

Meeting of Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee

Members: Councillors Pat Marsh (Chair), Chris Aldred, Philip Broadbank, Sam Gibbs, Hannah Gostlow, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Peter Lacey, John Mann, Mike Schofield, Monika Slater (Vice-Chair), Matt Walker and Robert Windass.

Date: Thursday, 8th June, 2023

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Council Chamber, Harrogate Civic Centre, St Luke's Avenue, Harrogate HG1 2AE.

Members of the public are entitled to attend this meeting as observers for all those items taken in open session. Please contact the Democratic Services Officer whose details are at the foot of the first page of the Agenda if you would like to find out more.

This meeting is being held as an in-person meeting that is being broadcasted and recorded and will be available to view via www.northyorks.gov.uk/livemeetings

Recording is allowed at Council, committee and sub-committee meetings which are open to the public, please give due regard to the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at public meetings, a copy of which is available to download below. Anyone wishing to record is asked to contact, prior to the start of the meeting, the Democratic Services Officer whose details are at the foot of the first page of the Agenda. We ask that any recording is clearly visible to anyone at the meeting and that it is non-disruptive. <http://democracy.northyorks.gov.uk/>

AGENDA

- 1. Election of Chairperson:**
To elect a Chairman of the Committee, to serve until the first meeting of the Committee following the Annual Meeting of the Council in 2024.
- 2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 March 2023 and the special meeting held on 5 May 2023:** (Pages 5 - 38)
Purpose: To decide whether these Minutes can be confirmed and signed by the Chair as correct records.
- 3. Election of Vice-Chair:**
Enquiries relating to this agenda please contact Mark.Codman@northyorks.gov.uk
Website: www.northyorks.gov.uk

To elect a Vice-Chair of the Committee, to serve until the first meeting of the Committee following the Annual Meeting of the Council in 2024.

4. Apologies for absence:

5. Declarations of Interest:

All Members are invited to declare at this point any interests they have in items appearing on this agenda, including the nature of those interests.

6. Public Questions or Statements:

Members of the public may ask questions or make statements at this meeting if they have given notice (including the text of the question/statement) to Mark.Codman@northyorks.gov.uk of Democratic Services **by midday on Monday 5 June 2023**. Each speaker should limit themselves to 3 minutes on any item. Members of the public who have given notice will be invited to speak:-

- At this point in the meeting if their questions/statements relate to matters which are not otherwise on the Agenda (subject to an overall time limit of 30 minutes).
- When the relevant Agenda item is being considered if they wish to speak on a matter which is on the Agenda for this meeting.

If you are exercising your right to speak at this meeting, but do not wish to be recorded, please inform the Chair who will instruct anyone who may be taking a recording to cease while you speak.

7. Petition referred to the committee for consideration - Submission of petition for a maximum speed of 20mph on roads in south & west Harrogate: (Pages 39 - 42)

8. Petition referred to the committee for consideration - Harrogate Station Gateway Opposition: (Pages 43 - 46)

9. Area Constituency Committees - Ways of Working: (Pages 47 - 52)

Report of the Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager.

Purpose: To provide a guide about Area Constituency Committees' ways of working for the period ending 31 March 2024.

10. Appointments to Outside Bodies: (Pages 53 - 60)

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)

Purpose: To invite the Area Constituency Committee to appoint the County Council's representatives on various outside bodies.

11. Update from the Climate Sub Group:

Report of County Councillor Paul Haslam (Chair of Sub Group)

12. Committee Work Programme (Pages 61 - 70)

Report of the Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager.

Purpose of the report: To ask Members to consider, amend and add to the Committee's work programme.

Members are reminded that in order to expedite business at the meeting and enable Officers to adapt their presentations to address areas causing difficulty, they are encouraged to contact Officers prior to the meeting with questions on technical issues in reports.

Contact Details:

Mark Codman – Democratic Services Officer

Mark.codman@northyorks.gov.uk

Barry Khan

Assistant Chief Executive

(Legal and Democratic Services)

County Hall

Northallerton

Wednesday, 31 May 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

North Yorkshire County Council

Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 16th March, 2023 commencing at 10.00 am at Harrogate Civic Centre.

Present: County Councillor Pat Marsh in the Chair, and County Councillors Chris Aldred, Philip Broadbank, Sam Gibbs, Hannah Gostlow, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Peter Lacey, John Mann, Mike Schofield, Monika Slater, Matt Walker, Arnold Warneken and Robert Windass.

Officers present: Mellisa Burnham, Liz Meade, John McGivern, Julia Lumley, Charles Casey, Mark Codman and Ruth Gladstone.

Other Attendees: Sarah Robinson (Corporate Affairs Advisor at Yorkshire water). Seven members of the public.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

33 Minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2022.

Resolved –

- (a) That the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2022, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

34 Declarations of Interest

County Councillor Sam Gibbs referred to item 8 on the agenda and declared that he was a trustee of Harrogate & District Community Action (HADCA) but that this was not considered a pecuniary interest and therefore he remained in the room to take part in the debate and vote. County Councillors Chris Aldred, Philip Broadbank, Hannah Gostlow, Paul Haslam, John Mann, Matt Walker, Robert Windass referred to item 4 on the agenda and declared that they were members of the ACC Planning Committee that would hear the application however this was not a pecuniary interest and therefore they would remain in the room for the debate and vote.

County Councillors Pat Marsh and Monika Slater also referred to item 4 on the agenda and declared that they were members of the ACC Planning Committee that would hear the application and would therefore leave the room for the debate and the vote.

Councillor Pat Marsh also declared an interest regarding item 4 on the agenda as she was a member of the Oatlands road safety and active travel campaign but as this was not a pecuniary interest she remained in the meeting for the debate and the vote.

Ruth Gladstone then delivered the following statement from Catriona Gatrell, NYCC's Head of Legal Corporate Services, regarding the Members declarations and the statement on the planned development of the Rotary Woods:

"Members will be probably aware that the statement touches on a planning matter which may ultimately come to the Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Planning Committee. Members of this Committee who sit on that Planning Committee or could be asked to be a substitute need to be alert to the issues of predetermination/ bias.

Staying to listen to the discussion on the statement or taking part in the discussion on the statement does not in itself amount to predetermination/bias, nor would it preclude Members of the Planning Committee (or substitutes) from participating in a planning decision in the future provided that they have not already reached a decision on the way they would vote at any future Planning Committee.

