

North Yorkshire Council

Thirsk and Malton Area Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, 27 March 2026 commencing at 10.00 am.

Councillor Nigel Knapton in the Chair and Councillors Caroline Goodrick, Joy Andrews, Alyson Baker, Sam Cross, Dan Sladden, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff, George Jabbour, Steve Mason, Janet Sanderson and Greg White.

In attendance: Councillor David Jeffels and Charlotte Liddle, Head of Primary Care - NHS Humber and North Yorkshire Integrated Care Board (ICB)

Officers present: Nicki Lishman - Senior Democratic Services Officer and Meirion Jones – Lead Local Flood Authority Team Leader and Heather Lagan – Senior Engineer Flood Risk Management

Apologies: Councillors Keane Duncan and Malcolm Taylor

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

1 Apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and confirmed there were no updates to provide.

2 Minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2025

Resolved

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Thirsk and Malton Area Committee held on 5 December 2025 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

3 Declarations of interest

Councillor Alyson Baker declared a personal non-pecuniary, non-prejudicial interest in item 7 as a member of her family worked for Yorkshire Water.

Councillor Janet Sanderson declared a personal non-pecuniary, non-prejudicial interest in item 7 as her property had been eligible for flood defences.

4 Public questions/statements

Question from Mike Potter

I'm Mike Potter, a project team member of Paths 4 Everyone. We intend to **deliver** a 50-mile circular, market towns, active travel route in Ryedale. I know that plans, strategies, consultations and protocols achieve nothing without **delivery**, which is why I stress that word.

I have a number of questions for you to mull over.

OFFICIAL

How many of those present drove here today? Were the roads congested? Would you have dared to cycle here even if the distance was reasonable? How fast and aggressive was the traffic? Or was it slow and congested? What was the air quality like in the congested bits? Will it be affordable for many people to fill their tank today? Next month? Is there a national costly epidemic of obesity, diabetes and associated health issues? Is there a similarly massive epidemic of mental health problems nationwide? Is climate change an existential threat, and what are we doing to mitigate it? Are we doing it fast enough? What'll be the cost if we don't?

And finally, if there was a network of **safe** active travel routes, would people use them to walk, wheel and cycle a lot more? Even to school during that most dangerous and congested twice daily school-run time?

You may have noticed that during Covid, when car travel largely ceased and the roads cleared, that's exactly what **did** happen. Young, old and whole families took to the roads because, unusually, they felt **safe**.

North Yorkshire has a huge number of quiet lanes, many narrow and twisting, with poor visibility, yet they invariably have a 60mph speed limit.

A Quiet Lanes protocol was adopted about 20 years ago. A Speed Management Strategy was recently adopted. Hence, a programme of speed limit reviews will be carried out over approximately five years, ultimately covering all roads in the county.

Where will we be with climate change, mental and physical health, and petrol prices and availability in five years' time? Wouldn't it be a good idea to deliver some safe quiet lanes rather more quickly, particularly those that could make up part of a unified safe active travel route such as our market towns circular?

What will you do to **deliver**?

Response from Assistant Director – highways and Infrastructure

Thank you for your question regarding the early delivery of Quiet Lanes, particularly those that could contribute to a coherent safe active travel route such as the proposed Market Towns Circular.

As noted, the Council has recently adopted the new Speed Management Strategy (SMS), which introduces a comprehensive programme of speed limit reviews across the county over a five-year period. This programme is a key dependency for progressing Quiet Lanes, as appropriate speed limits are a fundamental requirement for eligibility.

The Quiet Lanes protocol, however, was developed 15–20 years ago and does not fully reflect current policy direction, design standards, or the wider ambitions for active travel, safety, and climate action. Officers are therefore undertaking a review of the protocol to ensure it is fit for purpose before new designations can be made.

