

# North Yorkshire Council

## Thirsk and Malton Area Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, 26 September 2025 commencing at 2.00 pm.

Councillor Nigel Knapton in the Chair and Councillors Joy Andrews, Lindsay Burr MBE, Sam Cross, Gareth Dadd, Keane Duncan, George Jabbour, Steve Mason, Janet Sanderson and Greg White.

In attendance: Councillor Carl Les

Officers present: Shaun Berry – Head of Sustainability and Environment, Ellie Hook - Howardian Hills National Landscape Manager, Nicki Lishman - Senior Democratic Services Officer, Howard Wallis – Principal Regeneration Officer (remote).

Other Attendees: Chief Inspector L McNeill and Inspector M Dennison – North Yorkshire Police

Apologies: Councillors Alyson Baker, Dan Sladden, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff and Malcolm Taylor

---

**Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book**

---

### **1 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alyson Baker, Dan Sladden, Malcolm Taylor and Annabel Wilkinson.

### **2 Minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2025**

#### **Resolved**

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Thirsk and Malton Area Committee held on 13 June 2025 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

### **3 Declarations of interest**

Councillors George Jabbour and Caroline Goodrick declared an interest for the purposes of transparency in item 7 as Chair and Vice Chair respectively of the Howardian Hills National Landscape Joint Advisory Committee. Councillor Jabbour also declared an interest as a member of the North York Moors National Park Authority.

Councillor George Jabbour joined the meeting at 2.10 pm, having previously tried to join remotely.

Councillor Keane Duncan joined the meeting at 2.15pm.

### **4 Public questions or statements**

**There were three public questions.**

**From Richard Crabtree**

Good afternoon, Chair and Councillors.

I speak on behalf of parents from Sheriff Hutton and nearby villages about school transport to Outwood Academy Easingwold. We urgently need your help.

Children from our villages have had transport removed not once but twice, leaving those already settled into their new school without a way to get there.

This time last year, parents applied for secondary places. Most chose their catchment school, as they always had. We received no direct email or letter warning of any change, and your website continued to reference catchment schools in four places until March this year. Officers have acknowledged those errors, but parents made their choices in good faith, unaware the rules had changed.

On 3 March 2025, allocations were confirmed. Our children were accepted into their catchment school, preparations began, and families had every reason to assume transport would be provided.

Then, on 23 May, the bombshell landed. Parents received an email saying transport had been withdrawn under the new policy. No one in the village knew. Appeals followed, but two days before the end of term we were told that no paid-for passes would be available either, leaving children stranded.

At the eleventh hour, Outwood Academy arranged passes through Morse Coaches for this year only. But last Friday, parents were told that provision has been withdrawn. The costs are prohibitive, and North Yorkshire Council refuses to contribute. From October, our children will have no way to reach the school they have already started at and settled in to.

This pattern - poor communication, sudden policy bombshells, last-minute U-turns - has caused enormous stress and disrupted children's education. Officers were warned this policy would harm rural families, and here is the evidence. Yet nothing will change until 2028. By then, I fear villages like Sheriff Hutton may have no young families left. This is the kind of example our MP Kevin Hollinrake was taking about when expressed his concerns.

With all this in mind I ask the council to:

Recognise the exceptional circumstances here and work with the school and coach company to find an urgent solution so these children are not left stranded.

Restore the policy review to its original timing, so it begins this year, not next, and avoids further harm to rural villages like ours.

These children cannot be left in the lurch. We need action now. And I'd be keen to hear your views as our councillors on how to solve this.

**Response from Amanda Fielding, Assistant Director Inclusion**

Thank you to Mr Crabtree for your statement and questions.

The Council's Home to School Travel Policy was adopted at the meeting of the Full Council in July 2024 and was implemented with effect from 1 September 2024. The policy aligns the council's arrangements with the Department for Education's Statutory Guidance for home to school travel, including the main eligibility criteria which is that assistance is provided to the nearest suitable school with available places.

