	20,700	110,700	110,700	None
School streets x 4	18,000	/	4,140	22,140	22,140	None
School Streets monitoring	37,500	/	/	37,500	37,500	None
East Ayton new road crossing	12,500	2,500	3,450	18,450	18,450	None
					<b>369,709</b>	

- 8.2 Given the low complexity of the schemes it is envisaged that 23% optimism bias will cover the likelihood of increased delivery cost risk across the five schemes, whilst prelims of 20% is consistent with previous schemes being delivered through North Yorkshire Highways. Should there be a more cost-effective procurement option, NYC will take that forward.
- 8.3 Prelims costs have not been included for the '4 x School Streets' or 'School Monitoring/counts' as neither scheme involves construction of infrastructure. Optimism Bias has also been excluded on 'School Monitoring/counts' as this intervention cost is clear based on recent purchase of identical equipment.

- 8.4 The largest value scheme, the A661 Wetherby Road/Railway Road junction includes match funding of approximately £169,631 which will be funded from the North Yorkshire Traffic Capital Signals budget. . The estimated total cost of this scheme is expected to be in the region of £300k-£400k. The table above shows indicative scheme cost at approximately £350k to demonstrate the likely split of ATF5 funding and match funding.
- 8.5 The provision of infrastructure for a new school crossing patrol in East Ayton will require internal approval to recruit to the role of school crossing patrol once the scheme has been approved by ATE. The submission of this scheme to ATE deals with the infrastructure only and once approved by ATE, officers will seek approval to recruit. Should approval be gained the role of school crossing patrol will be funded from School Crossing Patrol North budget.
- 8.6 Funding is expected to be committed by March 2026, and construction schemes completed by 31 March 2027. A commitment could consist of a contract for design and construction, or a business case approving delivery of a scheme agreed by Council Executive Member approval.
- 8.7 Should costs overrun, NYC could look to utilise the Consolidated Active Travel Fund allocation of £1,256,601 to support the delivery of ATF5 schemes. This would be discussed with ATE in the first instance and could form part of a change control via ATE. Alternatively, NYC could look to descope schemes where possible.

## **9.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 There are no legal implications arising from the submission of these schemes to ATE. The Grant Acceptance for the Active Travel Fund tranche five allocation has already been approved and the submission of these schemes represents the next stage of the process whereby ATE will check the schemes meet the eligibility criteria through their assurance process.

## **10.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 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 B.

## **11.0 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1 There are no significant climate change issues arising from this report. A copy of the Climate Change Impact Assessment initial screening form is attached as Appendix C.

## **12.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 12.1 The submission of the schemes listed in this report is the next step required by ATE as part of the ATF5 approval process. The schemes meet the criteria, can be delivered within the funding window and within the budget available.

### **13.0 RECOMMENDATION**

13.1 It is recommended that the Corporate Director of Environment in consultation with the Executive Member for Highways and Transportation approves the submission of five schemes listed within this report to Active Travel England's assurance process as part of the Active Travel Fund tranche 5 submission process.

#### **APPENDICES:**

Appendix A – Schemes longlist

Appendix B – Equality Impact Assessment

Appendix C – Climate Change Impact Assessment initial screening form

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:** None

Barrie Mason  
Assistant Director – Highways and Infrastructure.  
County Hall  
Northallerton  
18 March 2025

Report Author – Alexander Kay, Senior Transport Planning Officer  
Presenter of Report – Louise Anne Neale, Transport Planning Team Leader