Members are reminded that they may be predisposed to a particular view, but in order to be able to take part in any future planning committee decision they need to maintain an open mind and avoid expressing views in relation to the issue which could be perceived as predetermined/ biased.

It is open to Members to withdraw or not take part in the discussion should they prefer, but they do not have to do so providing they act in line with the advice given."

35 Public Questions or Statements

Two notices had been received of statements from members of the public to be put before the committee at the meeting.

Proposed Development at Rotary Woods by Danone/Harrogate Spring Water:

Sarah Gibbs made the following statement to the Committee: "It's infuriating that we need to quote 'legal' reasons, material planning issues and policy, for our desire to save our green spaces to be seriously considered by those who represent us. Having finally recognised the state of emergency of the planet's climate, it has become more obvious that nature does not care for our laws, policies, or planning issues. Written and spoken words to reduce carbon will not matter without action, because nature *will* act. The climate will continue to worsen, unless we *act*, and we must act *now*. For what we do now is all that matters. It determines our future, just as the actions of others' years before determined the present day. Actions like planting a 4-acre woodland 18 years ago to help minimise the negative ecological impacts of what was then known as climate change. That action gave us an ACV area, a space for our emotional well-being, a nature corridor, biodiversity, a place for priority species, carbon sequestration. What is the sense of destroying past efforts that are at an optimal stage of carbon sequestration *now*? What those before us chose to do then, helped us to have a healthier present. What we choose to do *now*, will determine our future, our children's future, and the future of the planet. 'Compensation' is one of those words that nature doesn't care about. You cannot compensate such a loss, especially when the reason would result in more CO2 emissions, methane, ethylene, plastic pollution, water extraction, deforestation, fragmentation and biodiversity loss.

The laws of nature should take precedent.

In this case, this development is not in line with material planning issues: AVC Public Access; HBC policies: Carbon Reduction Strategy (11.04.2022): pg.3 Summary Paragraph 3, pg.4 Strategic Theme 3, Strategic Theme 5, pg.5 Part 1. Introduction: Summary, 1.1, Snapshots from 2038: 'The district...restored.', pg.6 and pg.7 1.2 The Need for Action; Biodiversity Action Plan (12.2012): pg.9, 5.4, pg.11 'Environmental education:...Young people also need to become stakeholders in the BAP process – understanding and taking responsibility for wildlife'; Harrogate BAP Action Programme: pg.104 FW-T1, pg.113 B-T4, B-A1, B-A7; Harrogate Action Plan Hedgerows; Habitat Action Plan Woodland: pg.33 Objectives, Introduction paragraph 3: 'Fragmentation of woodland is...a particular threat and protecting, expanding and linking existing woodland blocks is especially important for the conservation of biodiversity', pg.34 'Wet woodland', 'Broadleaved and mixed woodlands', pg.35 Local Priority Species: Dutch Rush (growing in Rotary Wood: documented); Species Action Plan Bats; Tree and Woodland Policy: pg.2, pg.9 Removal of Trees, Tree Planting, pg.10 Carbon Sequestration, pg.12 Trees and Development, pg.14 Planning applications involving trees: in line with BS5837:2012: Tree survey (sec 4.4), Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA sec 5.4), Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS sec 6.1), pg.15 Habitat and community use; NYCC draft Climate Change Strategy: 'Supporting Nature: Protect, enhance and link important nature sites and corridors...', NYCC Declaration of a 'Climate Emergency, 05.07.22; Government policies: Environment Act 2021, Part 6, 98 Biodiversity gain as condition of planning permission Schedule 14.

So, now's the time to act upon your words and honour what you say."

Ruth Gladstone (Principal Democratic Services Officer) read out the following response on behalf of Council: "Thank you chair you've allowed me to make a very brief comment back to Sarah Gibbs and that is that I believe members will wish to thank you very much indeed for making this statement and encourage you and indeed all members of the public who share your views to continue to pass your views to the council officers who are creating information on this planning application so that all comments can be taken into consideration when the planning application is determined".

County Councillor Mike Schofield (local Member) made a statement in support of the application.

Following the statement the Chair and Vice Chair returned to the room.

Request for 20mph speed limit and zone - Oatlands Road Safety and Active Travel Campaign

Hazel Peacock and Dr. Vicki Evans from the Oatlands road safety and active travel campaign made the following statement to the committee:

"Thank you chair and the committee for giving us the opportunity to read our statement. I am Hazel Peacock and this is Dr. Vicki Evans. We are from the Oatlands road safety and active travel campaign.

Road safety has been of particular concern from school leaders, parents and carers of school children and local residents in Oatlands and the wider Harrogate area for many years.

We want safer streets for the community and we are petitioning North Yorkshire County Council for a maximum speed of 20mph on roads in south and west Harrogate to improve road safety (shown in red on your maps).

This change is urgently needed to reduce road collisions, improve safety, reduce air pollution and create a better environment for walking, wheeling, and cycling to the schools, shops, workplaces and local amenities in our community.

Recent collisions have resulted in the serious injury of children walking to and from school while on pavements; one at Beechwood Grove in January resulting in the hospitalisation of a child and the second on the 2nd February on Yew Tree Lane causing the severe and potentially life changing injury, of two teenagers.

These awful events combined with evidence showing that approximately 16 children are killed or seriously injured in road crashes every week on their way to or from school (ref: Public Health England 2018) demonstrate the case for immediate action.

Maximum speed limits of 20mph have been delivered in other rural and urban areas of Yorkshire and the UK including Calderdale, Cornwall, Oxford, Edinburgh, the Scottish Borders and London with positive effects.

In example, the Edinburgh change to 20mph limits in 2021 reduced road traffic casualties by 40 per cent (ref: Jepson R et al. Public Health Res 2022) and recent research from Transport for London (TfL) shows people hit by a vehicle at 20mph are around five times less likely to be killed than at 30mph (TfL February 2023). Both illustrate why urgent action is needed now to protect lives with a maximum speed of 20mph.

Our proposal complements and is dovetailed with the initiative by Pannal Ash Safe Streets, also calling for 20mph. Together we have established a group who give their support, including national education leader Richard Sheriff OBE and Head teachers from all of the 9 schools in the area and by members here today Councillors Marsh, Mann and Schofield.