In adopting the policy, the Council determined that it should be implemented on a phased basis such that any pupil with existing eligibility for transport would not be affected. Whilst the Council acknowledged that this would result in pupils in individual areas having eligibility

to different schools this was considered preferable to the potential impact upon an individual pupil's education by the potential requirement to change schools. It is not true to say, therefore, that the Council has withdrawn assistance with travel from any pupil. The Council remains committed to meeting its statutory obligation to providing assistance with travel to all pupils who have eligibility.

The Council's consideration of the policy was preceded by an extensive consultation exercise about the policy proposals. All primary schools in the county were notified about the consultation and were asked to notify parents. The exercise was also promoted on the council's website, via its social media channels and via local media outlets.

Following the implementation of the policy, the council's website was updated to ensure that information was available to parents about its implications. For example, an online tool was provided to assist parents in identifying their nearest suitable schools. This information was made available on the web pages providing information about school admissions, and those completing applications for school places after 1 September 2024 were asked to confirm that they had considered the implications of the revised policy when making their application.

Whilst it is acknowledged that some pages on the council's website did contain old information about the previous policy, analysis of the use of the website has indicated that those specific pages were accessed on only a relatively small number of occasions. The council does not believe, therefore, that parents were misled through the continued existence of that information.

All pupils who were allocated a new school place to start in September 2025 had their eligibility for assistance with home to school travel assessed in accordance with the 2024 policy, and eligibility was not provided to pupils who are not attending their nearest suitable school where places were available at the point that places were allocated. Where pupils attend a school other than their nearest suitable school with places available then it remains that parents are responsible for the arrangements for their children's travel to school.

The council is not able to comment about any arrangements which have been established by schools but subsequently withdrawn.

In response to the specific questions raised:

The council's policy provides only limited discretion for the provision of assistance to pupils who have been determined as being not eligible for assistance, e.g. including where paid permits are offered where there is spare capacity on existing NYC contracted transport. The council remains committed to undertaking a Post Implementation Review of the implementation of the policy in accordance with the commitment provided at the meeting of the Full Council on 24 July 2024 and a report on this will be presented in autumn 2026.

**Mr Crabtree then asked the following supplementary question.**

At this point, I think the relevant point is that this is about taking responsibility for the acknowledged errors by the Council in, in which you've left. Children have already started.

Their new school stranded the Council's own failings, which have been acknowledged through the appeals process, have kind of have created this problem. I understand that you know that.

Hiding behind policy savings targets and the review being pushed to 2026 means nothing will change until 2028, with three more years of damage and whoever is here and in in in the seats here in this room will then be picking up.

There are 13 more families who are currently in the admissions window from Sheriff Hutton this year and they're left in the lurch. They have total uncertainty about what this means for the future of their children's education.

So, I would ask, and Sheriff Hutton residents would ask for two things, recognise and act on the exceptional circumstances this year for the families of Sheriff Hutton and start the post implementation review this year, as promised in the to the families in villages like I was. Otherwise, it's knowingly allowing harm to come to rural communities and families.

**From Chris Wilson**

Policy Review Delay

Chair, Members,

I am speaking today on behalf of parents in North Yorkshire who continue to be let down by the council's handling of the Home to School Transport policy.

When this policy was voted through in July 2024, councillors were promised a post-implementation review in 2025, with a working group. These safeguards were written into the official papers and intended to mitigate the clear risks to rural families.

Officers themselves acknowledged in the Equality Impact Assessment that rural communities would be disproportionately affected.

Disgracefully, this promise has been broken. Officers have delayed the review to start in 2026 and report in 2027. That means no changes can be actioned until September 2028 at the earliest. In the meantime, the flaws in this policy will continue to damage families and schools for years.