Area	Option	Deliverable within budget? (£369,709)	Deliverability of schemes within funding window	Alignment with relevant guidance on design quality and safety (initial officer assessment based on data available)	Value for Money as defined by ATF5 Value for Money guidance (AMAT/Cost effectiveness analysis). Medium VfM is expected for active travel programmes	Type	Complexity	Include in submission?
East Ayton	East Ayton new road crossing					Construction	Low	Yes
Harrogate	A661 Wetherby Road/Railway Road (Sainsburys junction)					Construction	Low	Yes
Harrogate	Bilton Lane Parallel crossing					Construction	Low	Yes
Various	School Streets					Construction	Low	Yes
Harrogate	Fulwith Mill Lane Bridleway					Maintenance	Medium	No, third party land concern
Harrogate	Parallel crossing of Knaresborough Road nr Willaston Road					Construction	Low	No, stray land/feasibility concerns
Harrogate	North Park Road/Park Place improved crossing point					Construction	Low	No, stray land needed, difficult design/delivery, further development needed
Various	Cycle Parking					Construction	Low	No, potential other funding route
Malton	Yorker's Gate Malton new road crossing					Construction	Low	No, not feasible
Harrogate	Victoria Avenue (cycle element)					Construction	High	No, insufficient budget
Richmond	Darlington Road					Construction	High	No, insufficient budget
Selby	Brayton to Selby					Construction	High	No, insufficient budget
Sutton in Craven	Continue footpath from Sutton in Craven to Eastburn along Sutton Lane					Construction	Medium	No, further development needed/feasibility needed
Harrogate	Beckwith Head Road - cycle priority over side roads					Development	Low	No, further development needed to assess VfM
Harrogate	Duchy Road new road crossing					Construction	Low	No, further development needed to assess impact
Harrogate	Station Parade new road crossing					Construction	Low	No, further development needed to assess impact
Harrogate	Blands Hill Knaresborough new crossing					Development	Low	No, further development needed to assess impact

Appendix A

Harrogate	Duchy Road traffic calming					Construction	Low	No, further development needed to assess impact
Skipton	Upgrade path through Aireville Park					Construction	Low	No, further development needed to assess impact
Thirsk	Thirsk LCWIP corridors					Development	High	No, focus on construction and LCWIP to be adopted
Whitby	Whitby LCWIP corridors					Development	High	No, focus on construction and LCWIP to be adopted
Catterick	Corridor 1:Richmond to Gilling West					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Catterick	Corridor 2:A6108 Corridor: Richmond Town Centre to Schools					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Catterick	Corridor 3:Richmond to Scorton via Brompton-onSwale					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Catterick	Corridor 4:Catterick Garrison to Catterick (Munster Barracks to Marne Barracks)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Catterick	Corridor 5:Hipswell Rd					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Catterick	Corridor 6:Richmond to Scotton via Catterick Garrison					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Catterick	Corridor 7:Richmond - Easby Hall					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Catterick	Corridor 8:Richmond - Gallowfields Trading Estate via Hurgill Rd					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Catterick	Corridor 9a:Richmond Town Centre: Do Min					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Catterick	Corridor 9b:Richmond Town Centre: Do Some					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Catterick	Corridor 9C:Richmond Town Centre: Do Max					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Stokesley	Stokesley to Great Ayton					Development	Medium	No, focus on construction
Thirsk	Sowerby Gateway cycle path to station					Development	Medium	No, focus on construction
Kirkby	Kirkby Lane KIRKBY-IN-CLEVELAND					Development	Medium	No, focus on construction
Stokesley	Improvements to the tarmac paths on the A172 near Strikes					Development	Medium	No, focus on construction

	for a shared path and cycle route							
Stokesley	Seamer (nr Stokesley) to Stokesley					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Great Broughton	Great Broughton to Stokesley					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Bilton Cycle Track maintenance					Maintenance	Low	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Knaresborough to Flaxby Green Park Industrial Site					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Bilton to Starbeck (Corridor 1)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Bilton to Hornbeam Park (via Town Centre) (Corridor 2)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Jennyfield to Harrogate town centre (Corridor 3)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Hornbeam Park to Starbeck (Corridor 4)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Pannal to Rosset Green (Harrogate)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Nidderdale Greenway (Harrogate)					Development	Medium	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Whinney Lane to Rosset Green (Harrogate)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Hookstone Chase					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Wetherby Road Woodlands Junction to Slingsby Walk					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Hookstone Road					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	A59 Forest Lane Head to Starbeck Level Crossing					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Wetherby Road Cemetary to Woodlands junction					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Hookstone Drive					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	Skipton Road (Roberts Crescent to Quarry Lane)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	A59 Starbeck level crossing to Empress roundabout					Development	High	No, focus on construction



