

Please note date and time of meeting

Agenda

Meeting: Richmond (Yorks) Area Constituency Committee

Venue: Remote live broadcast meeting via Microsoft Teams

Date: 8th January 2021 at 2pm

Pursuant to The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020, this meeting will be held using video conferencing with a live broadcast to the Council's YouTube site. Further information on this is available on the committee pages on the Council website - <https://democracy.northyorks.gov.uk/>

The meeting will be available to view once the meeting commences, via the following link - www.northyorks.gov.uk/livemeetings Recordings of previous live broadcast meetings are also available there.

1. **Chairman's welcome and introductions – including apologies for absence**
2. **Minutes of the meeting held on 25th November 2020** (Pages 4 to 15)
3. **Any Declarations of Interest**
4. **Public Questions or Statements**

Members of the public may ask questions or make statements at this meeting if they have given notice and provided the text to Daniel Harry of Democratic Services (*contact details below*) no later than midday on Tuesday 5 January 2021. Each speaker should limit themselves to 3 minutes on any item. Members of the public who have given notice will be invited to speak:-

- at this point in the meeting if their questions/statements relate to matters which are not otherwise on the Agenda (subject to an overall time limit of 30 minutes);
- when the relevant Agenda item is being considered if they wish to speak on a matter which is on the Agenda for this meeting.

If you are exercising your right to speak at this meeting, but do not wish to be recorded, please inform the Chairman who will instruct those taking a recording to cease whilst you speak.

- 5. Melsonby Flood Risks and Drainage Issues – Briefing** – Briefing report from Flood Risk Management – Business and Environmental Services
(Page 16 to 17)
- 6. Hambleton District Council Off-Street Parking Places Amendment Order** – Report of the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services advising the committee of proposals submitted by Hambleton District Council and seeking its views and comments on them.
(Page 18 to 29)
- 7. Council Budget proposals** – Presentation of the Corporate Director Strategic Resources, North Yorkshire County Council – TO FOLLOW
(Page 30)
- 8. Richmond (Yorks) Area Constituency Committee Work Programme** – Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)
(Pages 31 to 36)
- 9. Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to take place Wednesday 24th March 2021 at 10am.
- 10. Other business which the Chairman agrees should be considered as a matter of urgency because of special circumstances.**

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

23 December 2020

SML

RICHMOND (YORKS) AREA CONSTITUENCY COMMITTEE

Membership

County Councillors (13)			
	<i>Councillors Name</i>	<i>Political Group</i>	<i>Electoral Division</i>
1	BLADES, David	Conservative	Romanby and Broomfield
2	DICKINSON, Caroline	Conservative	Northallerton
3	GRANT, Helen	North Yorkshire Independent	Central Richmondshire
4	GRIFFITHS, Bryn	Liberal Democrat	Stokesley
5	HUGILL, David	Conservative	North Hambleton
6	LES, Carl	Conservative	Catterick Bridge
7	MOORHOUSE, Heather	Conservative	Great Ayton
8	PARSONS, Stuart	North Yorkshire Independent	Richmond
9	PEACOCK, Yvonne	Conservative	Upper Dales
10	SEDGWICK, Karin	Conservative	Middle Dales
11	THOMPSON, Angus	Conservative	Richmondshire North
12	WEIGHELL, John, OBE	Conservative	Bedale
13	WILKINSON, Annabel	Conservative	Swale
Members other than County Councillors – (1)			
	<i>Name of Member</i>	<i>Representation</i>	
1	Mr Malcolm Warne	Co-opted Member	
Total Membership – (14)		Quorum – (4 County Councillors)	

North Yorkshire County Council

Richmond (Yorks) Area Constituency Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 25 November 2020, commencing at 10am – held remotely via Microsoft Teams.

Present:-

Members: County Councillors Angus Thompson (Chairman), David Blades, Caroline Dickinson, Helen Grant, Bryn Griffiths, David Hugill, Carl Les, Heather Moorhouse, Yvonne Peacock, John Weighell OBE, Annabel Wilkinson, and co-opted member Malcolm Warne.

Other Cllrs Present: County Councillor Gareth Dadd

Apologies: County Councillor Karin Sedgewick

NYCC Officers: Pam Johnson (Technical Specialist, Development Management, Highways and Transportation); Victoria Ononeze (Public Health Consultant); Andrew Dixon (Strategic Planning Manager, Education and Skills); Julie Pattison (Principal Education Adviser); Nikki Joyce (Head of SEN and Disability Services); Howard Emmett (Assistant Director, Strategic Resources); Sally Dunn (Head of Finance – Schools and Early Years); David Edwardes (ICT Officer); Steve Loach and Melanie Carr (Democratic Services Officers)

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

95. Chairman's Welcome

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted a slight alteration to the agenda with the item on Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation being moved to the end of the meeting.

96. Minutes

Resolved -

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2020, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

97. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest to note.

98. Public Questions and Statements

The Clerk stated that a statement had been submitted by Harriet Corner from Coverdale in relation to the erection of 5G Mobile Technology masts in that area. He noted that the statement, detailed below, had been submitted after the registration date, but had been accepted due to postal difficulties in the Coverdale which had led to Mrs Corner only just

being aware of the meeting, and she had stressed the need to outline this current issue now, as she had recently referred the matter to Rishi Sunak MP. In view of the late submission, Mrs Corner had been advised that she would receive a reply to her statement directly, with a copy of the reply sent to Members of the Committee. The Clerk read out the following statement from Mrs Corner:-

“Having been ambivalent before about 5G , and very much understanding the need to have far better connectivity in our part of the Dale, I have not felt the need to voice any concern about it. However, recently there have been some issues that have made me extremely concerned.

Last week I talked to Nicholas Soames (who is an old friend) and explained these problems to him and he urged me to write to you as he believes there has been a serious abuse of local democracy.

Let me explain the background. In recent weeks I have read in the Darlington and Stockton Times that Coverdale has been chosen to be the initial location for a 5G test bed and trial by MANY (Mobile Access North Yorkshire, which I understand to be a consortium led by Quickline Communications and North Yorkshire County Council). This was the first time I had seen or heard anything about this, so I contacted our local parish councillor James Harrison -Topham.

James told me that he had had no information regarding this, either by email or letter. This was also true for all the residents that I have spoken to in and around our area of Coverdale. There certainly has not been, contrary to the claim on the MANY website, any “door to door canvassing”.

There has been, I understand, some consultation with Carlton Parish Council and Melmerby with an employee of MANY informing them of the project.

I was shocked subsequently when researching the MANY website to discover there is a plan for three 15 metre 5G masts, one of which has already been erected at Braidley, again without any knowledge of residents at our end of the Dale. It seems, that having contacted the landowners and looking at the 5G map of masts on their website, that here and at Coverhead they have been designated as being “emergency masts” and there has been a change of use without the knowledge of the landowner.

I cannot understand how such a thing could happen without a full and detailed consultation, since as you know, we have incredibly tight controls in the National Park regarding even the choices of roof tiles and colours of windows etc. I firmly believe that this behaviour flies in the face of the National Park’s duties of “conserving and enhancing the natural environment”, and frankly it seems to reflect an underhand and potentially deceitful pattern of behaviour over a very contentious issue.

