

North Yorkshire Council

Full Council

Minutes of the Quarterly Meeting of Council held on Wednesday, 21st February, 2024 commencing at 10.30 am.

County Councillor David Ireton in the Chair. Councillors Chris Aldred, Joy Andrews, Karl Arthur, Alyson Baker, Derek Bastiman, Philip Broadbank, Eric Broadbent, Barbara Brodigan, Andy Brown, Nick Brown, Lindsay Burr MBE, John Cattnach, David Chance, Liz Colling, Mark Crane, Sam Cross, Felicity Cunliffe-Lister, Gareth Dadd, Melanie Davis, Caroline Dickinson, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff, Stephanie Duckett, Keane Duncan, Richard Foster, Sam Gibbs, Caroline Goodrick, Hannah Gostlow, Bryn Griffiths, Tim Grogan, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Robert Heseltine, David Hugill, Nathan Hull, George Jabbour, David Jeffels, Janet Jefferson, Tom Jones, Mike Jordan, Peter Lacey, Andrew Lee, Carl Les, Cliff Lunn, John Mann, Steve Mason, Rich Maw, John McCartney, Heather Moorhouse, Andrew Murday, Simon Myers, David Noland, Bob Packham, Andy Paraskos, Stuart Parsons, Yvonne Peacock, Clive Pearson, Heather Phillips, Kirsty Poskitt, Jack Proud, Tony Randerson, John Ritchie, Janet Sanderson, Karin Sedgwick, Subash Sharma, Steve Shaw-Wright, Monika Slater, Andy Solloway, David Staveley, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers, Malcolm Taylor, Phil Trumper, Matt Walker, Arnold Warneken, Steve Watson, David Webster, John Weighell OBE, Greg White, Annabel Wilkinson, Peter Wilkinson, Andrew Williams and Robert Windass.

Apologies: Councillors Philip Barrett, Kevin Foster, Nigel Knapton, Pat Marsh, Mike Schofield and Angus Thompson.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

56 Minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2023

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes of the Quarterly Meeting of the Council held on 15 November 2023 having been printed and circulated, are confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

The vote was taken and the motion was declared carried.

57 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Phillip Barrett, Kevin Foster, Nigel Knapton, Pat Marsh, Kirsty Poskitt (apologies for the morning only, in attendance from 1.45 pm), Mike Schofield and Angus Thompson.

58 Declarations of Interest

Declarations of Interest were made as follows:

Councillor Karl Arthur regarding Minute 69(i)

Councillor Lindsay Burr regarding the second homes premium at Minute 64. Councillor Burr advised that she would not speak or vote on the item.

Councillor Gareth Dadd regarding the second homes premium at Minute 64.

Councillor Stephanie Duckett regarding Social Housing at Minute 68.

Councillor Michael Harrison regarding the Treasury Management report at Minute 62, for which he had been granted a dispensation by the Standards and Governance Committee.

Councillor Cliff Lunn regarding Selby Local Plan at Minute 64

Councillor Andy Solway regarding Minute 65

59 Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman welcomed the Honorary Aldermen and members of the public and press who were present. The Chairman also welcomed Councillor Dan Sladden to his first meeting of the Council following his election to the Sowerby and Topcliffe division on 30 November 2023.

The Chairman informed Members of the usual arrangements for the meeting.

The Chairman reminded Members that as per the email previously sent by Barry Khan, Assistant Chief Executive Legal and Democratic Services, there was a legal requirement to ensure that Members were not in arrears for their Council Tax when voting on the budget.

The Chairman informed Members that there were two Notices of Motion on the agenda. The Chairman was required to give a ruling on whether to follow the normal procedure of referring these motions to the relevant committee or whether they should be debated at the meeting, and ruled as follows:

- (1) Local Government Funding – motion to be debated at the meeting.
- (2) Town Council for Harrogate – motion to be debated at the meeting.

The Chairman reminded Members that when considering Notices of Motion a Member can move that the motion can be put now and one Member can speak for five minutes for that Motion and one Member can speak for five minutes against. Motions referred to committee would be moved and seconded without comment.

The Chairman then drew Council's attention to the King's New Year's Honours list and passed on congratulations to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Carl Les, who had been awarded an OBE. Also, to Chrys Mellor, who retired earlier last year from the role of Head of Libraries, who was awarded a BEM for services to Public Libraries. Also, to Margaret Fisher, of the Lollipop Crossing Patrol at Darley and Summerbridge Community Primary School, who was awarded a BEM for services to Child Road Safety.

The death of former North Yorkshire Councillor Dave Whitfield in December was noted. Dave was elected to the County Council for the first time in May 2022 and served through to October 2023 in the new unitary authority when he resigned from his position following a prolonged period of ill-health.

Members also noted the recent death of former North Yorkshire County Councillor, Harrogate Borough Councillor and Knaresborough Town Councillor Bill Hoult. Bill was the leader of the Liberal Democrat group at North Yorkshire County Council, where he served for 20 years from 1997 to 2017.

The Chairman also informed Councillors of the recent passing of former County Councillor and Selby District Councillor Roy Wilson. Roy served as a County Councillor from 1981 to 2002 when he was made an Honorary Alderman. He was also Chairman of the Council in 2000.

A minute's silence was held in memory of former County Councillors Dave Whitfield, Bill

Hoult and Roy Wilson.

60 Statement by the Leader of the Council

Councillor Carl Les made a statement and answered questions under Council Procedure Rule 2.3 as Leader of the Council, a summary of the key points of which had previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 31 and 32 of the agenda pack and in the Minute Book at pages 661 to 662.

61 Public Questions or Statements

There were seven public questions, as follows:

1. The following public question was read out by Hazel Peacock, Oatlands Road Safety and Active Travel Campaign – Road Safety:

I am Hazel Peacock, from Oatlands Road Safety & Active Travel Campaign.

I would like to start off with expressing gratitude to Cllr Duncan and officers on their commitment to delivering the 20mph scheme for south and west Harrogate. In particular to the Area 6 team for all their work especially Melisa Burnham and Heather Yendall. We look forward to our continued working with them on the scheme.

The issue and scheme is a cross party one and I would also like to thank all the members of the Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Committee who have supported it and express particular thanks to Cllr Pat Marsh, Cllr John Mann and Cllr Arnold Warneken for advocating and championing it.

The scheme is a great step forward. Therefore, given the road safety concerns and speed exceedances we and NYC are aware of on the arterial routes in the zone “What can be done to improve the safety of the children, older people and wider community on those arterial roads where there are schools and urban destinations (shops, train stations, hospitals, football clubs and businesses) and limits of 20mph declined?”

Harrogate Grammar School is situated on one, Willow Tree Primary School on another and a third has 5 schools and childcare settings on or just off of it; with Oatlands Infant School, Oatlands Junior School, Harrogate College, Busy Bees nursery, St John Fishers Catholic High School, Oatlands playing field, a business park, Hornbeam Park Train station (with 326,000 passengers pa/893 per day) and M&S Food Hall.

On this road at 15:27hrs on 17 January 2024 a pedestrian suffered “severe head injuries” as the result of a collision whilst using the signalised crossing by Hornbeam Park Train station; a key crossing used by children and families travelling to and from Oatlands Junior School, Infant School, Harrogate College, Harrogate Business Park and rail passengers passing from the car park to the platform.

With a density of schools on this road and schools situated on the others mentioned - safety is of paramount concern and the urban location and the characteristics of the roads are of key consideration.

Can you advise how these characteristics are considered and if built as new today what changes would be necessary, particularly in the case of the road with Oatlands Infant School and Hornbeam Park train station where there is a descent of 39ft (1/25) between the train station and Crimple Beck bridge. As the only route for pupils arriving by train and attending St John Fishers Catholic High School and St Aidan’s CE School and families travelling to Oatlands Infant and Juniors using the narrow pavement of approx 1209mm is intimidating alongside HGVs and double-decker buses coming downhill at 30mph.

Also, can NYC advise how the protected groups listed in the Equality Act 2010 have been considered in the equality impact assessment screening for the arterial roads with schools; which include age/(children and older people), disability, sex and pregnancy and maternity?

Finally, the importance of 20mph where there are young people is further supported in the research by Prof John P Wann, Damian Routler and C Purcell in "Reduced sensitivity to visual looming inflates the risk posed by speeding vehicles when children try to cross the road" 2011, which finds the neural mechanisms for detection of looming are not fully developed until adulthood:

"For a given pedestrian crossing time, vehicles traveling faster loom less than slower vehicles, which creates a dangerous illusion in which faster vehicles may be perceived as not approaching".

The study shows strong developmental trends in sensitivity so that children may not be able to detect vehicles approaching at speeds in excess of 20 mph, creating a risk of injudicious road crossing in urban settings when traffic speeds are higher than 20 mph.

I hope you are able to support us make these roads and the environments for our schoolchildren and community safer.

Many thanks for listening and for your ongoing support.

Note: At time of writing this a visit was schedule to Hookstone Road with Area 6 team at afternoon home time to see the issues and visit the key areas of concern.

Councillor Keane Duncan, Executive Member for Highways and Transportation, provided the following response:

On 18th December 2023, the Corporate Director in consultation with myself, approved a proposal to introduce 20mph speed limits on a wide range of residential roads in the West and South of Harrogate subject to satisfactory consultation on the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders. The approved scheme would also see the existing 30mph speed limit remaining on Leeds Road, Hookstone Road, Hookstone Drive, York Place and Leadhall Lane because of the function of these roads which are classed as Strategic and Main Distributer Roads. However, the council acknowledges the location of schools on these roads and has as a result agreed to carry out corridor reviews of signing and lining in these areas. Officers have recently facilitated the installation of two 30mph VAS signs on Hookstone Road as an example of what can be done.

NYC has also introduced a Schools Street Pilot on Beechwood Grove, just off Hookstone Drive and improvements to the local footpaths and crossing points between both Oatlands Infants School and Oatlands Junior school have been identified.

I was very sorry to hear of the accident that occurred last month on the signalised crossing and my thoughts are with the pedestrian that was injured. However, it is not practical to superimpose full new build design standards relating to horizontal and vertical alignments to existing urban roads that have developed over a long period of time.

