

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

SELBY AREA COMMITTEE

09 JUNE 2008

**PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING FOR 20MPH SPEED LIMIT
TADCASTER TOWN CENTRE**

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To update Members on progress following the previous report to the Area Committee on the 18 September 2006 in relation to the possibility of an alternative for traffic management in Tadcaster Town Centre.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of the Area Committee on 18th September 2006 a report was presented detailing the proposed Traffic Calming Scheme and associated 20mph speed limit for Tadcaster Town Centre. As a result Members resolved to implement the proposed scheme.
- 2.2 The decision of the County Council was challenged through judicial review by Sam Smiths Old Brewery (SSOB). In addition, following that, information was presented to the County Council concerning recent developments involving both Yorkshire Forward and Selby District Council. These included updated proposals for the regeneration of Tadcaster Town Centre and their interaction with the County Council's overall traffic management proposals evolved as part of the Traffic Management Strategy adopted in 2002.
- 2.3 In light of these developments a professional working group was established which consisted of County Council officers and representatives acting for SSOB. The group has sought to establish the implications of these proposals on the Traffic Calming Scheme (referred to previously as Option A) and the future delivery of the overall Traffic Management Scheme for the town centre. The Traffic Management Scheme adopted in the approved Traffic Management Strategy, was Option B and included making St Joseph's Street part of a new one-way system.
- 2.4 Option B has however now been assessed using the recently introduced Rating System and because of its low ranking it is unlikely to attract LTP funding within the foreseeable future.

- 2.5 SSOB proposals which would involve Yorkshire Forward funding and include various improvements around Tadcaster outside the highway are based on the introduction of Option C to address Traffic Management in Tadcaster Town Centre. These proposals offer benefits to the town of Tadcaster as a whole and are based on attracting Yorkshire Forward funding.
- 2.6 Subsequently the working group reviewed Option C. The delivery of this option would require St Joseph's Street to accommodate two-way traffic, including Heavy Commercial Vehicles (HCV's). Because of the closure on Chapel Street it would also become the main route for the A659 north-south traffic in the town. This would only be feasible if the carriageway and footways on St Joseph's Street were improved to an appropriate geometric standard. The highway standard for a main distributor route should be 7.30m carriageway with two 2.0m footways. However taking into account the anticipated vehicle widths and the anticipated traffic volumes the standards can be reduced to a 6.75m carriageway with two 2.0m footways and still maintain a safe environment to all highway users.
- 2.7 To achieve this standard would require the dedication of land from two adjacent properties in St Joseph's Street to form part of the widened highway. Selby District Council as lead partner in the Urban Renaissance Partnership undertook to negotiate with the land owners and tenants, in conjunction with North Yorkshire County Council to acquire the land without the requirement of a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO).
- 2.8 An essential part of the land required is ecclesiastical land. Negotiations with the Church as land owner have been unsuccessful. Therefore the only option would be to pursue a CPO. Because of the ecclesiastic status of the land, even with a CPO the Church would have to give consent for the land to be used for highway purposes. There is no guarantee that either a CPO would be successful or that the consent of the Church would be forthcoming. The estimate of the costs involved in pursuing a contested CPO through a public inquiry procedure could be around £10,000. Details of the CPO and consecrated land procedures are detailed in Appendix A for members' information.
- 2.9 As a consequence of this representatives acting for SSOB have recently met with County Council officers to review a further proposal on behalf of SSOB. The proposal is that the required widening element for St Joseph's Street is delivered in two phases.
- 2.10 On the first phase, a carriageway width of at least 6.5 m would be achieved with a constant width of 0.7m footway along the frontage of the land belonging to the Church. There would be the provision of two traffic calming features at the boundary extremities of the Church land. With at least a 2m width footway elsewhere along St Joseph's Street. The second phase would then be subject to the County Council successfully obtaining land from the Church to allow for the provision of the 2m width footway along their frontage.

- 2.11 An explanatory note of the Options (A, B and C) and the timeline of critical events are detailed in Appendix B.