We have been fortunate in consulting Mike Sparrow, who was recently a key speaker at the Planet in Crisis conference. He lives in Swaledale, the upper part of which the MANY website says is to be another area where 5G is to be trialled. Mike has been CEO of a worldwide utilities construction business and has a rational and objective approach to the issues raised by 5G. He has spent many years studying the science of cell phone/electromagnetic radiation (EMR), and has reached some disturbing conclusions based entirely on peer-reviewed science. He has no time for any conspiracy theories. He gave a local Webinar briefing about his grave concerns for the damage that this additional radiation will cause to our very precious ecology and wildlife here in the Coverdale. He believes the science showing this is conclusive and robust and I see no reason to disbelieve him. Indeed at least one of the mast sites is adjacent to an SSSI, where Hen Harriers nested this year. There must also be a real concern for the wellbeing of humans and livestock in our immediate area.

The urgency is that the residents of Coverdale remain unaware of these risks. The only information some of them may have seen or heard has come from MANY. They have had no consultation, and clearly have no control over what happens to the infrastructure that may be required. They have no information or detail regarding the nature of the trial. It seems to me that we are expected to trust MANY in telling the truth and given their underhand behaviour so far it seems a risky ask. To be frank this is a question of trust. We are also very concerned that the National Park, as the planning authority, has not given due consideration to the risks of 5G, and certainly has not fairly or properly alerted us to this serious development, or given us a chance to object to the planning applications.

We would be very grateful if you would kindly take an interest in this which is causing great anxiety locally. We would ask you kindly to insist that the National Park and MANY offer us and all other residents a full and detailed briefing and consultation in respect of this project. Of course we need to be connected to mobile telephony, but I understand that the safest and most secure and fastest route to achieve this is using fibre optic broadband (which you have already been so helpful in obtaining for us in Coverdale).

Once again I must apologise for raising this with you at such a fraught time, but I cannot over emphasise how disturbed we all are at this turn of events and the apparently disingenuous behaviour of the Authorities and MANY.

Since writing this, another planning application for a fourth mast has gone to the YDNP, again sold to the farmer as being an “emergency mast”. I wonder how long it will be before it appears on the MANY 5G map?”

Members discussed the statement and the following issues were raised:-

- A Member consider that consultation in respect of the masts should be taking place involving the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority and Parish Councils. She suggested that COVID may have affected the consultations but was aware that some Parish Councils had received presentations from MANY.
- It was noted that Rishi Sunak MP had received a copy of the statement and would be responding accordingly.
- A Member stated that, having spoken to Planning Officers at the North Yorks Moors Authority, he had been advised that the erection of the masts was permitted development.
- It was emphasised that only one side of this issue had been presented to the Committee and further details should be awaited before passing judgement on the matter. Members agreed with this and would await the response to be provided to the questioner.
- It was stated that the emergency masts referred to were provided for use by the emergency services, were funded by the Home Office, and were permanent.

The clerk advised that a response to the issues raised would be sent directly to Mrs Corner, and that response would be circulated to members of the Committee. Members noted the statement and how it would be responded to.

99. County Council’s Petition Scheme – Gilling West footpath and cycleway

The Clerk reported that a petition submitted in relation to this issue contained 500 signatures or more and was, therefore, scheduled for debate at this meeting of the area constituency committee.

The petition organiser, Janette Povey, who had also submitted a public question to the previous meeting on the same issue (Minute No. 87 2019/20) was given five minutes to present the petition and the petition was then discussed by County Councillors. It was explained how the Committee could decide how to respond to the petition at this meeting, including:

- to take the action the petition requests;
- not to take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate;
- to commission further investigation into the matter, for example by a relevant committee; or
- where the issue is one on which the county council executive are required to make the final decision, the county council will decide whether to make recommendations to inform that decision.

As the issue was raised as a public question at the previous meeting, information had been obtained in response to that and was provided within the papers for the meeting. (Page 12)

The petition organiser would receive written confirmation of the decision of the Committee and would be published on the website.

Janette Povey outlined the following:-

“Thank you for inviting me back to speak to you about the proposed cycle and footpath between Gilling West and Richmond.

I am very much encouraged by the public response to the petition, which has gathered 763 signatures. These are almost exclusively from local people, some of whom have for at least three decades been asking for something to be done to improve safety on this short but dangerous stretch of road.

There is overwhelming support too from local leaders, including several members of this committee, who are offering to help get this scheme approved.

I note that the Richmond (Yorks) Area Constituency Committee aim to ‘improve the quality of life for people in their area by acting as a critical friend to policy makers and decision makers, enabling the voice and concerns of the public to be heard, and driving improvements in public services’.

This encourages me to think that we might find a way forward with this proposal. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to voice the concerns of Gilling West villagers and Richmond townsfolk, the people who would benefit the most.

I thought that Councillor Yvonne Peacock made a very sensible suggestion at the last meeting. She said that there should be a list of schemes already planned and prepared so that as government funding became available the council would be in a position to quickly respond with a bid for funding.

The local transport planning team was asked to give a detailed report to this committee. I read it with interest. I am just a member of the public. I had never heard of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP) before reading the report. I requested sight of it as I am at a loss as to why the Gilling to Richmond route isn’t in such a document, considering how long the public have been asking for it. How can we be added to the plan?

In the Department of Transport’s technical guidance for local authorities it explains how local authorities should be assessing the number of cyclists and walkers they will need to cater for in the future. (Ref: 5.18) It says... ‘**Medium** flows of cyclists are forecast along desire lines that link to trip attractors such as schools, colleges and employment sites.’

Considering that **all** Richmonds schools are on Darlington Road, the nearest shop to Gilling West is on Gilling Road, and there are about 30 businesses along the B6274 that can **only** be accessed from that road, can you please change your assessment of potential usage from ‘very low’ to ‘medium’, in line with government guidance?

North Yorkshire County Council states that they intend to develop and adopt an LCWIP for each of the principal towns in the county. The aim of these is to identify the main cycle and walking improvements in a town to enable the county council to bid for government funding and/or to secure funding contributions from developers. This is **exactly** what we need!

I note that the only towns with plans so far are Harrogate area, Scarborough, Skipton area, Malton area, Northallerton, and Catterick. Dare I presume that Richmond will be included as a principle town? If so, when will the plan be drawn up, and how do we get this scheme onto it? The local support is evident, and it would be democracy in action.

How current is the data in the report? At the moment there is overwhelming public support for safe cycling and walking routes, and government incentives for encouraging walking and cycling.

No one can use this route safely at the moment, but many people want to be able to walk more and cycle more, and incorporate these activities into everyday short journeys. It is true that we are a rural location, but as Councillor Bryn Griffiths said at the last meeting, North Yorkshire is a rural county. Small rural road schemes need to be considered, -giving help to rural communities who need connectivity to nearby towns. I am taking this up with North Yorkshire Transport Planning Team, and I urge them not just to consider cycle paths in areas where they would be easy and cheap to construct, but to think about the more challenging, but more dangerous routes.

I urge you to please consult with the public. Find out what they want. Make it possible for cycling and walking to be an easy option for short journeys. It will get used!