An Equality Impact Assessment was considered as part of the approval of the 20mph & Zone Policy in January 2022 by the Executive and it is important to note that the application of this policy and any consequent changes of any speed limit requires a formal Traffic Regulation Order and consultation with stakeholders as part of the decision-making process.

The 20mph speed limit and zone policy approved by the Executive in January 2022 is consistent with the latest DfT guidelines for assessing speed limits on local roads and I am also pleased to confirm that officers continue to liaise with the campaign group and a

OFFICIAL

meeting is planned for next week (Wed 28 February) with them and local councillors to discuss concerns and potential further improvements that could be carried out in the local area.

Hazel Peacock then asked a supplementary question, and Councillor Duncan responded that a written response would be provided.

2. The following public question was read out by Ian Conlan – 20 mph speed limits:

I was delighted to hear at the Transport Scrutiny Committee that 20mph speed limits are now being rolled out across North Yorkshire, including in North Back Lane in Terrington, a tiny narrow street with 2 village schools on it. I am slightly puzzled that the main street in Terrington was missed off the scheme, leaving elderly and young alike vulnerable.

Malton's 20mph request for all 30mph areas to become 20mph, agreed at council over a year ago, with many more streets, pedestrian and traffic volumes than Terrington, has been told "no timescale for its implementation, if at all".

How long is the actual waiting list for schemes requested today? What is the prioritisation criteria if not a simple waiting list? What is the timescale for when you start installing 20mph across larger urban areas as you are currently considering in Harrogate, for instance? A strategy was going to be worked on last summer across all speed limits in the County to be completed over a period of a few months, we are now 7 months later, what is the date when this will be published?

With a new Mayoral authority being set up this May, what is North Yorkshire Council's Transport and Road Safety Strategy, and how will you demonstrate public support for it?

Will you be conveying to the new Mayor the huge support across the County for 20mph limits in built up areas?

This has already been demonstrated in Parish Council votes in triple figures for default 20mph, Area committee Votes, and the numerous consultations and petitions undertaken by residents and parish and town councils on this.

All the above have demonstrated substantial and majority support for default 20mph.

The context is that the City of York have just undertaken a public consultation to inform their Transport plans to help them work closely with the new Mayor with a clear democratic mandate. Will you do the same, or better?

I present you today with a York and North Yorkshire wide petition, organised by 20's Plenty and Action Vision Zero, on the latest evidence of that support, widening to include Vision Zero Safe System Approach which requires a whole suite of measures, including 20mph limits, to bring down to zero killed and serious injuries on our roads. This same petition has gone to City of York Council, as both areas are covered by the new Mayor. It includes support for a target for zero killed and seriously injured by 2030, a Safe Systems approach, including default 20mph speed limit in built up areas where people are, including arterial roads in built up areas where people are.

I am sure members would like to demonstrate with clarity that they are as committed as I am about improving the safety of the most vulnerable people, elderly, children and disabled on our roads, and also making quieter streets, and our places kinder places to be.

Councillor Keane Duncan, Executive Member for Highways and Transportation, provided the following response:

The council has only recently updated its 20mph speed limit policy to reflect the latest Department for Transport guidance following a thorough review and we have also undertaken to review all speed limits across the county using a new Speed Management Strategy which is to be developed.

Turning specifically to the locations mentioned, the request for a 20mph speed limit in Terrington referred only to North Back Lane to support road safety outside the schools. There was not a request for or identified need to extend the scheme wider within the village.

In Malton the Town Council passed a motion for all 30mph roads to be reduced to 20mph and subsequently submitted a request to NYC which was declined as the default application of 20mph speed limits is inconsistent with our recently updated policy.

Speed limits are currently introduced by the respective Area Highways teams and timescales for delivery can vary depending on the scale of the approved scheme, consultations and the completion of governance and legal processes and how this work is prioritised against other competing service demands.

We will be carrying out a strategic review of all speed limits in the county and work has commenced to establish the outline form and resource need of that project. This remains a priority and is being progressed and, given the size of our road network, will take up to 5 years to complete.

The council has revised its policy to have greater flexibility in its assessment of applications where it is appropriate and with the support of the local communities rather than unnecessarily imposed. This is resulting in many more schemes being delivered where it is appropriate to do so and has community support, which is essential to the success of any such scheme.

I am pleased to say that NYC has a policy which supports the implementation of 20mph schemes and will review all applications in accordance with that policy which is robust and fit for purpose.

I note the receipt of the petition and can confirm that we already have an existing Local Transport Plan in place and alongside City of York are developing a new plan which will sit under the remit of the new Combined Authority so there will be parity and documents that align across all three authorities.

Mr Conlon asked a supplementary question and Councillor Duncan responded.

3. The following public question was read out by David Watson – The Proposed Council Tax Premium – Second Homes:

By way of a background. With only three minutes allotted time it is not possible to go into details of the politics surrounding what is being proposed by North Yorkshire Council. But sufficient to say that it has gathered much media attention and controversy.

The article in the Telegraph best summarises the situation:

“The problem is not second homeowners; it is politicians failing to understand the issues and having the courage to do something about it – it really is not difficult.”

Council tax premiums on empty properties with a view to incentivising property owners to bring those properties back into use is commendable. My concern is purely the proposal to introduce a 100% Council tax surcharge on what the Government has classed as second homes.

My circumstances. I was born in Scarborough, moving to the property I now own when I was ten, my parents having purchased the property in 1959, I inherited the property when my father passed away in 2004.

My family having used the property extensively, all referring to the property as a family home.

As my family have owned the property for the last 65 years.

I do not believe that I can be accused of creating a shortage of affordable housing. However, the Council's proposed approach to dealing with a lack of affordable housing is to place an additional tax burden on second homeowners.

As the tax burden is substantial this naturally delivers the message that I and my family are no longer welcome in Scarborough, as for me private home ownership in Scarborough is no longer affordable.

The Council inferring that I need to sell or consider alternative uses, e.g., AirBnB, which certainly would not be well received in the neighbourhood. Having had a long association with Scarborough, along with family and friends in Scarborough, this is a difficult message to accept. And even more difficult to explain to one's family especially grandchildren, who enjoy coming to Scarborough.

My question for the Council.

The Government has stated that the Council has the ability to reduce the liability for Council Tax in relation to individual cases or class(es) of cases that it may determine where national discounts and exemptions cannot be applied. Also, the Council has stated that there would always be exceptional cases and officers would have the ability to grant reductions if certain criteria were met.

Can the Council please clarify how it intends dealing with exceptional cases, as surely the Council is not intending to classify all second homeowners as ogres eating up affordable housing.

Is this to be discussed and or considered as part of today's proposal or dealt with separately?

Can the Council please clarify their position on how the premium tax is to be applied, and the exceptional cases dealt with, along with the Council's rationale for their position.

Foot note: Would like to record my thanks to Councillor Eric Broadbent for his guidance.

Councillor Gareth Dadd, Executive Member for Finance and Assets, provided the following response:

Thank you Chairman. The government has defined second homes as properties that are no-one's main residence. This was agreed by Council at the meeting last year, but legislation was not passed to allow it to be introduced from April 2024. So Councillors are today being asked later in the agenda to introduce this premium which if agreed will come into force on 1 April 2025. Whilst we are still awaiting the details of the adaptations from these premiums from government, we understand the broad areas of exemptions. Properties being actively marketed for sale or rent; properties undergoing structural repairs; job related dwellings; and certain dwellings the occupation of which is restricted in some manner by planning rules. The duration of these restrictions are anticipated in some cases for 6 months. Applications will be invited and assessed on individual circumstances and it is anticipated that some evidence will be requested for example evidence that a property is for sale and the price being asked is one which may reasonably be achieved. In addition to

these exemptions is a general ability to consider reductions in council tax liability. In short, we have a duty for the betterment and promotion of our communities. In some localities of this county, we have communities which have been decimated by second homes with the resulting, unintended as they are, consequences on schools and other community assets. We all know the effects of this, and this is one tool in this authority's toolbox.

4. The following public question was read out by Mary McCartney – Selby Plan:

Cllr Bastiman, at the Executive meeting on 6 February you explained why the current Council policy of a 40% target for affordable homes, for all housing developments, has been removed from the emerging Selby Plan.

You said: "changed economic circumstances mean that the level of affordable housing that can now be justifiably requested is reduced from that set out in the adopted core strategy".

We have a housing crisis Cllr Bastiman, we need an increase in affordable housing not a reduction. More social housing to rent, and more starter homes to help people get on to the home ownership ladder.

This emerging Selby Plan sets out the proposals for house building in the Selby area for up to 17 years. I am aware that it will, eventually, be superseded by a new North Yorkshire wide plan. But, no-one can predict when that North Yorkshire Plan will be adopted. One thing we do know about emerging local plans is that they get delayed, often for years.

And, no-one knows what the "economic circumstances" will be in six months' time, let alone two or three years ahead.

I assume Cllr Bastiman that you do understand that once a local plan is adopted, it cannot be changed, not even if the economic circumstances change?

So, if this plan is adopted, with your reduced number of affordable housing, and we see, in a couple of years' time that the economic circumstances are changed, with the big builders making obscene profits again and paying out eye-watering bonuses to their bosses again, the Selby area will be stuck with your reduced number of affordable homes being provided. And that cannot be changed.

Do you think that would be acceptable Cllr Bastiman?

And could you please explain what the current "changed economic circumstances" are, that mean, in a housing crisis caused by a shortage of affordable homes, North Yorkshire Council think it is okay to badly let down those people, in the Selby area, who need social housing or are aspiring to home ownership, by reducing the number of affordable homes that will be provided by this emerging plan?

Local plan policies should not be made for short term reasons.

The 40% target is just that, a target; a sensible target that is adaptable, depending on the economic circumstances and the individual development sites. Your 5%, 10% and 20% policy is not adaptable it cannot be increased. no matter what the economic circumstance are. That is ridiculous.

The 40% target is eminently sensible, although I would like to see it enforced more robustly, and it should be retained so that the people of the Selby district get those much needed affordable homes.

Councillor Derek Bastiman, Executive Member for Open to Business, provided the following response:

I acknowledged in my explanation on 6 February that there is a high level of affordable housing need within the Selby Local Plan area and went on to explain that the proposals within the Selby Local Plan strike the right balance between meeting these needs when tested against viability.

