

North Yorkshire County Council

Selby and Ainsty Area Constituency Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the Selby and Ainsty Area Constituency Committee held at Brayton Community Centre, Brayton, Selby on 8 November 2019 at 10.00 am.

Present:-

Members:-

County Councillors Richard Musgrave (Chairman), Karl Arthur, Stephanie Duckett, Mel Hobson, Mike Jordan, Andrew Lee, Cliff Lunn, Don Mackay, Andy Paraskos, Chris Pearson and Cliff Trotter; together with Co-opted Member Howard Ferguson.

Officers:-

Hannah Bowles (Business Support), Jane Harvey (Strategic Planning and Development Officer, CYPS), Steve Loach (Democratic Services), Jane le Sage (Assistant Director Inclusion, CYPS) and Karen Siennicki (Interim Head of Service for Mental Health Services, HAS).

In attendance:

County Councillors Don Mackenzie and Patrick Mulligan.

There were eight members of the public in attendance.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

48. Chairman's Introduction

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

He explained the circumstances regarding the dissolution of Parliament leading to the Committee having to cancel the attendance of local MP, Nigel Adams, due to him no longer being an MP as Parliament had been dissolved and noting that the Committee was in the Purdah period due to the forthcoming General Election. He noted that Howard Ferguson, Co-opted Member, was in attendance in a politically neutral capacity.

He provided details of the planning condition put in place by Selby District Council in relation to the provision of broadband connections in new developments, following a request from the Area Constituency Committee. Members welcomed this approach from Selby District Council.

49. Minutes

Resolved -

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2019, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

50. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest at this stage of the meeting.

51. Public Questions or Statements

The Chairman noted that there was a public statement to be provided to the meeting, however, this was in relation to the item on the proposed special free school, and he suggested that this be delivered at the time of the consideration of that item. All agreed to this course of action.

52. Mental Health, Housing and Homelessness

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Health and Adult Services requesting Members to consider issues around mental health, housing and homelessness, how they correlate, how these matters had been addressed and to consider where improvements could be made to the services provided in addressing those issues.

The Interim Head of Service for Mental Health Services, Karen Siennicki, introduced the report highlighting the following:-

- ◆ Four out of five people who were homeless were thought to have mental health conditions.
- ◆ Potential loss of a job and income, breakdown in family networks and loss of daily living skills, due to the impact of the mental health condition, could lead to someone becoming homeless.
- ◆ Poor housing or homelessness could also increase the chance of developing mental health conditions.
- ◆ For many people support was provided in either one of the situations above and the Council aimed to focus on a holistic approach to support people to regain skills, social networks and an income, and an ability to access and maintain housing for the long term.
- ◆ The County Council had recently reviewed its mental health service and the nature of support provided to people with mental health. The focus had moved from working in an integrated team with health partners, often supported by using therapy in clinical setting, to being co-located with health teams, with the purpose of having a more community based approach and looking at the wider issues that may be impacting on a person's wellbeing.
- ◆ NYCC works under the Care Act and assessments are completed under a number of domains linking to managing and maintaining a home environment.

