



Harrogate Station Gateway

Third public consultation

July – August 2022

Consultation outcome report

Transforming Cities Fund (TCF)
Consultation & Engagement Team
West Yorkshire Combined Authority
December 2022

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Overview..... | 3 |
| Background | 3 |
| The scheme proposals 2022 | 4 |
| 2. Methodology..... | 5 |
| Consultation activity | 5 |
| Approach to equality, diversity, and inclusion..... | 8 |
| 3. Key messages..... | 9 |
| Section one: Your travel habits..... | 9 |
| Section two: Your views on the proposals – landscaping and lighting..... | 10 |
| Section three: Your views on the proposals – highway design and impact..... | 11 |
| Section four: About you (respondent demographics)..... | 15 |
| 4. Your Voice engagement analytics..... | 16 |
| 5. Survey results | 18 |
| Understanding the results..... | 18 |
| Analysis of survey responses..... | 18 |
| Section one: Your travel habits..... | 18 |
| Section two: Your views on the proposals – landscaping and lighting..... | 22 |
| Section three: Your views on the proposals – highway design and impact..... | 26 |
| Section four: About you (respondent demographics) | 36 |

1. Overview

Background

In 2019 North Yorkshire County Council held a public consultation on the Harrogate and Knaresborough Congestion Study. The outcomes of the public consultation found the majority of the public who responded to the consultation (77% of the c.15,000 that responded) did not support the building of a northern relief road. Instead, there was greater support for implementing more sustainable transport measures, including better provision for walking and cycling, and improved public transport access. To view the report, please [click here](#). Building on this outcome, proposals were developed through the Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) programme for improving walking and cycling access to rail and bus services and reducing general traffic within the town centre. Funded through the Leeds City Region [Transforming Cities Fund \(TCF\)](#), the scheme forms part of a major new programme of investment to improve access to public transport, cycling and walking, whilst helping to reduce car journeys and tackle the climate emergency and improvements to the public realm.

First consultation: March-April 2021

The first consultation returned 1,101 survey responses with overall support for the proposals. The main feedback points were:

Station Parade – of two options presented for traffic lanes, there was strongest support (49%) for the one-lane option, to provide space for buses and cycling on the northern section and for cycling and some footpath improvements on Station Parade itself. 27% of respondents preferred the two-lane option and 24% preferred neither option.

James Street – three pedestrianisation options were presented. 45% of respondents preferred full-time pedestrianisation, 32% preferred motor vehicle access to be always retained, and 17% preferred part-time pedestrianisation with traffic restrictions. 6% preferred none of the options proposed.

Station Square and One Arch - over half of respondents felt positive or very positive about the proposals to improve public space on Station Square (59%) and make One Arch safer for all users (71%).

Second consultation: November-December 2021

The second consultation presented more detailed designs reflecting feedback from the first consultation, including one lane of traffic throughout Station Parade. Although strongest support had been for full-time pedestrianisation of James Street, this was deemed no longer viable due to network capacity and access issues, and funding restrictions, and proposals were therefore adapted to include full-time-pedestrianisation on the eastern end of James Street only in this consultation.

The second consultation survey focussed on more detailed aspects of the proposed designs. 1,320 survey responses were received. The key feedback points were:

Overall proposals – over half of respondents felt negative or very negative (56%) rather than positive or very positive (39%) about the latest plans to improve the Harrogate Station Gateway.

Achieving scheme aims – over half of respondents felt the proposals would be very or fairly successful in achieving the scheme aims of improving the look and feel of the station gateway (52%) including more landscaping and greenery (65%). A majority (49%) said very / fairly successful in making it easier to walk, wheel or cycle. Positive but more mixed responses were received about the aims of encouraging more people to use public transport (35% saying very / fairly successful and 30% saying much / slightly worse), improving air quality (42% very / fairly successful and 37% much/slightly worse), and reducing the number of trips made by car (38% very / fairly successful; 33% much / slightly worse). However, over half of respondents said the proposals would make things worse for local businesses (52%).

Quality of materials – more respondents felt positive (43%) than negative (19%) about the quality and types of materials presented in the designs to match the heritage of Harrogate.

The scheme proposals 2022

Between Tuesday 20 July and Tuesday 23 August 2022, North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC), Harrogate Borough Council (HBC) and the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (the Combined Authority) sought feedback on the Harrogate Station Gateway scheme through a third round of public consultation.

The scheme proposals provided more detail on the following areas, building on feedback from earlier consultations:

- enhanced walking, cycling and bus access along Station Parade
- pedestrianisation proposals to James Street
- transformation of Station Square and One Arch

The scheme proposals have also been adapted following the second round of consultation, with refined designs for:

- One Arch and Station Square
- some junction designs - to make it easier to cross
- Station Bridge/East Parade roundabout by the Odeon cinema
- lighting proposals
- benches, bins and so on

Evidence supplied to address concerns raised

In the second round of consultation, some concerns were raised, and evidence has been supplied to address these concerns as follows:

Increased congestion resulting from closing one lane on Station Parade – A [congestion study is available to view](#), this uses a ‘worst-case’ scenario based on pre-pandemic traffic data and does not include any benefit from those who may change from private car journeys to walking and cycling. This shows that whilst there is likely to be some negative impacts during the busiest part of the day, they are not expected to cause excessive congestion and are considered within acceptable levels by highways officers.

A negative impact on local businesses – An [economic case](#) shows improvements to public spaces and improvements for walking and cycling tend to have a positive or neutral economic impact on local businesses. Plus, a [survey which took place on James Street](#) suggests that nearly all people would continue to shop here if parking was removed.

Air pollution – An [air quality assessment is available here](#) along with the [summary here](#), which considers that the proposals will have a negligible impact on the area. The designs aim to improve air quality by reducing traffic from James Street by enabling a shift towards less car use and more use of public transport, walking, and cycling.