At last week's Scrutiny Committee, councillors in this room had the chance to challenge this but failed to act. The broken promise of a 2025 review went largely unchallenged, the mitigation of harm to rural families was effectively abandoned and attempts by opposition councillors to create a mechanism for input on the scope and independence were quashed. As was said on the day, the officers who have engineered this mess have been left to mark their own homework. Bizarrely, officers dismissed the idea of independent oversight as "dangerous." For them, maybe - but not for the rural families relying on this review to correct injustices in appeals hearings week in, week out.

So I ask you, Members here today:

Do you find it acceptable that a written promise, which was the basis of the Full Council vote, has been reneged on without debate or consultation and understand that by refusing independent oversight and stakeholder involvement, this review has already lost all credibility with the very families it is supposed to reassure.

Chair, Members, this is not just about transport policy. It is about trust in this council. Trust that was already fragile - and which has now, frankly, been shattered. Unless councillors here begin to stand up, hold officers to account, and insist on keeping promises, that trust will not be rebuilt.

**Response from Amanda Fielding, Assistant Director Inclusion**

Thank you to Mr Wilson for his statement.

During the meeting of the Full Council on 24 July 2024 Councillor Wilkinson provided a commitment that she would commission a Post Implementation Review, to report in 2026. Given that that was the case, the council does not accept that there has been any delay to the proposed review.

The report relating to the Post Implementation Review will be presented to the Executive

OFFICIAL

during the autumn of 2026. If recommendations are proposed, then these may be subject to a consultation process and timescales set out in the Department for Education's Statutory Guidance for Home to School Travel. On this basis, a public consultation could be required during the spring of 2027, prior to the consideration of a revised policy by the Executive and Full Council before 31 July 2027. Should a revised policy be approved by the Council then it would be implemented with effect from 1 September 2027.

**Mr Wilson then asked the following supplementary question.**

I suppose my only comment on that would be that our understanding that was 2025, even if it is 2026 and 2027 when that comes through, you're still talking about another two years of uncertainty around this.

I still don't understand why it can't be done this year. It could have been possibly done in 2025, so I don't understand why that's not the case.

**Combined response to the supplementary questions above from Jon Holden, Strategic Planning Manager**

Thank you to both Mr Crabtree and Mr Wilson for their further questions to the Committee, the detail of both of which are noted.

The Post Implementation Review of the implementation of the Home to School Travel Policy will be undertaken in accordance with the commitment that was provided at the meeting of the Full Council on 24 July 2024, and the timetable that has subsequently been reported.

Parents and carers who are making applications for a school place for their children should continue to consider the information that is available on the council's website.

A briefing report about the Post Implementation Review was provided to the Council's Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 17 September. A copy of that report can be accessed utilising the following link: [North Yorkshire Council](#)

**From Simon Thackray**

The council report states:

"5.3 There are CCTV cameras at Malton and Norton (33), Pickering (12), Kirkbymoorside (1) owned by Ryedale Cameras in Action which are managed by the CCTV Control Room at Scarborough, and 12 cameras at Thirsk from 1 September 2025 managed by the 24-hour CCTV service at Harrogate.

**5.4 CCTV Performance**

In the period 01/04/2024 to 31/08/2025 (days), the Ryedale Cameras in Action cluster dealt with 223 incidents, undertook 87 evidential reviews and produced 63 pieces of evidence."

Question:

There are CCTV cameras in Malton and Norton which could help Trading Standards enforce the 7.5-tonne weight restriction over Norton level crossing. This restriction is vital to protect public health from the damaging effects of air pollution.

Of the 63 pieces of evidence produced by Ryedale Cameras in Action between 1 April 2024 and 31 August 2025, how many resulted in enforcement, or prosecution of individuals, for breaches of the 7.5-tonne weight restriction over Norton level crossing?

**Response from Julia Stack, Community Safety & CCTV Manager**

The evidence produced during the period identified has not been used in relation to any enforcement, prosecution of the 7.5 tonne weight restriction over Norton crossing.