- ◆ The service will focus on a person's strengths through the assessment process, looking at what a person is able to do for themselves and outcomes that they would like to achieve through any support required.
- ◆ NYCC Mental Health offers a team of Support Time Recovery Workers who offer a range of support to people, many areas of which can prevent a person losing their home or working towards moving to more appropriate accommodation.
- ◆ Details of the interventions were outlined in the report.
- ◆ NYCC Mental Health Teams also work closely with community and voluntary sector organisations.
- ◆ The Council's Living Well Team also provide support to people with mental health problems in relation to their housing circumstances.
- ◆ The Council commissions Horton Housing support who provide housing support to people with mental health problems.
- ◆ Homelessness is the statutory responsibility of the District Council under the Homeless Reduction Act. This Act has more emphasis on prevention than previous housing legislation. The Council does recognise, however, that it continues to have responsibility to consider the needs of individuals in line with the requirements of the Care Act and support, to maintain appropriate housing, would apply to this legislation. It also recognises the negative impact that homelessness has which can lead to increased demands on social care services.
- ◆ The Council has developed a collaboration agreement with the District and Borough Councils which would see £39k being invested in Selby to support homeless prevention for vulnerable people.
- ◆ The service would be integrated as part of the range of homeless prevention services that housing authorities provide, which include:-
 - loans/grants
 - discretionary housing payments
 - housing benefit/DWP links
 - bonds/rent in advance
 - prevention pot to assist with the prevention of homelessness
 - access to credit unions
 - access to affordable housing
 - private rented schemes and initiatives
 - specialist housing law advice.
- ◆ The service would develop more effective pathways for people by building stronger relationships between District/Borough Council officers and relevant NYCC officers such as Living Well, Care and Support, Income Maximisation Team and Mental Health staff.
- ◆ In conclusion it was suggested that it would be useful for the Committee to examine further the respective roles of Selby District Council, in relation to their statutory duty under the Homeless Reduction Act, or housing and the Council's Mental Health Teams roles to determine whether there were any processes that could be improved.

Following the presentation Members raised the following issues and points:-

- ◆ A Member noted that he was only aware of one high profile homelessness case in the Selby District and asked whether the results of the homelessness survey for the district were available, and whether these outlined more cases of homelessness in the area. In response it was stated that Public Health had undertaken the survey, details of which would be circulated, via the Clerk to Members. It was noted that homelessness within the Selby District was lower than the other districts within the county.
- ◆ It was asked how the various authorities and organisations co-ordinated to provide an effective service in preventing homelessness and how referrals were effectively co-ordinated to ensure that appropriate action was being taken as soon as possible. In response it was noted that referrals were obtained from a variety of sources and the aim of the integrated service was to ensure that an appropriate response was delivered efficiently and effectively in a co-ordinated manner. The development of the new service allowed a much more effective community response to issues that arose. It was expected that the community approach to the matter would allow the service to be more pro-active going forward.
- ◆ It was asked whether rough sleeping was taken account of through the co-ordinated services. In response it was stated that this was the case with work taking place alongside a variety of people to try and prevent rough sleeping where possible and give support where this was occurring. In relation to this, and referring back to the incident highlighted earlier, it was noted that there had been concerns for the welfare of the high profile rough sleeper, who had been sleeping on the streets of Tadcaster. The Member noted that despite the issue being brought to the attention of a number of agencies this was passed from one agency to another, without appropriate action being taken and it was asked how this could be guarded against. In response it was acknowledged that issues arose, in terms of taking the lead on matters, when a multi-agency approach had been adopted, therefore, the County Council would be acting as the conduit for such instances to ensure that the co-ordinated approach was undertaken and that the matter was dealt with appropriately, through one contact. It was emphasised, however, that unless an individual was deemed to be incapable of making their own reasonable decisions, then only advice could be provided.
- ◆ A Member noted that refuge accommodation for homeless people was often time limited and resulted in them having to move on, within a short period of time, often into other situations where homelessness could occur. It was suggested that an approach to entrepreneurs could be undertaken with a view to obtaining funding to ensure that people faced with being homeless could settle into an area and not face the prospect of having to continually move on. In response it was stated that issues around capacity and temporary refuge accommodation would be obtained and circulated to Members.

In relation to the issue raised in respect of homeless people being moved from area to area it was noted that this issue was being addressed through the development of the North Yorkshire co-ordinated approach, ensuring that places were provided for people who found themselves homeless to ensure they could get to a point where they were able to find accommodation for themselves. The investment outlined earlier in the report would assist the people outlined in developing the skills and knowledge required to move forward themselves.