2. Methodology

Consultation activity

This third stage public consultation was carried out over five weeks between **Wednesday 20 July** and **Tuesday 23 August 2022**.

The purpose of this consultation was to involve the public and stakeholders in the project development process to ensure the project achieves outcomes which benefit as

many people as possible. Final design decisions have not yet been made, and public feedback and input will help shape the future development of more detailed designs.

Promotion

The consultation was promoted via the following methods:

- **Press:** A press release was issued to local and regional media organisations to promote the consultation and encourage people to participate in the survey. The press release from the Harrogate Advertiser can be [read in full here](#)
- **Social media:** Frequent social media posts from North Yorkshire County Council, Harrogate Borough Council and the Combined Authority and across platforms such as Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn were used to promote the consultation, including paid for advertising. Harrogate Borough Council posts had a reach of approximately 6,000 via their own page and an estimated 50,000 via community group posts. These groups have a potential reach of around 40,000 per post
- **Residents and stakeholders:** Interest groups and other local stakeholders were contacted by the project team via email to encourage their participation. People who previously said they were interested in hearing about consultations in and around Harrogate were contacted by the Combined Authority via Your Voice digital engagement platform. Harrogate Borough Council also utilised its Residents' News email database and included an article in the July edition (51,444 subscribers and 1,852 clicks on the TCF link) and a special TCF edition on 10 August to specific postcodes (16,147 subscribers and 2,636 click throughs)
- **Flyers and Posters:** Information leaflets and posters were available at selected locations across Harrogate town centre, including Victoria Shopping Centre, Harrogate Library, Harrogate Borough Council civic centre and Starbeck Baths
- **Telephone number:** NYCC's 01609 780780 telephone number was made available for members of the public to request further information, printed copies, or information in other formats
- **Email address:** a dedicated email address was made available to write to with questions, concerns or feedback: Transformingcities@northyorks.gov.uk
- **Freepost:** Participants could call the above number to request printed copies of the survey for return to the Freepost address at NYCC
- **Face-to-face events:** Public events were held in the Victoria Shopping Centre over three days where members of the public could find out more information and ask questions directly to the project team

- **Libraries:** Paper copies of the proposals and paper survey were made available in Harrogate Library and Starbeck Library throughout the consultation period
- **Webinars:** An online webinar was held, which people could join to listen to a presentation on the scheme and ask the project team questions. 20 people attended and a recording can be [viewed here](#)
- **AdBike:** An advertising bike was used to cycle around the town, advertising the scheme plus handing out flyers

Your Voice online engagement website

The consultation was hosted on the Combined Authority's Your Voice digital engagement hub using the web address www.yourvoice.westyorks-ca.gov.uk/harrogate.

The following tools were available on Your Voice to help provide further information:

- **Your Voice survey tool:** The survey was hosted on the Your Voice site, which could be reached on the project page or via a direct web address link
- **Your Voice Q&A tool:** The Your Voice site hosted a Question & Answer tool (Q&A) allowing participants to submit queries for response by the project team
- **Your Voice FAQs:** The Frequently Asked Questions tool provided further information about the project and signposted participants to other resources
- **Your Voice documents:** Documents uploaded as PDFs to the consultation page provided details of the issues, opportunities, plans and proposals

Stakeholder engagement

Emails were sent to a list of stakeholders who may have interest in the proposals, connections to the area or who would be able to help promote the consultation.

Groups contacted included Harrogate Borough Council portfolio holders, the Combined Authority's Transport Committee, businesses and services, education providers, transport providers, community groups and other statutory stakeholders. Targeted mapping and engagement were also carried out to ensure the consultation was inclusive for 'seldom heard groups' (see section below).

Prior to launch of public consultation, NYCC and HBC officers took part in four separate briefings with key stakeholder organisations:

- Transport stakeholders – Taxis, Bus and Rail
- Economic groups – Civic Society, Civic Society, Harrogate BID
- Statutory and educational stakeholders – Disability Forum, Harrogate Hospital, Harrogate College
- Special interest groups – Harrogate District Cycle Forum, Harrogate District Climate Coalition, Zero Carbon Harrogate

Approach to equality, diversity, and inclusion

Inclusive engagement methodology

NYCC, HBC and the Combined Authority are committed to promoting equality and value diversity in driving inclusion, by encouraging fairness with equal chances for all to work, learn and be free from any barriers, discrimination, or victimisation. Please click [here](#) to read more about the Combined Authority's approach to equality, diversity and inclusion.

The term 'seldom-heard groups' refers to under-represented people and/or, communities, who rarely have the same opportunities or access to express themselves as other stakeholders. Due to multiple barriers affecting access to and the use of public and social services, often the views of these groups go underrepresented. It is critical that efforts are made to connect and communicate with diverse groups, to facilitate fuller participation and ensuring that our consultations are as accessible and progressively inclusive as possible. Many factors can contribute to people, who use services, being seldom heard, including:

- Gender, including trans identity / history
- Age
- Disability
- Race and ethnicity
- Sexuality
- Community impairments
- Mental health
- Homelessness
- Geographical isolation
- Socio-economic background
- Caring responsibilities
- Marriage, partner, and relationships
- Religion and belief
- Pregnancy, maternity, and parental leave

We are also keen to reach people who are unable to engage online, feel uncomfortable using online services, or may experience access issues. We supply a freepost address for letters or return of paper surveys, a dedicated telephone number for enquiries, printed leaflets, articles in local newspapers and we offer paper versions of our plans and surveys upon request. Contact details are supplied for those requiring consultation materials or to request alternative ways of accessing the information.

Utilising knowledge from within Harrogate Borough Council and building on previous engagement, seldom-heard groups were identified, and communications sent to key contacts signposting the consultation and survey and offering the opportunity to engage further. It was also requested that those contacts circulate the information supplied to their wider networks.

