



Agenda

- Meeting:** Richmond (Yorks) Area Committee
- To:** Councillors Yvonne Peacock (Chair), Caroline Dickinson (Vice-Chair), Kevin Foster, Bryn Griffiths, David Hugill, Tom Jones, Carl Les, Heather Moorhouse, Stuart Parsons, Karin Sedgwick, Angus Thompson, Steve Watson, David Webster, John Weighell OBE, Annabel Wilkinson, Peter Wilkinson and Malcolm Warne.
- Date:** Monday, 10 November 2025
- Time:** 10.00 am
- Venue:** The Grand, County Hall, Northallerton, DL7 8AD

This meeting is being live broadcast and recorded (audio/visual) and will be available to view [via our website](#) and uploaded to [our Youtube channel](#).

Business

1. **Apologies for absence**
2. **Minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2025** (Pages 3 - 12)
3. **Declarations of interest**
All Members are invited to declare at this point any interests they have in items appearing on this agenda, including the nature of those interests.
4. **Public questions/statements**
Members of the public may ask questions or make statements at this meeting if they have given notice to Democratic Services (details below) and supplied the text by midday on 5 November 2025, three working days before the day of the meeting. Each speaker should limit themselves to three minutes on any item.

If you are exercising your right to speak at this meeting, but do not wish to be recorded, please inform the Chair who will instruct anyone who may be taking a recording to cease while you speak.
5. **Update from the MP**
6. **Updates from previous meetings**
7. **Update from Yorkshire Ambulance Service NHS Trust** (Pages 13 - 16)
8. **Discussion session with representatives from Arriva** (Pages 17 - 18)
9. **Update on Catterick Integrated Care Centre** (To Follow)

- 10. Work programme** (Pages 19 - 22)
- 11. Any other items**
Any other items which the Chair agrees should be considered as a matter of urgency because of special circumstances.
- 12. Date of next meeting**
Monday, 2 March 2026.

Members of the public are entitled to attend this meeting as observers for all those items taken in open session.

You may also be interested in [subscribing to updates](#) about this or any other North Yorkshire Council committee.

Recording is allowed at Council, committee and sub-committee meetings which are open to the public. Please give due regard to the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at public meetings. We ask that any recording is clearly visible to anyone at the meeting and that it is non-disruptive.

Anyone wishing to record is asked to contact the Democratic Services Officer (details below) prior to the start of the meeting.

Contact Details

Enquiries relating to this agenda and meeting please contact:

Name: Nicki Lishman, Senior Democratic Services Officer

E-mail: democraticservices.east@northyorks.gov.uk

E-mail: nicki.lishman@northyorks.gov.uk

Tel: 01653 638476

Website: www.northyorks.gov.uk

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

Friday, 31 October 2025

North Yorkshire Council

Richmond (Yorks) Area Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 15 September 2025 commencing at 10.00 am.

Councillor Yvonne Peacock in the Chair and Councillors Caroline Dickinson, Bryn Griffiths, David Hugill, Carl Les, Heather Moorhouse, Stuart Parsons, Karin Sedgwick, Angus Thompson, Steve Watson, David Webster and John Weighell OBE.

Officers present: Nicki Lishman - Senior Democratic Services Officer and Jo Ireland – Assistant Director Culture, Leisure and Arts.

Other attendees: Sarah Robinson – Corporate Affairs Manager, Yorkshire Water, 19 members of the public.

Apologies: Councillors Kevin Foster, Annabel Wilkinson and Peter Wilkinson.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

162 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Kevin Foster, Annabel Wilkinson and Peter Wilkinson.

163 Minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2025

Decision

That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2025, be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

164 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

165 Public questions/statements

There were eight public questions or statements submitted to the committee. Questions 2 – 6 were considered at minute 167 – Receipt of a petition to save Richmond Swimming Pool. Questions 7 and 8 were considered at minute 168 – Presentation by Yorkshire Water.

1. From Mr Kodi Sanerivi

Parent Statement re: Home to School Transport Reality Check - I came today in the hope of speaking directly to you, Cllr Les, as Leader of the Council —and to the Executive Member for Home to School Transport, my own councillor, Annabel Wilkinson. It's a shame she isn't here today. I know that's just coincidence, but it does mean yet again parents like me don't have the chance to put our concerns to her directly.

I want to tell you that trust between this council and parents has been broken — and not by accident. It has been broken by your decision to press ahead with this home-to school

transport policy despite the warnings, despite the real human consequences being spelled out to you.