The approach we are taking aims to deliver housing for local people in a planned way. To do this we must ensure that sites are deliverable. The policy approach to affordable housing is underpinned by the necessary evidence and gives us the best chance of getting a sound Local Plan which will help us to achieve this aim.

There are many 'asks' on development, alongside providing affordable homes new developments also have to provide and or contribute towards new infrastructure such as schools, transport improvements, community and health care facilities, with increasing costs as well new building regulations requirements to tackle climate change and mandatory requirements such as biodiversity net gain. This all imposes increased costs on development, and this is the changed economic circumstances to which I referred. In conclusion the 40% target that was contained in the Core strategy is no longer supported by the evidence.

I must stress that the percentage requirements for affordable housing in the Selby Local Plan are minimum requirements and does not limit the potential for delivering more affordable homes on a particular scheme. The affordable housing targets in the emerging Selby Local Plan remain unchanged from the previous Publication Draft in 2022.

5. The following public question was read out by Jeff Bramley, Chair of Hambleton Parish Council: Selby Plan:

At the Selby and Ainsty Area Committee meeting on 19 January, members were told that the four new site allocations in the Revised Selby Publication Plan document had not previously been included for reasons that had now been 'addressed and overcome'.

HAMB-A was added in the Revised Plan for 128 dwellings, land which has had permission REFUSED numerous times for the following reasons, in short:

1. ...the scale and location significantly outside of settlement development limits would result in a pattern of growth that is not appropriate to the size and role of Hambleton.
2. ... The scale and location ... would be detrimental to the amenities of residents in the vicinity of the site.

And, I quote, "no amendments... could reasonably have been imposed" to make it acceptable.

HOW have THESE reasons for refusal now been simply 'addressed and overcome' enough for this site to be included in the Revised Plan? And can the Council understand how proposing to change Development Limits to shoehorn another 128 houses into Hambleton because a developer is pushing for it which makes it an easy option COMPLETELY UNDERMINES the whole concept of having Development Limits to protect our rural villages?!

Can the Council also see how continuing to allow developments of this size, as would happen in Hambleton on approval of this Revised Plan, means our rural community will have grown by 62% without any infrastructure or amenities upgrades? This is NOT sustainable growth; it is reckless and ill-considered. UNSUSTAINABLE development, which goes against National Planning Policy.

Hambleton Parish Council has repeatedly stressed how Hambleton is not able to cope with

such rapid growth and no infrastructure. It understands how important it is to get the 5-year land supply identified because insufficient land supply is exactly how the Whitacres estate came to be in the village! It urges the Council to direct officers to REMOVE the proposed housing allocations in Hambleton and possibly insist they redevelop Brownfield sites instead of destroying fertile land and having to implement a Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS)! So many other sites would be more suitable for this, but the easy option is to do as the developers say – it is time to stop taking the easy way out!

Hambleton has had enough, we will not stand by and let this happen in our community.

Councillor Derek Bastiman, Executive Member for Open to Business, provided the following response:

The level and distribution of new development across the Plan Area is set out in the spatial strategy of the emerging Local Plan and is underpinned by a Settlement Hierarchy. This Hierarchy and the allocations to deliver the planned level of growth is underpinned by detailed evidence set out in supporting background papers. In summary it is considered that the allocations in Hambleton are supported by evidence and should remain within the draft plan and be the subject of further statutory consultation. All comments received during the consultation period will be fully considered and addressed before deciding whether to submit the plan to examination.

Specifically in relation to HAMB-A, an application was refused in 2017 on the site, based on the national and local policies and material considerations that prevailed at the time. The planning context since that point has moved forward, and the emerging plan must re-evaluate the role of each village in the district to set appropriate development limits to meet the needs of the Plan Area.

6. The following public question was read out by James Clark

Council, I use my 3 minutes to address two problems. Namely the unsustainable and disproportionate level of development in Hambleton, and the lack of investment and foresight that has been shown by the updated draft plan.

I have no question, but this is an opportunity to present my perspective, so that those who do not live in Selby district and my village can understand the significance of the issue.

When considering Heronby, please take into account that Hambleton is already suffering the same problems which have gone unheard for years and there has been no real meaningful investment into our community.

Hambleton is a rural village without any significant amenities or infrastructure. Hambleton is set to increase by more than 60% in a short space of time, something that will erode the nature and characteristics of a village as it is forced to become a town. We will increase from around 14-1500 people- the proposal for over 350 homes will disproportionately increase the size and population of the village. This level of development is unprecedented and has not been seen before in my village or my local area.

I understand that development has to happen so we can provide enough homes. I was not against the proposal for Heronby, However what is proposed in the alternative is not sustainable. Our village lacks safe access to the A63, proven by recent incidents and the death of a villager. The A63 is already very busy and that is set to get worse as more is built in Selby. Adding to the village increases that risk.

That said, our amenities have been lacking for a significant period of time. York refuses to cooperate with our district and we are forced to rely on Scarborough and Hull services. Again, building more homes adds to this problem.

Heronby was set to help alleviate all of these issues. It would have been provided with new dentists, GPs, pharmacies and access to York, a major city with employment opportunities. This has effectively been abandoned because there is difficulty finding a solution to the traffic on the A19 and the need for a bypass. I would like the council to consider that this is and will be a daily occurrence for Hambleton. We have managed the situation until recently when it resulted in a death.

I see no promise of any increases in amenities, safety or bypass around Hambleton. Instead I see a miscalculated and short-sighted decision to redistribute housing into a rural village that is already struggling and is lacking support.

The planned developments are allowing for continued development outside of our village boundaries. The rapid and unsustainable development is proven by the existing Taylor Wimpey estate that will now be developed upon, not less than two years after it completed. It's inevitable that this will happen again and Hambleton, as a peaceful rural village, will disappear.

I urge Council to read and consider the representations that I made. It is a lengthy document that should help the Council understand why I stand here today.

Councillor Derek Bastiman, Executive Member for Open to Business, agreed to provide a written response.

7. The following public question was read out by Alex Smith, Kirk Hammerton Parish Council – Maltkiln New Settlement:

The interests of this new council's residents will be better served by rolling the DPD into its new Local Plan, rather than submitting now.

Why should the new council have this demanding cuckoo already in the nest before the new Local plan has even hatched?

The New Settlement policy hasn't been rigorously tested.

It's worth reminding ourselves that the Planning Inspector had notable reservations about the Council's New Settlement policy, particularly the number of dwellings that could be appropriately accommodated - a matter he suggested, that could be addressed in a Plan Review; and also the proximity to nearby villages.

Obviously, the Inspector's comments were made before a new rather fundamental constraint was revealed in 2023: the availability of the land itself.

The land availability 'car crash' is one that the council has actually steered towards, as it's tried to navigate through the problems of having chosen this site for this many houses.

In 2020, as per Fig 1, HBC's preferred location for the New Settlement was the 'Hammerton option'.

Caddick had already submitted the Maltkiln planning application.

HBC's long-standing preference for Hammerton discouraged Caddick from having serious land agreements, particularly in the western part of their site. For the 50 Ha in Fig 1, the agreement was due to expire in 2022; for the 75Ha - and this is this an important point - Caddick never had a land agreement or understanding of any kind. My understanding is that the landowner had no intention of this land *ever* being made available.

Later in 2020, HBC were realising that the Hammerton option was going to be too much trouble in all kinds of ways and started to steer away from it – but time was running out.

Hence, in 2022, just before their demise, HBC launched the DPD. As shown in figure 2, it had now adopted the form, the boundary, and even the name of the Caddick planning app.

Thereby running head on into the land availability issues, and so almost immediately having to pause the DPD.

Those issues mean there's likely to be ongoing legal and financial friction - with potentially further complications if it turns out that HBC have misrepresented the known available land in the LP Examination and in the High Court.

The DPD is too short-term / unstrategic

The NPPF is clear that new settlements should have policies looking at least 30 years ahead. But there's precious little in the DPD that looks beyond 2035.

Are Councillors sure that NS isn't going to be another Harrogate-centric project vacuuming time and resources from their areas?

For Harrogate councillors, what will be left for investment in the West of Harrogate - which has more new dwellings than the NS, but precious little new infrastructure.

Does it necessitate a Harrogate relief road? What's the effect on the York ring-road?

The data only goes to 2035.

And if Heronby is to return in the new Local Plan - shouldn't 2 new settlements 13 miles apart be part of a thought-through strategy?

Isn't it in the interests of the new council's residents to have a joined-up plan-led approach? If not, what's the point of the new council?

Affordable Housing

There must be some advantage? Affordable housing? After all, hasn't this proposal been compared by Cllr Myers to the great social housing projects of the past?

Well, unfortunately, even the mention of a 20% affordable ratio has been removed from the DPD. So it's likely the NS will deliver only 12-15 affordable dwellings a year for the life of the development.

So why have the additional expense and the questionable ethics of the CPO just so you persevere with a remarkably uncertain and ineffective way to deliver the houses your communities need?

And why do this at a time when you'll be reviewing every policy, apart from the only one - the New Settlement Policy - that the Planning Inspector presciently said actually might need one?

Councillor Derek Bastiman, Executive Member for Open to Business, provided the following response:

The principle of a new settlement in the Hammerton/Cattal area is established in the adopted Harrogate District Local Plan and forms a key part of the Plan's growth strategy. This approach was thoroughly tested at the Examination into that plan.

Stopping work on the DPD and allowing it to be picked up as part of the new local plan would undermine the ability of the Council to pursue a plan-led approach to the new

settlement in the event of speculative planning applications in the area.

In relation to land availability, there is and will continue to be on-going dialogue with relevant landowners. However, we are satisfied that the necessary tests for delivery of the Development Plan can be met. If submitted as proposed, this will be explored in detail at examination in public.

The draft DPD sets a clear and ambitious thirty-year vision for Maltkiln and a policy framework to guide how it is developed; there is nothing short term about this proposal.

In respect of affordable housing, the DPD requires it to be provided in line with the policies of the adopted Local Plan. This requirement is 40%, although I do acknowledge the potential viability challenge of delivering this particularly in the early phases.