Appendix A

Harrogate	Princes Street contraflow					Development	Low	No, focus on construction
Helmsley	Dropped kerb Riccall Drive, Helmsley					Maintenance	Low	No, focus on construction
Malton & Norton	Corridor 1: Central Loop					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Malton & Norton	Corridor 2: Core Connections					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Malton & Norton	Corridor 3: Amotherby Strategic Route					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Malton & Norton	Corridor 4: York Road					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Malton & Norton	Corridor 5: Old Malton Road					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Malton & Norton	Corridor 6: Pasture Lane					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Malton & Norton	Corridor 7: Langton Road					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Malton & Norton	Corridor 8: Norton Grove					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Malton & Norton	Corridor 9: Malton Town Curve					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Malton & Norton	Malton Circular					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Northallerton	Brompton to Northallerton Town Centre (Corridor 1)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Northallerton	South East Northallerton to Northallerton Town Centre (Corridor 2)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Northallerton	South Northallerton to Northallerton Town Centre (Corridor 3)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Northallerton	Standard Way Industrial Estate (Corridor 4)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Northallerton	The Tipton Trail					Development	Low	No, focus on construction
Pickering	Widening of shared use path east of Pickering					Maintenance	Low	No, focus on construction
Richmond	Catterick Racecourse to Catterick Village					Development	Medium	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Improved signage to City Centre car parks					Maintenance	Low	No, focus on construction

Ripon	Corridor 1a:Ripon City Centre to Fountains Abbey via Studley Road					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 1b:Ripon City Centre to Fountains Abbey via Whitcliffe Lane					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 2:Ripon City Centre to West Lane					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 3a/3b:Ripon City Centre to Newby Hall (section 1: Bedern Bank to Boroughbridge Road)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 3a:Ripon City Centre to Newby Hall (section 2: Boroughbridge Road to Skelton Lane)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 3b:Ripon City Centre to Newby Hall (section 2: Boroughbridge Road to Newby Hall)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 4a: Ripon City Centre to Claro Barracks (via Clotherholme Road)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 4b: Ripon City Centre to Claro Barracks (via Kirkby Road and College Rd)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 5:Church Ln					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 6:North Street					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 7:River Skell Path					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 8:City Centre					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Ripon	Corridor 9a:Ripon City Centre to Sharrow					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Scarborough	Eastfield to Scarborough (Corridor 1)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Scarborough	Eastfield & Cayton Central Spine (Corridor 2)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Scarborough	Scarborough Central Corridor (Corridor 4)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Scarborough	Link between North Bay and South Bay (Scarborough)					Development	High	No, focus on construction

Scarborough	Connecting A171 Tranche 2 scheme with Whitby Town Centre					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Scarborough	Guisborough Road (Whitby) - ATF 2 scheme (park and ride to Mayfield Road/Prospect Hill)					Development	Medium	No, focus on construction
Scarborough	Carrs Road to Town Centre (Whitby)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Scarborough	East Ayton to Irton					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Scarborough	Church Lane to Fot Hill Lane, adjacent to A170 Hutton Buscel					Development	Medium	No, focus on construction
Scarborough	A165 between Mill Hill, Filey and Primrose Valley					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Selby	Trans Pennine Trail (TPT) Connections (Corridor 2)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Selby	Selby South East (SE) Routes (Corridor 3)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Selby	Selby North Area (Corridor 4)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Selby	South Milford to Sherburn 2 Industrial Estate (Corridor 5)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Selby	Staynor Hall to TPT Southern Link (Corridor 6)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Skipton	Harewood Road to Airville Park, Skipton					Development	Medium	No, focus on construction
Skipton	Skipton Town Centre Core (Scheme 1)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Skipton	Skipton Town Centre to Snaygill (Scheme 2)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Skipton	Snaygill to Crosshills (Scheme 3)					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Skipton	Gargrave Railway Station (Scheme 4)					Development	Low	No, focus on construction
Skipton	Embsay to Skipton Town Centre					Development	High	No, focus on construction
Tadcaster	York Road, Islington, Tadcaster					Maintenance	Low	No, focus on construction
Thirsk	Thirsk Market Place					Maintenance	Low	No, focus on construction
Various	LCWIP dropped kerbs package					Maintenance	Low	No, focus on construction
Various	Cycle signage improvements					Maintenance	Low	No, focus on construction
Harrogate	A59 Maple Close Harrogate to Knaresborough Missing Link					Construction	High	Development ongoing, some challenges to overcome