Three councillors on this committee — and I thank them for this — recognised the harm it would do to rural families and voted against it. But the majority either didn't realise or chose to look the other way.

I know that in May to secure your vote at the Extraordinary Meeting many of you were told, "don't worry, any anomalies will be sorted out in appeals." But that was a false promise. Appeals are not the safety net we all hoped for — they have turned out to be just a box-ticking exercise. As one of your Conservative colleagues has said on the record, the whole appeals process appears to be rigged.

So let me give you just a hint of the injustices happening here, right on your doorstep and on your watch:

- Families in the Upper Dales denied transport because officers who've never even set foot there say single-track, high-elevation roads into Cumbria are "safe" — and won't assess them until a child is enrolled. No parent would gamble their child's safety just to tick a box in County Hall — especially when every local knows those routes are treacherous and impassable for much of the year.
- Families in North Richmondshire denied transport to Richmond School because the small Catholic school, SFX, is judged a stone's throw nearer. Yet the same bus serves both — and for safety reasons only stops at Richmond School, with SFX pupils simply walking the two minutes down the road.
- And my own son, living with life-changing Type 1 diabetes. He was in unconscious in critical care when school applications were being made last year, and like many parents I was wrong-footed by the council's poor communication. References to catchment schools were still on the website, so I thought I was doing the right thing. The first I knew transport had been denied was at the end of May. His best interests - his very safety - lie in staying with the friends who are supporting him through this. But instead, you've shipped him off alone in a funded mini bus to Yarm - Stockton on Tees, while empty seats sit unused on the Northallerton bus that passes our front door, carries his friends every day.

These are not statistics. They are children. They are families. They are your residents. And we feel short-changed by a council that isn't listening, and that seems indifferent to the impact on families like ours.

That must change. As we speak, another year group is about to be put through the mill, and another group of parents will soon be up in arms. We need you to act now - to stop more harm being done and more council resources being wasted defending the indefensible.

It's too late for us, but for the sake of other families, today, I ask for the support of this committee to back a request for a fully independent and, crucially, immediate policy review - starting this year. That way, improvements can be identified and implemented before next September, safeguarding the 2027 intake.

It's worth noting - when you voted for this policy in July 2024, officers promised that the review would happen in July 2025. That was their recommendation. Without any discussion, it has quietly been pushed back a year. Parents deserve to know why, and we deserve better than delay.

No officer was able to attend the Committee to respond to the statement, so a written response was provided.

Response from Amanda Fielding, Assistant Director, Inclusion

Thank you to Mr Sanerivi for submitting his statement, the content of which is noted.

In providing a response, the council would reiterate the advice which has been provided previously about the basis for the adoption of the Home to School Travel Policy.

The Home to School Travel Policy aligns the Council's arrangements for home to school travel with Statutory Guidance that is issued by the Department for Education (DfE). This includes the main eligibility criteria which is that assistance is provided to the nearest suitable school with available places.

In determining the nearest suitable schools to an individual pupil's home address the council utilises information in its own mapping system, which provides measurements to the nearest 1,000th of a mile. By using this information consistently throughout the county, the council has ensured that the policy has been applied equitably.

As has been reported previously, however, the routes that are used to identify the nearest suitable schools are not necessarily the routes that are taken if a pupil is provided with assistance with transport. Transport routes are determined after consideration of the number and location of eligible pupils in a specific area, and after consideration of the possible routes that can be taken, including in consultation with transport providers. All routes are subject to risk assessment, both generally and within the context of specific hazards including bad weather conditions.

In determining the home to school distance for individual pupils the council uses information from its mapping system to measure the distance from the home address to the nearest entrance of a school. It is recognised that some schools, such as the schools referenced in Richmond, are situated close together. However, the Council considers that applying the policy accurately and consistently throughout the county ensures that all pupils are treated fairly and equitably when their eligibility for assistance is considered.

Following the adoption of the policy new information was added to the council's website, included on the pages which related to school admissions. Parents did, therefore, have access to information and as part of the application process were asked to confirm that they had considered the implications of the Home to School Travel Policy when they submitted their online application for a school place.

A further 7 statements or questions were submitted and were heard at the appropriate items on the agenda.

2. From Stephen Saunders (read by clerk)

My main query is why the structure of the pool building is now under question, having spent money on re-roofing and new upgraded/replacement mechanical heating for the pool. Now the future of the pool is in doubt due to the internal finish of the ceiling. I have not seen anything published about why the pool is closed. Surely the internal costs of ceiling repair would be far less than the cost of previous works?