- ◆ Noting that Selby had a relatively small number of homeless people it was asked whether neighbouring authorities had a significantly higher number. In response it was stated that the details had been collected via a Public Health survey and would be provided to Members following the meeting.
- ◆ It was asked who should be called when a rough sleeper is seen on the streets. In response it was stated that much depended upon the severity of the case, however, initially, the Police should be called, allowing them to carry out a welfare check. The Police would then determine the level of risk and which authorities to involve. It was stated that the Police should be contacted on the 101 number. A Member stated that the District Council should also be contacted as they would provide assistance to anyone in this situation.
- ◆ A Member noted the issues that had arisen in the Harrogate area, noting that some homeless people had been offered accommodation, but had refused that, and wondered how that situation was addressed. In response it was acknowledged that such situations were challenging and some people chose to be homeless. Every effort would be made to try and accommodate homeless people but when this was refused other assistance would be provided. In relation to this it was noted that the person referred to earlier in the meeting, who was homeless in Tadcaster, had also turned down assistance. It was emphasised that there were a number of complex issues relating to this particular person's circumstances which had resulted in them sleeping rough. In relation to this it was emphasised that pro-active work was very important in ensuring that issues were addressed at initial stages, to prevent homelessness and rough sleeping from occurring in the first place.
- ◆ The Member for Tadcaster referred to the incident in Tadcaster noting that the person in question was suffering from mental health issues and had found it hard to get help from a number of agencies. Despite the intervention of Members it had been stated, at the time, that no accommodation was available to assist the person and the system was confusing for Members who were trying to seek assistance. He noted that this person had now left the area and it was hoped that he had returned to family.
- ◆ It was asked whether the collaboration between the District Council and the County Council on homelessness and mental health issues had commenced. In response it was stated that clarification of this position would be obtained and provided to Members, but it was believed that this was now in place.
- ◆ Members emphasised the need for pro-active work to prevent homelessness and address mental health issues.

Resolved -

- (i) That the additional information highlighted during discussion of the report be provided to Members accordingly.
- (ii) That Karen Siennicki be thanked for her presentation the content of which be noted.

53. Proposed Special Free School

Further to Minute No. 51 (Public Questions or Statements) it was noted that representatives of the Osgodby Residents Action Association were in attendance to provide a public statement in respect of this item.

The Chairman invited Jan Mitchell the Secretary of the Action Association to provide the statement which she did as follows:-

Residents of Osgodby believe that land at Millfield Ings, Osgodby, is unsuitable for any development, including that of a SEND school. We also believe that both residents and councillors have been kept in the dark and told half truths about the processes and decisions in selection of this site.

The Chairman then introduced Jane le Sage, Assistant Director Inclusion, CYPS and Jane Harvey, Strategic Planning and Development Officers, CYPS who would present the report.

The following highlights of the report were detailed:-

- ◆ The local authority had a statutory responsibility to keep its special educational provision under review, ensuring efficiency in placements to meet the needs of children and young people with SEND, working with parents, young people and providers.
- ◆ In view of this the local authority had developed a strategic plan for SEND.
- ◆ During engagement and consultation on the plan strong support for the establishment of a special school in Selby had been established. During the formal consultation 94% of survey respondents agreed, or strongly agreed, with the proposals for the establishment of a special school in the Selby area.
- ◆ Due to the lack of such a school children and young people were having to travel to other special schools in North Yorkshire, or in neighbouring local authorities, or to independent/non-maintained special schools. In October 2019 119 children and young people from Selby attended such schools.
- ◆ The average current daily travel distance for children and young people who reside in Selby and attended a North Yorkshire special school was 27 miles. This was higher than any other district in the county. The need for children and young people to travel long distances to school not only impacted on their wellbeing, readiness to learn and time away from their families and community but also increased pressure on SEN transport costs.