Page 27

<b>Initial equality impact assessment screening form</b>			
<b>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.</b>			
<b>Directorate</b>	Environment		
<b>Service area</b>	Highways and Transportation		
<b>Proposal being screened</b>	Active Travel Fund 5 – Submission of schemes		
<b>Officer(s) carrying out screening</b>	Alexander Kay		
<b>What are you proposing to do?</b>	Submit five schemes to Active Travel England's assurance process as part of Active Travel Fund tranche five submission process.		
<b>Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?</b>	To deliver construction schemes to encourage active travel using grant funding that has been allocated to North Yorkshire Council by Active Travel England.		
<b>Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources?</b> Please give details.	No. The grant funding will cover the cost of design and delivery of schemes.		
<b>Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYC'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>			
<b>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 directorate representative for advice if you are in any doubt.</b>			
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	
People in rural areas		X	
People on a low income		X	
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		X	
Are from the Armed Forces Community		X	
<b>Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts</b> (for example, disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.	No		
<b>Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate?</b> (for	No		

<p><b>example, partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics?</b> Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.</p>				
<p><b>Decision (Please tick one option)</b></p>	<p>EIA not relevant or proportionate:</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>Continue to full EIA:</p>	
<p><b>Reason for decision</b></p>	<p>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.</p>			
<p><b>Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)</b></p>	<p>Barrie Mason</p>			
<p><b>Date</b></p>	<p>18/03/2025</p>			

**Initial Climate Change Impact Assessment (Form created August 2021)**

The intention of this document is to help the council to gain an initial understanding of the impact of a project or decision on the environment. This document should be completed in consultation with the supporting guidance. Dependent on this initial assessment you may need to go on to complete a full Climate Change Impact Assessment. The final document will be published as part of the decision-making process. If you have any additional queries, which are not covered by the guidance please email [climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk)

<b>Title of proposal</b>	Active Travel Fund 5 – Submission of schemes
<b>Brief description of proposal</b>	Submission of schemes to Active Travel England's assurance process as part of the Active Travel Fund tranche 5 process.
<b>Directorate</b>	Environment
<b>Service area</b>	Highways and Transportation
<b>Lead officer</b>	Alexander Kay
<b>Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the impact assessment</b>	

The chart below contains the main environmental factors to consider in your initial assessment – choose the appropriate option from the drop-down list for each one.

Remember to think about the following;

- Travel
- Construction
- Data storage
- Use of buildings
- Change of land use
- Opportunities for recycling and reuse

Environmental factor to consider	For the council	For the county	Overall
Greenhouse gas emissions	No effect on emissions	No Effect on emissions	No effect on emissions
Waste	No effect on waste	No effect on waste	No effect on waste
Water use	No effect on water usage	No effect on water usage	No effect on water usage
Pollution (air, land, water, noise, light)	No effect on pollution	No effect on pollution	No effect on pollution
Resilience to adverse weather/climate events (flooding, drought etc)	No effect on resilience	No effect on resilience	No effect on resilience
Ecological effects (biodiversity, loss of habitat etc)	No effect on ecology	No effect on ecology	No effect on ecology
Heritage and landscape	No effect on heritage and landscape	No effect on heritage and landscape	No effect on heritage and landscape

If any of these factors are likely to result in a negative or positive environmental impact then a full climate change impact assessment will be required. It is important that we capture information about both positive and negative impacts to aid the council in calculating its carbon footprint and environmental impact.