I enjoy using the pool, which is used by various clubs for activities and general swimming and used by local schools and local residents

3. From Julie Young

If Richmond Swimming Pool closes, residents will be left without a clear alternative, and an equality and access impact assessment is essential to understand the effect on those without transport. The removal of one of the few accessible leisure facilities in the area would particularly disadvantage elderly residents and those with limited mobility, and the council must recognise that this decision undermines their ability to stay active and socially connected. Any claim that alternative activities can meet the additional demand must be

supported by clear evidence, as without it the community faces reduced opportunities and greater exclusion.

The process also raises issues of accountability and transparency. Consultation with local residents, clubs, and schools has been limited and poorly executed, with a survey that was badly publicised and failed to capture the full strength of local feeling. Closing the pool stands in direct contradiction to the council's commitments to health, wellbeing, and community resilience as set out in Richmondshire's local plan and policies, and the community deserves better than to see these promises set aside.

4. From Matthew Ward

Economics and Funding - The decision to close Richmond Swimming Pool cannot be made without recognising the long-term financial consequences for the NHS and social care budgets, as reduced activity levels across the community will inevitably lead to higher health costs that far outweigh the expense of keeping the pool open.

The council must also account for whether external funding sources such as Sport England, Levelling Up funds, or public-private partnerships have been properly and actively pursued to secure the pool's future. A full cost-benefit analysis should be available to demonstrate the balance between refurbishment and closure, because the value of this community asset extends well beyond numbers on a balance sheet.

The future of the site itself must also be considered carefully. Its cultural and community worth is significant and cannot be measured solely against potential land value.

Transparency is vital, and the financial modelling used to justify closure – including subsidy and user comparisons with other leisure facilities – must be open to public scrutiny so that the community can see that the decision-making process is fair, evidence-based, and accountable.

5. From Rachael Simpson, read by Julie Young

Health and Children - Closing Richmond Swimming Pool would have a serious impact on public health, particularly for older adults, children, and people with disabilities, and an assessment of these consequences must be recognised. The council has a responsibility to demonstrate how it will offset the loss of physical activity opportunities if the facility is withdrawn, because with NHS pressures and rising health costs, removing this resource clearly conflicts with the duty to promote healthier lifestyles and reduce long-term health inequalities.

For children, swimming provision must be maintained since it forms part of the National Curriculum. Many local children rely on Richmond Pool to learn this essential life skill, and guarantees are needed that lessons will still be provided locally. In addition, a clear plan is required to ensure that water safety education continues, so that closing the pool does not leave a critical gap in both health and education for the community.

6. From David Chefneux

In the last full year of operation under Richmondshire Leisure Trust, there were over 60,000 recorded visitors/users to the Pool, from a very broad range of the community including Schools, Swim Academy, RDASC, Richmond Triathlon Club, Swaledale Outdoor Club, Aquafit, Military, Waterbabies, Casual Swims and other regional clubs. The Pool also complimented activities at the neighbouring Liberty's facility.

With the River Swale and other water activities in the area, it is crucial that people of **all** ages are provided with an opportunity to learn to swim.

In addition to enhancing the tourism offering for the area, Covid clearly demonstrated the role the Pool plays in people's daily lives, physical health and mental well-being.

With all the pressures and challenges faced by us all in these current challenging times, this last point cannot be under-estimated and potentially reduces costs to the health and social care system, by keeping people active and healthy.

The Pool has been through three recent closures, including Covid and capital improvements and has bucked the national trend by recovering usage more quickly than elsewhere. This further emphasises the local demand as also evidenced by the number of responses to the local petition and Council survey.

Given that Richmond Pool is the only publicly owned leisure facility in the former Richmondshire Council area, can I ask the local members whether they are committed to seeing the facility continue in its present location.

Collective response from Jo Ireland, Assistant Director Culture, Arts and Leisure.

Thank you very much to everybody for coming today. As the Assistant Director for Culture and Leisure, it's really heartening to see the support that Richmond Pool has, so thank you for coming.

It's probably worth giving a little bit of background which many of you will know. The pool came into North Yorkshire Council in March and in April it was closed on safety grounds following a serious issue with the ceiling. The wooden battens had become loose and some had fallen.