The bid for a Special Free School in Selby area

- ◆ In view of the gap a bid was submitted to establish a special free school in the Selby area, to support the County Council's vision for all children and young people with special educational needs in North Yorkshire to have the best educational opportunities, be able to attend a school or provision as close to their home as possible, and to make progress with learning, have good social and emotional health and be prepared for a fulfilling adult life.
- ◆ During the bidding process the Government was particularly looking for bids from local authorities that:-
 - had a clear strategy
 - set out how the new school would help the local authority achieve better outcomes
 - supported inclusion
 - offered good value for money - focus on helping to manage high needs costs and identifying a value for money site which could be secured in a timely manner

- showed that a new school would be financially sustainable
 - benefitted a wider geographical area
 - extended the free schools programme to areas that had not previously benefitted.
- ◆ The bid was submitted in October 2018 and was supported by parents/carers and professionals in the Selby area and by Selby District Council. In March 2019 the local authority was notified that the bid had been approved to move to the next stage.
 - ◆ In terms of outcomes for children and young people the following positive impacts were expected:-
 - the achievement of aspirational progress and attainment
 - good progress in all areas of preparing for adulthood
 - reduced travel time and associated anxiety for children and young people
 - meaningful relationships with the school for parents/carers
 - children and young people could have their health needs met locally
 - children and young people more involved in their local community
 - children and young people able better to develop independence.
 - ◆ In addition, it was estimated that the provision would result in a long term saving to the high needs budget in the region of £250k to £500k per annum and in the in savings of £300k to £500k per annum in the local authority transport budget in the long term.

The Proposed Special Free School

- ◆ The school would accommodate up to 100 pupils aged 3-19 with needs in areas of communication and interaction and/or cognition and learning needs. Some children and young people may have related social, emotional and mental health needs but this would not be their primary need. Children and young people placed at the school would have an EHCP and would have been assessed as requiring this type of school.
- ◆ This would be a free school which are state funded academies outside of local authority control and operated by academy trusts. They had more control over how they operate, for example they do not have to follow the national curriculum. They are held accountable through Ofsted inspections and exam results.
- ◆ There was no opening date set for the school at present as the Department for Education had indicated that they did not anticipate that any of the special free schools in the current wave would open before September 2021

Proposed Site and Building the School

- ◆ In line with the bidding process, whereby a site which could be secured in a timely manner and where there was a commitment to use a local authority or Government owned site, it was also considered appropriate that these would not be costly to develop because of:-
 - ground contamination
 - flood risks
 - significant topographical issues
 - other costly issues.

- ◆ During the preparation of the bid two sites on the western side of Selby at Cross Hills were considered as well as the site at Osgodby. The Cross Hills sites were discounted on the basis of flood risk assessment in the context of the stated requirements. A search was undertaken of other Council and Government sites around Selby but none were deemed as suitable.
- ◆ The site at Osgodby was therefore selected on the basis of the following:-
 - it was already in the County Council's ownership
 - it was large enough for potential expansion of the school should this be required in future
 - it was accessible easily
 - it had a lower flood risk assessment than the other sites and better met the criteria set by the DfE.
- ◆ The school would be designed and procured by the DfE and their consultants, though they would work with the County Council, and the Trust appointed to open and operate the school. Work with the DfE in respect of the site and the building was in the early stages. Among considerations to be addressed would be the impact on the landscape and neighbouring properties, highway access and traffic and the public right of way which crosses the site. The DfE had to complete assessments before confirming the use of the site.
- ◆ The Planning Authority for the development of the school would be Selby District Council. A planning application for the school would be submitted by the DfE's consultant, however, it was unlikely that this would be until next year.

The Trust Competition Stage

- ◆ The local authority was engaged in a process with the DfE to identify an academy trust to open and operate the school. Engagement events had been held for proposer groups interested in making an application to operate the school. Comprehensive information had been published on the County Council's website for those meetings and the specification for the school.
- ◆ The window for applications from groups to open and operate the school closed at midday on 30 September 2019 and a process was now underway to consider the applications received. The groups would have to demonstrate that they could effectively provide high quality education for the children and young people who would attend the school. The County Council is involved in the process, however, the final decision on the successful proposer group rests with the Secretary of State for Education.
- ◆ It was expected that an announcement of the successful proposer group would be made in early 2020.
- ◆ Following a successful appointment there would be a pre-opening phase managed by the DfE. During that phase the trust would develop plans and meet legal requirements to turn their application into a school ready for opening. The time period for this could vary and potential opening dates were subject to confirmation from DfE.