With 9,000 plus children and young people travelling to the schools, colleges and early years settings in south and west Harrogate, and the Pannal Ash area each school day, implementing a maximum speed of 20mph has the potential to save the lives of children, young people and the wider community and make a significant and positive impact.

We really hope you can consider our proposal for the benefit and safety of the children and young people of Harrogate.

Thank you for listening".

The Chair invited Melissa Burnham, the area Highways Manager for North Yorkshire County Council, to address the point raised in the statement: It was confirmed that NYCC had attended the first meeting with the Oatlands road safety and active travel campaign group over a month ago and will be having another meeting next week with the North Yorkshire County Council Highway officers. The council is aware of the proposals and are engaging with the group proactively on these issues.

Councillor Chris Aldred asked MB what the process was to request 20 mph zones. MB responded that a petition needed to be formally submitted on such an issue but in this case

the petition had not yet been formally submitted. Consideration would include speed set, volume of traffic and the strategic overview for the area. The strategic impact was important because changes to one road could have significant impacts on others. Once a petition had been formally received the Council would review the request on the basis of its policy framework and consider the wider strategic effect on that particular area. Councillor Aldred asked about the petition for a 20mph zone in the Pannal Ash area that the Committee had voted on at a previous meeting. MB responded that the Council were assessing both the Oatlands and Pannal Ash areas as a combined project.

Councillor Arnold Warneken asked whether it had been considered that imposing 20mph areas without including all side roads would potentially create rat runs. MB responded that this would be considered as part of the strategic assessment of any area. Councillors Mike Scholfield and John Mann expressed their support of the proposals with Councillor Mann stating that he had also asked for Yew tree Lane, Green Lane, Hoxton Road and Beachwood Grove to be considered for 20mph zones.

36 Active Travel Update

Considered: A presentation by Melissa Burham (Area Manager of Highways) concerning the Active Travel Plan for North Yorkshire. MB identified the benefits to residents of walking, using bus routes and cycling to both the environment and health and wellbeing. MB advised the Committee that Active Travel Fund 4 was announced on the 6 of February this year and local authorities were invited to submit bids to identify active travel schemes that would help uptake active travel day trips. Of the £2 billion scheme announced by the Government NYCC's indicative allocation was around £1 million. The Council was in the process of deciding which schemes could be rolled out immediately given the tight timescales involved to use this money. Funding was expected to be announced on the 17 March and the schemes put forward in order of priority were:

- Victoria Avenue – At detailed design stage for a cycling route, public realm route and pedestrian crossing improvements either side of Victoria Avenue. This has additional benefit as it links into the transforming City proposals as well so the Town Centre.
- Darlington Road in Richmond – the proposals were for a key cycle link and the provision of a 20 mph speed limit and improved crossings outside the secondary school
- A59 Maple Close – a cycle route between Mother Shiptons Cave and the Golf Course – an offroad cycle and pedestrian route

MB responded to questions from Members:

- Cllr John Mann identified that improvements to the A61 Leeds Road Corridor could alleviate the significant congestion that occurs on that road at rush hour
- Cllr Paul Haslam asked that if the Otley Road improvements were no longer going ahead could that money be used to make smaller improvements around the District, examples would include better signage to alert road users to the Green Way or Beryl Burton cycles routes. MB advised that the Council could look at small wins in this way but money earmarked for the Otley Road corridor had to be spent in that location.

- MB explained that when assessing all schemes the air quality management was an assessment criteria– there were aspirations to make quick wins in this area and they were consulting the HBC Environmental Team on this issue
- In response to a question from Cllr Monika Slater regarding the requirements of the capability assessment part of the funding application MB agreed to provide further information.
- In response to a question about the indicative allocation of £1.8M it was confirmed that at this point it was indicative and that the actual funding allocation could be significantly different from this – depending on how much was awarded the Council would make further considerations on how that money was spent
- Cllr Haslam emphasised the importance of KPIs when implementing schemes that could include improvements to numbers and targets, for example the number of cars removed from the road as a result, etc.
- In response to questions about the involvement of local Councillors MB confirmed that local Members were to be consulted on plans at the next stage – this would include a walk around of appropriate areas.

In response to comments and questions about the overall coordination of planned schemes MB confirmed that the Council had launched the Strategic project map in late 2022 and this illustrated the relationship between each of the schemes, particularly to members of the public.

The Chair thanked MB and the Oatlands road safety and active travel campaign for their presentation and attendance at the meeting

Resolved –

That the report on the Active Travel Plan in the Harrogate and Knaresborough constituency area be noted.

37 Yorkshire Water - Management of Combined Sewer Overflows and Nidd Assets

Considered: A presentation by Sarah Robinson Corporate Affairs Advisor at Yorkshire water who delivered a presentation on the River Nidd Investment and YW's assets along the river Nidd and plans to improve the river health with a focus on the environment and public use of the water for activities such as swimming. The presentation was followed by questions from the Members:

Cllr Haslam requested that the notes from the discussion be forwarded to Yorkshire Water so that Members points could be followed up, this was agreed. The following points were raised:

- The actions taken by YW to prevent water getting into the system
- The indicators of volume of water such as KPI's
- Where there is/has been an overflow the potential for warning signs to be erected
- liaison with developers about preventive measures such as water butts on new housing
- Bilton Beck measures

SR confirmed that Yorkshire Water were undertaking a lot of work and looking at prevention i.e. preventing or slowing water from reaching the river during a downpour, one of the most

effective ways was to install underground tanks. They were a statutory consultee on planning applications but was unable to compel development companies to take action such as putting water butts on every new home, it was currently investigating permeable paving in the Hull and Doncaster areas.

- Cllr Walker asked how biodiversity and environmental impact were included within cost/benefit analysis
- Cllr Gostlow – Suggested that the Committee receive regular updates on sewerage discharges and full update on improvements from YW. The following points were also raised:
 - What is the surge capacity of the network given the amount of development around the district
 - Is there a tipping point for the river Nidd?
 - What technology improvements and mitigations have been explored?
 - Is there an environmental fund within YW to utilise?
 - What are the flooding and tourist implications?
 - How long after an overflow is river water safe?
 - The Committee to attend a site visit to Bilton Treatment Works

SR confirmed that YW were taking steps to improve water quality such as using UV to lessen or eradicate chemicals. Many issues were outside of YWs remit such as plastic in the water – different issues were the responsibility of different organisations – if there was flooding from a burst bank this was the Environment Agencies responsibility but if it was a full road gully then it became the responsibility of the local Council. It was recognised that capacity was a joint responsibility between all agencies and SR would take back the comments made at the meeting.