It is worth highlighting that the transport planning team may be using old data. Councillor Stuart Parsons (Richmond) implores me to ask for strong and meaningful testing on road speeds, and I would add accident data and road usage data to this request. He says that the police rely on data collected in 2015. I appreciate that traffic flow is not normal during lockdown.

There are so many options for improving safety on this stretch of road, not all of them are expensive options. May I ask, did the planning transport team do a site visit? Did they walk along this road? Did they feel safe doing so?

Here's what we are asking for... a distinct cycle path and footpath that follows the road but keeps separation between motorised vehicles and other road users, much like the path at Longwood Bank in Richmond. A first step would be to be included in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans.

I would be happy to work directly with local councillors and highways agencies to plan options for a proposed route. Are there any members of this committee who would work with me, and others, to push this scheme forward?

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to reinforce the aims of our petition."

Members discussed the presentation and the following issues were highlighted:-

- County Councillors Yvonne Peacock, Helen Grant and Angus Thompson offered to assist Janette Povey with consideration of how to develop the project further, providing local knowledge and process information to ensure that a scheme was ready to be enabled should funding become available.
- Members welcomed the presentation and considered that the proposal would be of benefit to the local community.
- A Member highlighted the process for cycleway schemes and emphasised the need for the project to be fully scoped and planned, before being submitted for consideration.
- A note of caution was outlined by a Member in relation to the number of similar schemes competing for limited funding in North Yorkshire, and the length of time that it could take for the project to come to fruition. He suggested that alternative sources of funding be investigated for the project. In response Ms Povey stated that the project had been discussed for approximately 30 years, and considered that all funding possibilities had been explored, therefore, she was looking to the County Council for support for the project.

Resolved –

That the Members identified provide further assistance to Janette Povey in respect of the project outlined.

100. North Northallerton Infrastructure and Development Project – Bridge Update

Members considered the written update provided by NYCCs Project Manager for the site, Pam Johnson, which gave details of the development of the bridge over the railway line.

The following issues were raised by Members:-

- A Member welcomed the report and the progress being made on the development of the bridge. Following on from the report to the previous meeting he asked that it be ensured that the following issues be addressed, if they had not already been:

The flooding on the A684 Stokesley Road;

The signage at the roundabout by the garage on the A684 advising the contractors of the correct route into the site;

Warning signs relating to the potential for ice along the A684, particularly between the stretch likely to flood and the new roundabout.

- A Member sought clarification in respect of the expected completion date for the bridge. In response it was stated that the current completion was expected in Autumn 2021, but regular work was taking place on the project delivery programme and this could be revised. It was noted that work on the structure of the bridge would not take place until Easter 2021, with the approach embankment work taking place in the meantime. The contractors and Network Rail continued to work closely together to ensure targets were being met. The Member noted that there had been some complications with the bridge development and sought to allay local fears that the project would not be completed, suggesting that providing a completion date may not be helpful to the situation. It was emphasised that the bridge would be completed and would ensure that the available funding was utilised within the timeframe identified. When the bridge is completed the route would need to be thoroughly tested before it can be used by traffic, being the first of its type to be developed, therefore, there will be a time lapse between the completion of the bridge and the route opening. The importance of the route was acknowledged with the opportunity provided to divert traffic away from Northallerton Town Centre. The Member welcome the reassurances regarding the completion of the project. He noted that signs near to the site provided details of a website relating to the project and wondered whether this covered the whole project or just the bridge. He also suggested that further communication should be provided in respect of the signs as these had been erected during the current lockdown and were unlikely to have been seen by many people. The position re publicising the website was acknowledged and further efforts would be made to enhance this. It was noted that the website related specifically to the bridge aspect of the project.

Resolved –

That the report, and updates provide, be noted with the action outlined undertaken accordingly.

101. Healthy Child Programme – Consultation

North Yorkshire County Council, in partnership with Harrogate and District NHS Foundation Trust, was proposing a new model for Health Visiting and School Nursing Services (the Healthy Child Programme) in the County. In respect of this a consultation document was attached as an Appendix to the report provided, together with a survey which posing various questions on which views/comments were sought as part of the consultation.

Public Health consultant, Victoria Ononeze, from the County Council's Health and Adult Services Directorate introduced the report and respond to any questions from Members.

She provided a presentation detailing the following:-

- The Healthy Child Programme
- Current Service – 0-6 years Health Visiting – 5 Mandated Contracts
- Current Service – 5-19 years Nursing - Health Reviews
- Funding context
- Proposed changes – 0-5
- Proposed changes – 5-19
- Service Timeline
- Consultation
- Consultation questions

The public consultation was taking place between 26 October 2020 to 4 January 2021 with a series of online events planned. In addition, the Healthy Child Programme Team was welcoming the opportunity to speak to any existing meetings or groups which would add value to the consultation process. There was also an online survey.

Any comments which the Committee wished to make could be fed into the meeting of the Scrutiny of Health Committee on 18 December 2020.

Members highlighted the following issues:-

- A Member raised concerns that under the revised proposals mothers with new born children would not be seen at home until between 10 and 14 days after the birth, and, potentially, then not until between 8 and 10 weeks after that. She considered that this was a vital time for new mothers, and been seen as soon and as often as possible after the birth was vital to their wellbeing. She noted that this could be particularly important for new mothers from service families, whose partners often worked away for long periods. In response it was noted that the proposals were based on national guidelines, however, new mothers would be monitored by Health Visitors prior to them leaving hospital, and should there be any concerns, additional monitoring would be put in place. There was also an awareness of the specific needs of service families. The member emphasised the vulnerability of new mothers in the initial two weeks.
- It was asked what feedback had been provided by schools in respect of the removal of a number of services currently provided such as sexual health advice, counselling, etc. In response it was stated that there had been little response to the consultation from schools as yet, however, there was some anxiety in terms of the provision of these services, and alternative providers were being considered to deliver these services at places where young people gather. Work was being undertaken alongside youth services to explore how services can be delivered appropriately.
- A Member raised concerns regarding the extra burden that may be placed on GPs through the cuts to services currently provided to schools and asked whether they had been targeted as part of the consultation. He also considered that Parish and Town Councils should be directly consulted, together with older children, as they would be most directly affected by the changes. In response it was stated that talks were being held with GPs who had raised concerns regarding the additional impact on them that could result from the proposals. Consideration would be given to specific consultation with parish and Town Councils. Work was taking place alongside youth services to obtain the views of older children
- Concern was raised that consultations with parents of the 0-5 years age range appeared to be moving more towards on-line or telephone, and it was emphasised that often face to face contact was the most effective method of communication with the parents of younger children. In response it was emphasised that the services were aware of the risks and carried out risk assessments to determine how specific parents should be contacted, with face to face engagement undertaken where appropriate, as it was recognised that this was important.
- It was suggested that a nominated single telephone number should be identified that parents could contact whenever they needed advice however old their child was, to provide peace of mind, and to make it simpler for advice to be provided. In response it was noted that all the services identified were available to parents, however, it was emphasised that this should be

a single point of contact rather different telephone numbers. In response it was stated that Compass Reach provide a one contact point, wrap around service for young people and their parents, although their services related mainly to older children. A system was being developed that would ensure that finding assistance, for parents and children, would be easier, with no gaps in service provision. As there would be no School Nurse provision in the proposed programme a framework of support and assistance would be provided.