Communications

- ◆ Details of the proposals were on the County Council's website.

- ◆ Parents and carers of children with SEND in Selby were being kept up to date through links with the groups Bee-Able and Parent Power and through the SEND support group which meets at Selby Children Centre. In addition, the website had a section about the proposed school specifically for parents and carers.
- ◆ A meeting was held in July 2019 with residents of Osgodby in respect of the proposals and there had been subsequent communication with individual residents.
- ◆ A meeting was held with education providers in the Selby area in September 2019 to provide information about the proposals.
- ◆ A short article was provided for the September 2019 edition of Citizen Link.
- ◆ A more details communication plan was being developed during the autumn of 2019 as more information became available from the DfE.

Members were reminded that, as the proposals were to be the subject of a planning application to Selby District Council, any Members of the District Council's Planning Committee should declare an interest and leave the meeting or should keep an open mind on the proposals and declare that when considering the application. In relation to this County Councillor Mike Jordan stated that he was a Member of the District Council's Planning Committee, but in view of comments he was to make, would not be taking part in the consideration of the application.

A discussion of the report and the issues raised by the Osgodby Residents Action Association, were undertaken and the following issues and points were raised:-

- ◆ A Member, in welcoming the report, stated that he had been involved in developing the Local Development Plan at Selby District Council and noted that this development had not been proposed for that particular area. He asked why Committee Members had not been involved in choosing a site for the proposed school and why this had not been a matter for public participation at an Area Committee meeting. In response the Assistant Director explained that, in line with procurement rules, as the site was owned by the County Council, the decision had to be taken at Executive Member level, as that was part of the conditions set by the DfE. She emphasised that the planning process for the development of the site would allow other County Councillors and members of the public, to be involved and raise any concerns that they have. She noted that, at this stage, the proposals had not entered the planning process stage.
- ◆ It was clarified that local Members had no involvement in the decision making process for the location of the school as that was the responsibility of the relevant Executive Member, as detailed in the guidance.
- ◆ A Member agreed that there had been consultation with the families of SEND children, however, the general community had not been involved in the consultation process, which had led to many of the concerns that had arisen. It was also noted that Parish Councillors within that area had not been informed of the proposal, which had led to difficulties between them and people within the local community who could not believe that local elected Members had no knowledge of this matter. It was suggested that lessons should be

learned for future consultations around such developments. In response the Assistant Director acknowledged that, initially, consultation had been held with only SEND families, however, she emphasised that this was the right approach, as the consultation informed the plan for details to be developed. She also noted that when it had been announced that a special free school was to be provided for Selby, local Members had provided their support for that, alongside their support for the location of the facility. It was noted that this was prior to the submission of the bid, which had been made in October 2018 and the Council was notified it had been successful in March 2019. Details of the success of that bid had been shared with local Members in April 2019. This included local councillors and County Councillors. The Chairman emphasised that Members had no issue with the provision of the special school, however, issues had arisen with the location of the development and the lack of communication with the local community in relation to that. The Assistant Director outlined that, initially, the County Council had submitted an unsuccessful bid, therefore, when a second bidding opportunity arose, it was ensured that this would meet the appropriate criteria set by the DfE. The guidance in relation to that dictated the type of site that could be utilised and, by process of elimination, the Osgodby site had been chosen to match those criteria. The sites at Cross Hills had been deemed to be unacceptable because of the potential flood risk.