3. Key messages

The consultation survey was divided into four sections: Section one asked about travel habits, Section two asked about proposals on improvements to public spaces, Section three asked about highway designs and a final optional section asked questions about respondents' demographic information.

The survey questions asked respondents about the extent to which they agree with the proposed plans for each area and included open text questions which provided space to enable respondents to say more about their views and opinions. Where any key common themes arise from these open text responses, they are included below. All open text responses are summarised in tables in the [analysis of survey responses](#) section and are shown in full in the accompanying '[Appendices](#)' document.

A total of 2,044 surveys were completed. A summary of the headline findings and most popular responses are shown below:

Section one: Your travel habits

- More respondents said they go shopping (1,653), meet people / visiting friends or family (1,302) or live near the town centre / surrounding villages (1,293)
- More respondents said they travelled in or around Harrogate on 2 – 4 days a week (33%), at least once a week (27%) or 5 days a week or more (26%)
- More respondents usually travel by car / van as a driver or passenger (1,510), walk (1,069), by bus (490), or cycle (458)

Section two: Your views on the proposals – landscaping and lighting

Q5a. When asked, ‘How do you feel about the designs for the public space, landscaping and lighting?’, 2031 respondents answered, and a majority felt positive or very positive:

- 51% positive / very positive
- 26% negative / very negative
- 21% neutral

Q5b. 948 respondents chose to say more about their views. The most popular themes emerging from these comments are listed below:

Issues raised / concerns:

- Cars and general travel concerns (175) – particularly concerns the proposals would worsen congestion (106)
- Concern over design features (99) – particularly concerns the designs don’t go far enough (68)
- Not best use of public money (97)
- Concerns about cycling proposals (86)

Supportive themes:

- Positive impact on residents, businesses and visitors (87)
- Encourages and improves active travel (walking and cycling) (83)
- Benefits of design features for everyone in the town (56)

A number of other suggestions were made for further improvements, including mainly landscaping, design features, and active travel.

Q6. When asked ‘What activities and/or events would you like to see held in these areas?’, 364 people responded. The most popular themes emerging from these responses are listed below:

Against:

- Other spaces in Harrogate are more suitable for activities and/or events (62)
- Against activities and/or events (37)
- Prefers the existing space as it is (37)

Supports:

- Arts and culture activities and/or events (37)
- Markets (16)
- Food and drink (12)
- Health and wellbeing (11)

Concerns:

- Access and safety issues (22) – particularly regarding people with disabilities (8)
- Impact on local business / retailers (17)
- Potential for anti-social behaviour (8)

Section three: Your views on the proposals – highway design and impact

Q7a. Respondents were asked, 'How successful do you feel these designs are in balancing the needs and safety of all road users (people on foot, people who cycle, bus users, private vehicle users)?'. The response from 2,057 respondents was mixed, but with a small majority saying unsuccessful / very unsuccessful:

- 45% - unsuccessful / very unsuccessful
- 39% - successful / very successful

Q7b. 1135 respondents chose to say more about their views. The most popular themes emerging from these comments are listed below:

Issues raised / concerns:

- Cars and general travel (471) – particularly concern the proposals would worsen congestion (326)
- Active travel (walking and cycling) (322) – particularly that priority for cycling is not needed (122)
- The proposed changes are not needed (91)

Supportive themes:

- Encourages and improves active travel (walking and cycling) (180) – particularly the proposals will encourage behaviour change to more sustainable methods of transport such as walking and cycling (117)

A number of other suggestions were made for further improvements including other designs for active travel, ideas for road layouts and improvements to public transport.

Q8a. Respondents were asked, 'What effect do you think these proposals for enhanced walking and cycling infrastructure would have for you and your travel in and around the town centre?', The response from 2,033 respondents was again mixed, but with a small majority suggesting a positive effect:

- 41% - positive effect
- 37% - negative effect
- 20% - no change

Q8b. 1394 respondents chose to say more about their views. The most popular themes emerging from these comments are listed below:

Issues raised / concerns:

- Active travel (walking and cycling) (462) – particularly perceived barriers to successful active travel (158) and that priority for cycling is not needed (125)
- Cars and general travel (431) – particularly concern that the proposals would worsen congestion (251)
- Impacts on residents, businesses, and visitors (200) – particularly that the proposals would impact negatively on businesses (119)
- The changes proposed are not needed, or would have little impact (110)

Supportive themes:

- Promotes and improves active travel (walking and cycling) (478) – particularly that the proposals encourage behaviour change to more sustainable methods of transport such as walking and cycling (263) and would improve safety for these travel methods (183)
- Positive about improvements to public space (96)
- Proposals would have a positive environmental impact (73)

A number of other suggestions were made for further improvements including more design features for active travel and ideas to improve cars and general travel.

Q9a. Respondents were asked to describe the likely impact of the proposals on businesses (shops, cafes, markets, offices). The response from 2,029 respondents was more mixed, with a slight majority suggesting a positive effect:

- 41% - positive / very positive
- 40% - negative / very negative
- 17% neutral
- 2% didn't know

Q9b. 1283 respondents chose to say more about their views. The top themes emerging from these comments are listed below:

Issues raised / concerns:

- Impact on businesses (348) – particularly concerns that people will shop less or go elsewhere (184) and that lack of parking will negatively impact businesses (104)
- Cars and general travel concerns (228) – particularly concerns about worsening congestion (107) and that motorists should be prioritised more (120)
- Active travel (walking and cycling) concerns (142) – particularly barriers to cycling (87)

- Negative impact on residents and visitors (129)
- Loss of parking would have a negative impact for people (118)

Supportive themes:

- Impact for residents and visitors (236) – particularly people will visit more often and stay longer in town (184)
- Positive impact on businesses (190)
- Positive about active travel improvements (cycling and walking) (112)
- Positive about environmental improvements (104)

A number of other suggestions were put forward for further improvements, including for public transport, businesses, and parking.