8. The following public question was read out by Paul Townsend on behalf of Green Hammerton, Hunsingore, Walshford with Ribston and Cattal PC, Kirk Hammerton and Whixley Parish Councils – Maltkiln New Settlement

Good morning. My name is Paul Townsend from Kirk Hammerton Parish Council, but I represent each of the four Parish Councils most closely affected by the proposed Maltkiln development; Green Hammerton, Hunsingore, Walshford with Ribston and Cattal PC, Kirk Hammerton and Whixley. This is a joint statement from each of those parishes and represents our common view.

We want to be quite clear at the outset: we are not asking Council to abandon Maltkiln, or to build a new settlement somewhere else. Local parishes accepted some time ago that a significant development would be going ahead in our area. Our members have given up a lot of time over the past 4-5 years liaising with the Council and the developer to enhance the scheme. If Maltkiln is going to happen, we want it to deliver the maximum benefits to make up for the disruption our residents will experience over the next 20+ years.

The important thing is to get it right. The latest version of the DPD doesn't achieve this. It needs more work. We're asking Council to vote today to defer the submission until various things have been dealt with properly. We can't accept that there's no time for this, because we've just had a period of more than a year when nothing has moved forward.

Consultation

The first problem is lack of public consultation. After months of radio silence, officials suddenly published a new draft DPD and are rushing to send it straight to the planning inspector, with no time given for public comment.

It's been several years since the Council arranged any public-facing meetings to explain its strategy. No public meetings were held as part of the regulation 18 or 19 stages. Yes, Covid was partly to blame, but that was 3 years ago now.

There has been no attempt to seek views from the Liaison Group, or anyone else, regarding the latest draft of the DPD, even though this is the document which will be reviewed by the planning inspector and despite significant changes to the project. This is not the inclusive approach people were promised from the new unitary authority and is neither reasonable nor proportionate. Time should be allowed for proper consultation and explanation. No doubt the project is behind schedule, but it's not local people's fault that this has happened.

Affordable Housing

When this project began, there was a policy commitment to create 40% affordable housing. That was an important part of creating an "exemplar" new settlement.

As NYC's own, recently published, Housing Strategy explicitly states, Harrogate is one of the most expensive places to live in the North of England and desperately needs affordable homes. Yet the latest DPD, which most of you are being whipped to vote through today, contains no commitment to build a single affordable home in the biggest development the area has known in living memory.

This cannot be right and it's not what we were promised. Please take more time to consider and make the policy joined-up.

Infrastructure

Anyone who has been involved in large projects (and there are plenty of people in our 4 villages who have) knows that the requirements for infrastructure need to be clearly stated, and carefully costed, at an early stage. Otherwise the risk is that costs run out of control, corners have to be cut and some important infrastructure may not be delivered at all. Look at HS2.

This is how the DPD deals with some of the biggest features of Maltkiln infrastructure:

- A59 improvements and dual carriageway: we don't know if the A59 will be dualled or not, let alone what the costs would be. Result? It probably won't happen.
- The road bridge over the railway: the stand-out feature of this development since day 1, but there's no permission in place to allow it to happen, even in principle. Network Rail are said to want £25m just to say yes, on top of the costs of actually building it. That hasn't progressed in 4 years.
- The link road to the A168: an important measure to reduce traffic and to give Maltkiln its own sense of place and identity, but there's no costing for it and who knows if the land is even available?
- Secondary school: everyone will have to travel to Boroughbridge, which will be upgraded using money from the developer. Yet the same school now wants to close down its 6th form, for which it has the support of NYC's Education department. Do they talk to NYC's Planning Department? We don't know.
- Flooding: the development will result in increased run-off of surface water. Ultimately this will drain into the River Nidd, adding to the flooding risk in our area or downstream in York. The DPD says nothing about how this risk will be assessed and managed.

Surely it's obvious this all needs more thought and preparation. Why rush into submitting something so half-baked?

Deliverability

Almost half the development land isn't controlled by the developer any more, and about a quarter of it never has been. It looks like nobody checked this properly and just took the developer's word as gospel. Surely the land issue has to be sorted out before going to the next stage. Otherwise the scheme risks being delayed by a lengthy legal battle.

The Council Executive has said it will use a Compulsory Purchase Order to acquire land if needed, but (as the Executive confirmed in response to a question at its meeting 2 weeks ago), it has no idea which land it intends to buy, nor what the cost would be. When NYC is already confirming a loss of £47m in its first financial year, surely someone needs to get more of a grip on the financial implications of this development?

We hope it will be clear why our Parish Councils are concerned about the scheme proceeding as it currently stands. A lot more work now will save time and money further down the line and we urge you to vote to delay the submission of the DPD.

Thank you.

Councillor Derek Bastiman, Executive Member for Open to Business, provided the following response:

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge and thank the Parish Councils for their constructive contributions at the Community Liaison Group meetings which both myself and officers have valued and appreciated. Like you, we want to get this right and ensure that we deliver the clear and ambitious thirty-year vision for Maltkiln that is set out in the DPD.

I now turn to the specific points that you make. Consultation has been carried out in line with the requirements set out in the relevant Statement of Community Involvement. Whilst face to face meetings were not held, consultations were well publicised and the consultation statement indicates high levels of engagement with 800 responses from some 131 individuals and organisations received at Regulation 19 alone. It is not normal practice to undertake further consultation following Regulation 19 unless significant changes are required. We do not believe this to be the case for the Maltkiln DPD.

In respect of affordable housing, the DPD requires it to be provided in line with the policies of the adopted Local Plan. This requirement is 40%, although I do acknowledge the potential viability challenge of delivering this particularly in the early phases.

We agree that delivering infrastructure to support the new community at Maltkiln is a key component which is why we have prepared an accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan and introduced a modification to the DPD to provide a greater focus on ensuring that it is successfully delivered.

The Council is satisfied that the necessary tests for delivery of the Development Plan can be met. If submitted as proposed, this will be explored in detail at examination in public.

62 North Yorkshire Council's Revenue Budget 2024/25 and the Medium Term Strategy (MTFS)

1. Revenue Budget 2024/25, Medium Term Financial Strategy 2025/26 and Council Tax for 2024/25

The recommendations at pages 81 to 83 of the agenda (pages 711 to 713 of the Minute Book) were moved by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Carl Les, and seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor Gareth Dadd.

i. The following amendment was moved by Councillor Bryn Griffiths and seconded by Councillor Peter Lacey:

“We note that in the recent additional £600m financial settlement to local councils made by Government the following points were made in the associated press release:

1. “£500m of this additional funding was added to the Social Care Grant **to bolster social care budgets.**”
2. “The Government’s manifesto commits to continuing **to protect local taxpayers from excessive council tax increases.**”

3. “The government is clear this funding is to be used to **address the pressures** facing councils and **improve performance**. **It should not be put aside for later use** or spent on areas that are not a priority.”

Taking these points on board and also in light of the current financial predicament of many of our residents, we suggest that there is sufficient leeway to lower the proposed 4.99% increase in Council Tax for 2024/25, by using the additional allocated funding in 2024/25 and still remaining financially prudent.

The medium-term goal of financial balance can be achieved by modifying the 2025/26 increase assumption from 2.99% to 3.99% and leaving the 2026/27 figure at 2.99%. This will smooth out the bump in tax rises and still match the 2026/27 Medium Term Financial projection given in Paragraph 2.7 on Page 42 of the Council report.

We therefore propose that the following amendments are made to the Revenue Budget for 2024/25 and the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2025/26 to 2026/27:

- a. Council Tax is raised by 3.99% in 2024/25 at a cost of £4.328M, therefore using the additional Central Government money to protect local taxpayers from excessive council tax rises as intended.
- b. The Medium Term Financial situation is achieved by assuming a 3.99% increase in Council tax for 2025/26 with a 2.99% increase for 2026/27.
- c. That with respect to improving performance and supporting Social Care, the HAS Directorate are supported financially to undertake a review of integrated commissioning opportunities with Housing and with the Integrated Care Board that can significantly improve health outcomes and value for money over the medium to long term.
- d. That other invest-to-save opportunities are identified and funded within the 2024/25 budget setting process, to improve performance in the medium to long term in areas such as sustainability and becoming net zero, given the high-risk status of this ambition highlighted in the Council’s risk assessment.”

The amendment was then debated.

A recorded vote was taken by roll call and the motion was declared defeated 13 for, 70 against and no abstentions.

For: Councillors Chris Aldred, Joy Andrews, Philip Broadbank, Barbara Brodigan, Felicity Cunliffe-Lister, Hannah Gostlow, Bryn Griffiths, Peter Lacey, Steve Mason, Andrew Murday, Dan Sladden, Monika Slater and Matt Walker

Against: Councillors Karl Arthur, Alyson Baker, Derek Bastiman, Eric Broadbent, Andy Brown, Nick Brown, Lindsay Burr MBE, John Cattnach, David Chance, Liz Colling, Mark Crane, Sam Cross, Gareth Dadd, Melanie Davis, Caroline Dickinson, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff, Stephanie Duckett, Keane Duncan, Richard Foster, Sam Gibbs, Caroline Goodrick, Tim Grogan, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Robert Heseltine, David Hugill, Nathan Hull, David Ireton, George Jabbour, David Jeffels, Janet Jefferson, Tom Jones, Mike Jordan, Andrew Lee, Carl Les, Cliff Lunn, John Mann, Rich Maw, John McCartney, Heather Moorhouse, Simon Myers, David Noland, Bob Packham, Andy Paraskos, Stuart Parsons, Yvonne Peacock, Clive Pearson, Heather Phillips, Jack Proud, Tony Randerson, John Ritchie, Janet Sanderson, Karin Sedgwick, Subash Sharma, Steve Shaw-Wright, Andy Solloway, David Staveley, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers, Malcolm Taylor, Phil

Trumper, Arnold Warneken, Steve Watson, David Webster, John Weighell OBE, Greg White, Annabel Wilkinson, Peter Wilkinson, Andrew Williams and Robert Windass

Abstentions: none

ii. The following amendment was moved by Councillor Andy Brown and seconded by Councillor Arnold Warneken:

Capital

“This council agrees to extend and enhance the Beyond Carbon pump priming funding by two years commencing in 2024—25 by allocating a further £1m in both 2024/25 and in 2025/26. The capital investments to be financed from capital receipts generated by the future sale of under-utilized council assets. The funding to be used:

- To assist the council to rapidly electrify the majority of the vehicles it owns and operates.
- To provide funding for council owned properties to reduce energy consumption and/or increase energy generation.
- For capital investments that reduce NYC running costs and carbon consumption.”