- The £180M that YW had been granted for improvements was still subject to approval/allocation and was part of an intensive cost-benefit analysis
- Sarah confirmed that YW were working in partnership with Nidderdale AONB through Beyond Nature and through this Farmers in Nidderdale were being offered incentives to take up greener farming methods
- The ‘near live’ monitoring system, planned for rollout in April 2024, meant people would be able to check whether there had been a discharge within an hour of the event – the alerts would remain on the website for 48 hours enabling members of the public enough time to check before going to the river
- YW considered certain areas ‘high priority’ this was a government designation and related to areas where there was likely to be a high degree of environmental impact
- YW had not paid dividends to its shareholders for the last seven years and would not be paying any during the rollout of AMP4 – it was anticipated this would continue for a few years after that as well
- SR agreed to take back the points and questions raised at the meeting

The Chair thanked SR for the presentation and attendance at the meeting

Resolved –

That the report on the Yorkshire Water CSO Management Plan in the Harrogate and Knaresborough constituency area be noted.

38 Bathing Water Quality - Knaresborough Lido

Councillor Hannah Gostlow confirmed there was no further action relating to the minutes of the last meeting of the group.

Councillor Monika Slater wanted to highlight that the last meeting had generated a lot of community support – around 70 members of the public had attended the meeting and there was a lively discussion around where the different groups were at the moment. Leeds University were conducting sampling for E-Coli and Bilton Conservation Group were starting to support similar testing but this would require funding support. All the tests run had come back positive for E-Coli and testing was going to be stepped up from 1/month to fortnightly. MP Andrew Jones was heading up a bathing water status campaign that would require some volunteers.

The Group was currently planning its next steps and was particularly keen to look at the issue of plastic in the water.

39 Stronger Communities Update

Considered: A presentation by Liz Meade - Stronger Communities Delivery Manager who presented the annual report that detailed the work of the Stronger Communities team over the last year. The report explained that The work of the Community Support Organisations (CSOs) had shifted focus in 2022/23, moving from pandemic response to recovery. Instead of supporting people who were self-isolating or shielding, their efforts had been on building confidence and independence and were helping to remove some of the dependencies that emerged during the pandemic. This had included activities such as supported shopping trips, accompanied walks, social events and support groups and activities. The report further covered the funding and future opportunities for the CSOs.

- Members wanted to congratulate the team on their fantastic work supporting people
- Members expressed concern that there was a potential deficit when it came to supporting the local community in Harrogate during the local government reorganisation and until the new Harrogate Town Council was formed – Liz explained that the Stronger Communities Team will continue to work with organizations in the Harrogate urban area and provide support for those in need. Liz explained that the team were developing a Community Anchor Model to provide support in 30 key areas across the County – this was a plan that would develop over the next three years

It was suggested that a time limited working group be set up to agree terms of reference for work to address any deficit in support for Community and Voluntary sector support in Harrogate prior to the establishment of a Harrogate Town Council. It was agreed that Cllrs Peter Lacey and Sam Gibbs bring a proposal to the Committee after 1 April 2023.

During the discussion Councillor Peter Lacey declared an interest in the item as he was the co-founder and chair of Knaresborough Connectors.

The Chair thanked LM for the presentation and attendance at the meeting.

Resolved –

That the report on the Stronger Communities Update for the Harrogate and Knaresborough constituency area be noted.

40 Harrogate Destination Management Organisation - Achievements During First Year

Considered: A presentation by John McGivern Destination Events Manager and Julia Lumley Place Marketing Manager who delivered a presentation on the DMOs Destination Harrogate work over the last year. The presentation detailed the work of the DMO, the Destination Management Plan, delivery of the Inward Investment Plan. The DMO's current strategy ran from 2022-25 but its ultimate ambition was that by 2030 the Harrogate District visitor economy would have accelerated its position as a substantial driver of sustainable economic growth. Its unique position as an event's destination embedded within a heritage spa Town continues to attract domestic and international visitors to the region. The result would be thriving local businesses, inward investment, job creation and a vibrant way of life for our residents. The presentation went on to outline the events that had been held over the last year and some of the planned events to be held over the next 12 months.

During discussion:

- Members highlighted the increased length of stay from 3.3 to 3.5 days but questioned how this would be affected if the HCC was not redeveloped as had been planned – JM confirmed that the HCC could answer this more fully but he explained that HCC had a direct effect on the accommodation side of the tourism in Harrogate, particularly helping during the quieter months
- Members also discussed the environmental impact of tourism in within the District – JM explained that sustainable tourism was an important part of the Destination Harrogate plan, the team were considering how people travelled to the District, how they got about when they were here and the overall carbon footprint of events – this was something the team were looking more at now they were entering year 2 of the DMO.
- Members considered the DMO's connection to other places within the District such as Knaresborough – Julia explained that any businesses could take part in the scheme so it was key to expand the message to all smaller and independent businesses – there was no specific performance data for individual places within the District – the data that the team had were averages about performance across the whole District
- In response to a question Julia explained that there were several DMO's across the County but the two leading 'attack brand' areas were Harrogate and Scarborough
- Members praised the most recent Christmas market but asked if there were any plans to extend the time that the market was open as this had been requested by members of the public – JM explained that the team were investigating the possibility of having the market run for longer in 2023 but they were keen to assess the response from local businesses and partners before confirming the final programme.

The Chair thanked JM and JL for the presentation and attendance at the meeting.

Resolved –

That the report on the Harrogate Destination Management Organisation – Achievements During First Year for the Harrogate and Knaresborough constituency area be noted.

41 Update from the Climate Sub Group

Councillor Arnold Warneken confirmed there was no further business from the previous meeting.

- The Committee assured that Councillor Warneken was welcome to attend future meetings of the Climate Sub Group and contribute his detailed knowledge on the subjects discussed, albeit not as a voting Member of the Committee.

42 Committee Work Programme

Councillor Chris Aldred suggested that attendance by local representatives from NYP be invited to a future meeting to provide local continuity from the existing district council to the Committee. This would also fulfil the crime and disorder terms of reference for the Committee in the new Council.