Delivery will depend on the outcomes of this protocol review, as well as alignment with the speed limit assessments being carried out under the SMS. Until these are in place, it would not be appropriate to designate routes prematurely. That said, we recognise the value of enabling safe active travel networks, including those that can strengthen opportunities for walking, wheeling and cycling between our market towns and rural communities. The review is being progressed with this in mind, and officers will provide further feedback as soon as the revised framework is ready.

We are committed to ensuring that the updated Quiet Lanes approach supports the Council's wider goals for safety, health, climate, and rural connectivity, and that opportunities for earlier

delivery, where justified and feasible, are fully explored once the review is complete.

Question from Simon Thackray

On 5 December, Members discussed concerns about Yorkshire Water, including the use of 'Grampian style' conditions on planning applications because of wastewater and sewerage infrastructure constraints.

The NYC Thirsk and Malton Area Committee and NYC CX raise concerns about the lack of wastewater treatment capacity in Malton and elsewhere. In Malton, these constraints have been known to the LPA since 2010, and the publication of the Ryedale Local Plan in 2013. EDM data has been available for the past five years, which shows excessive sewage spills into our local watercourses and clear evidence of lack of sewage treatment capacity in a very long list of towns and villages.

Re Malton: Yorkshire Water advised Ryedale District Council, in September 2010, that the Malton sewerage system lacked available treatment capacity. Yet, for the past 16 years, nothing has been done by the LPA to address the issue or press Yorkshire Water to invest. In that time, the number of houses approved and built in Malton and Norton has increased by 40t, with no increase in sewage treatment capacity.

Unfortunately, Ryedale District Council (and now North Yorkshire Council) has spent years defending Yorkshire Water and allowing it to evade its responsibilities. A shining example of collective failure being the continued operation of the Malton and Norton Pumping Plan, by which Yorkshire Water, North Yorkshire Council, and the Environment Agency are polluting the River Derwent with sewage and highway run-off as a means of flood alleviation.

In his Appeal decision for 200 houses at Peasey Hills, Malton, the Planning Inspector wrote:

7. "The Thirsk and Malton Area Planning Committee, at its meeting on 16 October 2025, considered that the application would have been refused for the following reasons: (vii) Insufficient capacity of the sewerage system to accept the proposed additional foul flows. Members raised concerns about both the cumulative impact from housing development on sewerage capacity along with concern about the weight to be given to new housing approvals, in light of housing land supply, and the deliverability of housing sites where Grampian style conditions were used owing to the uncertainty of the timescales for delivery."

117. "Testimony was given by an interested person on the long standing and frequent sewage spills into the River Derwent and Yorkshire Water's timeline for future improvements with investigations to be completed by 2030 and implementation of capacity improvements by 2035."

131. "I consider that the condition sought ['Grampian style' condition] is justified in all respects."

Update 1, Yorkshire Water, says Members discussed concerns about Yorkshire Water, including the use of 'Grampian style' conditions on planning applications because of wastewater and sewerage infrastructure constraints.

Question:

Assuming the Committee agrees with the Planning Inspector that the use of 'Grampian-style' conditions is "justified in all respects" to protect the environment from sewage pollution until Yorkshire Water has completed its necessary upgrades to its sewerage systems across North Yorkshire, does the Committee acknowledge that both Ryedale District Council, and North Yorkshire Council, are co-responsible for failing to ensure that the Statutory Sewerage Undertaker has upgraded its sewerage systems in a timely manner, to provide adequate sewage conveyance and treatment capacity relative to the sites allocated in the Ryedale

Plan Sites Document published in 2019?

Response from the Head of Planning Policy and Place

The Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy (2013) and Local Plan Sites Document (2019) were both independently examined and found sound. They were prepared in line with statutory requirements and in consultation with infrastructure providers, including Yorkshire Water. Although sewerage capacity was acknowledged as an important consideration, Yorkshire Water did not identify it as a fundamental constraint to development in the relevant settlements, nor request phasing. Imposing such restrictions without their direction could have raised soundness concerns at examination.