3.0 OFFICER COMMENT

- 3.1 In relation to the most recent proposal to widen St Joseph's Street in two distinctive phases. Officers have considered the feasibility of an interim measure followed with the permanent measure, subject to land acquisition. The initial phase with the reduction of the carriageway width from a minimum of 6.75m to a minimum of 6.5m, whilst not ideal, would be acceptable. However the omission of the 2.0m footway along the frontage of the property belonging to the Church does not allow for a safe environment to all highway users. Therefore this option should not be considered in view of the volume and classification of traffic that would be using St Joseph Street if Option C is adopted.
- 3.2 Even if the phasing of the proposals, as suggested by SSOB, was viable the assumption on this proposal is that both phases will be delivered. The success of the second phase is solely dependant on the County Council obtaining land from the Church. There is no guarantee of land acquisition being successful and, as a consequence, no guarantee on the provision for the requirement of a 2.0m footway. Therefore realistically the potential is for the interim measure being the **only** deliverable phase in relation to St Joseph's Street.
- 3.3 Officers have considered fully the proposals put forward by SSOB in paragraphs 2.9, 2.10, 3.1 and 3.2 above. However in view of these constraints, officers have considered those options and would advise that Option C although technically feasible cannot be delivered in practise due to the land purchase issues (phase 1 and 2), and the Health and Safety of highway users particularly pedestrians (phase 1). The traffic calming proposals (to align with Option B) previously agreed by the Area Committee in September 2006 are deliverable, but need to be reviewed.
- 3.4 The offer from Yorkshire Forward to finance the enhanced materials would be conditional on Option C being implemented. Therefore no Yorkshire Forward funding would be available for Option B. At the present time Yorkshire Forward's funding is time limited for all expenditure to be incurred by the 31 March 2009.
- 3.5 Since September 2006 the 20mph speed limit criteria have changed. This would have implications for the 20mph speed limit and traffic calming scheme originally approved in September 2006. The implications of the revised criteria mean that not all the traffic calming features would now be required. Those features that are no longer required could be removed from the scheme proposals and the scheme implemented accordingly.

- 3.6 Since the Traffic Management Strategy adopted in 2002 there have also been a number of changes to the highway network around Tadcaster. In order to ensure best use of the available funding relative to the changes referred to above, now would be an opportune time to review the proposed traffic management improvements for Tadcaster.
- 3.7 Plans showing the options A, B and C referred to above will be available at the meeting.

4.0 RECOMMENDATION

4.1 It is recommended that: -

- a) The Corporate Director of Business and Environmental Services reviews the proposed traffic management improvements and reports back to a future meeting of the Selby Area Committee.

RICHARD FLINTON
Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services

Background Papers:

1. Report to the Selby Area Committee, 18 September 2008 – Proposed Traffic Calming For 20 Mph Speed Limit, Tadcaster Town Centre.
2. Minute No. 115/2006 - Proposed Traffic Calming For 20 Mph Speed Limit, Tadcaster Town Centre.

APPENDIX A

1.0 PROCEDURE FOR MAKING A COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER

- 1.1 The Executive will have to authorise the making of a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) and there must be a compelling case in the public interest for the Order. An Order has to be drafted and sealed and then advertised.
- 1.2 Anyone is entitled to make a relevant objection to the Order. The objection period is a minimum of 21 days from the date of the Order being first published. If there are no objections to the Order or objections are subsequently withdrawn then the Order can be confirmed.
- 1.3 If there are objections then it is highly likely the CPO will be considered at a public inquiry. If a public inquiry is held Government Office will give notice of the inquiry at least six weeks before it is due to be held. The target date for the inquiry is within 39 weeks of the Order being sent to the Government Office. However it is likely to be at least four/five months between advertising the Order and the inquiry taking place.
- 1.4 If the Order is confirmed the County Council are then required to advertise confirmation. Once the advert appears in the local paper then anyone can challenge the CPO under judicial review to the High Court. There is a six week period for making any such challenge. If no High Court challenge is received the County Council can then normally proceed to serve notice to enter the land and commence the necessary works.
- 1.5 It is likely that an unopposed CPO would take between six months and one year to complete whereas an opposed Order could take between one to two years to complete.

2.0 ECCLESIASTICAL LAND

- 2.1 In this case there could be additional complications because it relates to land belonging to the Church. If the land is "consecrated land" which means land consecrated by a Bishop of the Church of England (this will normally cover the Church, its site and curtilage) it is subject to ecclesiastical law. This means that although not exempt from compulsory purchase it cannot be used for secular purposes such as highways unless freed from its consecrated restrictions. This can happen in a number of ways: -
 - (i) The Council could seek permission (it is called a "faculty") from the Ecclesiastical Court to use the land for highway purposes. An application would have to be made to the Chancellor of the Diocese. If granted the land would not need to be subject to a CPO.
 - (ii) The Council could use the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (Sections 238 – 240) which have the effect of lifting the restrictions imposed by ecclesiastical law. However, although this allows consecrated land which has been acquired by the CPO process to be used in accordance with the planning permission granted for the scheme, if a Church remains on the land the consent of the Bishop is still required.