Resolved –

(a) That the Work Programme be approved, subject to:-

- (i) Melissa Burnham confirmed further Active Travel reports to be brought to the Committee at a later date (TBC)
- (ii) Councillors Peters Lacey and Sam Gibbs bring a proposal to the June meeting about potential terms of reference for work to address any deficit in support for Community and Voluntary sector support in Harrogate prior to the establishment of a Harrogate Town Council.
- (iii) Attendance by local NYP representatives

North Yorkshire Council

Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at Harrogate Civic Centre on Friday 5 May 2023 commencing at 10.00am.

Present: Councillor Pat Marsh in the Chair, and Councillors Chris Aldred, Philip Broadbank, Sam Gibbs, Hannah Gostlow, Michael Harrison, Paul Haslam, Peter Lacey, John Mann, Mike Schofield, Monika Slater, Matt Walker and Robert Windass.

In attendance: Councillor Keane Duncan, Executive Member for Highways and Transportation, and Councillor Arnold Warneken

Officers present: Mark Codman, Charles Casey, Karl Battersby, Richard Binks, Barrie Mason, Matt Roberts, Tania Weston,

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

1 Apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. There were no apologies.

2 Declarations of interest

Councillor Michael Harrison declared an interest regarding minute no. 4 on the basis that he was a member of North Yorkshire Council's Executive which was to be the decision making body. This was not considered a pecuniary interest and therefore he remained in the room for the debate and vote.

Councillor Philip Broadbank declared an interest regarding minute no 4 on the basis that he was a member of the Harrogate Civic Society. This was not considered a pecuniary interest and therefore he remained in the room for the debate and vote.

Councillor Chris Aldred declared an interest regarding minute no 4 on the basis that he was a member of the Harrogate Cycling Forum*. This was not considered a pecuniary interest and therefore he remained in the room for the debate and vote.

* 08.05.23 - Councillor Aldred requested an amendment to reflect he was actually a member of the Harrogate District Cycle Action Group

Councillor Matt Walker declared an interest regarding minute no 4 on the basis that he was a member of Open Country and that he was Vice-Chair of the Harrogate and Knaresborough Liberal Democrat Group. These were not considered pecuniary interests and therefore he remained in the room for the debate and vote.

3 Public Questions and Statements

Thirteen notices had been received of statements and/or questions from members of the public to be put before the committee at the meeting.

The following public statement was read out by Kevin Douglas:

From Harrogate District Cycle Action and Open Country

We ask Councillors to support the Harrogate Station Gateway project for six main reasons which I will now outline.

1) It will improve the town centre as a place for people

The town centre will become a more pleasant place for people, and make them want to stay longer to eat, drink and shop.

2) Harrogate should benefit from the opportunity of this investment not reject it

Harrogate stands to benefit from an investment of £10.9 million. If we reject it now the money will be spent somewhere else – not in Harrogate or the District as a whole.

It will also almost certainly put in doubt the opportunity for future funding bids to be successful, therefore impacting upon the securing of further external funding.

3) Station Gateway will be good for town centre businesses

All the evidence shows that public realm improvements and active travel infrastructure lead to higher spending.

4) Responding to the 2019 Congestion Survey

In 2019, 77% of 15,500 respondents to the Harrogate Congestion Survey asked for better cycling and walking infrastructure. The Station Gateway projects shows a commitment to putting in place a hub on which to build that cycling and walking infrastructure.

5) Station Gateway will improve active travel facilities

66% of people say that it's too dangerous for them to cycle in traffic. To make cycling an option for all, including children, we need dedicated cycle tracks.

There are planned improvements for those on foot too. Of course people can continue to drive into town if they prefer.

The status quo does not represent a town centre accessible to all; Station Gateway will begin the process of changing that.

6) The Climate

Transport represents 28% of North Yorkshire's greenhouse gas emissions.

The Routemap to Carbon Negative for the York & North Yorkshire region recognises the need to:

- Reduce vehicle miles and
- Increase active travel

To do that, we need to enable active travel through better infrastructure. The Station Gateway project is a platform to begin to provide that infrastructure.

Without positive action North Yorkshire will not achieve its climate goals.

Summary

For these six reasons, we ask Councillors to support Harrogate Station Gateway. Please show your commitment to improving our active travel facilities, and to securing the future prosperity of Harrogate and its town centre

The following public question was read out by Sue Savill of Party Fever Ltd:

We've been situated on Station Parade since 2011. We are a party supplies shop and we provide a balloon decorating service. Customers either collect balloon orders or we deliver locally. We also provided large installations for corporate clients.

There's a good mix of other businesses on our street too, offering services to clients who may not be particularly mobile, hairdressers, a long-established shoe shop whose client base is 50+ and a physiotherapist, to name a few.

For the businesses situated on the east side of Lower Station Parade, who have NO access to the rear of their properties how does the council propose, if you take away our vehicular access at the front of our premises by introducing both a bus lane and a cycle lane, we should

1. Receive deliveries (which in our case involves heavy industrial-sized gas cylinders and palletised deliveries).
2. Load our own vehicles to do off-site contracts.
3. Allow customers ease of access to our services
4. Carry out maintenance to our property.

The provision of 3 parking spaces/1 disabled on the west side of the street is not enough for the businesses whose customers require ease of access due to convenience or lack of mobility.

And the 2 loading bays on the opposite side are impractical and unsafe.

I think the bus lane is unnecessary for the number of busses that pass along our road and nothing is to be gained by introducing one. If all these proposed changes are to add nothing but one minute to a typical car journey around town. What difference will a 66-metre stretch of bus lane make to the efficiency of a bus route?

If, despite new laws in favour of cyclists, the cycle lane has to be introduced then reduce the width of the wide pavements on both sides and situate the cycle lane on the West side, where businesses have access to the rear and leave ALL the parking in place.

Rather than restricting vehicular access, I think the aim should be to encourage a move to electric vehicles.

It has been stated that this is a transport project aimed to rebalance travel and promote other transport options.

However, if this goes ahead it will make shopping in Harrogate **more** difficult and the cost to local businesses will be devastating. It will result in less of a town centre for anyone to visit and the bus lanes and 'attractive corridors and welcome' will be pointless and redundant!

Richard Binks confirmed that the project team would work with concerned businesses with regards parking and loading areas. He explained that the

assessment had demonstrated that a bus lane was viable but the lane was to be truncated and there would be similar loading and customer parking option, i.e. 30 minute drop off, as there was currently.