The camera at this location is a fixed cameras and looks in the direction of Norton over the crossing and can pick up registration and vehicle information.

We have an additional camera that faces away from the level crossing looking across the bridge facing in the Malton direction. Visibility is not as good but can identify a vehicle if coming from Malton heading towards the crossing.

The CCTV service is currently working with colleagues within the Council to explore how the CCTV service can assist with the identification of vehicles that breach restrictions in specified areas, this work is ongoing.

Advise from colleagues within the NYC Bridges & Structures Team is that this is an environmental weight limit and would therefore likely come under the Area 4 Highways team. We do not have a structural weight limit on the adjacent bridge that would restrict vehicles below 44t gross weight, although we do generally limit abnormal load movements from crossing the structure.

Any surveillance undertaken has to be proportionate and in accordance with our policies and procedures.

**Mr Thackray then asked the following supplementary question.**

Highlighting the danger of noise pollution affecting the potential future occupants of the new houses subject to application reference 21/01115/MOUTE, for 645 houses at Norton Lodge, Norton, the NYC Environmental Health Officer wrote:

“Developers will be expected to apply the highest standards outlined in the World Health Organisation, British Standards and wider international and national standards relating to noise. As the applicant proposes some units with windows being kept closed for noise mitigation, this is not in line with the Ryedale Policy SP20. As such I cannot support this proposal.”

As we can see from the EHO’s statement, North Yorkshire Council now cites World Health Organisation noise-pollution standards in planning reports and decisions. By contrast, the council dismisses the WHO Global Air Quality guidelines as purely ‘aspirational’, in direct conflict with the views of the Royal College of Physicians and other equally emanant health organisations and professionals.

Question:

Given the proven harm caused by both noise and air pollution, will the Council now acknowledge the dangers of air pollution — even at very low concentrations — and give the WHO Air Quality Guidelines for the concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide in Malton and Norton the same weight it applies to WHO noise standards? In doing so, will the Council also enforce the 7.5-tonne HGV weight restriction over Norton Level Crossing to protect the health of the public with equal concern?

**Response from Dr Kevin Carr, Scientific Officer and R Marr, Manager Area 4**

The noise standards referred to from the World Health Organisation are community guidelines and the British Standards, again, are guidance. These are used to construct a response in the absence of statutory community noise limits. This is not the case for air quality, where there are statutory national air quality objective limits for the protection of human health. These statutory limits have precedence over guidance. This will continue to be the case until the UK Government replace or update them.

The 7.5t weight restriction will be added to our planned enforcement schedule once National Highways have erected to necessary advance warning signs on the A64.

## 5 Update by the local MPs

Sir Alec Shelbrooke MP submitted a written update, which was included with the agenda.

Kevin Hollinrake MP attended the meeting in person. Key issues discussed included:

- Home to school transport provision and the budget pressures faced by the Council
- The cumulative impact of a significant number of solar farms applications, the infrastructure associated with this and impact on tenant farmers in particular.
- Flag flying
- Challenges faced by the farming community due to the impact of the weather, volatility of prices, family farm tax and the withdrawal of the sustainable farm incentive.
- Challenges faced by the hospitality industry – Members drew attention to local businesses that were successfully reopening
- Continued support and campaigning for the duelling of the A64
- Holiday and second homes and the investment of the second homes premium in affordable homes
- Malton livestock market, funding and a solution to relocate the market
- A replacement for the Filey town bus service and possible support from the Mayor.
- Views on the provision of free parking and public toilets in local towns and the challenges of bringing seven variations of the same service together.

The Chair thanked Mr Hollinrake for his attendance.

## 6 Community safety and CCTV update

A member of the public asked a question and was responded to as in minute 4 above.

Officers from the Community Safety and CCTV teams presented an annual update on the work of the team.