Given the costs and the extent of the repairs that were required, and because we know that wasn't the only issue with the pool, we took the decision to pause to undertake a full options appraisal in relation to the future of the pool and what the options might be. That has covered many of the things that you have said today. We did include public consultation, and we had a really great response to that – over 2,200 responded - in addition to separate dialogue with clubs and with schools. I think the strength of feeling from the local community about the importance of that facility was really clear and Members listened to that. We also looked at issues around supply and demand, and the impact of the alternative facilities in the area, obviously including Catterick, which is very close. We also did financial modelling around the options.

I think many of you will have seen in the press the recommendation, which is due to be discussed at Overview & Scrutiny this week and will then be considered by the Council's Executive in October, is that we undertake the repairs to Richmond Pool and that the pool reopens to the public. That is the recommendation that will be considered by Members in October. Previously we expected this to go to the Executive in November along with the wider Leisure Investment Strategy however, given the recommendation, we brought that forward so there wouldn't be any further delay before that formal decision is made. Arrangements will then be made for the works to be undertaken and the pool to be reopened.

The works that are required are quite extensive. Obviously, the ceiling works are the biggest single item and that will require scaffolding but there are other works required that we will be doing at the same time. It is also recommended as part of the broader Leisure Investment Strategy, that the gym equipment at Liberty, which is quite old, is replaced as part of a wider programme to replace that equipment, and we will be programming that in, following consideration by the Executive in November.

7. From Hilary Plews

On 29/8/25 Richmondshire Today stated that YW is investing £3m in Leyburn STW to improve the quality of the River Ure. The Environment Agency and SOS have pointed out numerous concerning operational issues at Richmond STW and its adverse impact on the River Swale, yet we understand there is to be no investment in Richmond STW 2025-2030.

Why is this?

Response from Sarah Robinson, Corporate Affairs Manager, Yorkshire Water

Regarding Richmond, I did speak to the Asset Manager, effectively the site manager, last week who shared some data with me. The site is currently operating within in all of its permitted levels but if you share your concerns in more detail I can look into them. At present the site is operating within its biological, oxygen dissolve, phosphorus levels and so on but I can look into your concerns in more detail if you let me know exactly what they are.

8. From Deborah Meara

Can Yorkshire Water guarantee that the 31 percent increase to consumers' bills in 2025-26 will be kept within the regulated water and sewerage company to be used, within its entirety, for enhancement work only, not for remediation of past underinvestment in base work, and not taken out to pay unjustified dividends to shareholders or inflated bonuses to senior managers?

Response from Sarah Robinson, Corporate Affairs Manager, Yorkshire Water

Regarding finances I couldn't comment on what dividends are planned for the upcoming year. The remuneration package is fully published on our website in our accounts every year.

166 Updates from the previous meeting

1. At the meeting of the committee held on 17 March 2025 Members requested further information on the following matters:

- a) Climate change activity report - Members highlighted that a number of inaccuracies that required amendment.

Reference to the Catterick Town Regeneration project was corrected to 'Catterick Garrison'.

- b) The urgent need to connect the EVCs provided in the various market towns. Assurances had been given that this would be implemented but was yet to happen. There was concern that Members had been reassured that this would happen on several occasions without materialising and there was now an urgent need for these to be connected. In response it was stated that this would be fed back accordingly.

This delay it was due to a national procurement issue – something not unique to or controlled by NYC. This has now been resolved, and the LEVI (Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure) fund is progressing. We are at the final stages of our procurement process with a couple of items to sign off before contract signature.

- c) Issues around heat pump heating were discussed and it was stated that there had been problems where these had been installed as repairs were an issue. It was stated that each property was considered on the merits of a specific provision and would not be forced into having a system that was inappropriate for their needs.

The Housing team take a 'fabric first' approach to retrofit, which prioritises improvements to the home before installing new heating systems. Therefore, properties are considered on an individual basis and appropriately installed with measures that are suitable for the home and the tenant.

2. The Chair received an update on 11 August on the Upper Dales flood alleviation scheme. The Flood Risk Project Manager advised that there had been a delay in some of the areas receiving property flood resilience (PFR) but this situation has changed.

Fremington inc. Grinton contract has been handed to the design and installation team. The

contract for Whaw, Langthwaite, Reeth, Bainbridge and Gayle will be completed this week.

Watertight will start contacting residents over the next few weeks with a view to start design assessments from September onwards.

167 Receipt of a petition to save Richmond Swimming Pool from closure

The Committee considered the following petition.

The Issue

Richmond swimming pool is under threat of closure.

My 7-year-old finds great joy in swimming at Richmond swimming pool. Lessons have given him so much confidence, and a new love of swimming.