The following public question was read out by Andrew Brown for the Harrogate Civic Society:

Harrogate Civic Society has over 300 members and these comments are the result of an open meeting of the members and detailed consideration of the proposal by the Planning and Development sub-group of the Society.

Whilst the Society recognises that some changes could enhance the town centre, the present proposal focus on a relatively small section and there is no indication of these being part of a longer-term, integrated traffic policy. Without long-term planning these changes may, in the future, be seen as having been unnecessary and/or detrimental. In particular, the Society is concerned that reducing the main south-bound route through the town centre to a single lane will result in significant tailbacks, increased pollution, and, potentially, grid-lock.

The proposal appears to have been driven by an imperative to introduce cycle lanes wherever possible (even when they will be of little use) with limited, if any, consideration being given to the way that pedestrians, the users of mobility scooters, and disabled drivers move around the area. The Society considers that the proposed cycle lanes, accelerating traffic after the single carriageway section, and the additional street furniture, will hamper their movement.

The proposals relating to the northern section of Station Parade are welcomed but the suggested cycle lanes along the remainder of Station Parade are fragmented and confusing; as a result, they will not result in safe, attractive routes for cyclists. The Society considers that the previous proposals for extensive cycle lanes along East Parade represent a much better option.

The widening of the pavements along James Street and the introduction of trees is welcomed but the Society would strongly prefer James Street to remain open to vehicular traffic and to provide on-street parking at all times. In relation to the detailed design for James Street, there is concern about the introduction of low-level planting, which will be vulnerable to damage.

The Society is concerned that the detailed design of the proposal will result in a clutter of signs, barriers, and other street furniture, plus a variety of surface treatments, that will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Also, the need for major change to Station Square is questioned. The principal problems with this space relate to inadequate maintenance and poor collection of litter (problems that we suspect will remain however much money is spent on re-design). The proposed introduction of water jets suggests that the designers have failed to understand that for much of the day, the relevant section of the Square is in shadow.

As a result of all the above, the Society considers that the proposals will be detrimental for many users of the town centre and will result in serious damage to the character and appearance of the Harrogate Conservation Area.

The following public question was read out by William Woods of William Woods and Independent Harrogate:

I am William Woods representing 156 businesses called Independent Harrogate. The Station Gateway scheme is very well intentioned to encourage people out of cars to walk or cycle thus reducing congestion and pollution but I strongly believe this is the wrong scheme at the wrong time.

Like most town and city centres Harrogate is struggling to recover from COVID, the impact of Brexit and the challenges of on line shopping. The last thing businesses want now is 12 months or more disruption of the town being turned into a building site. This disruption will be hugely damaging and undoubtedly tip many over the edge.

On September 13th 2021 The Chamber of Commerce, The BID and Independent Harrogate conducted a comprehensive survey of nearly 900 businesses which showed emphatically they were against the scheme.

Those against were: The Chamber of Commerce -The BID -Independent Harrogate - The Harrogate Residents Association (over 1000 members) The Harrogate Civic Society, Granville Road Residents Group(over 300 members) and finally The British Independent Retail Association, a national organisation, representing over 3000 retailers across the country. You must ask yourselves "can all these important groups be wrong"?

There are two very successful businessmen in Harrogate who have a considerable stake in the town centre. They are prepared to spend over 1/2 million pounds opposing this scheme because they believe it would be hugely damaging to the town and its future. You have to ask if the scheme is such a good idea why would they waste their money and not fully support it.

How many of you have read the Economic assessment report cobbled together to try to justify the scheme and say it would boost the economy - the conclusions are dubious at best. Key businesses in the town do not believe for one moment cycling and walking will increase business by 30%. The vast majority of businesses rely on 60-70% of customers coming from all over the country by car, so they need easy access to the town and easy places to park including on street parking.

Consultation has been poor - zoom meetings are limited especially when you can only ask questions by typing them out. For something that impacts on the town so seriously why has there not been a public meeting so everyone can air their views. The Chamber of Commerce organised an open meeting when Don Mackenzie and others spoke - about 100 attended and a vote produced only 2 in favour.

What upsets us is that all the business groups have made alternative suggestions and amendments to improve the scheme but they have been totally ignored apart from one or two minor adjustments.

If NYCC is serious about reducing congestion and pollution they need to address the queues of traffic coming into Harrogate daily especially on Wetherby Road. The 11 million pounds spent on the Gateway Scheme will do nothing to solve this significant problem.

There has been three consultations and three times people have voted against the scheme. The significant stake holders in the town have shown they are against the scheme but still NYCC is trying to force this harmful scheme upon us - how is that democratic?

It is not WSP, County Councillors scattered across North Yorkshire or their officers that live as far away as Rotherham that will have to live with this detrimental scheme.

It is the residents and the business communities who live in the district that will have to suffer the consequences.

I firmly believe you have never had to make a more important decision as Councillors. If you really care about Harrogate and its future wellbeing you must reject this scheme and look at other options.

The following public question was read out by J M d’Arcy Thompson, Chair of the Stray Defence Association:

What this project will create is a road to nowhere, achieving nothing. Not a Gateway but a Portcullis slamming down on the main A road, restricting Harrogate’s centre for emergency vehicles, commerce and those who drive in order to work. Hindering not only Harrogate folk but those from outlying villages.

The scheme is based on the overriding premise of the May 2021 WSP report ‘Transforming Cities fund- Harrogate Gateway’.

Which starts: ‘Need for the proposed scheme POINT 1’ ...’*Harrogate has no dedicated cycle route which connects with the front of Harrogate Railway Station to the Bus Station, resulting in fewer opportunities for sustainable modal transfer*’.

As the walk between them is merely 20 paces, is a cycleway *really* required? £11. Million + seems very costly for such a distance, even with supposed improvements *to the public realm*.

Surely people arriving by bus or train will, as always ...dissipate and depart to where they want to be, not lingering outside but heading for their Harrogate destination?

Construction itself will create pollution, havoc and significantly increased congestion, creating a narrow corridor, decimating and dividing the town, and blighting it’s centre.

How are less able people on the Western Arc going to access the other side of Harrogate?

Closing roads between West Park and Station Parade means a lengthy, convoluted route will be needed to get from one side of the town to the other.

Many people already choose to walk and cycle when it is possible and conducive to do so. However, this is not Holland but hilly and often chilly Harrogate.