The relevant Executive Member, County Councillor Patrick Mulligan, was in attendance at the meeting and highlighted the following:-

- ◆ There was no doubt that a special school was required in the Selby area as had been highlighted during the meeting.
- ◆ The main issue that had arisen was finding an appropriate and suitable site.
- ◆ The issue of the location of the site had been communicated to local councillors, who had been in favour of the development, and it was perhaps an oversight in terms of putting the need of the school ahead of its location and potential impacts on the local community.
- ◆ With that in mind, future communication on such matters would take account of those factors, ensuring that there was much closer engagement with local elected members and local communities.
- ◆ He emphasised that the planning process would allow local councillors and the local community to consider and outline their objections in respect of the location of the proposal, when the plans had been submitted for consideration.
- ◆ He agreed that improvements were required to the communication process in relation to the development of such facilities.

The discussion continued as follows:-

- ◆ A Member highlighted a consultation meeting that he had arranged in relation to the development, in July 2019. This involved members of the public and local Parish Councillors, to ensure that appropriate information was being provided to them, however, he acknowledged that this was a little late in terms of advice of the chosen site. It was suggested that the matter should have been brought to a meeting of the Area Committee, allowing members of the public to be involved at the same time as informing local members. Other Members stated that they were aware of the proposals but did not know of the site choice until April 2019 when they were informed of the Osgodby site. It

was emphasised that it would have been useful for local Members to have been involved in the discussions of the different sites before the choice was made.

- ◆ A Member noted that it was difficult to accommodate everyone in terms of their wishes for the placement of a site, but suggested that a more central location could have been chosen as many young people would still have to travel long distances to access the development at Osgodby.
- ◆ A Member noted that he had been fully informed of the process, which could relate to him being a serving member on the Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee where details had been outlined. He considered that the facility was required in the area, therefore Members needed to accept an appropriate development site had been identified, rather than re-opening the site choice scenario.
- ◆ The Chairman noted the criteria that had been laid down by the DfE in relation to how the site should be chosen, but suggested that there were other areas of County Council owned land within the district and wondered why these had not been taken account of during the choice. He reiterated that having a special school in the district was positive for the area but raised concerns regarding the very few sites identified to be chosen for the development. In response it was stated that the sites identified were done so to ensure that the criteria laid down by the DfE were fully met. Prior to the identification of the final sites numerous sites throughout the district had been considered and dismissed. The details as to why they had been dismissed were not available at the meeting. It was also noted that the DfE would have to carry out their own assessments on the chosen site and would need to determine whether they felt the site was effectively sustainable. It was noted that for the bid to be submitted it was better that a site be identified beforehand, therefore, the elimination of the sites had taken place prior to that.
- ◆ The Chairman emphasised that, at this stage, no decision had been made on the development at the Osgodby site as the matter had to be considered by the DfE and go through the planning process at Selby District Council. As with all planning applications this would be decided on its own merits and Members and local people would have an opportunity to participate in that process. He again reiterated the position that having a special school in the Selby district was good news.

Resolved –

- (i) that the Executive member be thanked for his attendance on this matter; and
- (ii) that the report, and issues raised, be noted.

54. Superfast North Yorkshire - Broadband - Update

The Executive Member for Access, County Councillor Don Mackenzie, provided an update on the development and provision of Superfast Broadband in the constituency area, highlighting the following:-

- ◆ The Superfast project had commenced in 2012, with Phase 1 being undertaken in conjunction with BT to provide broadband of greater than 24mbps 158,000 premises. The project had been developed as these connections would not have been financially viable for the private sector providers because North Yorkshire's population of 605,000, scattered over 3,000 square miles, is too

thinly spread. The cost of SFNY's Phase 1 roll out was approximately £170 per premise.