<b>Decision (Please tick one option)</b>	Full CCIA not relevant or proportionate:	X	Continue to full CCIA:	
<b>Reason for decision</b>	The report covers the submission of schemes to Active Travel England's (ATE) Active Travel Fund 5 assurance process. Schemes are subject to approval by ATE and prior to construction of any scheme, appropriate consultation will be undertaken and scheme specific climate change impact assessment completed.			
<b>Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)</b>	Barrie Mason			
<b>Date</b>	18/03/2025			

This page is intentionally left blank



## North Yorkshire Council

### Environment & Resources

28 March 2025

## Permission to apply for Yorkshire Regional Flood and Coastal Committee Local Levy for Flat Cliffs Coastal Adaptation Plan and wider Filey Bay Coastal Change Management Area

### Report of the Assistant Director – Regulation and Harbours

#### 1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 Request approval from the Corporate Director of Environment and Corporate Director Resources (delegated to the Assistant Director Resources for Environment) to apply for funding from the Yorkshire Regional Flood and Coastal Committee Local Levy to undertake a Coastal Adaptation Plan for the community of Flat Cliffs and establish a wider Coastal Change Management Area for the undefended frontages within Filey Bay

#### 2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 North Yorkshire Council has inherited the role of Coast Protection Authority, historically undertaken by the former Scarborough Borough Council. In this role, the Council is responsible for carrying out coastal protection works and coastal erosion risk management activities. Coastal Protection Authorities are responsible for developing Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs) which provide a long-term holistic framework for managing coastal change on their section of coast. The Council's adopted Shoreline Management Plan is the River Tyne to Flamborough Head SMP2.
- 2.2 The Shoreline Management Plan 2 (2007) has a policy of No Active Intervention for the frontage covering Flat Cliffs, allowing the natural development of the coast. No coastal defences are in place to protect the community and none are planned across the 100-year horizon of the SMP.
- 2.3 This area is covered by the approved Filey and Cayton Bay Coastal Strategy (2018). The strategy sets out coastal intent, policy and how assets will be managed now and in the future. The strategy sets and confirms policy for the next 100 years. The action is to develop a plan for the adaptation of the communities at risk.
- 2.4 The Yorkshire Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC) comes together as a regional partnership to take an overview of flood and coastal erosion risk management. They also seek to promote investment and encourage innovation which is good value for money and benefits communities. RFCCs raise a Local Levy on Lead Local Flood Authorities, including North Yorkshire Council, which provides an invaluable resource to help fund local flood and coast priorities.
- 2.5 The Environment Agency's Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) National Strategy sets out the vision for a nation that is ready for, and resilient to, flooding and coastal change today, tomorrow and to the year 2100. One of the long-term ambitions is a nation ready to respond and adapt to flooding and coastal change.

2.6 To date, there isn't an example of a coastal adaptation plan adopted by a maritime Local Authority in England. North Yorkshire Council will apply to the YRFCC using their pilot study proforma with the intention of sharing knowledge and lessons learned with the Environment Agency and Local Government Association Coastal Special Interest Group. Other maritime Local Authorities in England could use this study as an example to follow and as a collective will deliver against the FCERM National Strategy in supporting their communities in adapting to coastal change.

### **3.0 DETAILED PRESENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIVE ISSUE**

- 3.1 At Flat Cliffs, the Strategy recommended an option of 'limited intervention prior to coastal adaptation'. Subsequently, a project was completed in 2018 to provide local management measures at the pinch point where the sole access road was at risk of imminent loss. The works are intended to prolong the duration before its loss, whilst acknowledging that recession processes would continue. The solution is a temporary one intended to 'buy some time' to allow the residents of the forty-five homes and Yorkshire Water to plan for adapting to coastal change and implement the necessary relocation and removal activities to withdraw themselves and their assets from the areas at risk.
- 3.2 North Yorkshire Council is looking to produce a Coastal Adaptation Plan to raise awareness of the coastal risks within the affected community and support residents and affected parties in planning for change in the future. This will build upon the previous Strategy to look at the community in greater detail. The focus of the Coastal Adaptation Plan will be on identifying the expected timescales of loss for individual properties utilising the Environment Agency's newly published NCERM2 data (see Appendix A), consultation with the affected residents and parties, and investigating and reaching a consensus on the way forward.
- 3.3 The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) is the policy lead for flood and coastal erosion risk management in England. New or revised policies are prepared with other parts of government such as the Treasury, the Cabinet Office (for emergency response planning) and the Department for Communities and Local Government (for land-use and planning policy). These national policies are then delivered by Risk Management Authorities (RMAs), which includes North Yorkshire Council as Coast Protection Authority, amongst other key statutory functions.
- 3.4 Relevant service areas within North Yorkshire Council, such as Planning, Emergency Planning, Housing and Highways will be prepared to support the community to adapt through an agreed sequence of actions with identifiable trigger and decision points.
- 3.5 With reference to Planning, The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires councils to identify Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMAs) where rates of shoreline change are expected to be significant over the next 100 years, taking into account impacts of climate change. There are no such designations on the North Yorkshire coast and the Local Planning Authority currently consults with coastal engineers on an ad-hoc basis in respect of managing any development within active coastal zones. In establishing a CCMA within the undefended areas of Filey Bay, planning policy will mitigate the risk posed by coastal change in safeguarding vulnerable areas from further development.