- A Member raised concerns regarding the onus of identifying children's issues becoming the responsibility of teachers under the proposed programme. In response it was stated that it was recognised that removing School Nurses would be a difficult issue and schools would be provided with an information resource pack to assist them with addressing this.
- It was asked how vulnerable parents were assisted with access to services. In response it was stated that within the 0-5 age group Health Visitors would continue to identify needs and make referrals to the appropriate services, and would ensure that early intervention remained in place. Schools would assist with identifying appropriate services for older children through the information resource packs.
- It was acknowledged that no alternative resource was planned to replace School Nurses other than the information packs. It was emphasised that savings in the region of £750k were required and these had resulted in alternative service provision being suggested for the 5-19 age group to protect early intervention. It was asked that further details be provided to the Committee in respect of how much would be saved by the removal of School Nurses and it was stated that consideration would be given to this.
- A Member welcomed the comprehensive presentation provided on this issue. She encouraged Members to ensure that all those that would be affected by the proposals took part in the consultation, and to share the consultation details on social media. Victoria Oneneze thanked Members for their responses and feedback.

Resolved –

That Victoria Oneneze be thanked for her presentation, the contents of which be noted, and Members encourage those affected to take part in the consultation taking place in respect of the proposed Healthy Child Programme.

102. Schools educational achievement and finance (including update on Northallerton College)

Considered –

The report of the Corporate Director Children and Young People's Services updating Members on the local educational landscape, educational achievement and the financial challenges which affect schools in the Richmond Constituency Committee area. Andrew Dixon (Strategic Planning Manager, Education and Skills); ; Julie Pattison (Principal Education Adviser); Nikki Joyce (Head of SEN and Disability Services); Howard Emmett (Assistant Director, Strategic Resources); and Sally Dunn (Head of Finance – Schools and Early Years) attended the Meeting to assist Members with their consideration of this item. The report detailed the following:-

Local educational landscape

Summary of schools' status – October 2020

School standards

School Ofsted judgements

Attainment overall

Early Years Foundation Stage Profile

Key Stage 2

Key Stage 4

Key Stage 5

Not in education, employment or training

Fixed-term and Permanent Exclusions

Fixed-term exclusion incidents

Permanent exclusions

Special Education Needs and Disabilities

Reshaping of SEN Provision in Richmond over the 2019/20 Academic Year

Targeted Mainstream Provision

SEN Statistics for Constituency Area

School Finance

Schools in Financial Difficulty – the countywide position

School Projections - Based on May 2020/21 Start budgets

Funding

Schools in Financial Difficulty – Richmond

Planning school places

School sustainability

Collaborative working

Pupil rolls – current and future

Planning Areas and forecast surplus/shortfall school places

The following issues and points were raised during a discussion of the report:-

- It was asked whether there had been delays to the work required to re-open the School site for Northallerton School and Sixth Form College in the currently unused school facilities and what had caused these. In response it was stated that the project was funded through the Education and Skills Funding Agency, as an Academy Trust, and although there was an awareness of a delay, the reasons for that were not clear. Another Member stated that she had been contacted by the Trust's Chief Operating Officer and had been advised that there had been initial issues but the contractors were now on site and the school was expected to transfer sites in September 2021.
- It was clarified that the OFSTED judgements referred to in the report included all the schools for the Richmond Constituency. A Member raised concerns regarding the current position in respect of the judgements for Secondary schools in the area. In response it was stated that the concerns were shared by officers and work was taking place behind the scenes to try and improve that position. It was noted that further work was being undertaken within schools in relation to this, however, it had

been difficult of late due to the closure of schools because of the pandemic. It was noted that it was a mixture of maintained schools and Academies that were affecting these figures.

- It was asked whether the facilities within the new North Northallerton Primary School would be made available to the public. In response it was noted that the specification for applications for a Multi Academy Trust had recently been published, and clear intention is that the school's facilities would be made available to the public through the chosen Trust.
- A Member referred to the closure of Arkengathdale School due to low numbers of pupils and emphasised the need to work alongside the National Park Authorities to ensure appropriate homes were being built and provided in rural and deeply rural areas to ensure schools remained viable. It was emphasised that the development of affordable housing in all areas was also required to ensure that younger families moved into areas, keeping the numbers of children using local schools at a sustainable level.
- A Member asked whether the school places detailed within the report related to actual figures.. In response it was stated that the numbers were a mixture of actuals and forecasts, and included an allowance where planning permission had been granted for residential development, but not for as yet unapproved Local Plan proposals.

Resolved –

That the officers be thanked for their report, the content of which be noted, together with the issues raised during the discussion.

103. Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation – Implications for ACC

The Leader of the Council provided a verbal update in respect of proposals for Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation in North Yorkshire, highlighting the following:-

- An outline submission for a single unitary Local Authority in North Yorkshire had been developed, and the final submission would be sent to Central Government on 9th December 2020.
- Since the debate, and agreement to submit this proposal, at the November County Council meeting, a number of issues had been developed as part of the bid including the Planning Function, the constitution of overview and scrutiny and housing.
- The principle of “double devolution” was embedded into the bid, with the possibility of enhanced an role and powers for Parish and Town Councils, Neighbourhood Forums and the Area Constituency Committees.
- Whereas there had been some doubt expressed regarding the experience and competency of Parish Councils to undertake an enhanced role, the Leader emphasised the vast amount of experience operating at that level, and the benefits that could be brought to the local community, citing Bedale Town Council as an excellent example of this in operation. It was emphasised that there was no compulsion for extra duties to be taken on by Parish Councils if they did not want these.
- Neighbourhood Forums were important as they brought all services together to be held to account by the public.
- In respect of the Area Constituency Committees, consideration would be given to how they would be utilised within the local democratic process, with an opportunity provided to enhance powers and decision-making. Members will be invited to provide details of how these could be developed before the final submission of the proposal.

A discussion of the matters was undertaken by Members and the following issues and points were raised:-