- ◆ Phase 2 of the project connected up approximately 17,000 further properties at an average cost of £480. This took account of some of the more difficult to access areas, to ensure that connectivity was in place.
- ◆ Phase 3 of the project had commenced and would connect up to 4,239 premises. Again these were mainly difficult to reach areas, which had not been addressed through the initial phases of the programme. Many of the Phase 3 connections were being undertaken through 'fibre to the premise', which provided significantly higher speeds of broadband than those in the initial phases. Around 2,000 premises had been connected through Phase 3 to date.
- ◆ Funding of around £20.5m, provided by NYCC, was being utilised to provide Phase 3 and, potentially this could be extended to up to £33m, to enhance this phase, providing a further 9k connections.
- ◆ The Constituency area had 80% of its premises now connected to Superfast Broadband, with that expected to rise to 86% by the end of Phase 3, Part 1. The Executive Member acknowledged that this was still too low as the aim was to ensure that 100% of premises were connected.
- ◆ A local full fibre network project had commenced in the area very recently, with the launch being at Brayton Primary School, near to the venue. The scheme involved investment of around £15.1m from DCMS, allowing 370 public buildings, including schools, to be connected to a full fibre network. This would have a connectivity of 1,000mb per second or more. 24 public buildings in the Selby area were to be connected, which would have benefits for neighbouring households and businesses. A detailed list of the public buildings to be connected would be provided to Members.

Following the initial presentation a number of issues and points were raised through discussion with Members, as follows:-

- ◆ A Member welcomed the update, but noted that two villages in his locality, Long Drax and Newland, were now having to access their connections through a radio mast from Howden, as they were yet to be connected to the Superfast Broadband network. In response the Executive Member acknowledged that there were many small villages in rural areas that were still to be connected to the network and a number had undertaken connection to a wireless programme at their own expenses by utilising Government grants available. He noted that many residents preferred a fibre connection, which was being provided through the Phase 3 of the scheme. He emphasised that where possible all areas would be connected eventually, however, this had to be measured up against ensuring that it was value for money to deliver the connections.
- ◆ The Chairman emphasised that despite the issues that had arisen regarding some areas being difficult to connect to the network, North Yorkshire was one of the first areas to benefit from the provision of Superfast Broadband, which was a good news story for the area, which should not be overlooked.
- ◆ A Member noted that many developers were now under an obligation to provide fibre connections to new developments and fibre was being provided to premises under Phase 3 of the Superfast project and wondered whether homes that had been previously connected using older methods would be upgraded to fibre. In response the Executive Member emphasised that the project was

to deliver 24mb and above per second to premises in North Yorkshire which had been carried out through the methods available at that time. It was unlikely, therefore, that those who had received appropriate connections, within the scope of the project, would be provided with fibre at a later date. This did not prevent anyone from seeking to upgrade their own provision through commercial providers.

- ◆ An issue regarding connections via poles was clarified and it was noted that fibre would not be provided through this method. In terms of an obligation for developers to provide fibre connections it was noted that this had been outlined by the Chairman at the beginning of the meeting, in terms of Selby District Council and it was noted that an earlier meeting had been advised of a similar planning condition utilised by Harrogate Borough Council. Members emphasised the need to ensure that as many developers were now providing fibre connections, other, existing premises should benefit from the available funding for the Superfast North Yorkshire project, allowing more people to benefit from the enhanced connections.
- ◆ Connectivity to industrial estates was raised as an issue. It was noted that many businesses had struggled through the lack of appropriate broadband connection and it was hopeful that the full fibre network would be of benefit to these companies. It was also noted that the implementation of the planning condition outlined, by the District Councils, would ensure that this was in place for future developments.
- ◆ The Co-opted Member stated that he had followed the development of the project very closely and raised some concerns regarding the provision to some of the harder to reach areas. He noted that there were solutions that could be obtained, via grants, by the communities themselves and many had obtained connections through this method. He noted the changes that had taken place in terms of the provision of broadband since the initial phase of the project in 2012, with much higher speeds now being obtained through the provision of full fibre connections, which in turn could create a further demand for enhanced connections from those who originally benefitted from the Superfast scheme. His main concern, however, was the issue around delivering value for money, in terms of Phase 3 of the project and how this could be delivered for some hard to reach areas. He expected that the cost for full fibre would be above £1k per premise, and if prices were to rise significantly from that, in terms of providing a connection, then it could be that local communities were ruled out from receiving an appropriate connection due to the value for money element. In response the Executive Member confirmed that the current cost per premise for connection, under the Phase 3 implementation, was around £1,400. Other solutions for the difficult to reach areas were also available to Superfast North Yorkshire and were being investigated. He emphasised, however, that the County Council had to decide on value for money in terms of whether it was too costly to implement a connection for a specific community or premise in terms of benefit v cost. Where this was the case those alternative solutions were under consideration.
- ◆ The Chairman noted that the Leader of the County Council had originally stated that the contract for Superfast Broadband was for a 100% upgrade to the levels required in terms of broadband connection. It was recognised that there were some difficulties in providing that connection to some areas in terms of value for money, but emphasised the need to continue to strive to meet that 100% commitment. He again emphasised that this was a huge success for the county, but acknowledged that those areas that had not received a connection would not see this as being the case. He emphasised the need to continue to