APPENDIX B

EXPLANATORY NOTE OF THE TADCASTER TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STRATEGY OPTIONS (A, B AND C) AND THE TIMELINE OF CRITICAL EVENTS

1. Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy Consultation Options

Option A Proposed 20mph speed limit and traffic calming scheme.

Option B Proposed one way traffic system in St Joseph Street, the change of direction of the one way system in Chapel Street and access only for all vehicles in Kirkgate.

Option C Proposed two way traffic in St Joseph Street and access only for all vehicles in Chapel Street and Kirkgate.

2. Timeline of Critical Events

2002 Traffic Management Strategy adopted.

2003 The proposed 20mph speed limit and traffic calming scheme (Option A) was consulted upon.

2004 Consultation responses received were reported to the Selby Area Committee. The Area Committee resolved further consultation with a number of amendments.

2005/06 Further consultation took place and the responses reported to the 18 September 2006 meeting of the Selby area Committee.

2006/07 Judicial Review sought by Sam Smith Old Brewery (SSOB) on the basis of the proposals in Option A impinge on the proposals in Option B: SSOB have objections to Option B. SSOB had promoted Option C as an option for consultation for Traffic Management Strategy prior to the strategy adoption.

2007/08 SSOB and the County Council established the professional working group, which consisted of your officers and representatives acting for SSOB and they have been in discussion to establish the implications of these proposals on the Traffic Calming Scheme and the future delivery of the overall Traffic Management Scheme for the town centre based on Option C. Stalemate has been reached in the negotiations with landowners.

2008 SSOB discusses with the County Council the possibility of a two phase approach for the widening of St Joseph's Street, dependant on successful negotiations with landowners.

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

SELBY AREA COMMITTEE

18 SEPTEMBER 2006

**PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING FOR 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT,
TADCASTER TOWN CENTRE**

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the response to the re-consultation and public advertising in respect of the amendments to the traffic calming features proposal for the 20mph speed limit in Tadcaster Town Centre.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Members will be aware that a comprehensive and integrated strategy for traffic management in Tadcaster has been adopted, following extensive consultation with the whole of the local community within the Town. One of the elements of this strategy which received widespread support from the local community was a proposal to improve safety generally in the centre of Tadcaster by the introduction of a 20mph speed zone with associated traffic calming measures.
- 2.2 The proposals were consulted upon in 2003 and the responses received were reported to the meeting of this Area Committee on the 19 April 2004. The committee resolved the following: -
- a) Further consultations be carried out in respect of the amendments described in i), ii) and iii) below, and the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with the Chairman of the Area committee and the local Members, be authorised to consider the responses and to decide how these aspects of the scheme should proceed;
 - i) New Street and Centre Lane could either be provided with alternative traffic calming features, or be left out of the 20mph zone altogether. Further discussion to be held with the police and local users on this aspect of the proposals.
 - ii) The proposals for High Street and Bridge Street be modified by removing the speed cushions proposed on High Street west of the New Street junction, and also those on Bridge Street at the western end of the bridge. These features could be replaced by kerb build-outs, and a patch in the adjacent carriageway having a colour/texture

contrast. This type of feature near New Street would also assist pedestrians crossing High Street and help clear the junction of parked vehicles. Further local consultation would be necessary in respect of these amendments.

- iii) To facilitate the passage of horse drawn brewery drays it is suggested that the speed cushions proposed adjacent to the Britannia at the eastern end of Tadcaster Bridge to be replaced by a speed table.
- b) The remainder of the 20mph speed limit and associated traffic calming measures be implemented;
- c) The objectors be informed of the Committee's decision.

2.3 The amendments re-consulted on were as follows: -

- iv) No speed cushions to be provided in New Street and Centre Lane. Measures will be provided by way of road markings.
- v) The proposed speed cushions in High Street and Bridge Street to be replaced by kerb build outs and carriageway patches of contrasting colour and texture.
- vi) The proposed speed cushions at the eastern end of Tadcaster Bridge to be replaced by a speed table.