- It was noted that some of the District Councils had substantial reserves and it was asked how these would be allocated should the proposals be accepted, as it was felt unfair that these should be utilised in another area. In response the Leader stated that the reserves held by the District Councils would be allocated to the new Authority under the proposals, however, he considered it appropriate that these would be allocated in the area where they were accrued. A Shadow Board and Governance arrangements would be in place and it was expected that major projects, such as the Hambleton Crematorium, would be able to utilise this funding through those arrangements. County Councillor Dadd, Executive Member for Finance, and present at the meeting, emphasised that this was not an opportunity for the County Council to obtain additional reserves, as some were intimating, as the total level of reserves held would only allow the new Authority to operate for two days. He stated that the new Authority would look to provide a fair allocation of resources to all local communities but geographically areas would still be separated, with resources allocated accordingly.
- A Member stated that it would be beneficial for Members to take account of other local authorities that had become unitary authorities to benefit from their experiences. In response the Leader stated that there had been close links with both Cornwall and Buckinghamshire unitary authorities in respect of this, which had been extremely helpful in the process to date.
- The Leader highlighted the timeline for the process from this point, noting that the Government would provide a decision on whether the two proposals were valid (2 unitary authorities with an east/west split or a single unitary authority) early in the new year, with a consultation process then following to determine the way forward.
- A Member raised concerns that the Neighbourhood Forums may be disbanded in their current format under the new proposals. The Leader provided reassurance that it was intended that these carry on should the single countywide proposal be accepted.
- It was noted that within the “double devolution” proposals, Parish Councils would be able to take control of vehicle parking processes within their local areas.
- It was stated that documents were being produced to show how functions would be transferred from District Councils to the new Authority, including the Planning function and Council Housing. In terms of housing it was noted that unless the District Council had previously transferred their stock to a Housing Association, this would transfer directly to the new Authority. The management of the housing stock, in the future, would subsequently be determined by the Members of the new Authority. A Member stated that some housing tenants had raised concerns that the transfer may adversely affect them. Reassurances were provided that there would be no adverse effects for tenants resulting from this process. A Member recalled concerns being expressed by tenants in relation to the transfer of local authority housing stock to a Housing Association, but the transfer had resulted in improved housing, services and facilities.
- A Member noted that Local Plans were currently developed and produced at District Council level and wondered how the new arrangements would take account of these and whether they would be amalgamated into a single Plan. In response it was stated that Local Plans would continue to be developed on a geographical basis the boundaries of which would be determined by the new Authority before eventually being amalgamated into a single Plan. In the interim reliance would be placed on the existing Local Plans developed by District Councils. It was noted that there was likely to be a lengthy period before a single Plan could be developed. Area Constituency Committees would be at the forefront of the Local Plan process.
- The Leader expressed his disappointment in recent press coverage of the reorganisation process, whereby a recent press release had indicated that there was 92% support for the East/West split Authorities in Richmondshire, with similar figures outlined for Harrogate and Scarborough. However, he had subsequently discovered that the published results had been based on a very small survey

(between 29 and 31 response in total for each area) and considered the press statements to be misleading. He emphasised that the issue was not for the public to be directed by politicians, but for them to be given the facts and make informed decisions based on those.

Resolved –

That the issues raised be noted.

104. Work Programme

Considered -

The report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) providing a Work Programme for Members to consider, develop and adapt.

Information regarding the current Scrutiny Work Programme was also provided for Members to consider in terms of developing the Committee's Work Programme overall.

It was noted that Members were invited to identify issues for inclusion in the Work Programme outside of the meeting and inform the Clerk accordingly.

It was noted that Members had also been invited to undertake an additional meeting to consider the proposals for the County Council Budget 2020/21, with Friday 8th January 2021 at 2pm suggested.

Resolved -

- (i) That the Work Programme be updated to reflect the following additional items for the next meeting:

Further data on the removal of School Nurses
Flooding leading to raw sewage on the streets – Melsonby

- (ii) That Members be contacted to determine whether an additional meeting to consider the proposals for the County Council Budget 2020/21, on Friday 8th January 2021 at 2pm, be arranged.

105. Next Meeting

Resolved -

That the next scheduled meeting of the Area Constituency Committee would take place on Wednesday 24 March 2021 at 10am – to be held remotely via Microsoft TEAMS, subject to the outcome of minute no 104 (ii), above.

The meeting concluded at 12:25pm.
SML



**North Yorkshire County Council
Richmond (Yorks) Constituency Committee – 8 January 2021**

Briefing on the Melsonby Flood Risks and Drainage Issues

1.0 Background of briefing

- 1.1 On the 7 December 2020 the Corporate Director Business and Environmental Services, accompanied by representatives from the Local Highway Office and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) team, met with the Parish Council and residents of Melsonby and also representatives of Northumbrian Water, to discuss the concerns of residents regarding flood risks. These related to the historic drainage system and its condition and the associated impact the development proposals would have on its finite capacity.
- 1.2 Concerns over a potentially collapsed culvert at the entrance of Limegarth, Moor Road were raised at the meeting. Following further investigatory work, the location of the collapse is confirmed to be in private third party ownership. Under common law, the responsibility to repair the watercourse falls to the riparian landowner. The County Council has permissive powers to serve notice on any landowner who does not undertake regular maintenance work or fails to repair a section of watercourse. NYCC will write to the landowners to remind them of their responsibilities and requesting that the culvert is repaired at the earliest opportunity.
- 1.3 Northumbrian Water explained the status of work concerning the proposed development and the adequacy of the existing system. Investigations are ongoing into the condition and serviceability of the combined sewer network. Hydraulic capacity will be investigated once the condition surveys have been completed and once it is confirmed that there are no defects exacerbating the issue the flooding issues. There is a known issue with tree root ingress into the surface water sewer on Saint James' close. Northumbrian water plan to re-line the sewer to prevent re-occurrence.
- 1.4 Blocked culverts under the ford on West Road and the condition of the watercourse upstream of the road were also discussed at the meeting. The local highways team has raised an order for the culverts to be jetted clear. The development management team will write to the landowner requesting the stream and culvert inlets are cleared at the earliest opportunity.
- 1.4 Additional water being diverted into the ditch network on Moor Road and unconsented culverting works were also discussed during the site meeting and will be investigated further in the coming weeks.

2.0 Outcome of meeting

- 2.1 It was agreed that the LLFA would follow the meeting up with additional guidance on maintenance responsibilities for ditches, drains and watercourses for the Parish Clerk to share with all councillors and residents. Where required, the LLFA will write to the appropriate landowners reminding them of their riparian responsibilities to maintain the free-flow of water.

- 2.2 Flooding events are increasing in prevalence. Whilst the risk of flooding can never be removed altogether, ensuring that drainage systems are functioning adequately gives communities the best chance to mitigate any impacts leading from periods of heavy rainfall. Residents can ensure their community is as prepared as possible through appropriate resilience planning, creating an agreed response to events and also by reporting concerns over drainage assets to the relevant organisations to progress at the first opportunity, to ensure the appropriate action can be taken.

Author: Emily Mellalieu, Meirion Jones
Flood Risk Management
Business and Environmental Services
North Yorkshire County Council
December 2020



**North Yorkshire County Council
Richmond (Yorks) Constituency Committee – 8 January 2021**

Hambleton District Council Off-Street Parking Places Amendment Order

1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 In accordance with the requirement for the County Council to provide consent to district councils to amend the operation of off-street car parks, this report advises the committee of proposals submitted by Hambleton District Council and seeks its views and comments on them.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 Hambleton District Council has powers under Sections 32, 33, 35 and 124 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) to make changes to existing car parking conditions and restrictions by means of Traffic Regulation Orders, which are enforced under the Traffic Management Act 2004.
- 2.2 An Amendment Order is required to amend conditions relating to the use of a car park or parking place which extend beyond varying existing charges. In exercising these powers district councils are required by Section 39(3) of the 1984 Act to obtain the consent of North Yorkshire County Council as traffic authority. The County Council has power to give or withhold consent to the making of the Order and may require such modifications of the terms of the proposed Order as they think appropriate.
- 2.3 In formulating a response the County Council must pay due regard to Section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004, which places a duty on every local traffic authority “to manage its road network to secure the expeditious movement of traffic on their road network”. Consideration therefore needs to be given to the transport policy implications of the proposed changes along with the road safety and traffic management impacts on the local highway network.
- 2.4 Where proposals are classed as Wide Area Impact TRO’s it necessary to consult with the relevant Area Constituency Committees. A wide area TRO is where proposals meet the following criteria.
- The proposal affects more than one street or road and,
 - The proposal affects more than one community and,
 - The proposal is located within the ward of more than one County Councillor.
- 2.5 It is considered that collectively, the proposals meet the above criteria.
- 2.6 The Role of Area Constituency Committee is consultative only on wide area impact TRO’s. The Corporate Director Business and Environmental Services (BES) will take the final decision on the proposals in consultation BES Executive Members.