He says, "It is great fun to learn to swim. I like the parents being able to watch from the cafe. It makes me feel like I'm very included in the swimming group. The teacher is really friendly and doesn't tell you off. My swimming has got much better. Without the swimming pool I would feel sad that I couldn't go to my swimming group."

Richmond swimming pool is not just about swimming; it's about fostering community. It supports local jobs, brings people together, and helps reduce social isolation. With every swim session and lesson, bonds are strengthened, and friendships are forged in our community.

We understand the financial constraints, however, cutting off such an essential facility is not the right solution. We urge the local council to explore funding sources.

Please sign this petition to show your support to keep Richmond swimming pool open.

Six public questions/statements were submitted, and the response was given by the Assistant Director, Culture, Arts and Leisure as shown in minute 165.

It was proposed by Councillor Yvonne Peacock and seconded by Councillor Caroline Dickinson that the committee preferred options 1 and 4 of the report namely that:

- **Option 1:** That the Richmond (Yorks) Area Committee supports the request to keep Richmond Swimming Pool open.
- **Option 4:** The Richmond (Yorks) Area Committee can prepare a report to the decision maker, with recommendations to inform the decision.

Resolved

It was unanimously agreed that the Richmond (Yorks) Area Committee wants the Richmond Pool to remain open (option 1 of the report) and asks the Democratic Services Officer to send a report (the minutes) to the Housing and Leisure Overview & Scrutiny Committee and then to the Executive stating the Committee's wishes (option 4 of the report).

168 Presentation by Yorkshire Water

Two public questions were asked and responded to as in minute 165 above.

Sarah Robinson, Corporate Affairs Manager, Yorkshire Water (YW) gave a presentation

which addressed Members' questions that had been submitted in advance.

- Response times to reported leaks and how their response is co-ordinated
- What steps are being taken to reduce river pollution?
- Housing development, sustainable water management and infrastructure
- Sewerage management, capacity, pollution incidents
- Sustainable land management and natural flood management
- Roadworks and traffic management
- Yorkshire Water are spending significant amounts of capital funding in Northallerton and Brompton, separating surface water runoff from combined drainage to prevent overloading water treatment plants. This is welcome but seems completely at odds with new developments in Northallerton being allowed to use retention ponds and pumping surface water drainage into the existing combined drainage water system in Northallerton. Who has ultimate responsibility for this in planning terms and what can Yorkshire Water do to resist such moves?

Following the presentation, members raised a number of other issues including:

- Road works and closures signs left out after any works have finished. This will be reported to the YW Streetworks Manager.
- Bainbridge and Aysgarth not mentioned on list of works along the Swale. Community groups believe there are pollution issues there – can this be checked and does YW work with those groups who undertake sampling of the river? Works are programmed based on the highest discharging sites but the officer will share more information on this. YW has 2050 to tackle CSO discharges. The River Health team works with local groups.
- Leaks are a serious concern. There has been a leak on the main highway in the village of Moulton for more than year and there appears to be an issue of ownership. It is important to stop the leak before winter. The officer asked to be provided with more details and would investigate and respond directly.
- The algal bloom on R Swale has been very prolific – is that monitored and how does it compare to other parts of Swale? YW test what may be discharged from their works. The Environment Agency is responsible for monitoring what's happening in the rivers.
- Does YW influence planning decisions, especially coping with increased development? YW is not a statutory consultee but they will comment on planning applications if there are concerns and their Head of Town Planning works closely with NYC.
- How does YW deal with invasive plants such as Himalayan Balsam? YW has an Invasive, Non-native Plants Policy and also funds Yorkshire Wildlife Trust to assist with species control but this may be the EA's responsibility if found on a general water course.
- NYC supported Blue Flag status for all rivers but phosphate levels were high in the Swale. Coliform was also high and is a health issue. The officer will take this back to their team and provide the correct information.
- It was sometimes difficult to know who to contact YW or the EA. Is there a conflict? The EA are the regulator but they work with YW. The Independent Water Commission's recent review set out recommendations for reform to improve the water sector regulatory system in England and Wales.

The Chair thanked the officer for the informative presentation and for attending.

169 Briefing note on local banking and cash handling services

Members requested an update on the latest situation for banking and cash handling in the committee area.