The amendment was then debated.

A recorded vote was taken by roll call and the motion was declared defeated 24 for, 57 against and no abstentions.

For: Councillors Chris Aldred, Joy Andrews, Philip Broadbank, Barbara Brodigan, Andy Brown, Lindsay Burr MBE, Sam Cross, Felicity Cunliffe-Lister, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff, Hannah Gostlow, Bryn Griffiths, Janet Jefferson, Mike Jordan, Peter Lacey, Steve Mason, John McCartney, Andrew Murday, David Noland, Stuart Parsons, Dan Sladden, Monika Slater, Andy Solloway, Matt Walker and Arnold Warneken,

Against: Councillors Karl Arthur, Alyson Baker, Derek Bastiman, Eric Broadbent, Nick Brown, John Cattanach, David Chance, Liz Colling, Mark Crane, Gareth Dadd, Caroline Dickinson, Stephanie Duckett, Keane Duncan, Richard Foster, Sam Gibbs, Caroline Goodrick, Tim Grogan, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Robert Heseltine, David Hugill, Nathan Hull, David Ireton, George Jabbour, David Jeffels, Tom Jones, Andrew Lee, Carl Les, Cliff Lunn, John Mann, Rich Maw, Heather Moorhouse, Simon Myers, Bob Packham, Andy Paraskos, Yvonne Peacock, Clive Pearson, Heather Phillips, Jack Proud, John Ritchie, Janet Sanderson, Karin Sedgwick, Subash Sharma, Steve Shaw-Wright, David Staveley, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers, Malcolm Taylor, Phil Trumper, Steve Watson, David Webster, John Weighell OBE, Greg White, Annabel Wilkinson, Peter Wilkinson, Andrew Williams and Robert Windass

Abstentions: none

At 12:55 pm the Chairman adjourned the meeting for lunch.

The meeting was re-convened at 1:45 pm.

The following Councillors were not present after the adjournment: Councillors John Cattanach, Stephanie Duckett, Janet Jefferson and John Weighell.

Councillor Kirsty Poskitt arrived during lunch and was present following the adjournment.

iii. The following amendment was moved by Councillor Andy Brown and seconded by Councillor Arnold Warneken:

Revenue

“To commence NYC investment in additional council and/or social housing from 1st April 2024 in anticipation of additional funding from increased second homes charges. The emphasis of investment to be on locations where there is the greatest shortage of genuinely affordable housing.”

The amendment was then debated.

On a vote being taken on a show of hands the motion was declared carried 70 for, 1 against and no abstentions.

For: Councillors Chris Aldred, Joy Andrews, Karl Arthur, Alyson Baker, Derek Bastiman, Philip Broadbank, Eric Broadbent, Barbara Brodigan, Andy Brown, Nick Brown, Lindsay Burr MBE, David Chance, Liz Colling, Mark Crane, Felicity Cunliffe-Lister, Gareth Dadd, Melanie Davis, Caroline Dickinson, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff, Keane Duncan, Richard Foster, Sam Gibbs, Caroline Goodrick, Hannah Gostlow, Bryn Griffiths, Tim Grogan, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Robert Heseltine, David Hugill, Nathan Hull, David Ireton, George Jabbour, David Jeffels, Tom Jones, Mike Jordan, Peter Lacey, Andrew Lee, Carl Les OBE, Cliff Lunn, John Mann, Steve Mason, Rich Maw, John McCartney, Heather Moorhouse, Andrew Murday, Simon Myers, David Noland, Bob Packham, Andy Paraskos, Stuart Parsons, Yvonne Peacock, Clive Pearson, Heather Phillips, Kirsty Poskitt, Jack Proud, Tony Randerson, John Ritchie, Janet Sanderson, Karin Sedgwick, Subash Sharma, Steve Shaw-Wright, Dan Sladden, Monika Slater, Andy Solloway, David Staveley, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers, Malcolm Taylor, Phil Trumper, Matt Walker, Arnold Warneken, Steve Watson, David Webster, Greg White, Annabel Wilkinson, Peter Wilkinson, Andrew Williams and Robert Windass

Against: Councillor Sam Cross

Abstentions:

iv. The following amendment was moved by Councillor Andy Brown and seconded by Councillor David Noland:

Revenue

“To remove any expenditure on creating new community networks and to focus efforts on utilising existing networks such as Parish Councils.”

Following debate on the amendment, the amendment was withdrawn by the mover of the amendment.

v. The following amendment was moved by Councillor Andy Brown and seconded by Councillor Arnold Warneken:

Revenue

“To reduce the Communications & Marketing budget by an additional £200,000 a

year and to cease the purchase of any advertising apart from absolutely essential public information notices.”

vi. The amendment was tabled with a further amendment which was moved by Councillor Andy Brown and seconded by Councillor David Noland:

Revenue

“To increase the expenditure on public and community transport schemes by £200,000 a year.”

The amendments were then debated together.

A recorded vote was taken by roll call and the combined motions were declared defeated 4 for, 76 against and no abstentions.

For: Councillors Andy Brown, David Noland, Stuart Parsons and Arnold Warneken

Against: Councillors Chris Aldred, Joy Andrews, Karl Arthur, Alyson Baker, Derek Bastiman, Philip Broadbank, Eric Broadbent, Barbara Brodigan, Nick Brown, Lindsay Burr MBE, David Chance, Liz Colling, Mark Crane, Sam Cross, Felicity Cunliffe-Lister, Gareth Dadd, Melanie Davis, Caroline Dickinson, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff, Keane Duncan, Richard Foster, Sam Gibbs, Caroline Goodrick, Hannah Gostlow, Bryn Griffiths, Tim Grogan, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Robert Heseltine, David Hugill, Nathan Hull, David Ireton, George Jabbour, David Jeffels, Tom Jones, Mike Jordan, Peter Lacey, Andrew Lee, Carl Les, Cliff Lunn, John Mann, Steve Mason, Rich Maw, John McCartney, Heather Moorhouse, Andrew Murday, Simon Myers, Bob Packham, Andy Paraskos, Yvonne Peacock, Clive Pearson, Heather Phillips, Kirsty Poskitt, Jack Proud, Tony Randerson, John Ritchie, Janet Sanderson, Karin Sedgwick, Subash Sharma, Steve Shaw-Wright, Dan Sladden, Monika Slater, Andy Solloway, David Staveley, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers, Malcolm Taylor, Phil Trumper, Matt Walker, Steve Watson, David Webster, Greg White, Annabel Wilkinson, Peter Wilkinson, Andrew Williams and Robert Windass

Abstentions: none

vii. The following amendment was moved by Councillor Andy Brown and seconded by Councillor David Noland:

Revenue

“To reduce the budget for mowing and spraying by at least £100,000 a year and to cease all purchases of any products containing glyphosate or neonicotinoids.”

Following debate on the amendment, the amendment was withdrawn by the mover of the amendment and referred to the Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

viii. The following amendment was moved by Councillor Steve Shaw-Wright and seconded by Councillor Eric Broadbent:

“Scrutiny committees will be encouraged to regularly monitor and scrutinise the proposed budgetary savings and efficiencies, to assist executive members and officers in the execution of their duties.”

The amendment was then debated.

On a vote being taken by a show of hands the motion was declared carried 80 for, none

against and no abstentions.

For: Councillors Chris Aldred, Joy Andrews, Karl Arthur, Alyson Baker, Derek Bastiman, Philip Broadbank, Eric Broadbent, Barbara Brodigan, Andy Brown, Nick Brown, Lindsay Burr MBE, David Chance, Liz Colling, Mark Crane, Sam Cross, Felicity Cunliffe-Lister, Gareth Dadd, Melanie Davis, Caroline Dickinson, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff, Keane Duncan, Richard Foster, Sam Gibbs, Caroline Goodrick, Hannah Gostlow, Bryn Griffiths, Tim Grogan, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Robert Heseltine, David Hugill, Nathan Hull, David Ireton, George Jabbour, David Jeffels, Tom Jones, Mike Jordan, Peter Lacey, Andrew Lee, Carl Les, Cliff Lunn, John Mann, Steve Mason, Rich Maw, John McCartney, Heather Moorhouse, Andrew Murday, Simon Myers, David Noland, Bob Packham, Andy Paraskos, Stuart Parsons, Yvonne Peacock, Clive Pearson, Heather Phillips, Kirsty Poskitt, Jack Proud, Tony Randerson, John Ritchie, Janet Sanderson, Karin Sedgwick, Subash Sharma, Steve Shaw-Wright, Dan Sladden, Monika Slater, Andy Solloway, David Staveley, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers, Malcolm Taylor, Phil Trumper, Matt Walker, Arnold Warneken, Steve Watson, David Webster, Greg White, Annabel Wilkinson, Peter Wilkinson, Andrew Williams and Robert Windass

Against: none

Abstentions: none

A named vote was taken by roll call on the substantive motion, the recommendations at pages 81 to 83 of the report, and declared carried with 61 for, 4 against and 14 abstentions.

