

North Yorkshire Council

Richmond (Yorks) Area Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 2 March 2026 commencing at 10.00 am

Councillor Yvonne Peacock in the Chair and Councillors Caroline Dickinson, Kevin Foster, Tom Jones, Carl Les, Stuart Parsons, Annabel Wilkinson and Peter Wilkinson

Present (remote): Councillors Brynn Griffiths, David Webster and John Weighell

In attendance: Lisa Pope – Deputy Place Director, Humber and North Yorkshire Integrated Care Board

Officers present: Julie Bunn - Head of Education and Access, Jon Holden - Head of School Organisation and Transport and Nicki Lishman - Senior Democratic Services Officer

Apologies: Councillors David Hugill, Heather Moorhouse, Karin Sedgwick, Angus Thompson and Steve Watson.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

Due to other commitments of the attendees, the agenda was considered in the following order.

1. Update from the MP
2. Receipt of a petition for congestion relief on the A6136 in Catterick
3. Updates from the previous meeting
4. Schools educational achievement and finance annual update
5. Update on Catterick Integrated Care Campus
6. Work programme

184 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Hugill, Heather Moorhouse, Karin Sedgwick, Angus Thompson and Steve Watson.

185 Minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2025

Decision

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2025, be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

Voting record

Unanimous.

186 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

187 Update from the MP

The Right Hon Rishi Sunak MP attended the meeting and gave the following update.

Stokesley banking hub

Mr Sunak updated the committee on efforts to secure a banking hub for Stokesley following recent bank closures. He has written to LINK requesting reassessment, arguing that circumstances have materially changed.

Councillors highlighted:

- The area's older demographic.
- Significant local employment.
- Use of facilities by visitors.
- The importance of non-cash banking services that post offices cannot provide.

Mr Sunak requested any information or evidence to support further representations.

Congestion in the Catterick Garrison and Colburn area

Mr Sunak confirmed a meeting will take place involving the MoD, North Yorkshire Council, the Mayor, councillors and other stakeholders.

A fresh review of the A6136's capacity was considered overdue. Councillor Carl Les noted the need for updated traffic surveying methods that avoid exacerbating congestion, such as using ANPR combined with postal surveys.

Councillor Stuart Parsons emphasised the A6136's role as the designated emergency diversion route for the A1, leading to severe congestion during closures.

A66 upgrade

The upgrade has already been approved and an announcement on start dates is expected soon. Mr Sunak has written to the Secretary of State requesting timely commencement and completion of the works.

Health infrastructure: The Friary and Catterick Integrated Care Centre

Progress on Catterick's integrated care centre was welcomed.

There were ongoing discussions about the future use of the Friary, focussing on protecting patient services.

Bus services and rural transport

Catterick Garrison – Richmond bus route - Councillor Kevin Foster requested support for introducing a 30-minute bus service. Congestion currently causes significant timetable disruption.

Mr Sunak agreed to follow this up and requested further details.

The committee had commissioned a feasibility study that showed issues that meant that residents may not reach key employment or study areas (e.g. Northallerton) by public transport. The study had been sent to the Mayor and would be forwarded to Mr Sunak.

Mr Sunak emphasised the importance of including rural communities in Combined Authority transport planning.

He also praised local community transport providers and the regulatory issues they face.

Middle East security situation

Concerns were raised about local anxiety due to international developments affecting armed forces personnel. Mr Sunak advised that government prioritises the safety of military staff, particularly abroad, and a Prime Ministerial statement is expected.

He acknowledged the uncertainty but praised the dedication and sacrifice of the armed forces.

Support for Service Families and SEND

Mr Sunak would raise in Parliament the work local schools are doing under the Garrison Assist Project to support service children with SEND. He highlighted the need to address systemic challenges caused by pupil mobility in military families.

Richmond Town of Culture bid

Mr Sunak noted progress on the joint bid, supported by Northallerton. The congestion issues discussed earlier were also relevant to ensuring infrastructure supports cultural development.

He thanked councillors for their work and confirmed his willingness to attend future meetings if scheduling allows.

188 Public questions or statements

There were no public questions or statements.