- 2.7 Hambleton District Council has ensured the proposals have been the subject of consultation and public advertisement in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
- 2.8 No objections were received to the proposals.

3.0 Proposals

- 3.1 In summary Hambleton District Council (HDC) have requested consent for the following amendments;
- Modify car park layout plans for legislative clarity to remove individual bays and replace with parking place described within a boundary demarcation.
 - Provide payment for parking by cash, debit and credit cards, smartphone or mobile device at ticket machine.
 - Provide extension of parking period in Northallerton Applegarth short stay, Northallerton Forum short stay, Thirsk Market Car Park, Thirsk Millgate Car Park and Stokesley Showfield Car Park.
 - Provide clarification to permit a vehicle to occupy more than one parking bay within a car park on payment of appropriate charge.
 - Provide Blue Badge parking bays with a maximum parking period of 3 hours.
 - Provide clarity to permit blue badge holders to park within a standard parking bay 1 hour after the expiry of the charging period.
 - Provide coach parking at Bridge Street car park Bedale.
 - Provide electric vehicle charging point bays in Northallerton Applegarth long and short stay car parks, Northallerton Forum long and short stay car parks. Thirsk Market Place, Millgate and Nursery car parks. Bedale Auction Market and Bridge car parks. Stokesley Showfield car park
 - Proposal to introduce a cashless payment system to all pay and display car parking in the Hambleton District.

4.0 Consideration of the proposals

4.1 Proposed - Car Park Layout

The purpose of this amendment is to remove individual parking bay detail shown on the car park plan associated with the Order and replacing it with a parking place described and shown by boundary. This simplifies the process for adjusting the layout of the parking place allows the council (HDC) to be more responsive in changes in legislation. The introduction of the boundary plans (removing the detailed car park layout) removes the requirements for statutory process.

4.1.1 NYCC Officer Comment;

The proposal to specify car parking places by boundary only and removing the layout detail i.e. showing the actual spaces, removes the requirement for HDC to amend its off-street parking places order each time it amends the layout of a car park. Clarification was sought from HDC to understand if this course of action may negate the need to seek consent from NYCC in the future. It was confirmed by HDC that this course of action was being taken simply to save the amendment of the Parking places order and consent and all other statutory consultations would still be however, formal consent would still be required from North Yorkshire County Council. This proposal is considered to be acceptable.

4.2 Proposed - Payment for Parking by Cashless Parking System

The purpose of this amendment is to implement payment of a parking charge by means of a cashless payment system. A cashless payment System means a system using electronic payments, records and communication methods (for example, mobile phone, internet or application on an electronic device) to accept and record payment of parking charges. This will support the introduction of increased flexibility of payment methods available to car park users.

- 4.2.1 NYCC Officer Comment;
The proposal to introduce a Cashless Payment System is in principle supported, and provides an additional and flexible payment option, which should encourage off-street parking which is in line with the strategic approach and the digital agenda. Should such a system(s) become commonplace throughout the county for both on and off-street parking then it would be desirable to have consistency in provider. However, it is accepted NYCC cannot instruct HDC to use a specific provider for that purpose. This proposal is considered acceptable but further engagement with HDC should be sought to try and forge a consistent application countywide.
- 4.3 Proposed - Payment for Parking by Cash, Debit & Credit Cards and Smartphone or Mobile Device
To allow payment of a parking charge by means of cash, debit and credit card and smartphone or mobile device at the ticket machines. This will support the introduction of increased flexibility of payment methods available to car park users.
- 4.3.1 NYCC Officer Comment;
The proposal to extend payment options for parking charges to include Debit & Credit Cards and Smartphone or Mobile Device, is a welcome addition to the off-street carpark as it may encourage greater use, potentially removing some on-street parking in line with the strategic approach to parking management. This proposal is considered to be acceptable
- 4.4 Proposed - Extension in Parking Period
The purpose of this amendment is the extension of a parking period in the Northallerton Applegarth Short Stay Car Park, Northallerton Forum Short Stay Car Park, Thirsk Market Car Park, Thirsk Millgate Car Park and Stokesley Showfield Car Park. The maximum extension of a paid parking period will be until the end of the prescribed hours for charging. This change will enable car park users to park for longer than they anticipated allowing them to complete their business whilst still complying with the parking order. In common with other town centre high street parking in the district Thirsk Market Place Car Park will retain its two-hour limit.
- 4.4.1 NYCC Officer Comment;
The proposal to provide an extension to the parking period allows a driver to extend their parking period beyond the current maximum time limit in the short stay car parks, however drivers will be paying a higher rate than the equivalent time had they parked in the long stay car park. This is not seen to be of any particular detriment to on-street parking, though it may encourage some drivers requiring additional time to seek parking elsewhere, potentially on-street. Performance of this amendment will require monitoring, but at this stage it is considered acceptable.
- 4.5 Proposed - Parking Bays
The purpose of this amendment is to allow a vehicle to occupy more than one parking bay on payment of the appropriate charge due for each parking bay occupied.
- 4.5.1 NYCC Officer Comment:
This proposal is primarily focused on larger vehicles which ordinarily couldn't be accommodated in a standard bay but such parking can be supported within the car park. The numbers of vehicles accessing this allowance is considered to be low and would not have an impact to on-street parking and therefore considered to be acceptable.

4.6 Proposed - Disabled Parking Bays

The purpose of this amendment is to apply a maximum parking period of three hours to disabled parking bays in short stay car parks. This will ensure that they are not occupied by a single user for the whole prescribed charging period thereby allowing other disabled car park users to occupy the parking bay during the same prescribed charging period.

4.6.1 It is intended that a disabled badge holder parked in a standard parking bay in a short stay car park whose parking period expires before the end of the charging period, can continue to occupy the parking bay for a period of up to one hour after the expiry time shown on their ticket. A valid disabled badge must be displayed in the motor vehicle alongside the ticket. This confirms an existing arrangement allowing disabled badge holders extra time to complete their business. An extra hour of parking time will be included in a parking session obtained by means of a cashless payment system. A valid disabled badge must be displayed in the motor vehicle.

4.6.2 NYCC Officer Comment;

The intention of this proposal is to clarify that part of the current off-street parking order in respect of disabled parking bays and the introduction of a maximum time limit of 3 hours along with the clarification to allow disabled badge to park up to 1 hour after the time of the limit expires. Blue badge parking on-street is free and time unrestricted, so this may encourage drivers to seek on-street parking ahead of off-street. However, given the number of bays this is to apply is not considered to have any or minimal impact to the local highway network. Nevertheless, performance monitoring should be applied.