Q10. Respondents were asked to select how much they agree with a series of statements and over 2000 responses are summarised below:

- Make it easier and safer for everyone, including people with disabilities or impairments, to get around the town centre
 - More strongly agree / agree (48%) than disagree / strongly disagree (38%) while 13% felt neutral
- Be a better use of public space, and make the town centre more attractive to residents and visitors
 - More strongly agree / agree (51%) than disagree / strongly disagree (37%) while 11% felt neutral
- Support businesses by encouraging people to spend longer in the town centre or visit more often
 - A mixed response with 44% saying disagree / strongly disagree and 43% saying agree / strongly agree while 12% felt neutral
- Be more convenient for taxis and their passengers
 - More disagree / strongly disagree (37%) than agree / strongly agree (28%) while 27% felt neutral
- Be more convenient for loading and deliveries
 - More disagree / strongly disagree (37%) than agree / strongly agree (21%) while 32% felt neutral
- Create more space for trees and other green features
 - More strongly agree / agree (57%) than disagree / strongly disagree (20%) while 20% felt neutral
- Improve air quality as plans may persuade more people to leave the car at home
 - A more mixed response with 45% saying strongly agree / agree and 41% saying disagree / strongly disagree while 12% felt neutral

Q11. Respondents were asked to comment on how much the proposals would encourage people to take up various travel options. The response was overall generally positive and over 2000 responses are summarised below:

- Walk
 - A majority of respondents felt people would be encouraged / strongly encouraged to walk (48%) than discouraged / strongly discouraged (12%), however, 41% felt there would be no change
- Cycle
 - A majority of respondents felt people would be encouraged / strongly encouraged to cycle (48%) than discouraged / strongly discouraged (12%), however, 38% felt there would be no change
- Get the bus
 - A majority of 47% felt there would be no change in bus use, whilst more respondents felt people would be encouraged / strongly encouraged to get the bus (38%) than discouraged / strongly discouraged (12%)
- Get the train
 - A majority of 53% felt there would be no change in train use, whilst more respondents felt people would be encouraged / strongly encouraged to get the train (32%) than discouraged/ strongly discouraged (11%)
- Drive
 - A majority of 52% felt that people would be discouraged / strongly discouraged to drive and 40% felt there would be no change, whilst 5% of respondents felt people would be encouraged / strongly encouraged
- Spend more time in the town centre
 - A majority of 42% felt people would be encouraged / strongly encouraged to spend more time in the town centre, whilst 30% of respondents felt people would be discouraged / strongly discouraged and 26% felt there would be no change

Q12a. When asked, 'Overall, how do you feel about the latest plans to improve the Harrogate Station Gateway area?' 2,030 respondents gave a balanced, but slightly more negative response:

- 46% - negative / very negative
- 45% - positive / very positive

Q12b. 999 respondents chose to say more about their views. The top themes emerging from these comments are listed below:

Issues raised / concerns:

- Not the best use of public money (240)
- Cars and general travel concerns (222) – particularly concerns about worsening congestion (144)
- Concerns about proposals for active travel (walking and cycling) (185)
- Proposals are not needed (112)
- Consultation and decision making (109) – particularly concerns over the decision-making process (104)
- Impact on residents, businesses, and visitors (93) – particularly concerns that the proposals would affect local businesses negatively (50) and people will visit less or go elsewhere (33)

Supportive themes:

- In general support for the proposals (126)
- Positive about active travel improvements (cycling and walking) (46)
- Support the improvements to the public space (24)
- Positive environmental improvements (23)
- Positive impact on residents, businesses and visitors (20)

A number of other suggestions were put forward for further improvements, including for public transport, general travel, and design features.

Section four: About you (respondent demographics)

Respondents were asked whether they had responded to this consultation before, 2,005 responded: 52% said no, 38% said yes and 10% did not know. In response to the demographic questions, 52.3% were male and 40.5% were female, 90.6% identified with the same sex registered at birth and 75% of respondents described their sexual orientation as heterosexual or straight. 85% of respondents identified as White/White British. 72% of respondents said they were aged over 45 and 79% said they did not have any physical or mental health conditions, or illnesses, lasting, or expected to last longer than, 12 months. Of those that said they did, 77% said their conditions or illnesses did not reduce their ability to carry out day-to-day activities. Respondents' religion or beliefs were predominantly described as None (41%) or Christian (38%).

4. Your Voice engagement analytics

During the five-week engagement period, 9,390 visits were made by 8,348 'visitors' to the Your Voice engagement hub. A single visitor may visit the site several times, which is why the total number of 'visits' is higher than the total number of 'visitors'. Visitors can be divided into the following categories:

Aware (7,297 visitors): Visitors that we consider to be 'aware' have made at least one single visit to the project page. These people have seen the information on the landing page about the project and survey, but not taken any further action (not clicked on anything).

Informed (3,254 visitors): An informed visitor has taken the 'next step' from being aware and clicked on something. That might be to read Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) about the project, or download the proposal plans or the privacy notice.

Engaged (1,993 visitors): Every visitor that contributes to a website 'tool' (in this case, the survey or Q&A tool) is considered to have actively 'engaged' with the project. A single participant can perform multiple actions. **2,016 online surveys** were completed, with **28 paper surveys** received, and **18 questions** were asked via the Your Voice web page Q&A tool.


Questions and responses can be viewed in the separate supplementary [Appendices](#) document held on the Your Voice webpage.

Correspondence: Three emails were received via the Your Voice email inbox, all of which can be viewed along with associated responses, in the [Appendices](#) document.