2.4 The Traffic Regulation Order for the 20mph speed limit has already been sealed and would become operational when speed limit signs are erected.

2.5 Plans of the original and amended proposals will be on display at your meeting on the 18 September.

3.0 RE-CONSULTATION

3.1 The re-consultation process for the proposed traffic calming measures involved consultation, re-adverting of all the traffic calming features and the on-site notices displayed. All those who had submitted comments and objections to the original proposals were re-consulted formally in June 2005 and concurrently with the public advertisement.

4.0 RESPONSE TO RE-CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC ADVERTISEMENT

4.1 Responses were received from 26 residents and organisations, of which 6 were from objector/consultees on the consultation to the original proposals. The objections and comments received are summarised in Appendix A.

5.0 URBAN RENAISSANCE - TADCASTER

5.1 The Tadcaster Renaissance Town Team (Town Team) requested that consideration be given to enhancing the features for the traffic calming scheme by using conservation quality materials to enhance the street scene. Discussions at officer level have been ongoing with Yorkshire Forward, Selby

District Council and the Town Team to explore the opportunity of enhancing the proposals.

- 5.2 The County Council's Partner Consultant, Mouchel Parkman, were engaged direct by the Town Team and Yorkshire Forward to develop options for the enhancement of the Town Centre area, which included the 20mph zone and the pedestrianisation of Kirkgate.
- 5.3 During that process it became evident that the Town Team were considering options that included Option C consulted upon in the Tadcaster Traffic Management Strategy but which had not gained popular support from the community. Option C included for St Joseph Street remaining two way but taking all the A659 traffic, a point closure in Chapel Street with two way access from each end, pedestrianisation of Kirkgate and changing Westgate to two way traffic flow. Option C was also the preferred option of the developer who had submitted a planning application to the District Council on the redevelopment of the Central Area Car Park.
- 5.4 Option B has been adopted in the approved Traffic Management Strategy. Option B included for St Joseph Street being made one way, changing the direction of the one way traffic system in Chapel Street, and the pedestrianisation of Kirkgate. The 20mph and traffic calming proposals are included in this years capital programme and the funding for the pedestrianisation of Kirkgate only has the design fee in the current two year programme. The details of Option B and Option C included in the Traffic Management strategy consultation leaflet are appended as Plan1.
- 5.5 An impasse has been reached with the Town Team as they sort a conditional approval for the funding to enhance the street scene from the renaissance funding by moving forward on Option C and including the pedestrianisation of Kirkgate. The inclusion of the pedestrianisation of Kirkgate in the same phasing programme would not be possible with the current commitments in this Council's LTP financial programme.
- 5.6 The Director of Business and Environmental Services has discussed this situation with the Chairman of your Area Committee and the local Member. It was agreed that the amended proposals consulted upon without the conservation enhancements proposed by Yorkshire Forward and the Town Team be presented to your Committee to consider the objections and comments received.

6.0 OFFICER COMMENT

- 6.1 The amended proposals consider the objections originally received and include changes to facilitate the concerns raised for horse drawn brewery drays and the other concerns that were discussed at this Area Committee on the 19 April 2004.

- 6.2 Although a number of objections and comments have been received, your officers would recommend that amended proposals re-consulted upon should be implemented.
- 6.3 The original proposals were put out to competitive tender. Following the objections originally received the Tenderers were asked if they were prepared to hold their prices for an additional three months for the objections to be resolved. The offer from Yorkshire Forward to finance the enhanced materials would have substantially changed the scope of the works proposed and would have required the construction work to be retendered. If members of the Area Committee resolve to implement the amended original traffic calming scheme then the scope of work is similar to the original tenders submitted. Therefore your officers would recommend that the three lowest Tenderers are contacted to determine whether they are prepared to hold their original tendered price, with inflation indices adjustment and price the variations for the proposed amendments. The Director of Business and Environmental Services to evaluate the revised tenders and to accept the lowest revised tender, if appropriate.

7.0 RECOMMENDATION

7.1 It is recommended that: -

- b) That having considered the objections received the amended traffic calming features re-consulted upon are implemented.
- c) The Director of Business and Environmental Services negotiates with the three lowest Tenderers to determine whether they are prepared to hold their original tendered price, with inflation indices adjustment and adjustment for the variations for the proposed amendments; and accepts the lowest revised tender.
- d) The objectors are advised accordingly.