189 Update on Catterick Integrated Care Campus

Lisa Pope, Deputy Place Director, NHS Humber and North Yorkshire ICB, gave an update on the development of the Catterick Integrated Care Centre (CICC), a project first conceived 11 years ago.

It represented a world-first fully integrated partnership between the NHS and the Ministry of Defence (MOD). Unlike other co-located facilities, the CICC would integrate NHS and MOD services operationally and physically. Some services were already integrated and a five-year plan would complete full integration once the centre opened.

The project was in response to:

- Significant population growth in the Catterick area.
- The Army 2020 rebasing programme, which increased military personnel.
- Challenges in both NHS and MOD estates, creating an opportunity to jointly redesign services.

A core aim was parity of access between military personnel, their families and NHS patients. Historically, military personnel, their families had faced disadvantages due to frequent moves and limited visibility in deprivation formulas. The integrated model aimed to improve fairness, reduce waiting list disruption and address rural access issues.

The CICC would bring together:

- Primary care practice (Harewood and DPH)
- Secondary care
- Community health services
- Mental health services
- Local authority services
- Out-of-hospital secondary care services.

Extensive community engagement continued through roadshows, newsletters, targeted outreach, a website and FAQ log.

The build was close to completion. A “Government soft opening” was expected in June, with full occupation by September, subject to weather and final testing.

The ICB remained committed to the future of the Friary Hospital, including primary care provision and ward-based services. Any changes would require public engagement and consultation.

Following the update, Councillors had the following questions.

1. When would the current day facilities at the Friary move to the CICC?

Transitions were planned for June – August depending on build completion.

2. What was the timescale for determining the future of the Friary and its services?

There was no firm timeline and it was dependent on:

- Any changes to primary care over the next few months.
- Discussions with the University Hospitals Trust regarding the ward and care model.
- Ongoing restructuring within the ICB.

More clarity was expected once these factors were concluded.

3. Members advised that consultation events had occurred during work hours and asked if this could be addressed?

Ms Pope acknowledged this and agreed to look at engagement options to improve access for working residents.

4. Various conflicting rumours existed about dental provision at the CICC. What is the correct position?

Community Dental services (mainly for people with learning disabilities) will continue at the CICC.

The ICB has approved a test-case pilot with MOD dental services whereby military dentists would provide NHS dental care for serving personnel’s families only. The pilot aimed to assess whether MOD dental capacity could support NHS needs.

Military dental capacity must always ensure forces were battle ready and there was concern that NHS demand might compromise this. The pilot will be cautious and incremental, to potentially expand military dental capacity to support wider NHS need.

5. Will families have two dentists (NHS and MOD) during the test?

The intention was that families register with the military dentist only during the trial. Colleagues were working through the detailed design, but reassurances were given that the aim was to avoid destabilising military or NHS dental services.

6. Could a clear commitment be given?

As work was ongoing firm guarantees could not be given but the key message was that the ICB was actively trying to create more NHS dental capacity, using MOD resources where possible.

190 Receipt of a petition for congestion relief on the A6136 in Catterick

The Committee considered the following petition which was submitted by Councillor Kevin Foster and contained 1028 signatures of people who live, work or study in the county.

“We call for urgent action to deliver improvements to the Key Route Network in Colburn and Hipswell. The daily congestion is hugely disruptive to people who live and work here. It is harmful to the local economy, it is harmful to health, and it is harmful to the education of local children.

We call for investment in a relief road in any places where lower cost forms of improvements cannot alleviate congestion.

We call for investment to create better bus services with access to enough road capacity so that our buses can run to timetable throughout the day.”

The petition had been submitted to North Yorkshire Council and to the Mayor of York and North Yorkshire, Combined Authority (CA). The CA had considered the petition at its meeting held on 23 January 2026.

Councillor Foster presented the petition to the committee and drew Members attention to some queries he had with the officers’ report, namely:

- The report references a “bypass” however the petition had requested a “relief road” to relieve pressure on existing streets.
- The report references modelling that was done in 2018-2020 for the Richmondshire Local Plan, suggesting that most journeys were internal journeys within Catterick and Colburn. However, congestion builds from the A1 which indicated that people throughout the area and beyond were accessing jobs and education.