A number of emails were sent to the dedicated NYCC email address – for those interested in reading the emails and associated responses please email: transformingcities@northyorks.gov.uk

Timeline of visits

The graph below shows the timeline of visits to the Your Voice webpage over the course of the consultation period:



Traffic channels

The table below shows the different channels that were used to visit the Your Voice webpage between 20 July and 23 August 2022.

| Site access routes | Number of visits |
|--|------------------|
| Referrals: (re-directed to the site) This includes the HBC text service | 4,082 |
| Direct: (by typing the web address URL (short for universal resource locator) directly into the address bar on browser to access site). N.B. this category also includes site access via links within emails that were sent out | 3,560 |
| Social media: (including Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Instagram) | 793 |
| Email: (site access via direct email campaigns using external email tools) | 532 |
| Search engine: (including Google, Bing, Internet Explorer etc) | 314 |
| .GOV sites: (referrals from government websites) | 109 |

5. Survey results

Understanding the results

Quantitative data analysis: The quantitative responses from the survey were analysed using standard frequency counts and percentages (where figures in this report do not add up to 100%, this is the result of computer rounding or multiple responses). Any questions in which respondents could select multiple options (for example, how they travel), are reported by the number of respondents per option.

Qualitative data analysis: Open text questions were included to enable respondents to tell us more about their views and opinions. The analysis of open text qualitative data in survey responses was carried out using thematic coding. This process involves identifying themes in responses and assigning responses, or elements of responses, to these themes to gain a deeper understanding of views and perceptions. Comments relating to each theme are then grouped together and counted which allows the most common themes to emerge. All open text responses are summarised below and shown in full in the supplementary [Appendices document](#).

Analysis of survey responses

The consultation survey was divided into four sections: section one asked about travel habits, section two asked about proposals on improvements to public spaces, section three asked about highway designs and a final optional section asked questions about respondents' demographic information.

A total of 2,044 surveys were completed, comprising of 2,016 online surveys and 28 on paper. The following section includes charts and graphs representing quantitative analysis of the data received. Comments received as open text responses have been coded by subject matter and summarised at the relevant questions. Please note some questions have fewer responses because respondents self-selected which they would like to answer.


Data Protection

Q1. All respondents were required to confirm they had read and understood our privacy notice.

Section one: Your travel habits


Please answer based on your general travel habits when travelling to and from Harrogate town centre.

Q2. Please tell us why you travel to and from Harrogate town centre? Please select all that apply (2042 responses, 2 skipped)




Other: Visiting (6), Church (5), Bike rides (4), Commute (3), Nearest rail station (3), Exercise (2), Activities for children (1), Camping (1), Moving to Harrogate soon (1), Action for Yorkshire (1), Travel through to other destinations (1), Used to live there (1), Would like to live in Harrogate (1), Delivery driver (1), Bank (1), Shop (1), Coffee / lunch / dinner (1), Blue badge (1), Wheelchair and taxi (1), Health appointments (1), Taxi driver (1), Wheelchair user (1), To catch the bus (1), Eating and drinking (1), Drive with assistance (1), Cinema (1), Against one lane option (1), To avoid Skipton Road (1)

Q3. How often do you make a journey into or out of Harrogate town centre? Please select one option below (2035 responses, 9 skipped)



Q4. Please tell us how you usually travel to and from Harrogate town centre? Select all that apply (2040 responses, 4 skipped)



Other: Bus (2), All (2), Run (1), Minibus (1), Mobility vehicle (1), None (1), Lorry (1), Tricycle (1), Kick Scooter (1), E-Scooter (1)


Section two: Your views on the proposals – landscaping and lighting

In the last public consultation, held between October and November 2021, you told us that the following features were the most important: benches, planting, lighting, cycle storage and litter bins.

We have therefore updated the designs for public space, landscaping and lighting – please see the designs at <https://www.yourvoice.westyorks-ca.gov.uk/harrogate> or call 01609 780780 if you can't access the internet.

Q5a. How do you feel about the designs for the public space, landscaping and lighting?

Please select one option below (2031 responses, 13 skipped)



Q5b. If you would like to tell us why you feel this way, please use the box below:

948 comments received. Below is a summary table of key themes emerging from the comments with a tally of the number of times those themes were mentioned. Some comments included multiple themes, so the total tally may not equal the total number of comments.

A full list of verbatim comments is provided in the [Appendices document](#).

| Concerns / issues raised | No. of comments |
|--|-----------------|
| Cars and general travel | 175 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would worsen congestion rather than improve it | 106 |


| | |
|--|----|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would cause problems for parking and loading / taxis • Proposed road layout and signalling would cause problems • Concerns about accuracy of traffic studies | 32 |
| Concern over design features | 99 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designs do not go far enough • Other design concerns | 68 |
| | 31 |
| Not best use of public money | 97 |
| Cycling concerns | 86 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycling priority is not needed • Cycling safety concerns • Barriers to cycling | 34 |
| | 33 |
| | 19 |
| General - proposals not needed | 40 |
| Impact on residents, businesses, and visitors | 36 |
| More greenery required | 35 |
| Environmental impact concerns | 24 |
| Walking and pedestrianisation | 21 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagrees with pedestrianisation • Safety concerns for people walking | 11 |
| | 10 |
| Concern over consultation and decision-making process | 18 |
| Concerns about accessibility for all users | 18 |
| Public transport concerns | 8 |
| Miscellaneous | 8 |

| Supportive comments | No. of comments |
|--|-----------------|
| Impact on residents, businesses, and visitors | 87 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on residents/visitors • Impact on businesses | 53 |
| | 34 |
| Encourages and improves active travel | 83 |
| Benefits of design features | 56 |
| General support for proposals | 42 |
| Environmental impact | 27 |
| Landscaping | 26 |
| Cars and general travel | 14 |
| Public transport | 9 |

| Suggestions | No of comments |
|--|----------------|
| Landscaping | 38 |
| Design features | 22 |
| Public transport | 10 |
| Active travel (walking and cycling) | 17 |
| Cars and general travel | 11 |
| Other | 8 |
| Sense of place and identity of Harrogate | 6 |
| Consultation | 4 |

We intend to use the space in Station Square and James Street for events and activities.