G GRETTY
Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services

Background Papers:

None

31 August 2006

Appendix A - 18 September 2006

Comments Made	Officer Comments
1. Problem lies with HCV's travelling through the Town. Speed is not a real problem in the Town. (1).	1. Existing speeds within the proposed 20mph zone exceed the 'enforcement threshold'; therefore traffic calming required to reduce vehicles speeds to that threshold.
2. Introduction of speed humps will discourage drivers from coming into town centre and using local businesses, many of which struggling to make a living. (2, 15, 24, 25).	2. Traffic calming will provide safer conditions for all highway users which will encourage people into a safer environment.
3. Speed humps cause problems for ambulances and other emergency vehicles, and can reduce their efficiency. (2, 7, 9, 15).	3. No objection has been received from the Ambulance service, who were consulted as a statutory consultee on the original proposals.
4. Speed humps increase noise levels and exhaust emissions as vehicles slow down and then speed up. (2, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25).	4. The proposals are designed to have minimal impact on the existing environment.
5. Speed humps are designed to discourage drivers from using 'rat runs' and short cuts through residential areas; there are no alternative routes through Tadcaster to avoid humps. (2).	5. The use of 'rat runs' and alternative short cuts are not encouraged; they will increase the danger to road safety of all highway users on these roads.
6. Speed Humps cause damage to Vehicle steering and suspension and no matter how slowly they are negotiated fragile and brittle goods can be damaged in transit. (2, 17, 20, 21, 25).	6. Not if drivers traverse the features at an appropriate speed.
7. Put installation of traffic calming measures on hold until talks with Yorkshire Forward/Town Team (Urban Renaissance), Selby DC and Sam Smith's Old Brewery have resulted in a plan subscribed to by all parties. Otherwise could be installing measures in street that will be closed, or in which direction of traffic reversed, thus rendering measures irrelevant and wasting public money. (3, 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 19, 22, 26).	7. The traffic calming measures compliment the traffic management options for the town centre supported by the majority of the community who responded to the consultation for the Traffic Management Strategy for Tadcaster.

Comments Made	Officer Comments
8. No objection to traffic calming measures, but do think that road 'humps' are unimaginative. (5).	8. Road 'humps' are an effective traffic management tool in reducing vehicle speeds to an appropriate level.
9. Proposed traffic calming measures are unnecessary in Tadcaster Town centre. Features like narrow streets, pedestrian crossing, parked vehicles, traffic lights, traffic islands, short street length provide adequate traffic calming measures. (6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25).	9. Existing speeds within the proposed 20mph zone exceed the 'enforcement threshold'; therefore traffic calming required to reduce vehicles speeds to that threshold.
10. Supports 20mph speed limit. (11, 20).	10. Noted.
11. Vehicle activated signs (VAS) would be useful in reducing vehicle speeds. (11, 16, 23).	11. County Council policy is that VAS are only used where other appropriate forms of traffic calming measures have been implemented and have been unsuccessful in reducing vehicle speeds.
12. Few HCV's come through town therefore no problem. (13).	12. Existing speeds within the proposed 20mph zone exceed the 'enforcement threshold'; therefore traffic calming required to reduce vehicles speeds to that threshold.
13. Traffic calming outside Riverside School ineffective, therefore revise or withdraw proposals. (13, 14).	13. Traffic Calming schemes are monitored in the first twelve months after implementation. If vehicle speeds are not at an appropriate level addition measures would be considered if practicable.
14. All the accidents that have occurred would not be prevented by installing speed humps; caused by carelessness. (15).	14. Noted, however excessive vehicle speeds contribute to some of those accidents.
15. HCV's traversing speed humps will cause vibration disturbing residents, and office and shop employees. (16).	15. The traffic calming features proposed are designed to accommodate HCV usage to reduce the impact of increased noise and vibration.
16. In the past the standard of construction of speed humps has on occasion caused problems for buses. (18, 24).	16. The traffic calming features proposed are designed to accommodate bus routes.
Comments Made	Officer Comments
17. Proposals appear excessive, and will impact on the perceived and actual quality of service we can offer bus passengers. (18).	17. The traffic calming features proposed are designed to accommodate bus routes.

