

North Yorkshire Council
Richmond (Yorks) Area Committee

2 March 2026

Receipt of petition for congestion relief on the A6136 in Catterick

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)

1.0 Purpose of the report

- 1.1 To advise of a petition containing more than 500 signatures.
- 1.2 To ask the Area Committee to consider a response.

2.0 The petition

2.1 A combined paper and electronic petition has been received by North Yorkshire Council and contains 1028 signatures of people who live, work or study in the county.

2.2 The petition, which is also available on [the Council's website](#) reads as follows:

“We call for urgent action to deliver improvements to the Key Route Network in Colburn and Hipswell. The daily congestion is hugely disruptive to people who live and work here. It is harmful to the local economy, it is harmful to health, and it is harmful to the education of local children.

We call for investment in a relief road in any places where lower cost forms of improvements cannot alleviate congestion.

We call for investment to create better bus services with access to enough road capacity so that our buses can run to timetable throughout the day.”

The full text of the petition is included as appendix A

2.3 The petition was submitted to the Leader of North Yorkshire Council and to the Mayor of York and North Yorkshire.

2.4 The petition was taken to a meeting of the Combined Authority (CA) on 23 January 2026 to consider a response, as outlined in the committee report attached at appendix B.

2.5 During the discussion Councillor Carl Les advised that that the petition was also addressed to him as Leader of North Yorkshire Council and he had raised the issue with the local MP, who had offered to host a round table discussion with the council, the Combined Authority, the Ministry of Defence and defence estates to consider a way forward.

2.6 The CA's decision was to refer the petition to the next meeting of the Transport Advisory Board for further discussion as shown at CA24-79 in the minutes attached at appendix C.

3.0 The Council's arrangements for receiving and responding to petitions

3.1 The key features of the Council's arrangements for receiving and debating petitions, as published on the Council's website, are as follows:

- Receipt of the petition is published on the Council's website (which has been done in the case of this petition).
- If a petition contains 500 or more signatures (but less than 30,130 signatories), it will be scheduled for debate at the next meeting of the appropriate Area Committee.
- The petition organiser is offered the opportunity to speak for five minutes at the Area Committee meeting to present their petition. Subsequently, at the meeting, the petition will be discussed by Councillors for a maximum of 15 minutes, and a decision will be made on how to respond to the petition.
- Possible responses by the Council to petitions, as shown on the website, are:
 - (a) to take the action requested by the petition
 - (b) not to take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate
 - (c) to commission further investigation into the matter, for example by a relevant committee; or
 - (d) where the issue is one on which the council Executive is required to make the final decision, the council will decide whether to make recommendations to inform that decision.
- The petition organiser will receive written confirmation of this decision. This confirmation will also be published on the website.

3.2 In accordance with the arrangements described above, the petition organisers have been invited to join today's meeting to present their petition.

4.0 Officers' comments regarding the petition

4.1 Officers from the Council's Highway Development Management & Adoption Team and Transport Planning Team have provided the following information.

4.2 The last time that the network in this location was examined holistically and strategically was as part of Richmondshire District Council's (RiDC) Local Plan work in 2018-2020. At the time, a number of traffic surveys were undertaken in the area surrounding Catterick, including the A6136, and the information gathered was used for the creation of a strategic traffic model to help understand the impacts of future development on the existing highway network and plan appropriate mitigation.

4.3 The model, which also incorporated military movements, identified several junctions on the route where capacity was neared in future years as a result of development and this was verified by a more detailed analysis of those specific junctions.

4.4 The model used industry standards and analysed the average hourly flows on the network. The outputs were that, with mitigation at several junctions, the scale of development proposed at that time could be mitigated successfully through amendments within the existing highway network and surrounding land. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the lived-in experience is that at times, the network in Catterick is under strain but this is exacerbated at peak times and associated with specific events in the vicinity. Using standard analysis, it is clear that whilst subject to observable queues and delays, traffic does continue to move through the junctions at a rate which is not substantial enough to be picked up by WEBTAG compliant modelling platforms (the national standard).

4.5 The modelling indicates that most trips on the network are to destinations along the route, meaning they are internal journeys within Catterick and Colburn rather than through traffic. Consequently, a relief road or bypass would have limited impact in reducing perceived

network strain. The modelling shows that, at best, a bypass would displace that traffic to other access routes towards the town.

- 4.5 For that reason, a modal shift toward walking, wheeling and cycling for short journeys is encouraged as this is a viable way of reducing trips on the network at the busier times. Infrastructure is available on the route to support the switch to walking, wheeling and cycling for shorter journeys though we recognise that, in places, improvements could be made or new links delivered which would ease the strain on the network at busier times. Proposals for future improvements can be found in our Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan for Catterick ([Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans \(LCWIPs\) | North Yorkshire Council](#)) though we do not have delivery funding at this time.
- 4.7 Although work on the Richmondshire Local Plan has now been overtaken by the emerging North Yorkshire Local Plan and was undertaken out to support development planning, it still provided a useful indication of the network's capacity at that time. It also offers a reference point for assessing planning applications that come forward in the interim.
- 4.8 Looking forward, the North Yorkshire Local Plan will need to understand the impacts of development upon the existing highway network. It is not required that developers address existing issues, but rather that they mitigate their own impacts.

5.0 Comments on the options available to Members:

5.1 The petition requests:

1. urgent action to deliver improvements to the Key Route Network in Colburn and Hipswell.
2. investment in a relief road in any places where lower cost forms of improvements cannot alleviate congestion.
3. investment to create better bus services with access to enough road capacity so that buses can run to timetable throughout the day.

5.2 As set out at 3.1, there are four options available to Members:

- Option A: that the Richmond (Yorks) Area Committee supports the action requested by the petition.
- Option B: to not take any action for reasons put forward in the debate.
- Option C: to support the York and North Yorkshire Combined Authority's decision to refer the petition to the next meeting of its Transport Advisory Board for further discussion and the MP's offer to host a round table discussion with the council, the Combined Authority, the Ministry of Defence and defence estates to consider a way forward.
- Option D: does not apply in this instance.

5.0 Recommendations

5.1 That the Committee notes the petition and considers a response.

Barry Khan
Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)
County Hall
Northallerton

Author of report: Nicki Lishman, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Background document: North Yorkshire Council's petitions information and advice, available on the Council's website [Petitions | North Yorkshire Council](#)