Realistically who is going to walk or cycle at night or in bad weather, to either shop, visit a professional business, go the theatre, cinema or a restaurant?

Gateway will remove freedom and flexibility from residents and others throughout the district *whilst* discriminating against the elderly and disabled. It will accelerate use of internet shopping, creating a doughnut effect, with accessible companies only on the outskirts, while a large hole, empty of businesses, shops, recreation... is left in the centre.

Harrogate & Knaresborough host the secondary schools and much congestion is created by parents driving children long distances in and out of town and nearby villages. Wouldn’t better use of Government funding be a fleet of electric school minibuses to collect and return children, thereby removing many private cars from rush hour roads?

Harrogate does not have a university, or factory based industry which might warrant extra cycleways. What we *do* have is a largely intelligent, conscientious population, aware of, and very much engaged with, the need to protect the planet. The integrity of Harrogate's many excellent green credentials must be safeguarded.

Bordered by the Yorkshire Showground, and Harlow Carr's gardens, within the town are 18 parks, the largest being the Valley Gardens.

Harrogate has several notable woods. The Pinewoods connect Harlow Carr to the Valley Gardens, providing a much used green corridor to the town. Another, from the Showground to the Stray, is Hookstone Wood.

At the centre of all of this is our wonderful Stray, open grassland with over 2000 mature trees, free for the use of all. Two hundred acres of what is arguably Harrogate's greatest environmental resource. A much loved, *well walked*, and *run*, enormously beneficial green lung wrapped, quite literally, around the very centre of Harrogate.

Gateway would isolate the crucial hub of Harrogate from so many. Please, do not bring down the portcullis and tear the heart out of Harrogate.

N.B. Ref: May 2021 WSP TCF-WSP-NYC-16X-RP-LE-EIASCR-P01 report 'Transforming Cities fund- Harrogate Gateway'.

The following public statement was read out by Caroline Bayliss:

This project was originally designed in 2016, before Covid and before the vast increase in on-line shopping. The town centre landscape going forward suggests a totally different future.

For the tourism offer in this town shopping is a vital ingredient and its uniqueness is essential to its success. Visitors come for the specialist independent shops, the wonderful ironwork facades, the amazing cafes all set in a sea of greenery which is our Stray and our wonderful Victorian flower beds.

The Gateway Plan though seemingly unobjectionable is bland and could be found in Peterborough, Milton Keynes or Croydon. There is nothing unique about it.

A totally new plan of how the town centre is going to be used for the next twenty years needs working on before £11 million of our money is spent on a scheme that finds little favour with residents, solves so few problems, adds to congestion and does nothing to beautify the town that we love,

Rather it takes away yet more of our distinct character to be replaced by concrete. Please think again?

The following public statement was read out by Barry Adams of Harrogate Resident's Association Member:

Harrogate is not against change but the meaningless Gateway Project is one that NYC seem determined to champion at all cost. Is this because they secured funding before the idea was thoroughly explored in detail? As with the doomed Otley Road cycleway all for the sake of doing something.

The Highways Executive has a history of ignoring the democratic process; not listening and dismissive of public comment, hiding behind a meaningless excess of words in press releases. A publicity exercise massaged to justify the Project but with a hint of desperation as threats emerge of funding being moved elsewhere. Businesses and residents understand what is at the heart of the town far better than those on the Executive representing disparate constituencies across the new County.

Public consultation has been poor. Wording of surveys steer you in a particular direction. Results can be deceptive. Clearly demonstrated in consultations, even prior to the Gateway Project. It has relied on Consultant's irrelevant and questionable data relating to much larger towns with a totally different demographic.

It will not solve congestion in Harrogate – a problem generated by ever increasing levels of traffic in and out of as well as through the town. It is not an inclusive vision delivering a balanced and green approach to travel for all road users. No inclusion of high quality sustainable public transport links. What is required is an holistic Masterplan for Harrogate that looks at all factors and influences to form a solid basis for future co-ordinated projects. No 'Pocket Planning' which the Gateway Project is.

We do care what the millions are spent on so why all this public realm expenditure if it doesn't amount to real improvements. It is a vanity project, blinkered and contrived. Unfortunately a Highway Engineer's led solution not capable of celebrating this as an exemplary and attractive Gateway to the town. And I say that as an award winning Architect, albeit now retired.

We need clear leadership on the design side - an experienced Urban Designer capable of bringing together all stakeholders and co-ordinating professional disciplines to deliver a considered solution through a highly motivated Design Team knowledgeable of the town, capable of engaging in original, imaginative but structured thinking. After all, would you go to an eye consultant for brain surgery? Then we need ongoing maintenance – something which has been missing over the last decade or more.

Consider, what has made the town successful in the past. We are getting nothing more than a "desktop" design because of this lack of awareness from those with limited understanding of Harrogate, it's character and the largely cohesive Conservation Area it sits in. The proposals must clearly say "This is Harrogate" - not Leeds, not York or any other place. The DNA of these is so different.

The Gateway Project will do far more harm than good. No guarantee of success. Obsessed with "changing travel patterns and behaviours" to the detriment of much broader concerns. Businesses and residents are vehemently against it. We therefore ask you to make the sensible and important decision not to support the Gateway Project.

There is an alternative

The following public statement was read out by Veronica Adams:

When Malcolm Neesam passed away last year Harrogate lost a brilliant and highly respected citizen of this town. Unfailingly polite, an often reserved person but one who was deeply committed to the idea of civic pride. Knowledgeable on every aspect of Harrogate's history and heritage, willing to share this through his many books, writings and columns that were published on a regular basis, often using these columns in the local media to express his concerns.

It is only within the last week or so that a good friend of Malcolm's came across some of his thoughts expressed in writing, not long before he passed away and obviously wished to share. He was clearly not impressed with the direction Harrogate was moving in and in light of the Gateway Project I would like to share his thoughts with you to reflect on.

"At all the peaks of Harrogate's past successes, the authorities not only had a clear vision for what the town could become, but also managed to fire the community with an understanding of what the vision was and how their enthusiastic support could convert that vision into profitable reality for the benefit of the entire community. Let us, for the moment, discard all the fashionable rubbish about goals, targets, objectives and policy statements, which can be so much verbal fudge for doing nothing, and ask if today's Harrogate Council really knows what it wants Harrogate to become, and how it intends to invoke the aid of the population. And please, don't try to tell me that "consultation exercises" with biased questions that lead to pre-approved answers, have anything to do with a genuine council/populace spirit of mutual striving for the improvement of Harrogate. The scale and tone of recent correspondence to the Harrogate Advertiser is ample evidence to show the degree of public concern about the future of our community, so it is not only reasonable to ask the council what – in clear and basic English – is its vision for Harrogate?, but also to demand an answer. If this basic question cannot be answered, then the top leadership and administration should be replaced by one which is in possession of such a vision.