Councillor Foster proposed and the Chair seconded option C of the report to support the York and North Yorkshire Combined Authority’s decision to refer the petition to the next meeting of its Transport Advisory Board for further discussion and the MP’s offer to host a round table discussion with the council, the Combined Authority, the Ministry of Defence and defence estates to consider a way forward.

Decision

That the committee unanimously supports the York and North Yorkshire Combined Authority’s decision to refer the petition to the next meeting of its Transport Advisory Board for further discussion and the MP’s offer to host a round table discussion with the council, the Combined Authority, the Ministry of Defence and defence estates to consider a way forward.

191 Schools, educational achievement and finance annual update

John Holden, Head of School Organisation and Transport and Julie Bunn, Head of Education Access and Engagement attended to take question on the annual update.

Councillors had a number of questions on the contents of the report.

1. In respect of point 8.4 of the report regarding compliance with school admissions and registration regulations, Councillors questioned why the council used its discretion for a “nearest gate in the federation” policy for home to school transport only for the Reeth and Gunnerside Schools Federation.

Officers stated that this reflected individual negotiations with each governing board following detailed public consultations. The nearest gate issue specifically arose and was requested by the federated governing board of the Reeth and Gunnerside Federation and was contingent on the governing board continuing to provide inter-school transport.

A Member proposed asking the Executive (Executive Member) to consider offering the same discretion to Middleton and Spennithorne and Bainbridge and Aiskew (and any future federations). It was later clarified that the decision sat with the Executive Member for Education, Learning and Skills, who confirmed no objections to the proposal had been received within the statutory period but agreed to seek clarity and feedback on whether that option had already been offered and declined.

2. Did officers and the Executive Member accept that schools locally were under increasing strain (falling primary rolls, weaker secondary outcomes, disproportionately high permanent exclusions), and what specific actions were being taken to stabilise provision?

Officers noted the challenges that were faced by schools arising from falling roll numbers and the consequent impact upon school funding.

It was noted that the schools within the constituency are both local authority maintained schools and academies and that, as a result, schools received support in different ways and that there is not a single solution to the issue.

The council provides support to small schools, including pupil number forecasts, financial support processes and close work with governing boards on local solutions (e.g. federations).

It was noted that 2 small schools were closed within the Committee’s area during 2024-25, one Local Authority maintained school and one academy arising from low pupil numbers.

The national context was one of falling birth rates and population movements (with rural and some urban areas affected) being significant drivers. It was not possible to attribute trends to any single factor.

3. Why there was no reference to the recent home-to-school transport policy, and what assurance was there that it wasn’t contributing to falling published admission numbers, funding pressure or secondary strain? Had an assessment been undertaken, and would it be included in the post-implementation review?

Officers noted that the report related to schools and provided information about performance during a single year. It was noted that parents make applications for school places based upon a number of factors and that it would not be appropriate to attribute any changes within the context of a single year to one specific issue.

The Council has committed to working with schools during the course of the phased implementation of the policy to monitor its impact, and also to undertaking a post implementation review of the policy.

Officers reiterated broader national trends (declining pupil numbers) and ongoing monitoring with schools.

4. Reports reference catchment, while families have been told nearest school matters for transport, causing confusion. Can future reports clarify the difference and usage?

Officers clarified that the term 'nearest suitable school' has been utilised within the context of reports about the Home to School Transfer Policy.

Catchment areas continue to be utilised for the purpose of admissions.

Officers advised that the Council has provided a 'nearest school' school tool on its website to enable parents to identify the nearest schools to their home address, and that parents are then able to access information about those schools via a range a data sources, including schools' websites and via Ofsted.

Decision

That the report be noted.

192 Updates from the previous meeting

The updates were noted.

193 Work programme

The work programme was noted.

The Chair reminded Councillors of the work planning meeting to be held on Teams and scheduled for 1.30pm on 1 May 2026.

194 Any other items

There were no urgent items of business.

The meeting concluded at 11.25 am.