4.7 Proposed - Coach Parking

The purpose of this amendment is to make provision for coach parking at Bridge Street Car Park, Bedale within a designated area and limited to 4 hours between the hours of 7am and 11pm on all days and unlimited at other times.

4.7.1 NYCC Officer Comment;

The provision of coach parking in the Bridge Street car park, Bedale could be seen as a benefit to the local road network by providing a designated parking area which should encourage off-street parking. The Bridge Street car park has 67 general parking bays which would be reduced by 17 spaces to 50 spaces to accommodate coach parking. The capacity and usage of both Bridge Street and Auction Mart (located across the road) car parks have been examined by HDC and it was resolved that there is sufficient capacity to cater for the loss of bays in Bridge Street car park. Therefore this proposal is considered to be acceptable.

4.8 Proposed - Electric Vehicle Parking Bays

It is intended to introduce electric vehicle charging point bays for electric vehicles to park and charge vehicle batteries. A phased strategy is to be carried out to which initial provision is for 4 EV bays in Applegarth Short Stay car park Northallerton and 4 bays in Millgate Thirsk, a scheme is also progressing to provide power supplies for Market Traders in Thirsk Market Palace, the six power supply bollards will have dual function of EV charging outside of market days. Further provision will be on a demand led basis.

4.8.1 NYCC Officer Comment;

The provision of electric vehicle (EV) charging bays is in line with the county councils strategy of encouraging EV use and the development of the wider infrastructure to support that transition. Past discussions with district councils and other off-street parking providers/stakeholders have focused on developing a formalised network of charge points for on and off-street to offer a consistent service for users throughout the county. It is however accepted that the county council is not yet in a position to provide on-street facilities and realises that district councils wish to progress the

delivery of their strategic transport objectives. This proposal is considered to be acceptable.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 In consideration of the above, it is the opinion of Officers that the proposals are reasonable in their intended effect and operation and should have minimal impact on the surrounding highway network respectively.

6.2 As a standard measure to safeguard against any unforeseen future impact to the highway network from operational changes it is suggested that NYCC places a condition on its consent to ensure the district council funds any required remedial works required as a consequence of the changes or amends its operations to relieve the network of the problem(s).

7.0 Equalities Implications

7.1 Consideration has been given to the potential for any equality impacts arising from the proposal. It is the view of officers that the recommendation does not have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010 and a copy of the Equality Impact Assessment screening form is attached as Appendix A.

8.0 Financial Implications

8.1 It is the view of officers that the proposals do not have any financial implications for the County Council.

9.0 Legal Implications

9.1 The main legal aspects are covered in the section 2.0 Background to this report. Beyond that, it is the view of officers that the proposals do not have any legal implications for the County Council.

10.0 Climate Change Impact Assessment

10.1 It is considered the proposed amendments will not have any climate change impact. The assessment has been included as appendix B to this report.

11.0 Recommendations

- 11.1 It is recommended that: -
- i. Members consider the officers comments on the proposals from HDC and offer any views they would like the Corporate Director (BES) to consider.

Author: David Kirkpatrick
Traffic Engineering
Business and Environmental Services
North Yorkshire County Council
December 2020

Initial equality impact assessment screening form (As of October 2015 this form replaces 'Record of decision not to carry out an EIA')			
This form records an equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether or not a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.			
Directorate	Business and Environmental Services		
Service area	Highways and Transportation		
Proposal being screened	Hambleton District Council – Off Street Parking Places Amendment Order		
Officer(s) carrying out screening	David Kirkpatrick		
What are you proposing to do?	Provide consent to Hambleton District Council to amend its off-street parking places order.		
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?	In accordance with the procedure for district councils to seek the consent of the county council as local highway authority on any operational amendment to its off-street parking order which extends beyond the changing of tariffs.		
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.	No		
Is there likely to be an adverse impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYCC's additional agreed characteristics? As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics? Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important? Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to? If for any characteristic it is considered that there is likely to be a significant adverse impact or you have ticked 'Don't know/no info available', then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your Equality rep for advice if you are in any doubt.			
Protected characteristic	Yes	No	Don't know/No info available
Age		✓	
Disability		✓	
Sex (Gender)		✓	
Race		✓	
Sexual orientation		✓	
Gender reassignment		✓	
Religion or belief		✓	
Pregnancy or maternity		✓	
Marriage or civil partnership		✓	
NYCC additional characteristic			
People in rural areas		✓	
People on a low income		✓	
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		✓	
	No		

Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.				
Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.	No			
Decision (Please tick one option)	EIA not relevant or proportionate:	✓	Continue to full EIA:	
Reason for decision	NYCC as highway and road traffic authority is required to provide consent to District Councils when making operational changes to off street parking facilities by means of a Traffic Regulation Order. This is to ensure the proposed changes are reasonable, will not adversely impact the highway network and are in accordance with the county parking strategy.			
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)	Barrie Mason			
Date	22 December 2020			



Climate change impact assessment

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

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

If you have any additional queries which are not covered by the guidance please email climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk

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

Planning Permission
Environmental Impact Assessment
Strategic Environmental Assessment

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

Please contact climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk for advice.

Title of proposal	NYCC Consent to Hambleton District Council to amend its off street parking order
Brief description of proposal	Amend (in part) the operation of HDC off-street car parks
Directorate	BES
Service area	Traffic Engineering
Lead officer	David Kirkpatrick
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the impact assessment	Andrew Clare
Date impact assessment started	22.12.20

<p>Options appraisal Were any other options considered in trying to achieve the aim of this project? If so, please give brief details and explain why alternative options were not progressed. None</p>
<p>What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs? Please explain briefly why this will be the result, detailing estimated savings or costs where this is possible. None</p>

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</p>	<p>Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>No impact (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>
<p>Minimise greenhouse gas emissions e.g. reducing emissions from travel, increasing energy efficiencies etc.</p>	<p>Emissions from travel</p>	X				
	<p>Emissions from construction</p>	X				
	<p>Emissions from</p>	X				

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</p>	<p>Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>No impact (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>	
	running of buildings						
	Other		X				
<p>Minimise waste: Reduce, reuse, recycle and compost e.g. reducing use of single use plastic</p>		X					
<p>Reduce water consumption</p>							
<p>Minimise pollution (including air, land, water, light and noise)</p>		X					
<p>Ensure resilience to the effects of climate change e.g. reducing flood risk, mitigating effects of drier, hotter summers</p>		X					

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</p>	<p>Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>No impact (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO₂e • Links to relevant documents 	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>
Enhance conservation and wildlife		X				
Safeguard the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of North Yorkshire's landscape		X				
Other (please state below)		X				

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

None

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

There are no impacts within the assessment, as the proposal is to consider only the proposed amendments to the management of the respective car parks which are considered to be acceptable in terms of scale and potential impact to the highway network.