Yorkshire Water has only recently raised capacity concerns in relation to proposals for development. Grampian conditions are now being applied (where they can be justified and are necessary) to ensure appropriate infrastructure is delivered. For current applications, the council will reflect recent decisions and Yorkshire Water's latest advice where such conditions are necessary.

The council will continue to work closely with Yorkshire Water and other utilities to secure timely infrastructure delivery, including through the preparation of the North Yorkshire Local Plan, to ensure that essential water infrastructure supports development now and into the future.

Mr Thackray had the following supplementary question

There is a letter from Yorkshire Water to the Head of Planning, Ryedale District Council on 13 September 2010 that specified the lack of sewage treatment capacity in Malton. With respect to what the officer has stated, if you read the Ryedale local plan strategy document, it has a list of designations of sewage treatment capacity for all the major locations, including Norton. I think everybody will understand a simple, one-word designation - 'constraints'.

On 15 November 2023, North Yorkshire Council resolved to: "Ask all relevant water companies, from this date onwards, in its planning consultation responses for major developments, to clarify which treatment works will be managing the sewage; confirm that these treatment works have the additional capacity to take waste from agreed developments; and confirm whether they have the information available to assess the impact on the number or duration of sewage discharges into local rivers or seas, and, if they do have this information, to share it."

Has North Yorkshire Council received that confirmation?

Response from the Head of Development Management

We consult Yorkshire Water on major schemes to ensure that we have the necessary information to make planning decisions. In addition, we are currently undertaking improvements linked to a new IT system which will ensure that the points highlighted are fully addressed.

5 Update by the local MPs

Councillors received a written update from Sir Alec Shelbrooke MP and a verbal update from Kevin Hollinrake MP. Mr Hollinrake provided an overview of current national and local issues affecting communities across North Yorkshire and answered questions from members.

1. Cost of living and the economy
Mr Hollinrake highlighted the continued pressures facing households and businesses. Rising energy and fuel costs are being felt particularly sharply in rural areas, where many homes rely on heating oil, and the hospitality sector is under strain due to increased operating costs.
2. A64 improvements
Members were informed that the planned upgrade to the A64 has been delayed for a further five years. Mr Hollinrake expressed disappointment and stressed the need for a united cross-party effort to secure progress, given the importance of the scheme for safety, connectivity and the local economy.
3. Housing and infrastructure
The MP raised concerns about the significant increase in national housing targets for North Yorkshire, noting that the higher numbers place added pressure on essential infrastructure such as highways, drainage, GP practices and dental services. He emphasised that while he supports new homes, the distribution of national targets should be fair.
4. Local Government funding and SEND
Mr Hollinrake acknowledged the financial challenges facing the Council, particularly in social care, special educational needs and home-to-school transport. He noted long-standing issues with the national funding formula, which disproportionately affects rural areas, and committed to continuing to raise these concerns in Parliament.
5. Solar developments
He reiterated his opposition to large solar farm proposals on high-quality agricultural land due to their impact on food production and the landscape.
6. Local transport and community assets
The MP explained that he would continue working to secure progress on the Filey town bus service following a lack of support from the Combined Authority. He also expressed regret at the national closure of the Community Ownership Fund, which had supported valued community projects in the area.
7. Other local issues
Mr Hollinrake confirmed his support for the “Paths for Everyone” project and spoke about the importance of the rural shooting industry to local jobs and tourism.

Issues raised by Councillors

Councillors raised a number of matters with the MP, including:

- A64 delays and the need to maintain pressure for improvements.
- Wood-burning stove regulations and their impact on rural households facing high heating costs.
- Shrinkflation, where product sizes reduce while prices rise, and the effect on household budgets.
- SEND funding and ongoing deficits, and concerns about how future shortfalls will be managed.
- Second homes premium and its impact on local businesses in Filey.
- Public toilet provision in Filey, with concerns about reduced facilities during busy periods.
- Travel issues for staff affected by proposed moves and congestion on the A64.
- Access to energy retrofit schemes, particularly for households who are not eligible for low-income support but still struggle with rising costs.