highlight the huge progress made and to try and meet that 100% commitment. The Executive Member echoed the Chairman's statement. He noted that he had a great deal of communication in relation to those areas that were still waiting to be connected and that every effort was being made to ensure that they were.

Resolved -

That the Executive Member be thanked for his update on the Superfast Broadband project, the contents of which be noted.

55. Selby and Ainsty Area Constituency Committee Work Programme

Considered -

The report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) providing details of the Work Programme for the Committee to consider, develop and adopt.

A Member considered that the role of the newly developed Area Constituency Committees differed from that of the previous Area Committees in terms of wanting to be more pro-active, and develop issues that were important to the local communities and could be progressed further. He stated that there had been a desire to move away from merely having reports to note, that were of interest to local Members, but had little development potential. He felt that there was a need for the Constituency Committee to take the lead on a number of matters and enable those to be developed accordingly to benefit the area. The Chairman agreed with this statement and noted that Executive Members regularly attended the Area Constituency Committee to assist with that progress. He suggested that it was for the Committee to set its Work Programme accordingly, to ensure that pro-active issues were being considered and developed. The Member who raised the issue suggested that an item on fairer funding was an important issue to be addressed by the Committee, linking in to national Government and various local authorities and organisations to see how this matter could be addressed. It was considered that this issue would be best revisited following the election of a MP for the area at the forthcoming General Election, to allow an input from Central Government in relation to that.

A Member referred to a document that had been received in relation to cycling and walking in the Selby district, with no item having been placed on the agenda for today's meeting. In response it was noted that this was a coincidence in terms of receiving the document, as the closing date for the consultation was the same date as the meeting, however, these two issues were entirely separate. It was noted that an item on cycling and cycle-ways would feature on the agenda for the next meeting of the Committee.

The Chairman emphasised that it was for Members to set the agenda for Area Constituency Committee meetings and to make suggestions as to topics that could be discussed for pro-active action to be taken and further developments to be made on those issues. It was noted that the free school issue had been raised by Members and had been acted upon accordingly in terms of bringing the matter to the Committee for discussion.

It was suggested that the issues of tourism in North Yorkshire and traffic congestion would be suitable items for consideration at forthcoming meetings. It was also emphasised that, whenever possible, the MP be invited to attend meetings of the Committee to assist with the debate and to allow feedback, both ways, on important Constituency matters.

Resolved -

- (i) That the development of the Work Programme, as described above, be undertaken and the items mentioned be included on forthcoming agendas for the Committee.
- (ii) That the contents of the report be noted.

56. Future Meetings

Resolved -

That the next meeting of the Committee be held on Monday 6 January 2020 at a venue to be confirmed at 10 am.

(The meeting was taking place on the above date, rather than that originally timetabled, in view of the need to submit comments to the Executive in relation to the 2020/21 County Council budget, which would be one of the main items for consideration at that meeting.)

The meeting concluded at 11.40 am.

SL/JR