The report outlined the focus of:

### **Community Safety Hub:**

- Local issues and delivery – dealt with by joined up working with internal and external partners and multi-agency visits to the locations to provide engagement, awareness and evidence gathering where possible.
- Ongoing work to tackle local issues – including Community Protection Warnings, Acceptable Behaviour Contracts, Criminal Behaviour Orders, rapid deployment CCTV cameras, MAPS meetings and work with partners such as the Police and social landlords.
- Community Safety Hub tools and powers – use of tools and powers within the Anti-social behaviour, Crime and Police Act 2014
- Project/thematic work – knife bins, “Bleed kits” in the local market towns, events and education sessions around national awareness weeks, links with local Policing teams and work with schools.
- Community Safety Hub activity as per the Performance Framework - currently developing a Performance Framework to enable the Service to evidence performance against identifiable outcome measures

### **Community Safety Partnership**

- Domestic abuse - a crucial role in addressing domestic abuse by ensuring early intervention, safeguarding and multi-agency collaboration
- Preventing and reducing serious violence - a multi-agency approach that focuses on early intervention, public awareness and targeted enforcement
- Night-time economy - to support the NYP Nighttime Economy Strategy
- Tackling hate crime and extremism - a multi-agency approach that prioritises prevention, intervention, and community resilience
- Prevent groups and Protect and Prepare groups - work together with partners, communities and businesses to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism, and to identify risk and vulnerability in relation to a potential terrorist attack in North Yorkshire
- Martyn's law - mandates that public premises with a capacity greater than 200 are better prepared for terrorist attacks and ready to respond

### **CCTV & CCTV performance**

The future of CCTV across North Yorkshire was subject to further strategic review and transformation.

In the period 01/04/2024 to 31/08/2025, the CCTV Control Room in Northallerton monitored total of 134 incidents, 10 arrests, undertaken 29 reviews of footage and provided 22 copies of evidence to potentially be utilised for court proceedings; 13 of which were related to ASB.

For the same period the Ryedale cameras in Action cluster dealt with 223 incidents, undertook 87 evidential reviews and produced 63 pieces of evidence.

Officers from North Yorkshire Police presented crime statistics from 1 September 2024 to 31 August 2025.

The report included data on:

- Crimes per ward
- Violence against women and girls
- Retails crime
- Anti-social behaviour (ASB)
- Crime and ASB in Kirkbymoorside, Pickering and Filey.

North Yorkshire Police had seen a steady decrease in crime year on year and a decrease in a number of crime types.

Areas seeing an increase were Kirkbymoorside and Pickering around ASB and graffiti incidents in Malton and Norton.

Members questioned the actions taken against young people and the officers confirmed that the approach to dealing with young people has been the intent to try to not criminalise young people. Rather than arrest, charge and send to court, a load a whole raft of diversionary measures may be used such as one-to-one coaching, some form of work experience or any number of diversionary tactics. Many structures and mechanisms were predicated upon this approach. The intention with young people was not to punish but to break the cycle of offending and rehabilitate. However, more serious actions and sanctions were used when required.

Members with specific concerns were advised to contact the officers directly to discuss.

On behalf of the committee, the Chair thanked the officers for their reports.

### **Resolved**

That the report be noted.

## **7 Howardian Hills management plan update**

Officers presented an update on the National Landscape Management Plan which must be reviewed every 5 years.

The management plan was developed on behalf of North Yorkshire Council (as host authority) and was adopted by the council for the National Landscape to deliver. The management plan formulates policy for the management of the National Landscape area and for carrying out functions in relation to the National Landscape Area.

The Management Plan set out objectives for the next 5 years relevant to the conservation and enhancement of the National Landscape area to include:

- Climate
- Natural environment
- Historic environment
- Built environment
- Living and working
- Visiting

In addition, the Countryside and Right of Way Act 2000 (as amended in December 2023) placed a duty on all relevant authorities to 'seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'. The team was actively working with the Yorkshire Dales, North York Moors National Parks and the county's two National Landscapes, to understand and explore how we can most effectively comply with this duty.