Mr Hollinrake acknowledged the challenges raised and the wider pressures on public finances. He stressed the importance of constructive cross-party working to address issues such as the A64 and local transport. He agreed that some residents fall between existing support schemes and said he would reflect their experiences in his discussions with government.

The Chair thanked the MP for his attendance and contribution.

6 Primary medical care and general practice access

Charlotte Liddle, Head of Primary Care, NHS Humber and North Yorkshire Integrated Care Board (ICB) gave a detailed presentation on the operation of and pressures facing general practice (GP) across the Thirsk and Malton area.

Business model.

- Independent businesses, not part of the NHS.
- Three types of GP contracts and most local practices held a GMS contract with no end date.

The current essential service obligations, core opening hours and the national funding formula, which has not kept pace with the complexity or cost pressures modern practices face, were summarised.

GP funding streams.

- Core GMS income remained the majority of practice funding, supplemented by voluntary Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) participation, national and local enhanced services and primary care network (PCN) funding.
- Additional Roles Reimbursement Scheme (ARRS), which financed a range of staff such as physiotherapists, mental health practitioners and dieticians to reduce GP workload.
- Rising running costs, including energy, estates and staffing, had outstripped income increases, contributing to recent collective action by practices.

The range of PCN workforce roles available and the importance of directing patients to the most appropriate clinician were highlighted. Members were reassured that physiotherapists and other ARRS-funded clinicians could refer patients for diagnostic imaging and support those cases traditionally seen by GPs. The high proportion of over-65 residents in North Yorkshire increased demand for continuity rather than urgent same-day appointments. Preferences of telephone versus face-to-face appointments and ongoing concerns about the volume of “did not attend” (DNA) appointments were also reported.

National workload trends showed a sharp rise in appointment numbers post-COVID and changes in patient expectations, with many seeking repeat appointments sooner than clinically necessary. NHS budgets have increased overall but growth had not been proportionate in community and primary care. The number of fully qualified GPs had fallen nationally, despite higher numbers entering training. The UK currently has record numbers of unemployed qualified GPs due to insufficient practice funding for recruitment.

There were ongoing pressures including persistent staff sickness linked to stress, high DNA rates, unexpected public health outbreaks and significant estates challenges. Many practices were officially undersized for their patient populations and lacked capital funding to expand. Even where capital funding existed, ICBs may lack the revenue budget to reimburse future rent, creating an ongoing bottleneck.

A comprehensive explanation was provided on Section 106 developer contributions, including eligibility, trigger points, time limits and restrictions on use. S106 funds could only

be drawn down once housing developments reached specific build or occupancy stages and funds were strictly for capital projects rather than staffing. It was noted that extensions to S106 time limits could sometimes be negotiated where developments were delayed. The Committee discussed the need for better communication with practices regarding available S106 funds. It was confirmed that annual estates planning was undertaken and that additional funds such as the Utilisation and Modernisation Fund had been made available this year.

It was explained that historical planning applications predating the current ICB had sometimes not included S106 requests and that such contributions could not be retrospectively applied. Members raised the impact of significant new developments and institutional settings such as care homes and prisons, which created substantial additional GP workload with no dedicated funding stream.

The Committee explored wider system issues including care home development, workforce pressures, and mental health demand. Practices often received no advance notification of new care homes because registration was managed by the Care Quality Commission and the ICB could not prevent new developments even where pressure on local practices was significant due to the complexity of supporting care homes, the need to build relationships with providers and the mismatch between funding levels and the intensity of GP work required.