Further recent closures of bank branches had raised concerns for a number of reasons including:

- The distances residents may have to travel in order to access banking services, particularly if using public transport.
- The impact of businesses at the lack of access to cash for customers and the costs to business of processing card payments.
- Whilst the service provided by the Post office was welcome, Members were concerned at the lack of local access to other financial services.
- The limited access to ATMs

Councillor Brynn Griffiths proposed and Councillor Stuart Parsons seconded that this Area Committee requests a review of the Stokesley community's cash access needs by applying to LINK for a banking hub.

Resolved

It was unanimously agreed that this Area Committee requests a review of the Stokesley community's cash access needs by applying to LINK for a banking hub.

It was subsequently realised that an assessment of Stokesley's banking needs had already been undertaken and found that the provision of any new or improved cash access services in Stokesley was not recommended at this time.

170 Work programme

Arriva Transport had agreed to attend the next meeting of the Committee to be held on 10 November 2025 and had requested that the Committee submit any questions in advance.

Members were asked to submit their questions to the Senior Democratic Services Officer by 13 October 2025.

For November's meeting

- Members requested an update on ambulance response times.
- An update on the Catterick ICC and details of the services that would be available to the general public. Members had concerns that if services were moved into the garrison for the general public, had access to public transport been considered.

Emptying of litter bins and dog bins, especially in play areas and the fact that domestic waste may be left at litter bins.

Members had concerns about the resource in Planning teams across the Council.

171 Items circulated for information only

Agenda items 10a-10d were for information only.

Members were asked to submit any questions or requests for further information from the authors or Senior Democratic Services Officer.

Cllr Heather Moorhouse joined the meeting at 11.05am.

172 Any other items

There were no urgent items of business.

The meeting concluded at 11.32 am.

Update from Yorkshire Ambulance Service NHS Trust

Date	10 November 2025
Forum	North Yorkshire Council Richmond (Yorks) Area Committee

1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to provide an update for the Richmond Area Committee on the performance and services provided by Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS) within the Richmondshire area of North Yorkshire.

2.0 Demand and performance

2.1 As a key part of the urgent and emergency care system, YAS continues to see high levels of operational demand across its services, which are;

- Accident and Emergency Operations, A&E Operations, (both receiving 999 calls and responding to them);
- Integrated Urgent Care (IUC) service (including the NHS 111 urgent medical help and advice line); and
- non-emergency Patient Transport Service, PTS, (taking eligible patients to and from their hospital appointments and treatments).

The Trust continues to focus on providing the very best care to patients despite operational pressures and tighter financial constraints.

2.2 Response times in A&E Operations (the emergency ambulance service) continue to see some challenges, particularly for category 1 and 2 patients, who are the most seriously ill. The national target for 2025/26 is for all English ambulance services to achieve a category 2 average mean response time of under 30 minutes set by NHS England; (however the statutory response target is 18 minutes).

2.3 The average category 2 response time for YAS for 2025 to date is 26 minutes 48 seconds. This is an improvement on the average response for 2024, which was 30 minutes and 15 seconds. A more detailed breakdown on performance by category of patient and postcodes for the Richmond area is attached in **Appendix 1**. This compares performance between January to September 2024 to the same period in 2025 and shows improvement across the Trust and in the Richmond area in the highest priority categories, 1 and 2.

2.4 Another key measure of performance in urgent and emergency care is the time taken to handover patients at hospital Emergency Departments from the ambulance service. The national target for patient handovers at Emergency Departments is 15 minutes. Pressures across the health and social care system contribute to the hospital handover delays, and it remains a Trust priority to minimise these delays, given the impact this has on the availability of emergency ambulances and on patient care.

2.5 Significant progress has been made in reducing handover delays across Yorkshire, with the introduction of the 'transfer of care' operating procedure; a structured, safe, and timely process for transferring patient care from YAS staff to acute trust

colleagues. This has been developed to ensure patient handover takes place within a maximum of 45 minutes and helps to support timely patient handovers, which in turn supports rapid ambulance turnaround and preserves emergency response capacity. The overarching aim is to reduce the risk to patients waiting for a 999 response in our communities, therefore improving response times and maximising patient safety and experience.