<p>18. Supports flat topped speed tables of 75mm height. (20).</p> <p>19. Suggests speed cushion in Station Road unnecessary as speed table provided for at the pedestrian crossing close by. (20).</p> <p>20. Suggests speed cushion on A162 be replaced with speed table to enable brewery workers to get to and from car park. (20).</p> <p>21. Suggests provision of flat topped crossing around Westfield Crescent. (20).</p> <p>22. Community not aware that 20mph speed limit would be accompanied by traffic calming using humps and tables not. (21).</p> <p>23. Decision based on 2004 Consultation and is based on out of date information and an out of date consultation. (22).</p> <p>24. In evenings a problem with boy racers. Not convinced that speed tables and cushions will slow them down. (23).</p> <p>25. Not convinced that measures required, think that measures proposed and agreed could be improved on. (23).</p>	<p>18. Maximum height on vertical features is 75mm.</p> <p>19. The number of features proposed are designed to achieve the appropriate reduction in vehicle speeds.</p> <p>20. Traffic calming features are not designed to cater for pedestrian crossing point other than where a controlled crossing facility is being provided.</p> <p>21. Noted.</p> <p>22. Existing speeds within the proposed 20mph zone exceed the 'enforcement threshold'; therefore traffic calming required to reduce vehicles speeds to that threshold. Details of the type and location of the traffic calming features proposed were included in the re-consultation were available for inspection at Tadcaster Post Office and County Hall; as advised in the re-consultation letter and public advertisement.</p> <p>23. Relates to Town Team being set up since 2004 consultation.</p> <p>24. Traffic calming will reduce the speed of vehicles generally but speed tables are used where HCV traffic is anticipated and therefore accommodate the requirements to reduce speed without increasing significantly environmental concerns.</p> <p>25. Existing speeds within the proposed 20mph zone exceed the 'enforcement threshold'; therefore traffic calming required to reduce vehicles speeds to that threshold.</p>
<p>Comments Made</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p>
<p>26. Suggests finances better utilised on paved parking bays on narrow part of Wighill Lane and the bad bend on Oxton Lane. (24).</p>	<p>26. The highway authority is not responsible for providing residents parking; particularly where off street parking could be provided within the cartilage of the property.</p>

27. Why if considering traffic calming not using cycle lanes; greener, cheaper and healthier. (14).	27. There is insufficient width generally for cycle lane provision through the Town Centre, without consider significant changes to the existing traffic management.
28. Discomfort for passengers. (14).	28. Not if drivers traverse the features at an appropriate speed.

Comments received from the following: -

1. Margaret Dawson (Civic Society), Manor Farm, Toulston
2. Colin Drake, 11 Meadow Garth, Tadcaster
3. John Notley, 12 Edgerton Court, Tadcaster
4. Graham Auton, 'Stonelea', Ouston Lane, Tadcaster
5. A P Carlton-Scott, 'Casita' Beech close, Ouston Lane, Tadcaster
6. Ian Page, 1 Edgerton Court, Tadcaster
7. Juliet Crawley Peck (Chair, Tadcaster Civic Society), York Road Mews, Healaugh
8. R Harvey, 8 Golf Links Avenue, Tadcaster
9. Peter Atkin, 37 Calcaria Road, Tadcaster
10. M Overton – Address not provided
11. Brian Percival (Percivals), 4-6 Bridge Street, Tadcaster
12. Steve Helsdon, 53 York Road, Tadcaster
13. Joan Clarke, 15 Golf Links Crescent, Tadcaster
14. David and Sally Nelson (Nelson's Bookkeeping), 4 Station View, Church Fenton
15. John Barton (President, Tadcaster Chamber of Trade)
16. Bartle and Son, 1 Bridge Street, Tadcaster
17. Mrs B Knowles, 129 Stutton Road, Tadcaster
18. Arriva Yorkshire Ltd
19. John Holgate Butters, 'Rivermead', Ouston Lane, Tadcaster
20. Stephen Cobb, 11 Fairfield Way, Tadcaster
21. David Horner, 18 Golf Links Crescent, Tadcaster
22. Roderic Parker, 15 Prospect Drive, Tadcaster
23. Elaine and Paddy Brooks – Address not provided
24. John Haynes, 42 Oxtan Lane, Tadcaster
25. M Baker, 1 Oxtan Drive, Tadcaster
26. Tadcaster Town Council