Q6. What activities and/or events would you like to see held in these areas? (1851 responses, 193 skipped)



365 respondents said 'Other'. Below is a summary table of key themes emerging from the comments with a tally of the number of times those themes were mentioned. Some comments included multiple themes, so the total tally may not equal the total number of comments. A full list of verbatim comments is provided in the [Appendices document](#).

| Supports | No. of comments |
|--|-----------------|
| Arts and culture activities and/or events | 37 |
| Markets | 16 |
| Food and drink | 12 |
| Health and wellbeing | 11 |
| Seating / relaxing | 10 |
| General support for all or some of the suggestions | 9 |
| Greenery / gardening activities | 8 |
| Sports | 6 |
| Seasonal activities | 5 |
| Transport suggestions | 3 |
| Public toilet | 2 |
| Tourist information | 2 |
| Other | 22 |

| Against | No. of comments |
|--|------------------------|
| Other spaces are more suitable for events | 62 |
| Against events general | 37 |
| Prefers existing space - leave it as it is | 37 |
| Against the space being used for events | 26 |
| Against traffic lane removal | 23 |
| Against the suggestions | 20 |
| Against parking removal | 14 |
| Not best use of public funding / resources/ other priorities | 13 |
| General against | 11 |
| Doubts this would be a success | 9 |
| Specific types of activities and/or events | 8 |

| Concern | No. of comments |
|--|------------------------|
| Access / safety issues | 22 |
| Impact on local business / prioritise local business | 17 |
| Potential for anti-social behaviour | 8 |
| Needs to be in keeping with the town | 7 |
| Standard of events | 6 |
| Consultation issues | 5 |
| Impact of bad weather on activities and/or events | 5 |
| Displaced traffic/parking | 3 |
| Other | 9 |


Section three: Your views on the proposals – highway design and impact

We have updated the designs for the road layout including the Station Bridge/East Parade roundabout – please look at the designs online.

Please note: A technical note considering the impact of these changes is also available and uses a ‘worst-case scenario’ based on pre-pandemic traffic data. This is not including a forecast of people switching to walking and cycling in the town centre. The changes provide what is considered an acceptable balance between improved safety for walking and cycling and maintaining the flow of traffic. This shows that whilst there is likely to be some negative impacts during the busiest part of the day, the morning and afternoon peaks, they are not expected to cause excessive congestion and are not expected to cause excessive congestion and are estimated to be within acceptable levels by highways officers.

Q7a. How successful do you feel these designs are in balancing the needs and safety of all road users (people on foot, people who cycle, bus users, private vehicle users)?

(2037 responses, 7 skipped)



Q7b. If you would like to tell us why you feel this way, please use the box below:

1135 people chose to respond. Below is a summary table of key themes emerging from the comments with a tally of the number of times those themes were mentioned. Some comments included multiple themes, so the total tally may not equal the total number of comments. A full list of verbatim comments is provided in the [Appendices document](#).

| Concerns / issues raised | No. of comments |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Cars and general travel | 471 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about worsening congestion Concerns about road layout and signalling Impact on car journeys Prioritise motorists more Concerns about parking and loading / taxis | 326 89 23 21 12 |
| Active travel (walking and cycling) | 322 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cycling priority is not needed Cycling proposals don't go far enough Safety concerns for people walking Barriers to active travel Cycling safety concerns Disagrees with pedestrianisation | 122 60 53 52 29 5 |
| General – proposals not needed | 91 |
| Impact on residents, businesses, and visitors | 72 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on businesses Concerns that visitors would decrease Concerns about anti-social behaviour | 41 22 9 |
| Environmental impact concerns | 69 |
| Not the best use of funding/resources | 53 |
| Concern over consultation and decision-making process | 36 |
| Concerns about accessibility for all users | 27 |
| Concerns about design features | 27 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designs do not go far enough Other design concerns | 18 9 |
| Public transport concerns | 15 |
| Miscellaneous comments | 5 |


| Supportive comments | No. of comments |
|--|------------------------|
| Encourages and improves active travel (walking and cycling) | 180 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourages behaviour change Improves safety | 117 63 |
| General support for proposals | 44 |
| Improvements for cars and general travel | 26 |
| Environmental impact | 23 |
| Impact on residents, businesses, and visitors | 18 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on businesses Impact on residents/visitors | 9 9 |
| Improvements to accessibility | 13 |
| Improvements to public space | 10 |
| Improvements to public transport | 4 |

| Suggestions | No. of comments |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Active travel (walking and cycling) | 25 |
| Cars and general travel - road layout | 16 |
| Public transport | 11 |

| | |
|---------|---|
| Other | 2 |
| Parking | 1 |

Q8a. What effect do you think these proposals for enhanced walking and cycling infrastructure would have for you and your travel in and around the town centre?

(2033 responses, 11 skipped)



Q8b. Can you please explain your answer?

1,394 people chose to respond. Below is a summary table of key themes emerging from the comments with a tally of the number of times those themes were mentioned. Some comments included multiple themes, so the total tally may not equal the total number of comments. A full list of verbatim comments is provided in the [Appendices document](#).