For: Councillors Karl Arthur, Alyson Baker, Derek Bastiman, Eric Broadbent, Nick Brown, David Chance, Liz Colling, Mark Crane, Sam Cross, Gareth Dadd, Melanie Davis, Caroline Dickinson, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff, Keane Duncan, Richard Foster, Sam Gibbs, Caroline Goodrick, Tim Grogan, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Robert Heseltine, David Hugill, Nathan Hull, David Ireton, George Jabbour, David Jeffels, Tom Jones, Mike Jordan, Andrew Lee, Carl Les, Cliff Lunn, John Mann, Rich Maw, Heather Moorhouse, Simon Myers, Bob Packham, Andy Paraskos, Yvonne Peacock, Clive Pearson, Heather Phillips, Kirsty Poskitt, Jack Proud, John Ritchie, Janet Sanderson, Karin Sedgwick, Subash Sharma, Steve Shaw-Wright, Andy Solloway, David Staveley, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers, Malcolm Taylor, Phil Trumper, Arnold Warneken, Steve Watson, David Webster, Greg White, Annabel Wilkinson, Peter Wilkinson, Andrew Williams and Robert Windass

Against: Councillors Lindsay Burr MBE, John McCartney, David Noland and Tony Randerson

Abstentions: Councillors Chris Aldred, Joy Andrews, Philip Broadbank, Barbara Brodigan, Andy Brown, Felicity Cunliffe-Lister, Hannah Gostlow, Bryn Griffiths, Peter Lacey, Steve Mason, Andrew Murday, Dan Sladden, Monika Slater and Matt Walker

Resolved –

1. That
 - a. the Section 25 assurance statement provided by the Corporate Director, Resources regarding the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the reserves (paragraph 8.12) and the risk assessment of the MTFs detailed in Section 9 are noted;
 - b. An increase in Council Tax of 4.99% (basic 2.99% and Adult Social Care 2%) resulting in a Band D charge (including special expenses) of £1,847.62 – an increase of £87.80 (paragraph 4.3.8 and Appendix D);

c. That, in accordance with Section 31A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended by Section 74 of The Localism Act 2011), a Council Tax requirement for 2024/25 of £454,532,423.44 is approved;

d. That a Net Revenue Budget for 2024/25, after use of reserves, of £684,764k (Appendix G) is approved;

e. *(recommendation removed as no longer required following the revised local government settlement)*

f. That the Corporate Director – Children and Young People’s Service is authorised, in consultation with the Corporate Director, Resources and the Executive Members for Schools and Finance, to take the final decision on the allocation of the Schools Budget including High Needs, Early Years and the Central Schools Services Block (paragraph 3.1.17).

g. That the Medium Term Financial Strategy for 2025/26 to 2026/27, and its caveats, as laid out in Section 3.0 and Appendix G is approved in line with the proposed council tax option.

h. That the Corporate Director – Environment is authorised, in consultation with the Executive Members for Highways & Transportation and Open for Business, to carry out all necessary actions, including consultation where considered appropriate, to implement the range of savings as set out in Appendix B (ENV 1 to 14).

i. That the Corporate Director – Community Development is authorised, in consultation with the Executive Members for Planning for Growth and Culture, Arts and Housing, to carry out all necessary actions, including consultation where considered appropriate, to implement the range of savings as set out in Appendix B (CD 1 to 11).

j. That the Corporate Director – Health and Adult Services is authorised, in consultation with the Executive Members for HAS, to carry out all necessary actions, including consultation where he considers it appropriate, to implement the range of savings as set out in Appendix B (HAS 1 to 7).

k. That the Corporate Director – Children and Young People’s Services are authorised, in consultation with the Executive Members for CYPS, to carry out all necessary actions, including consultation where he considers it appropriate, to implement the range of savings as set out in Appendix B (CYPS 1 to 14).

l. That the Corporate Director – Resources, in consultation with the Executive Members for Finance & Resources and Corporate Services, to carry out all the necessary actions, including consultation where he consider it appropriate, to implement the range of savings as set out in Appendix B (RD 1 to 7).

m. That the Chief Executive is authorised, in consultation with the Executive Members for Central Services, to carry out all necessary actions, including consultation where he considers it appropriate, to implement the range of savings as set out in Appendix B (CS 1-11 and LGR1).

n. That any outcomes requiring changes following Recommendations h), i), j), k) and l) above be brought back to the Executive to consider and, where changes are recommended to the existing major policy framework, then such matters to be considered by full Council.

o. That £5,000k be provided for development of the Local Plan and that the

Corporate Director, Community Development be authorised, in consultation with the Corporate Director, Resources and the Executive Members for Planning and Finance, to approve spending from this sum to progress the Local Plan as set out in paragraphs 4.8.2 to 4.8.3.

p. That £1,000k be added to the North Yorkshire Local Assistance Fund in recognition of additional claims currently coming through and therefore allowing targeted support to continue to support our most financially vulnerable residents (paragraph 4.8.4)

q. That the proposed policy target for the minimum level of the General Working Balance is £33m in line with Appendix F.

2. That the delegation arrangements referred to in Section 11 are agreed and that the Corporate Directors are authorised to implement the Budget proposals contained in this report for their respective service areas and for the Chief Executive in those areas where there are cross-Council proposals.

3. That the Council have regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (identified in Section 7 and Appendix I) in approving the Budget proposals contained in this report.

2. Council Tax Resolution Report

The recommendation at page 148 of the agenda pack (page 785 of the Minute Book) was moved by Councillor Gareth Dadd and seconded by Councillor Carl Les.

A replacement page 157 was circulated at the meeting detailing an amendment to the parish precepts and council tax amounts.

A named vote was taken by roll call on the substantive motion, the recommendation at pages 148 of the Council tax Resolution Report, and Appendix A at pages 151 and 152, and declared carried with 77 for, 2 against and no abstentions.

For: Councillors Chris Aldred, Joy Andrews, Karl Arthur, Alyson Baker, Derek Bastiman, Philip Broadbank, Eric Broadbent, Barbara Brogan, Andy Brown, Nick Brown, David Chance, Liz Colling, Mark Crane, Sam Cross, Felicity Cunliffe-Lister, Gareth Dadd, Melanie Davis, Caroline Dickinson, Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff, Keane Duncan, Richard Foster, Sam Gibbs, Caroline Goodrick, Hannah Gostlow, Bryn Griffiths, Tim Grogan, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Robert Heseltine, David Hugill, Nathan Hull, David Ireton, George Jabbour, David Jeffels, Tom Jones, Mike Jordan, Peter Lacey, Andrew Lee, Carl Les, Cliff Lunn, John Mann, Steve Mason, Rich Maw, John McCartney, Heather Moorhouse, Andrew Murday, Simon Myers, David Noland, Bob Packham, Andy Paraskos, Yvonne Peacock, Clive Pearson, Heather Phillips, Kirsty Poskitt, Jack Proud, John Ritchie, Janet Sanderson, Karin Sedgwick, Subash Sharma, Steve Shaw-Wright, Dan Sladden, Monika Slater, Andy Solloway, David Staveley, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers, Malcolm Taylor, Phil Trumper, Matt Walker, Arnold Warneken, Steve Watson, David Webster, Greg White, Annabel Wilkinson, Peter Wilkinson, Andrew Williams and Robert Windass

Against: Councillors Lindsay Burr MBE and Tony Randerson.

Abstentions: None

Resolved –

That the Council Tax Resolution be approved.

3. Capital Five Year Spending Plan and the Treasury Management Strategy

These items were taken as one. The recommendation regarding the Capital Five Year Spending Plan at page 200 of the report (page 847 of the Minute Book) and the recommendation regarding the Treasury Management Strategy 2023/24 at page 209 of the report (pages 856 to 857 of the Minute Book) were moved by Councillor Gareth Dadd and seconded by Councillor Carl Les.

The vote was taken and the motion was declared carried, with 77 for, 2 against and no abstentions.

Resolved -

That the refreshed Capital Plan summarised at paragraph 3.3 of the report be approved; and

That (1) the Treasury Management Strategy Statement at Annex 1, consisting of the Annual Treasury Management Strategy (Section 1), Capital Prudential Indicators (Section 2), Borrowing Strategy (Section 3) and Annual Investment Strategy 2023/24 (Section 4), be approved, including in particular;

- i. an authorised limit for external debt of £660.9m in 2024/25;
- ii. an operational boundary for external debt of £633.3m in 2023/24;
- iii. the Prudential and Treasury Indicators based on the Council's current and indicative spending plans for 2024/25 to 2026/27;
- iv. a limit of £60m of the total cash sums available for investment (both in house and externally managed) to be invested in Non-Specified Investments over 365 days;
- v. a Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy for debt repayment to be charged to Revenue in 2024/25;
- vi. the Corporate Director – Strategic Resources to report to the Council if and when necessary during the year on any changes to this Strategy arising from the use of operational leasing, PFI or other innovative methods of funding not previously approved by the Council;

(2) The Capital Strategy as attached as Annex 2 be approved;

(3) That the Audit Committee be invited to review Annex 1, 2 and 3 and submit any proposals to the Executive for consideration at the earliest opportunity.

4. Housing Revenue Account

The recommendation regarding the Housing Revenue Account made by Executive at its meeting of 23 January 2024 and as described at pages 37 and 38 of the report were moved by Councillor Simon Myers and seconded by Councillor Derek Bastiman.

On a vote being taken the motion was declared carried with 54 votes for the motion, none against and there were 15 abstentions.

For: Councillors Karl Arthur, Alyson Baker, Derek Bastiman, Eric Broadbent, Andy Brown, Nick Brown, Lindsay Burr MBE, David Chance, Liz Colling, Mark Crane, Sam Cross, Felicity Cunliffe-Lister, Gareth Dadd, Melanie Davis, Caroline Dickinson, Michelle Donohue-

Moncrieff, Keane Duncan, Richard Foster, Sam Gibbs, Caroline Goodrick, Tim Grogan, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Robert Heseltine, David Hugill, Nathan Hull, David Ireton, George Jabbour, David Jeffels, Tom Jones, Mike Jordan, Andrew Lee, Carl Les, Cliff Lunn, John Mann, John McCartney, Heather Moorhouse, Simon Myers, David Noland, Andy Paraskos, Stuart Parsons, Yvonne Peacock, Clive Pearson, Heather Phillips, Jack Proud, Tony Randerson, John Ritchie, Janet Sanderson, Karin Sedgwick, Subash Sharma, Steve Shaw-Wright, Andy Solloway, David Staveley, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers, Malcolm Taylor, Phil Trumper, Arnold Warneken, Steve Watson, David Webster, Greg White, Annabel Wilkinson, Peter Wilkinson, Andrew Williams and Robert Windass

Against: none

Abstentions: Councillors Chris Aldred, Joy Andrews, Philip Broadbank, Barbara Brodigan, Hannah Gostlow, Bryn Griffiths, Peter Lacey, Steve Mason, Rich Maw, Andrew Murday, Bob Packham, Kirsty Poskitt, Dan Sladden, Monika Slater and Matt Walker.