Over the last 18 months officers had run workshops - four with experts in nature recovery and five on heritage housing, historic environment and tourism. In addition, there were two public meetings and an online public consultation.

The updated plan was now out for formal statutory consultation until 21 October 2025.

Members queried the possible conflict between national landscape status and housing allocations. National landscape colleagues were working with colleagues through the local plan process, but officers confirmed that they would liaise with Planning Policy colleagues and a written response to this query would be provided.

The Chair thanked officers for their presentation.

Councillor George Jabbour thanked the Manager and the team for their achievements during the life of the existing Management Plan.

Councillor Joy Andrews left the meeting at 4.10 pm.

## **8 Town improvement plans**

The Principal Regeneration Officer explained that Town Investment Plans (TIPs) were strategic documents that would drive a long-term vision for economic growth and regeneration, support bids for external funding and identify a list of priority projects and investment opportunities that were realistic and deliverable.

The focus for Malton and Norton was on people and place to ensure the towns were safe,

accessible and attractive for people to live, work and visit and support investment, tourism and business.

A review of previous plans and studies had taken place, followed by initial stakeholder engagement. This work has identified a strong focus on environmental sustainability, climate change mitigation and resilience and helped in drawing up an initial long-list of potential initiatives.

Examples of potential strategic initiatives include:

- A second platform at the train station, together with pedestrian cycle bridge and link path through to Norton
- New and improved junctions with the A64 to help take some traffic out of the town centre
- Flood mitigation and resilience measures via partnership working with Yorkshire Water, the Environment Agency and inhouse teams
- A proposal for a Malton to Norton link road and bridge

Local regeneration initiatives and projects include:

- Proposals for improving the public transport interchange as a key gateway into Malton and Norton
- Other public realm enhancements along key routes such as Castle Gate, Norton Road, Church Street
- The link from Wentworth Street car park to Malton Market Place
- A focus on the need for improved and sustainable travel
- Green space improvements
- Making better use of the River Derwent
- Relocation or redevelopment of Malton Museum
- Relocation of the livestock market and freeing up the site for redevelopment
- Improving public realm in the town centre

The next steps would include:

- Targeted engagement with seldom heard from groups such as younger people, older people, disability groups and migrant groups
- Proposal to form a steering group to seek initial feedback.
- Shortlisting the initial long list of projects and identifying a defined list of realistic and deliverable projects. This will then go out to public consultation and engagement in approx. spring 2026
- Assess capacity and resourcing in terms of external funding, internal funding and other resources
- The aim is to have a finalised plan ready for endorsement summer next year.

Initial work on the Thirsk TIP has commenced and Filey, Pickering, Easingwold, Helmsley and Kirkbymoorside will follow in due course.

Members asked the officer how any future decisions would be made and what engagement would take place with local Members. They emphasised the need for elected representatives to have a strong say due to their accountability to constituents.

The officer confirmed that any final decisions would be made by the Council's Executive and/or Council but only after extensive consultation and engagement with all stakeholders.

The Chair thanked the officer for the update.

## **9 Briefing note on banking and cash handling services in the area**

Members noted the information in the briefing note and requested a further update on the impact on local businesses of bank branch closures.

## **10 Work programme**

Members considered the Committee's current work programme for the remainder of the municipal year.

Members requested more information as follows:

- The impact on local businesses of bank branch closures.
- Use the briefing note on S106 and CIL as the basis for a further report to explain the differences between S106 and CIL and for officers to respond to Members' questions

### **Resolved**

That the work programme be noted and the agreed additions be included in the work programme for future consideration.

## **11 Reports circulated for information only**

Agenda items 11a-11c were for information only.

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

## **12 Any other items**

There were no items of urgent business.

## **13 Date of next meeting**

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 10am on Friday, 5 December 2025.

The meeting concluded at 4.55 pm.