| Concerns / issues raised | No. of comments |
|---|-----------------|
| Active travel (walking and cycling) | 462 |
| • Barriers to active travel | 158 |
| • Cycling priority is not needed | 125 |
| • Cycling proposals safety concerns | 88 |
| • Cycling and walking proposals don't go far enough | 74 |
| • Disagrees with pedestrianisation | 17 |
| Cars and general travel | 431 |
| • Concerns about worsening congestion | 251 |
| • Prioritise motorists more | 80 |
| • Concerns about parking and loading / taxis | 45 |
| • Concerns about road layout and signalling | 30 |
| • Impact on car journeys | 25 |
| Impact on residents, businesses and visitors | 200 |


| | |
|---|-----------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on businesses • Concerns that visitors stop visiting the town • Concerns about anti-social behaviour | 119 60 10 |
| General – proposals are not needed / will have little/no impact | 110 |
| Concerns about accessibility for all users | 59 |
| Public transport concerns | 55 |
| Not best use of public money | 47 |
| Negative environmental impact concerns | 47 |
| Concern over design features | 36 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designs do not go far enough • Other design concerns | 31 5 |
| Concern over consultation and decision making | 14 |

| Supportive comments | No. of comments |
|--|-----------------|
| Promotes and improves active travel (walking and cycling) | 478 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages behaviour change • Improves safety | 263 183 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the proposals | 32 |
| Improvements to public space | 96 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved image • Community experience improved | 20 76 |
| Positive environmental impact | 73 |
| Positive impact on residents, businesses and visitors | 39 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on residents/visitors • Impact on businesses | 30 9 |
| General support for proposals | 22 |
| Improvements to accessibility | 9 |
| Improvements to public transport | 5 |

| Suggestions | No. of comments |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Active travel (walking and cycling) | 21 |
| Cars and general travel | 17 |
| Public transport | 6 |
| Design features | 5 |
| Parking | 4 |
| Other | 10 |

In the last consultation, you told us you were worried about the potential impact on businesses. We have completed a review of available research, and this shows that improvements to public spaces and improvements for walking and cycling tend to have a positive economic impact on businesses in the surrounding areas. Our survey on James Street suggests that nearly all people would continue to shop here if parking was removed. Further information is available at www.yourvoice.westyorks-ca.gov.uk/harrogate or call 01609 780780

Q9a. How do you feel about the likely impact on businesses (shops, cafes, markets, offices?) (2029 responses, 15 skipped)



Q9b. Please tell us the reasons you feel this way:

1283 people chose to respond. Below is a summary table of key themes emerging from the comments with a tally of the number of times those themes were mentioned. Some comments included multiple themes, so the total tally may not equal the total number of comments. A full list of verbatim comments is provided in the [Appendices document](#).

| Concerns / issues raised | No. of comments |
|---|------------------|
| Negative impact on businesses | 348 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern people will shop less/elsewhere Lack of parking will impact businesses Will worsen existing issues for businesses | 184 104 60 |
| Cars and general travel concerns | 228 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would worsen congestion rather than improve it Prioritise motorists more | 107 120 |
| Active travel concerns | 142 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barriers to cycling Cycling priority is not needed | 87 23 |


| | |
|--|-----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety for people walking and cycling • Disagrees with pedestrianisation | 19 13 |
| Impact on residents and visitors | 129 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on visitors • Impact on residents | 106 23 |
| Impact of loss of parking | 118 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of parking impact on specific people • General impact of loss of parking | 61 57 |
| Concern over consultation and decision making | 63 |
| General - proposals not needed | 46 |
| Not best use of funding / resources | 24 |
| Public transport concerns | 23 |
| Concern over design features | 15 |
| Environmental impact concerns | |

| Supportive comments | No. of comments |
|---|----------------------|
| Impact for residents and visitors | 236 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People will visit more often and stay longer in town • Improving visitor experience | 184 52 |
| Positive impact on businesses | 190 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better for businesses (more customers, trade and businesses) • Pedestrianisation helps businesses • People walking are more likely to shop and use businesses • General impact on business | 82 47 39 22 |
| Active travel (Cycling and walking) | 112 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports behaviour change • Improves safety | 69 43 |
| Environmental improvements | 104 |
| Sense of place and identity of Harrogate | 87 |
| Improvements for cars and general travel | 67 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves general travel / reduces traffic • Positive about parking proposals | 37 30 |
| Consultation/Research | 39 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting evidence shows successful examples in other places • Agrees with supporting research | 30 9 |
| Improvements to accessibility | 29 |
| Public transport | 2 |


| Suggestions | No. of comments |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Public transport | 19 |
| Businesses | 12 |
| Parking | 11 |
| Active travel (walking and cycling) | 9 |
| Cars and general travel | 3 |
| Other | 2 |
| Consultation | 2 |

Q10. Please let us your views on the following by selecting how much you agree with the following statements: (2034 responses, 10 skipped)


I think the proposals for Harrogate Station Gateway will...



Q11. How much do you think these proposals would encourage people to do the following? Please select one option on each row (2034 responses, 10 skipped)



Q12a. Overall, how do you feel about the latest plans to improve the Harrogate Station Gateway area? (2030 responses, 14 skipped)



Q12b. Do you have any other comments on this scheme?

999 comments received. Below is a summary table of key themes emerging from the comments with a tally of the number of times those themes were mentioned. Some comments included multiple themes, so the total tally may not equal the total number of comments. A full list of verbatim comments is provided in the [Appendices document](#).

| Concerns / issues raised | No. of comments |
|---|----------------------------|
| Not best use of public money | 240 |
| Cars and general travel | 222 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about worsening congestion Concerns about road layout and signalling Concerns about parking and loading / taxis Prioritise motorists more Impact on car journeys | 144 45 15 13 7 |
| Active travel (walking and cycling) | 185 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cycling priority is not needed Cycling proposals don't go far enough Barriers to active travel Safety concerns for people walking | 60 55 22 17 |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Won't promote behaviour change • Disagrees with pedestrianisation • Cycling safety concerns | 14 9 8 |
| General - proposals not needed | 112 |
| Concern over consultation and decision making | 109 |
| General concern over consultation and decision making | 104 |
| Difficulty accessing consultation materials | 5 |
| Impact on residents, businesses, and visitors | 93 |
| Impact on businesses | 50 |
| Concerns that visitors would decrease | 33 |
| Concerns about anti-social behaviour | 9 |
| Benefits not felt equally across Harrogate | 1 |
| Concerns over design features | 43 |
| Designs do not go far enough | 29 |
| Other design concerns | 14 |
| Public transport concerns | 41 |
| Environmental impact concerns | 37 |
| Concerns about accessibility for all users | 32 |