Ms Liddle explained the challenges in mental health provision, particularly for adults under Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys NHS Trust (TEWV) and noted that while ARRS mental health workers were available, their deployment depended on 50/50 funding between PCNs and TEWV, making recruitment difficult. There was rising demand for mental health support, increasing requests for fit notes and limited clinical tools available to GPs. Further discussion covered the Mayor's emerging interest in health hubs and high-street models. The ICB is engaged in early discussions but had highlighted that single-site hubs were impractical for rural PCNs covering hundreds of square miles. There was ongoing work on neighbourhood models, integrated frailty services and potential mobile or market-day hubs to deliver flexible local support.

It was explained that GP practices almost universally use one IT system, while hospital trusts used varied and sometimes internally inconsistent IT systems, limiting interoperability. National procurement constraints, historical system differences and safety considerations had prevented adoption of a single NHS-wide system. The ICB was focused on expanding shared care records and enabling information exchange between systems even where platforms differ. Improvements would take time but remained a national priority.

Members were interested in receiving a further update later in the year once they had digested the material and considered next steps. Ms. Liddle confirmed she would be happy to attend future meetings.

The Chair thanked Ms. Liddle for her exceptionally comprehensive presentation. The Committee requested follow-up information and suggested a referral to the Council's Scrutiny of Health Committee.

Useful link

[Appointments in General Practice - NHS England Digital](#) select the month then select Annex 1 – Appointments recorded in General Practice MM YY: Practice Level Summary.

7 Summary of the section 19 report - Storm Darragh flooding on Rye tributaries

Meirion Jones, Lead Local Flood Authority Team Leader, and Heather Lagan, Senior

Engineer for Flood Risk Management gave a summary of the recent report - Section 19 Storm Daragh flooding on Rye tributaries.

The presentation summarised the investigation, impacts, response and recommendations following the flooding event in Kirby Mills, Keldholme, Sinnington and Marton in December 2024 and gave the latest updates to the recommendations.

1. Members queried how the Council ensured that recommendations in the Section 19 report - many phrased as “investigate”, “consider”, or “discuss” - were acted upon rather than being delayed or dropped.

Officers confirmed that while the Council could not enforce recommendations on partner agencies, strong collaborative relationships allowed the Council to influence delivery. The publication of the report also enabled political and public scrutiny. A review of all Section 19 recommendations (2015 - 2023) was underway, with further examination by the Transport, Environment, Enterprise and Scrutiny Committee later this year.

2. Members raised concerns that the upstream flood storage area at Pickering came close to overtopping during Storm Darragh and asked whether reinforcement or redesign should now be considered.

Officers explained that the scheme, designed by the Environment Agency (EA), maximised the standard of protection achievable at the time. Any reassessment of the embankment would require the EA to revisit its business case, taking account of climate change modelling and potential partnership funding contributions.

3. There was frustration among residents about repeated surveys, slow progress, and long timescales between identifying need and installing Property Flood Resilience (PFR). Concerns included mixed communications, contractor delays and the impact of bureaucratic processes.

Officers outlined the mandatory stages required by national PFR codes of practice:

- Initial risk assessment survey
- Funding bid development
- Pre-installation surveys
- Costing and business case submission to the EA
- Release of funding and scheduling of works

These steps created unavoidable periods where little visible progress occurred. Officers acknowledged communication challenges, particularly across varying resident preferences (digital, phone, via parish councils). They confirmed all properties in the current scheme - including those in Hovingham - were now programmed for installation by August, with no further approvals outstanding.

4. Members asked why historical flood events from the 1800s were highlighted, when the increased frequency of recent flooding events was of greater relevance.

Officers noted the historical context informs understanding of catchment behaviour over “deep time”. However, current planning used contemporary frequency trends and updated climate change guidance. EA policy now acknowledged that “1-in-100-year” terminology was no longer an accurate reflection of risk.

5. Members asked how the Council balances natural flood management (NFM) with engineered solutions, highlighting Pickering as an example where both approaches worked effectively.