- 2.6 The average handover time across the Trust for the year to date (April to October 2025) is 19 minutes 38 and this average handover time has improved every month since January 2025.
- 2.7 This procedure has been introduced at all hospitals across Yorkshire. Work is underway at hospitals outside the YAS area to improve handover times and North East Ambulance Service are leading this work at Darlington Memorial Hospital and at The James Cook University Hospital. Details of average handover times in local hospitals over 2024 and 2025 are included below:

Year	Hospital	Handover Time
2024	Darlington Memorial Hospital	00:20:42
	Harrogate District Hospital	00:22:55
	James Cook University Hospital	00:31:30
2025	Darlington Memorial Hospital	00:18:44
	Harrogate District Hospital	00:17:28
	James Cook University Hospital	00:26:27

3.0 Further updates

- 3.1 The Trust has recently completed a transformation project to change the primary triage tool for 999 call handling in our Emergency Operations Centres (EOCs) to NHS Pathways, as part of the delivery of our 2024-29 strategy. This alignment with our NHS 111 service (which already uses ‘NHS Pathways’), aims to streamline the patient journey, ensuring patients receive the most appropriate care early on, leading to improved patient outcomes. NHS Pathways allows for a broader range of questions during 999 calls, enabling more in-depth triage and accurate assessment of patient needs, focusing resources on higher acuity cases to save more lives.
- 3.2 Our call-taking performance for 999 is seeing some impact from the training for this new triage system and, although we are receiving mutual support from other ambulance services, we are looking to improve our performance, which for the year to date (April to September 2025) is 8 seconds (against a national performance target of a 10 second average).
- 3.3 In addition, we continue to increase the number of appropriate pathways available to patients who require different access to healthcare rather than attending the emergency department. The Trust is aiming to increase ‘hear and treat’ rates, (where a clinician is able to provide treatment and advice over the phone and an alternative, more appropriate service is identified). In 2024/5, 15.6% of patients successfully experienced ‘hear and treat’ and our objective for 2025/6 is to achieve 17.9%.
- 3.4 Our Integrated Urgent Care (IUC) service, which provides our NHS 111 service, remains in the top quartile nationally for call answering with the service, receiving 144,208 calls in September. Calls answered within 60 seconds has performed well during 2025, although performance in September was down from August (at 83.7% compared to 90% in the previous month).

- 3.5 In our Patient Transport Service, (PTS) over 69,000 journeys were operated in September across YAS. Call performance has been over 80.0% for the fourth month running, with over 91% of calls were answered in 180 seconds in September.
- 3.6 NHS England have recently published the new [NHS Oversight Framework](#) which has included [performance league tables](#). Yorkshire Ambulance Service was ranked third amongst the country's ambulance trusts, which is positive news for the Trust and the communities we serve and a reflection of the hard work and dedication of our staff and volunteers.
- 3.7 The new framework gives a view on how NHS organisations are performing and compares trusts with others across England. Trusts are placed into one of four core segments - segment 1, where YAS is placed (and the only Trust in the Yorkshire region in this segment), represents the organisations with the narrowest range of challenges, while segment 4 contains those with the broadest. The scores are compiled from a range of measures under five domains of access to services, effectiveness and experience, patient safety, people and workforce, and productivity and value for money.
- 3.8 At YAS we perform well in a number of areas including our category 2 response time, NHS Staff Survey engagement scores, and finance, among others. However, it has also highlighted areas of focus and improvement including our sickness absence rates and the number of patients we convey to emergency departments. The Trust will be focusing on these areas and continue to reflect on performance as the rankings are recalculated each quarter, to reflect overall changes in relative performance across the NHS.

4.0 Recommendation

It is recommended that this update is noted for comment and consideration.

Appendix 1

Performance and Handover Times

Jan 24 - Sept 24 compared to Jan 25 - Sept 25

Year (calendar)		Cat1		Cat2		Cat3		Cat4	
		Mean	90th	Mean	90th	Mean	90th	Mean	90th
2024	*Richmond area postcodes	00:09:25	00:18:50	00:25:02	00:53:34	00:55:47	02:04:24	00:56:44	02:09:31
	YAS	00:07:59	00:13:54	00:30:15	01:07:58	01:29:24	03:24:40	01:36:34	03:54:38
2025	*Richmond area postcodes	00:09:13	00:18:01	00:23:39	00:48:07	00:53:59	02:03:09	01:34:42	03:33:42
	YAS	00:07:49	00:13:32	00:26:48	00:57:19	01:17:59	03:00:22	01:33:28	03:51:01

Page 10

*Richmond area postcodes;

DL6, DL7, DL8, DL9, DL10, DL11, DL12, HG4, TS15

For Councillors reference

Questions submitted to Arriva

- When buses don't turn up, passengers are often given no explanation or notice. Why is there no reliable communication when a service is cancelled or delayed?
- The Arriva app regularly shows buses that never arrive or disappear from tracking altogether. Why does this keep happening, and when will the app be fixed so it accurately reflects the buses on the road?
- When services fail, it's often those with no other transport options - especially young people, older residents, and those travelling to work or hospital appointments - who are most affected. How is Arriva taking their needs into account when planning improvements?
- When buses are missed, passengers sometimes have to wait over an hour for the next one. Will Arriva review the timetable to ensure there's at least a backup option or additional service at peak times?