Resolved –

That

- a. the approval of the HRA budget for 2024/25 as set out in paragraph 6.3, being a net surplus of £1.307m which will be transferred to the HRA working balance;
- b. the approval of the HRA Medium term financial plan for 2025/26 and 2026/27 and the 30-year HRA Business Plan, as set out in paragraph 6.3 and Appendix D respectively;
- c. an increase of 7.7% be applied to social, affordable and hostel rents from 1 April 2024 and recommends this to the Council for approval;
- d. an increase of 2% be applied to shared ownership rents from 1 April 2024 and recommends this to the Council for approval.

63 Council Plan 2024-2028

The recommendation at page 269 of the agenda pack (page 916 of the Minute Book) was moved and seconded.

On a vote being taken the motion was declared carried, with 69 votes for, none against and 10 abstentions.

Resolved -

That the draft Council Plan be approved and that the Chief Executive be authorised to make any necessary changes to the text, including reflecting decisions made by the Council on the budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy, and updated performance data and key performance indicators.

64 To consider the report and recommendations of the Executive and make decisions on them

Second Homes Council Tax Premium

The recommendation at page 334 of the agenda pack (page 981 of the Minute Book) was moved and seconded.

A vote was taken and the motion was declared carried with 75 votes for the motion, 1 against and 3 abstentions.

Resolved –

That implementation of the following be approved:

- i. The application of the current premium of 100% for all dwellings which are unoccupied and substantially unfurnished (empty dwellings) from a period of one year with effect from 1st April 2024;
- ii. The application of a premium of 100% for all dwellings which are unoccupied but substantially furnished (second homes) with effect from 1st April 2025; and
- iii. That the Section 151 Officer is given delegated powers to implement the policy in line with the Council's requirements and any guidance given by the Secretary of State or regulation

Selby District Local Plan – Revised Regulation 19 (Publication version) Draft Plan for Public Consultation

The recommendation at pages 334 and 335 of the agenda pack (pages 981 and 982 of the Minute Book) was moved and seconded.

- i. The following amendment was moved by Councillor John McCartney and seconded by Councillor Mike Jordan.

“The reduction of the affordable housing targets in the emerging Selby Local Plan is unacceptable to this Full Council.

NYC’s “Allocation Scheme for the provision of social housing” which is on today’s agenda, states at 1.2; “North Yorkshire is an area of high demand for social housing. There is a scarcity of affordable housing and a high number of people who wish to be housed. There is also a substantial level of homelessness across the authority, so even if an applicant is accepted onto the Housing Register this does not mean they will ever be made an offer of accommodation”

Currently the Selby district has a 40% affordable housing target.

The emerging plan has sites with 5%, 10% and 20% allocations. So, the overall affordable target would, be at most, 13%. But the developers of the 20% sites will inevitably put in Viability Assessments to get that 20% lowered, thereby reducing, even further, the overall target in the emerging plan.

Cllr Bastiman admitted at the Executive meeting of 6 February that there is a reduction in the new plan saying, “changed economic circumstances mean that the level of affordable housing that can now be justifiably requested is reduced from that set out in the adopted core strategy”.

If this plan is allowed to go through with this reduced affordable housing target, then no doubt that will be replicated in the new North Yorkshire wide plan.

“The Selby Local Plan should be delayed; the 40% target should be retained, and the Council should commit to robustly challenging the developers’ Viability Assessments so that we get as many affordable homes as possible on all the sites in the Selby district.”

The amendment was then debated.

On a vote being taken the amendment fell with 14 votes for, 60 votes against and 4

abstentions.

- ii. The following amendment was moved by Councillor Mike Jordan and seconded by Councillor John McCartney

“That the proposal for Heronby be re-included in the plan for Selby.”

The amendment was then debated.

On a vote taken on the amendment there were 2 votes for the amendment, 74 against and 2 abstentions.

On a vote being taken on the recommendations of the Executive and the motion was declared carried with 74 votes for the motion, 2 against and 2 abstentions.

Resolved –

- i. That the Draft Revised Publication Local Plan document at Appendix 1 of the report is approved for consultation in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) regulations 2012 (as amended);
- ii. Delegate to officers the arrangements for the consultation to take place for six weeks between 8 March and 19 April 2024; and
- iii. Delegate to the Head of Policy and Place and Assistant Director of Planning in consultation with the Executive Member for Open to Business, any minor amendments required to the documentation for typographical, grammatical and factual or Plain English purposes and any amendments required to address issues raised in the final HRA and SA reports to the documents prior to publishing for consultation.

Malkiln New Settlement – Submission of the New Settlement (Malkiln) Development Plan Document

The recommendation at pages 334 and 335 of the agenda pack (pages 981 and 982 of the Minute Book) was moved and seconded.

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Arnold Warneken and seconded by Councillor Andy Brown.

- i. That the Council delays the Submission Draft DPD (Malkiln) and accompanying submission documents to the Secretary of State allowing time for the the inclusion of a policy of at least 30% truly affordable housing in the draft DPD (Malkiln) document .
- ii. This Council takes seriously the concerns of residents and Parish Councils regarding the lack of affordable housing in the draft DPD (Malkiln) and is therefore will take action on their behalf. It recognises that any short delay in submission as a result of amending the documents to accommodate the required 30% will be significantly exceeded by the public good.

The amendment was then debated.

On a vote being taken the amendment fell with 19 votes for, 50 votes against and there was 1 abstention.

A vote was taken on the recommendations of the Executive and the motion was declared

carried with 68 votes for the motion and 2 abstentions.

Resolved –

- i. That the Council submit the Submission Draft DPD and accompanying submission documents to the Secretary of State for examination.
- ii. That the Corporate Director Community Development in consultation with the Executive Member for Open to Business, be authorised to make minor amendments and graphical improvements to the Submission Draft DPD and submission documents prior to submission.
- iii. That for the period of the examination in public, delegated authority be given to the Head of Infrastructure and Delivery, in consultation with the Executive Member for Open to Business, to:
 - a. provide formal responses to questions from the Inspector alongside other supporting statements and documentation as requested by the Inspector.
 - b. agree modifications to the plan through the examination period in order to make the plan sound.
 - c. To undertake all other necessary steps required as part of the Examination

North Yorkshire Council Pay Policy for Senior Managers

The recommendation at pages 334 and 335 of the agenda pack (page 982 of the Minute Book) was moved and seconded.

A vote was taken and the motion was declared carried unanimously.

Resolved –

That the 2024-2025 Pay Policy be approved for publication.

65 Admission Arrangements 2025/26

The recommendations at page 341 of the agenda pack (page 988 of the Minute Book) were moved and seconded.

A vote was taken, and the motion was declared carried unanimously.

Resolved –

That the proposed Admission Arrangements for 2025/2026 be approved and include:

- i. the proposed co-ordinated admission arrangements (appendix 1)
- ii. the proposed co-ordinated in year admission arrangements (appendix 1a)
- iii. the proposed admission policy for community and voluntary controlled schools (appendix 2)
- iv. the proposed admission policy for nursery schools, schools with nursery classes and pre-reception classes (appendix 3)

v. the proposed published admission numbers (PAN's) for community and voluntary controlled schools as shown in appendices 6 (Primary) and 7 (Secondary)

vi. Proposed changes to school catchment area – Thirsk School and Sixth Form College (appendix 8)

66 Appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies

The recommendations at page 397 of the agenda pack (page 1043 of the Minute Book) were moved and seconded.

A vote was taken and the motion was declared carried unanimously.

Resolved –

1. York and North Yorkshire Combined Authority

Substitute Members for the Leader and Deputy Leader:

Councillors Michael Harrison, Simon Myers, Janet Sanderson and Annabel Wilkinson.

2. Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Audit and Governance Committee

Authority be delegated to the Assistant Chief Executive Legal and Democratic Services in consultation with Group Leaders to confirm appointments to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Audit and Governance Committee from the nominations circulated at the meeting.

3. Skills and Employability Working Group

Councillors Derek Bastiman and Annabel Wilkinson to be appointed.

4. Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Planning Committee

Councillor Pat Marsh to come off

Councillor Mike Schofield to be appointed

Councillor John Mann to be appointed Chair of the Committee

Councillor Chris Aldred to be appointed Vice Chair of the Committee in place of Councillor Paul Haslam

5. Scrutiny of Health Committee

Councillor Nathan Hull to be replaced by Councillor Andy Paraskos

6. Pension Board

David Portlock be re-appointed as the Independent Chair and Gordon Gresty be re-appointed as a Scheme Member representative; both for a period of 4 years.

67 Revised arrangements for the North Yorkshire Police, Fire and Crime Panel

The recommendations at page 400 of the agenda pack (page 1047 of the Minute Book) were moved and seconded.

A vote was taken and the motion was declared carried unanimously.

Resolved –

That the revised arrangements for the North Yorkshire Police, Fire and Crime Panel as provided at Appendix be approved.

68 Allocations scheme for the provision of social housing - Approval of the proposed North Yorkshire Council allocations policy for social housing following public

consultation

The recommendations at page 415 of the agenda pack (page 1062 of the Minute Book) were moved and seconded.

Resolved –

That the draft Housing Allocations Policy be approved.

69 Statements of Executive Members and Chairmen of Overview and Scrutiny Committees

Statements of Executive Members, in the order set out below, followed by the Statements of the Chairmen of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

69 Executive Member for Children and Families - Councillor Janet Sanderson

(a)

Councillor Janet Sanderson, Executive Member for Children and Families, made a statement and answered questions. A summary of the key points of which had previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 463 – 466 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1109 to 1113).

69 Executive Member for Managing our Environment - Councillor Greg White

(b)

Councillor Greg White, Executive Member for Managing our Environment, made a statement and answered questions. A summary of the key points of which had previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 467 - 470 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1114 to 1117).

69 Executive Member for Education, Learning and Skills - Councillor Annabel Wilkinson

(c)

Councillor Annabel Wilkinson, Executive Member for Education, Learning and Skills, made a statement and answered questions. A summary of the key points of which had previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 471 – 474 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1118 to 1121).

69 Executive Member for Finance and Assets - Councillor Gareth Dadd

(d)

Councillor Gareth Dadd, Executive Member for Finance and Resources, made a statement and answered questions. A summary of the key points of which had previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 475 - 476 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1122 to 1123).