Officers confirmed a national policy shift: from October 2025, DEFRA's new funding guidance gave priority to NFM but still recognised the need for engineered structures where appropriate. The Council was working with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, North York Moors National Park, Rivers Trusts, and landowners to align opportunities and funding.

6. Examples where highways and flood teams were unaware of historic drainage assets or grips were given and Members asked whether inter-service coordination had improved.

Officers confirmed significant progress, with strong working relationships between highways, flood officers, inspectors, and maintenance teams. Members were encouraged to report local knowledge and issues, so these can be added to the programme of works.

7. The importance of mapping drainage infrastructure and the role of community knowledge was highlighted, noting successful locally led interventions (e.g., grip reinstatement) that have reduced flood risk.

Officers agreed that local knowledge was invaluable and confirmed that community-based partnership projects could be effective when guided by technical oversight.

8. Members asked what issues had contributed to delays and whether procurement processes could be improved.

Officers stated that some delays stemmed from the constraints of the EA's national procurement framework, which had not been designed with local authority needs in mind. Local procurement teams were acting appropriately to protect Council finances but inflexibilities in national processes caused delays. Officers were working with the EA to improve the interface.

9. Members asked whether the Council could quantify the cost of responding to flood events and demonstrate savings from preventative measures and inclusive wealth benefits.

Officers confirmed that local costs (e.g. clearance, skips, infrastructure damage) could be quantified. However, DEFRA's national funding rules restricted which costs were eligible in business cases. Internally, more detailed costing work could support future lobbying.

10. Members expressed concern about the multi-year timescales for delivery and asked whether resourcing constraints contributed to delays.

Officers clarified that while the Section 19 report on the event in Malton dated from 2019, delivery did not begin until 2021/22 due to limited staffing and the concurrent delivery of major schemes in Malton. Even so, national processes meant two to four years from initial survey to installation remained typical across the country.

The Chair and members expressed appreciation for the dedication of the flood risk team, acknowledging:

- Effective partnership working with parish councils, landowners and farmers
- The complexity of flood funding and national constraints
- The positive impact of the support of North Yorkshire's and regional committees

It was noted that Yorkshire remains one of the most flood-prone regions nationally, and ongoing investment, coordination and community involvement would continue to be essential.

Resolved

That the report be noted.

8 Updates from the previous meeting

1. Yorkshire Water (YW)

Members were aware that the Chief Executive has met with YW but believe that the focus has been on bathing water quality at Scarborough.

In light of the information provided by the ICB earlier in the meeting, Members were concerned that the delays caused by the issues with YW infrastructure, which have resulted in Grampian conditions on approved planning applications, would impact on the funding available for S106 and CIL.

It was agreed that these concerns would be fed back to the Chief Executive and that Councillors request to be involved in discussions with YW.

2. Quiet lanes

Noted.

3. Request for written updates from the Mayor

Members thanked the officer for the summary provided but were of the view that any updates should be provided directly from the Mayor's office.

Concerns were raised that the local Councillor were not informed when the Mayor was visiting projects etc in their division.

4. Data on other GP surgeries

Noted. Members also requested information on dentistry in the committee area.

9 Work programme

Members considered the Committee's current work programme.

Following discussion Members requested information on the following topics:

1. Various highways matters including Traffic Regulation Orders, enforcement of the weight limit on County Bridge, Malton, the use of ANPR cameras and road haulage in the Committee area
2. The impacts of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (LURA) on the Howardian Hills National Landscape and what local Councillors can do to help protect the landscape
3. Information on dentistry in the committee area

10 Any other items

There were no items of urgent business.

11 Date of next meeting

The next meeting was confirmed at 10am on Friday 12 June 2026.

12 Schools, educational achievement and finance report

Report circulated for information only to inform Members of the local educational landscape, educational achievement and the financial challenges which affected schools in the Thirsk and Malton committee area.

Resolved

That the report be noted.

The meeting concluded at 1.15 pm.