Colburn

- Many residents in Colburn report buses simply not turning up, leaving people stranded, sometimes for long periods. What is causing these no-show services, and what immediate action will Arriva take to stop this happening?
- Some Colburn residents have said they've stopped using Arriva altogether because of the unreliability. What is Arriva doing to rebuild public confidence in its service?
- Can Arriva confirm whether Colburn has a specific local operations manager responsible for service reliability, and if not, will one be appointed so there's local accountability?
- Will Arriva commit to meeting with Colburn Town Council and residents' representatives to discuss the ongoing poor service and find local solutions

This page is intentionally left blank

Richmond Area Committee Work Programme 2025-26

Monday 30 June 2025 at 10am

Election of a Chair	
Election of a Vice Chair	
Community Safety & CCTV Annual Update	Paul Romans - Community Safety & CCTV Manager
Traffic management for diversions	Jayne Charlton – Area Manager and Alex Hollifield - Network Information and Compliance Team Leader
£50k Seed Funding	Details of the progress made on the projects implemented through the Seed Funding provided to the Committee Louisa Carolan – Principal Regeneration Officer
Update on Richmond Town Investment Plan	Verbal update - Louisa Carolan – Principal Regeneration Officer
Discussion item – Yorkshire Water	To gather information that Members would like to be updated on
Work Programme 2025-26	To consider the committee’s work programme for the coming municipal year
Let’s Talk Active outcomes	For information only
Annual report 2024/25	For information only

Monday 15 September 2025 at 10am

Receipt of petition for Richmond Pool	
Presentation by Yorkshire Water	Sarah Robinson, Corporate Affairs Manager
Banking and cash handing facilities	Discussion item
Update from the MP	Written update
Update from other water suppliers in the committee area	For information only
Localities update 2024/25	For information only
The latest information on ash dieback	For information only
Work Programme 2025-26	To consider the Committee’s Work Programme

Monday 10 November 2025 at 10am	
Update from the MP	
Ambulance response times	Martin Dodd, Area Operations Manager and Helen Edwards, Ass Director Communications and Community Engagement
Update on Catterick Integrated Care Campus and the Friary Community Hospital	Lisa Pope – NHS Humber and North Yorkshire ICB
Public transport issues	Q&A session by Arriva buses
Work Programme 2025-26	To consider the Committee's Work Programme
12 January 2026 at 10am – Budget briefing	
2 March 2026 at 10am	
Town Investment Plan progress for plans in the committee area	Principal Regeneration Officer
Local Nature Recovery Strategy annual update	Timothy Johns – Senior Policy Officer - Sustainability
Schools, educational achievement and finance annual update	Annual Update – Jon Holden, Assistant Director, Education & Skills and colleagues (information item)
Climate change strategy annual update	To discuss the delivery of the Climate Strategy in the Area Committee area

To be confirmed but likely to be September 2026 meetings

- Mayor and members of the Y&NY MCA - Update on the work of the MCA (1 hr session)

To be scheduled:

A684, Morton Flatts, River Swale flooding update

Meeting dates for 2025-26

Monday 10 November 2025 at 10am

Monday 12 January 2026 at 10am (Budget Consultation)

Monday 2 March 2026 at 10am

Work Programme 2025-26

Issues identified for future work programme	
Highways	
Utility company street works	Information on what is required of utility companies when seeking access to their apparatus, for both planned and emergency works and what powers North Yorkshire council have.
Parking charges	Overview of changes since LGR
Health and Social Care	
Mental health	A report on how mental health issues are being addressed in the area.
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
Education and Schools	
Small schools	Review of educational outcomes at small schools – linked to the Young People’s Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Review of the Home to School Transport Policy	To consider the review of the new Home to School Transport Policy
Economic Development	
Catterick Levelling Up Bid	A presentation on the successful Levelling Up Bid and the current position of the project – Catterick Garrison town centre North Yorkshire Council
Scotch Corner	An update on the issues at Scotch Corner Roundabout A66 road dualling approved again after spending review - BBC News

This page is intentionally left blank