| Supportive comments | No. of comments |
|---|-----------------|
| General support for proposals | 126 |
| Encourages and improves active travel (walking and cycling) | 46 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages behaviour change • General support • Improves safety | 24 14 8 |
| Improvements to public space | 24 |
| Positive environmental impact | 23 |
| Impacts on residents, businesses, and visitors | 20 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on businesses • Impact on residents/visitors | 11 9 |
| Improvements for cars and general travel | 9 |
| Improvements to accessibility | 3 |
| Improvements to public transport | 2 |


| Suggestions | No. of comments |
|--|-----------------|
| Improve public transport | 59 |
| Cars and general travel | 48 |
| Design features | 37 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soft landscaping | 19 |
| Other | 32 |
| Active travel (walking and cycling) | 29 |
| Better and cheaper parking | 16 |
| Consultation | 13 |

Section four: About you (respondent demographics)


Thank you for taking the time to provide your feedback.

These next questions are optional. If you choose to answer these questions you will not be identified by the information provided. All information will be handled and dealt with in line with the Data Protection Act 2018, as detailed in our privacy notice (at the end of the survey).

Q13. Have you responded to this consultation before? The first round was held February to March 2021 and the second was held October to November 2021 (2005 responses, 39 skipped)




Q14. Are you responding as an individual or an organisation / business? (1997 responses, 47 skipped)



Organisations: Printzone; Liferiders Community Cycling project; Woodruff Brewing LTD; Open Country; Action for Yorkshire Transport; Specsavers Opticians; Ethical Team Ltd; Dishang Cherry Ltd; Fennec & Darwin; Harrogate Line Supporters Group; G Shaw Restorations; JarFull Ltd; Green Tree Development Ltd; CPRE North and East Yorkshire; B&B owner; Hempsons LLP; Harrogate District Climate Change Coalition

Q15. How did you find out about this consultation? (2000 responses, 44 skipped)




We want to better understand who we are engaging with and hearing from. We are required to act in line with the [Equality Act 2010](#). By asking these questions we can make sure our work reflects the diverse communities we serve.

Area: What is your postcode? If you prefer not to say, please leave blank (n = 1,560)

[Please see map supplied on the next page]

Harrogate Station Gateway

| Postcodes Not Shown | Number of Responses |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| BD21 5 | 1 |
| HG3 3 | 3 |
| HG3 4 | 3 |
| HG3 5 | 7 |
| HG4 1 | 8 |
| HG4 2 | 3 |
| HG4 3 | 3 |
| HG4 5 | 1 |
| HG5 9 | 1 |
| HX6 4 | 1 |
| LS15 7 | 1 |
| LS17 0 | 2 |
| LS22 5 | 2 |
| LS22 6 | 5 |
| LS22 7 | 2 |
| LS29 0 | 1 |
| LS29 6 | 2 |
| LS7 4 | 1 |
| YO24 4 | 1 |
| YO26 6 | 1 |
| YO26 8 | 1 |
| YO31 7 | 1 |
| YO31 9 | 3 |
| YO51 9 | 2 |
| YO61 2 | 1 |
| YO7 3 | 1 |



This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office & Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings (100020521) 2019. © OpenStreetMap contributors. Document Path: Q:\Spatial Projects\067 Consultation Response Mapping\067 Consultation Response Mapping.mxd




**West Yorkshire
Combined
Authority**

0 1.5 km
1:20,000 © A3


What is your sex? (1594 responses, 450 skipped)

[Question added to survey at 11:46am on Wednesday 27 July 2022, one week after launch. It was initially missed out due to human error]




Is the gender you identify with the same as your sex registered at birth? (1573 responses, 471 skipped)


[Question added to survey at 11:46am on Wednesday 27 July 2022, one week after launch. It was initially missed out due to human error]




How old are you? (1985 responses, 59 skipped)




Do you have any physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last 12 months or more? (1975 responses, 69 skipped)



Do any of your conditions or illnesses reduce your ability to carry out day-to-day activities? (1903 responses, 141 skipped)




How would you describe your ethnicity or ethnic background? (1959 responses, 85 skipped)




| Ethnicity | Number of responses | % of respondents |
|---|---------------------|------------------|
| Asian/Asian British | 19 | 0.97 |
| Indian | 3 | 0.16 |
| Pakistani | 1 | 0.05 |
| Chinese | 3 | 0.16 |
| Any other Asian background | 2 | 0.10 |
| Prefer not to say | 1 | 0.05 |
| Black/African/Caribbean/Black British | 1 | 0.05 |
| African | 1 | 0.05 |
| Mixed/multiple ethnic groups | 10 | 0.51 |
| White and Black African | 1 | 0.05 |
| White and Asian | 1 | 0.05 |
| Any other Mixed/multiple ethnic background | 4 | 0.20 |
| Prefer not to say | 4 | 0.20 |
| White/White British | 1664 | 84.94 |
| English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British | 1570 | 80.14 |
| Irish | 12 | 0.61 |
| Gypsy or Irish traveller | 1 | 0.05 |
| Eastern European | 11 | 0.56 |
| Any other White background | 40 | 2.04 |
| Prefer not to say | 12 | 0.61 |
| Other ethnic group | 16 | 0.82 |
| Other ethnic group | 15 | 0.77 |
| Prefer not to say | 1 | 0.05 |
| Prefer not to say | 249 | 12.71 |

How would you describe your sexual orientation? (1925 responses, 119 skipped)



What is your religion or belief? (1924 responses, 120 skipped)





Find out more

westyorks-ca.gov.uk

West Yorkshire Combined Authority

Wellington House

40-50 Wellington Street

Leeds

LS1 2DE

All information correct at time of writing

End of Report