## **4.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 Under the **Do-Nothing** option, awareness of the coastal erosion risk amongst residents may remain low. There would be no forward planning for managing the consequences of coastal erosion. Residents would be unprepared for the loss of properties creating difficulties for the Risk Management Authority to manage the process when the time comes for residents to have to leave. Significant mental health burden for residents becoming suddenly aware of the risks in an emergency situation, and with no forward plan for dealing with the risks residents may be left feeling unsupported and isolated. Whilst the cost of this option is zero in the present day, it may increase the costs to the Risk Management Authorities for dealing with the issue as the properties become at imminent risk of loss.
- 4.2 North Yorkshire Council is the lead Authority of the Environment Agency funded Cell 1 Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme. Under the option of Do-Minimum, North Yorkshire Council will continue to monitor coastal change from the ongoing Cell 1 Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme to inform the likely remaining life span of the properties. The cost of this option would be minimal because the monitoring data is funded and so only RMA staff time for reviewing timescales would be required. However, this option poses the same risks as the Do-Nothing option in terms of community preparedness, and increased costs to the RMAs for dealing with the issue as the properties become at imminent risk of loss.

## **5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 If the bid is successful, it will secure capital funding of £90,000 to deliver a Coastal Adaptation Plan for Flat Cliffs. The project costs, including NYC staff time and consultant fees, will be fully funded through Yorkshire Regional Flood and Coastal Committee Local Levy. No match funding would be required from NYC.
- 5.2 If successful, the terms and conditions of the grant will be reviewed ahead of acceptance by NYC, this will include the financial years in which the grant must be spent and any clawback arrangements.
- 5.3 Should the bid be unsuccessful; North Yorkshire Council will continue under the Do-Minimum option outlined above in Section 4.2. This option currently presents as 'business as usual' as the Cell 1 Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme is well established and is likely to continue into its next phase.

## **6.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 Coastal protection authorities and the Environment Agency have permissive powers to protect against coastal flooding and to carry out erosion defence works. However, this is not a legal obligation.
- 6.2 The Council does however have well-being powers under the Local Government Act 2000. granting local authorities' power to promote the well-being of their area and inhabitants. It also places authorities under a duty to develop community strategies, together with other local bodies, for this purpose. These provisions are intended to give local authorities increased opportunities to improve the quality of life of their local communities.

## **7.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 None

## **8.0 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 The proposed funding bids if successful will lead to adaptation to climate change. A key avoidance action will be the integration of a Coastal Change Management Area into the Local Plan to safeguard land within Filey Bay that may be subject to future coastal erosion risk from development. The project will form a key part of NYC's emerging Climate Adaptation Strategy as nowhere are the effects of climate change felt more acutely than on the coast.

## **9.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 9.1 As Risk Management Authority, North Yorkshire Council, under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, is required to act in a manner that is consistent with the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England and work collaboratively with other RMAs. Climate resilient places and communities that are ready to adapt to flooding and coastal change are at the core of the Strategy. The plans aim to discharge our responsibilities as RMA and work with other stakeholders in supporting the affected communities to plan and adapt to coastal change. The Coastal Adaptation Plan and Coastal Change Management Area will form a key part of the emerging NYC Climate Change Adaptation Strategy.