Sign off section

This climate change impact assessment was completed by:

Name	David Kirkpatrick
Job title	Traffic Engineering Team Leader
Service area	Traffic Engineering
Directorate	BES
Signature	
Completion date	13.11.20

Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature): Barrie Mason

Date: 22/12/20

**North Yorkshire County Council
Richmond (Yorks) Area Constituency Committee
Friday 8 January 2021**

County Council Budget 2021/22

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To advise of the arrangements for reporting the County Council's budget for 2021/22 at this meeting and to seek the Committee's comments concerning the budget for referral to the Executive.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The local government finance settlement is the annual determination of funding to local government and requires the approval of the House of Commons.
- 2.2 The local government settlement for 2021/22 has been published later than anticipated and so it has not been possible to prepare a paper regarding the settlement for circulation with the agenda for this meeting.

3.0 Arrangements

- 3.1 Gary Fielding (the County Council's Corporate Director - Strategic Resources) will attend this meeting to give a verbal briefing on the 2021/22 local government settlement and to respond to questions.
- 3.2 The Committee, having received the verbal briefing, is invited to comment on the County Council's budget for 2021/22.

4.0 Recommendation

- 4.1 That the local government settlement, as reported verbally at this meeting, be noted.
- 4.2 That the Committee's comments concerning the County Council's budget for 2021/22 be referred to the County Council's Executive for consideration.

Steve Loach
Principal Democratic Services Officer
Legal and Democratic Services
North Yorkshire County Council
County Hall, Northallerton, DL7 8AD

Background Documents – None



North Yorkshire County Council

Richmond (Yorks) Area Constituency Committee

8th January 2021

Work Programme

Purpose of Report

That Members review the Committee's work programme, taking into account the outcome of discussions on previous agenda items and any other developments taking place across the area.

Work Programme

The most recent Work Programme is attached at **Appendix 1** and takes account of the areas of work identified at previous meetings. The items in the future Work Programme were to be considered during 2020/21 and Members can prioritise these for consideration at future meetings.

Given the situation in 2020, with the COVID 19 pandemic, it is recommended that the Committee revisits the Work Programme to review areas that could be covered in forthcoming meetings, in response to the situation created by the pandemic, with additional, relevant items identified by Members added to the Work Programme.

Remit of the committee

The Area Constituency Committees:

- Act as a forum for Members to bring forward issues affecting their local Electoral Divisions
- Hear and respond to questions and statements from members of the public relating to anything affecting the community within the constituency area
- Agree a Work Programme which lists items of business which the Committee wishes to consider at future meetings
- Undertake meaningful scrutiny of local health issues within their constituency area, complementing the strategic work undertaken by the Scrutiny of Health Committee

- Undertake meaningful scrutiny of local transport issues within their constituency area, complementing the strategic work undertaken by Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- Act as consultees in major decisions that affect their constituency area (including responding to consultations)
- Make recommendations on the application of Innovation funding (supported by the Stronger Communities Team)
- Develop a working relationship with the local MP, sharing updates and information on relevant local issues being addressed by the committee.

Scheduled committee dates in 2020/21 and 2021/22

The final meeting for 2020/21 is scheduled for:

- 10am on Wednesday 24th March 2021

The scheduled meeting dates for 2021/22 meetings are as follows:-

- 10am on Wednesday 9th June 2021
- 10am on Wednesday 25th August 2021
- 10am on Wednesday 24th November 2021
- 10am on Wednesday 23rd March 2022

Recommendation

(i) Members are asked to consider and develop the Committee's Work Programme; and

(ii) Note the date and time of scheduled meetings for 2020/21 and 2021/22 as detailed.

Steve Loach
Democratic Services

December 2020

**Richmond (Yorks) Area Constituency Committee
Work Programme 2020/21**

10.00 a.m. on Wednesday 14th October 2020

Subject	Description
Highways Issues	To provide an update on issues raised at recent informal meetings of the ACC
North Northallerton Infrastructure and Development project	To provide an update on the project
Update on work of Community Support Officers	To provide an update on the work of the Community Support Officers in the Constituency area during the COVID 19 outbreak
Return to Schools	An update on the return of pupils to schools in the Constituency area, following the recent closure in relation to COVID19
Work Programme	To consider the Committee's Work Programme

10.00 a.m. on Wednesday 25th November 2020

Subject	Description
County Council's Petition Scheme – Gilling West Cycleway and Footpath	Janette Povey of Gilling West will be provided with 5 minutes to present a case for the provision of a footpath and cycleway at Gilling West, in line with the County Council's petition scheme. Members will then be provided with 15 minutes to debate the issue and provide a decision in line with the scheme.
Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation – Implications for ACC	The Leader of the Council will provide a verbal update in respect of proposals for Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation in North Yorkshire and will lead Members in a discussion on the implications for the ACC

Schools Educational Achievement and Finance	To update Members on the local educational landscape, educational achievement and the financial challenges which affect schools in the Richmond Constituency Committee area
Healthy Child Programme - Consultation	The Committee will be invited to comment on this consultation.
North Northallerton Infrastructure and Development project	An update report will be provided on this issue
Work Programme	To consider the Committee's Work Programme

2pm on Friday 8th January 2021

Subject	Description
Melsonby Flooding and Drainage Issues	To provide a briefing on this matter following a meeting between local representatives and Northumbrian Water.
Hambleton District Council Off-Street Parking Places Amendment Order	To advise the committee of proposals submitted by Hambleton District Council regarding off-street parking places and seeking its views and comments on them.
County Council Budget 2021/2022	To provide Members with an opportunity to comment on proposals for the County Council's Budget for 2021/22
Work Programme	To consider the Committee's Work Programme

10.00 a.m. on Wednesday 24th March 2021

Subject	Description
North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service – Forthcoming projects	A presentation detailing projects to be undertaken by the North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service in the near future.
Catterick Integrated Care Programme	To provide details of the development of the Programme

North Northallerton Infrastructure and Development project	An update report will be provided on this issue
TBC	
Work Programme	To consider the Committee's Work Programme
Issues identified for future work programme	
Subject	Description
Discussion of issues with Local MP	Rishi Sunak will be attending to discuss topical issues – dependent upon commitments
Supported Living	Update on implementation of review
Lorry Driver parking	Follow up to consider how issue is being addressed following earlier consideration
Schools educational achievement and finance	To receive an annual update on these issues
Small Schools	Review of educational outcomes at small schools – linked to the Young People's Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Delayed Transfers of Care	Further review of work by Health and Social Care to reduce Delayed Transfers of Care following consultation – linked to the Care and Independence Overview and Scrutiny Committee
The expansion of Catterick Garrison	To further consider the impact of such a large confluence of people who are not local to the area and how this might be mitigated (following on from 29 August 2018).
Friary and Friarage Hospitals	To consider updates on these facilities.
Provision of a Northallerton Relief Road	To consider any progress on the provision of a Relief Road.
Healthy Child Programme	An update on the position regarding the Healthy Child Programme following the end of the current contract and the development of a new provision.

Health Issues relating to e-cigarettes	To consider further national guidance in relation to health concerns in relation to the use of e-cigarettes
Safety on the Constituency Area's roads	A Joint report by Highways and Public Health to consider data relating to incidents that have occurred on the Constituency Area's roads and the work being carried out to address these.
Mental Health	A report on how mental health issues are being addressed in the area.

Final Scheduled Meeting date for 2020/21:

24th March 2021

Scheduled meeting dates for 2021/22

9th June 2021

25th August 2021

24th November 2021

23rd March 2022

All Meetings are on Wednesday at 10am.