69 Executive Member for Open to Business - Councillor Derek Bastiman

(e)

Councillor Derek Bastiman, Executive Member for Open to Business, made a statement and answered questions. A summary of the key points of which had previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 477 - 482 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1124 to 1128).

69 Executive Member for Corporate Services - Councillor David Chance

(f)

Councillor David Chance, Executive Member for Corporate Services, made a statement and answered questions. A summary of the key points of which had previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 483 – 486 of the agenda pack and in the Minute Book (pages 1130 to 1133).

69 Executive Member for Highways and Transportation - Councillor Keane Duncan

- (g) Councillor Keane Duncan, Executive Member for Highways and Transportation, made a statement and answered questions. A summary of the key points of which had previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 487 – 488 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1134 to 1135).
- 69 Executive Member for Health and Adult Services - Councillor Michael Harrison**
(h) Councillor Michael Harrison, Executive Member for Health and Adult Services, made a statement and answered questions. A summary of the key points of which had previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 489 - 492 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1136 to 1138).
- 69 Executive Member for Culture, Arts and Housing - Councillor Simon Myers**
(i) Councillor Simon Myers, Executive Member for Culture, Arts and Housing, made a statement and answered questions. A summary of the key points of which had previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 493 - 496 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1140 to 1143).
- 69 Scrutiny Board (Chair: Councillor Karin Sedgwick)**
(j) The written statement of Councillor Karin Sedgwick having previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 497 – 498 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1144 to 1145), was noted. The Scrutiny Board Chair then answered questions.
- 69 Care and Independence and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Chair: Councillor Karin Sedgwick)**
(k) The written statement of Councillor Karin Sedgwick having previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 499 - 502 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1146 to 1148), was noted.
- 69 Corporate and Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Chair: Councillor Andrew Williams)**
(l) The written statement of Councillor Andrew Williams having previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 503 - 504 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (page 1150), was noted.
- 69 Scrutiny of Health (Chair: Councillor Andrew Lee)**
(m)) The written statement of Councillor Andrew Lee having previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 505 - 508 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1152 to 1154), was noted.
- 69 Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Chair: Councillor David Staveley)**
(n) The written statement of Councillor David Staveley having previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 509 – 510 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1156 to 1157), was noted.
- 69 Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Chair: Councillor Barbara Brodigan)**
(o)

The written statement of Councillor Barbara Brodigan having previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 511 - 512 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1158 to 1159), was noted.

69 Transition (LGR) Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Chair: Councillor Malcolm Taylor)
(p)

The written statement of Councillor Malcolm Taylor having previously been circulated and which appeared at pages 513 - 516 of the agenda pack and which appears in the Minute Book (pages 1160 to 1162), was noted.

70 Notices of Motion

The Chair, Councillor David Ireton, advised that three Notices of Motion had been submitted. The Chair confirmed that he had ruled as follows on each of the submitted motions:

- (1) Local Government Funding – motion to be debated at the meeting
- (2) Town Council for Harrogate – motion to be debated at the meeting

70 Local Government Funding
(a)

This council continues to make cuts to the services it provides to its residents, to avoid what would become a catastrophic financial deficit. Proposals for budget savings this year include reductions in home-to-school transport provision and support to local communities. Additionally, the council's reserves are being used to support underfunded mandatory services e.g. Social Care. The proposed economies result from long-term inadequate funding from central government to this local authority.

With this in mind, the council requests that the leader, Councillor Carl Les, writes to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Right Honourable Jeremy Hunt, requesting that he does not reduce taxes in his March 2024 budget and instead undertakes to provide long-term government funding to the meet mandatory provision of council services.

Proposer - Cllr Andrew Murday
Seconder - Cllr Barbara Brodigan

The notice of motion was moved by Councillor Andrew Murday and seconded by Councillor Barbara Brodigan.

The motion was then debated.

On a vote being taken 23 Members voted for the motion, 42 against and there were no abstentions. The motion therefore fell.

70 Town Council for Harrogate
(b)

In accordance with Rule 14 regarding Previous Decisions and motions, the mover & seconder of this motion along with 14 other members signed below, wish to have this motion debated and note that it seeks to rescind, in part, a resolution passed at Full Council on 19 July 2023.

Council sees no need to delay its stated purpose in creating a Town Council for Harrogate, by continuing to link this process to the evolving process in Scarborough, which by necessity involves the creation of new Wards. Council therefore instructs

that Council Officers immediately undertake the necessary public consultation on the 19 single member wards, based on the ward boundaries previously used by Harrogate Borough Council, as agreed on 19 July 2023, in the most cost effective way possible and mindful of the results of the two previous consultations undertaken on this matter since the 2022 Council Elections, reporting back the results of this consultation to the Standards & Governance Committee at its 15 March meeting, with a view to a report being presented to Council on 15 May.

Proposed – Cllr Chris Aldred, High Harrogate & Kingsley
Seconded – Cllr Philip Broadbank, Fairfax & Starbeck

and supported by – Cllr Peter Lacey, Cllr Monika Slater, Cllr Dan Sladden, Cllr Matt Walker, Cllr Bryn Griffiths, Cllr Steve Mason, Cllr Joy Andrews, Cllr Hannah Gostlow, Cllr Pat Marsh, Cllr Felicity Cunliffe-Lister, Cllr Barbara Brodigan, Cllr Kevin Foster, Cllr Arnold Warneken, Cllr Stuart Parsons.

The notice of motion was moved by Councillor Chris Aldred and seconded by Councillor Philip Broadbank.

The motion was then debated.

On a vote being taken 26 Members voted for the motion, 39 voted against and there were no abstentions. The motion therefore fell.

71 Motion on United Nations Sustainable Development Goals Referred from Council on 15 November 2023 - Recommendation from the Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Council were requested to consider the recommendation of the Audit Committee and the Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee following consideration of a Notice of Motion which had been referred to them by Council at its meeting held on 15 November 2023.

The recommendations of those Committees were set out at page 521 of the agenda.

The original motion that was to be debated is as detailed below:

Background - the [United Nations Sustainable Development Goals \(UNSDGs\)](#) are a set of 17 goals that aim to address global challenges and foster sustainable development worldwide. These goals cover a range of issues, including strong economic growth, strong institutions, poverty eradication, equality, clean energy, climate action, and nature protections, among others.

Motion to Council - A more equitable, sustainable, and resilient North Yorkshire
This Council notes with concern the recent Special Report from the United Nations Secretary General – [“Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals: towards a rescue plan for people and planet”](#) - published in July 2023 to mark the midpoint between 2015 and the delivery date of 2030.

The Secretary General finds that “... *many of the Goals are moderately to severely off track and puts forward five major recommendations to rescue the Goals and accelerate implementation between now and 2030.*”

This Council notes the third of those recommendations, calling upon Governments to “... strengthen national and subnational capacity, accountability and public institutions to deliver accelerated progress towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.” Furthermore, this council recognises the main reasons of the Local

Government Association as to why councils should investigate and implement the UNSDGs:

- Making progress towards these comprehensive and universal global goals by 2030 will depend on action at the local level, and councils are key actors at that level.
- The SDGs can help focus efforts on the health and wellbeing of people that are the furthest behind.
- Engagement with the SDGs supports and complements the declaration of a climate emergency.
- The SDGs can provide councils with a framework for strategic planning, policy review and action for sustainable development – for economic progress, social justice and inclusion, protection of the climate, environment and biodiversity, and ensuring no one is left behind.
- The SDGs can help councils to foster strategic partnerships, framing joint actions and shared priorities in terms of the goals.
- The resource burden for initial engagement with the SDGs is low.

To that end, North Yorkshire Council resolves to adopt the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs) as a framework for informing our local authority's policies, work programs, functions, and initiatives. By doing so, we commit to aligning our strategies with the national and global agenda for sustainable development and working towards achieving these goals within our sphere of influence; thus recognising the significance of the UN SDGs as a comprehensive framework for sustainable development at the global level. We shall seek to apply the UN SDGs at the local level for the wellbeing of our residents.

The Council believes that:

1. Adopting the UN SDGs will provide a clear direction for our local authority's policies, work programs, and initiatives, ensuring their alignment with the national and global agenda for sustainable development.
2. Emphasising the importance of multi-stakeholder collaboration and partnerships will help in implementing the UN SDGs effectively.
3. Committing to regular monitoring, reporting, and evaluation of our progress towards achieving the UN SDGs is vital to engage our community in the process.
4. Encouraging cooperation and knowledge-sharing with other local authorities across the UK and world that have already adopted the UN SDGs, will help in promoting collective action and learning both locally and globally.

The Council therefore agrees to:

- A. Adopt the UN SDGs as a framework for informing our local authority's policies, work programs, and initiatives.
- B. Contribute to the achievement of the UN SDGs through the council strategies and developing plans.

C. Actively engage and collaborates with other local authorities, organisations, and community groups to share best practices, experiences, and lessons learned in advancing the UN SDGs.

D. Receive an annual report setting out the Council's contributions to the global agenda for sustainable development.

By taking this step, we can also demonstrate our commitment to act at a local level whilst contributing to the global effort to achieve a more equitable, sustainable, and resilient world for future generations.

Proposer Cllr Steve Mason
Seconder Cllr Peter Lacey

The motion was moved by Councillor Steve Mason and Seconded by Councillor Peter Lacey.

In moving the motion Councillor Steve Mason proposed that the recommendation of the Audit Committee be removed and the Council vote on the recommendations of the Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee only, and this was seconded by Councillor Tom Jones.

Councillor Cliff Lunn, the Chair of the Audit Committee, consented to the withdrawal of the recommendation of the recommendations of the Audit Committee.

On a vote being taken the recommendations of the Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee were approved unanimously.

72 Use of special urgency procedures since the last meeting of Council - Report of the Leader

The report on the Use of Special Urgency Procedures since the last meeting of the Council on 15 November 2023 was considered and the recommendation at page 523 - 528 of the agenda pack (page 526 of the Minute Book) was moved and seconded.

Resolved –

That the report on the Use of Special Urgency Procedures since the last meeting of the Council in November 2023, be noted.

73 Council Procedure Rule 10 Questions

There were no Council Procedure Rule 10 questions.

The meeting concluded at 6.13 pm.