### **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 10.1 That the Corporate Director of Environment and Corporate Director Resources (delegated to the Assistant Director Resources for Environment) agrees to the Council bidding for £90,000 from the Yorkshire Regional Flood and Coastal Committee Local Levy to produce a Coastal Adaptation Plan for Flat Cliffs.

### **APPENDICES:**

Appendix A – National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping 2 (NCERM2) Coastal Erosion Projections

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:**

None

Callum McKeon  
Assistant Director – Regulation and Harbours  
County Hall  
Northallerton  
15 March 2025

Report Author – David Robinson, Strategic Coastal Monitoring Project Officer  
Presenter of Report – Stewart Rowe, Principal Coastal Officer

## National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping 2 (NCERM2) Coastal Erosion Projections

The Environment Agency has a duty to update their understanding of current and future flood and coastal erosion risk as part of our statutory 'strategic overview' role for all sources of flood and coastal erosion risk. This is described in the 2010 Flood and Water Management Act.

The EA have spent the last four years working with coastal local authorities across England to develop the second iteration of a National Coastal Erosion Risk Map (NCERM). They use the best available data, information and modelling from both the Environment Agency and local authorities. For the first time the data is displayed through lines on maps which are available on gov.uk for open access to the public.

The below screenshots from the gov.uk website show erosion maps for two time periods for the three communities with the Shoreline Management Plan delivered:

- Medium term to the year 2055
- Long term to the year 2105

Erosion risk zones are shown for three climate change scenarios:

- **Present Day (2020)** –uses historical erosion rates to provide future projections without calculating any additional impacts of climate change and rising sea levels. The year 2020 is taken as the baseline year for the erosion projections.
- **Climate Change Higher Central** –uses sea level rise data from 70th percentile UK Climate Projections 2018 (UKCP18) Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5 climate projection.
- **Climate Change Upper End** –uses sea level rise data from 95th percentile UKCP18 Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5 climate projection.

The map does not show the area of land that will definitely be lost to erosion. The absolute extent of future erosion could lie anywhere within the risk zone, or in extreme cases beyond it. The rate of erosion can be highly variable. It may be relatively consistent over time or could involve periods of faster or sudden erosion. Due to the complexity of predicting the location, timing and extent of erosion events, it is possible for the projections shown on the map to be exceeded.






**Flat Cliffs 2055**



**Legend**



**Coastal erosion risk projections**

-  Shoreline Management Plan Delivered, Present Day Climate (2020 data), 2055
-  Shoreline Management Plan Delivered, Climate Change (Higher Central), 2055
-  Shoreline Management Plan Delivered, Climate Change (Upper End), 2055
-  Flood frontage
-  Erosion Feature Line








**Flat Cliffs 2105**



**Legend**



**Coastal erosion risk projections**

-  Shoreline Management Plan Delivered, Present Day Climate (2020 data), 2105
-  Shoreline Management Plan Delivered, Climate Change (Higher Central), 2105
-  Shoreline Management Plan Delivered, Climate Change (Upper End), 2105
-  Flood frontage
-  Erosion Feature Line

The area at risk of coastal erosion is shown in metres measured from the position of the coast in 2020 (the red erosion feature line).

<b>Shoreline Management Plan Delivered</b>		
	<b>2055</b>	<b>2105</b>
<b>Present Day Climate (2020 data)</b>	7m	16m
<b>Climate Change (Higher Central)</b>	11m	35m
<b>Climate Change (Upper End)</b>	12m	40m
<b>No Future Intervention</b>		
	<b>2055</b>	<b>2105</b>
<b>Present Day Climate (2020 data)</b>	7m	16m
<b>Climate Change (Higher Central)</b>	11m	35m
<b>Climate Change (Upper End)</b>	12m	40m

The 'Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) delivered' scenario means the coastal erosion risk assuming the SMP management approach is followed. The 'No future intervention' scenario means the coastal erosion risk with no future investment in building or maintaining coastal defences. Note for this frontage the SMP policy is to not intervene and therefore the figures are identical.

The effect of climate change on coastal erosion is provided in the 'Higher Central' and 'Upper End' projections in the table and on the map. They use the UK Climate Projections Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5 (RCP8.5) 70th percentile (Higher Central) and 95th percentile (Upper End) sea level rise projections