I suggest that Harrogate's past successes have arisen because the authorities and residents have been united in their efforts to provide the highest standards, the best facilities, and the most attractive amenities for whatever special, niche market they succeeded in attracting to Harrogate. Today, it is irrelevant whether that market is for the spa, exhibitions and conferences, festivals or tourism. It is here that I find the lack of clear vision for the town's future so alarming. Again, I ask of our council, what is your vision for our community?"

Malcolm concludes "I have written enough, so will end."

On behalf of Malcolm I would like to thank you for listening.

The following public statement was read out by Jemima Parker:

Good morning. I'd like start with a quiz question for you?

What do Sheffield, Wakefield, Huddersfield, Barnsley, Oxford, Cambridge, Bristol, London Kings Cross, have in common? The answer, if you haven't guessed already, is that these towns and cities have all invested in multi-million pound projects to improve their gateway for visitors arriving by train, limiting traffic and creating an attractive pedestrian environment. These are in local authorities, like North Yorkshire, that have made public climate emergency declarations, and they are actively striving to shape places that are conducive to low carbon living.

The project which you are being asked to endorse today seeks to add Harrogate to this list of forward-thinking, climate-crisis responsive places. These are places that have grasped the need to invert the transport pyramid and prioritise infrastructure for pedestrians and public transport users ahead of private car drivers.

At 49% of the district's emissions, carbon from transport in Harrogate and across North Yorkshire are higher than the UK average of 36%, and these are probably the

hardest area of emissions to tackle. While this scheme is predicted to bring only modest carbon reductions, it sits at the centre of wider sustainable transport opportunities for the town. The first few key pieces of a bigger jigsaw puzzle.

Of course there are transport elements to the climate change strategy, being developed by North Yorkshire Council at the moment, but you will be aware that there is at present, no budget to support these. The current approach to deliver the Council's net zero ambition is to bid for government pots of money, such as the Transforming Cities Fund. Whatever imperfections we may see in this Station Gateway scheme, it is a £10 million investment. Decarbonisation funds are not coming from anywhere else in the near future.

Throughout the consultation processes local public opinion has been split pretty much 50/50 for and against the scheme, so you will not please everyone whatever you decide. Can I suggest this leaves you free to take a long view of the best interests of the town, to grasp the vision of a low carbon future where shared and active travel complement a more attractive and less polluted Harrogate?

I urge you to follow the Officers recommendations and endorse the implementation of the scheme and recommend that the Executive approves the making of TROs.

The following public statement was read out by Dame Francine Holroyd JP:

Good morning Councillors, Guests and members of the public.

By way of introduction my name is Francine Holroyd and I am the very proud owner of a large number of properties in Princes Square and the Montpellier Quarter in Harrogate. I am also Chair of Governor's for Harrogate Ladies' College as well as being both an Adult and Youth Magistrate for over 18 years.

The Gateway Project is not the way forward for Harrogate, it does not deliver what our town needs in any shape, manner or form. For our town to thrive we need excellent infrastructure and yes that means good on-street parking allowing easy access to a good range of independent and chain stores. Walking, cycling, bus and rail services are not able to fully deliver this. The key to Harrogate's success is that it is unique, it is special and the plans we have seen are generic, soulless, lacking in character and without individuality, in fact it could be any town anywhere in the UK. Cars and taxis are essential for the elderly and disabled to enable them to have a good quality of life and I would say this Project is actively discriminating against them.

Let's be honest, when someone thinks about going for a day out shopping do they see travelling by bike as the answer? I don't know about you but getting hot and sticky cycling over Harrogate's hilly topography, which you must have to agree is unsuited to non-leisure cycling, then trying to try on clothes etc. and subsequently cycling home with a load of parcels just does not work. A lunch out with friends? Again, the same problem.

Yes, I agree we need to encourage more walking and cycling but not at the detriment of making our town centre unusable.

Now let's talk about the areas of Harrogate that are pedestrianised; Cambridge Street, Oxford Street, Beulah Street - can you honestly say that the pedestrianisation is successful and we can all look at the street scene with pride? You have to agree that the answer is a resounding NO - the street scene is dirty, the paving is damaged with pooling water, the materials used are poor quality and really need replacing, the

street furniture is tatty and most of the anti-social behaviour is conducted around these areas. If we continue to pedestrianise will this encourage the use of electric scooters and increase anti-social behaviour? I see the evidence weekly in Harrogate's Magistrates Court.

If Station Parade was reduced to one lane the traffic would back up all the way back to Ripley, it already backs up to Ripon Road frequently and there are two lanes. People would really think twice about visiting Harrogate at all. The Gateways Scheme also shows cycling both ways on Station Parade, that is just an accident waiting to happen. All of Harrogate's business groups, who after all represent businesses, have been totally ignored. Is that right?

Councillors, please see sense and reject the Gateway Project in its entirety. You need to work with local businesses and stakeholders on a scheme to enhance Harrogate for the future, I am sure that many business and property owners would be happy to help and I am one of them.

Thank you.

The following public statement was read out by Rachael Inchboard:

Residents are quite horrified after 3 consultation results against this scheme that it is still going ahead- where is democracy?

I have lived in the town centre on Granville Rd since 2001. Residents believe this scheme in its whole entirety, will have many negative impacts on our daily lives. Many who also run small businesses in and around the town which are just recovering them from the lockdowns.

- **The scheme proposes to redirect the town centre traffic from the A61, including large vehicles, to go onto residential areas-Cheltenham Mount (which is at the bottom of Granville Rd) and across Mount Parade (which is at the top of Granville Rd, a very narrow small road) or towards Bower Road creating some dangerous junctions near Commercial Street/Bower Rd and Strawberry Dale for pedestrians and vehicle traffic.**
- **Concerns include-** reduced **parking/ congestion/ noise/ air pollution/** visual intrusion/safety/health & wellbeing/ **Construction of the scheme will be over 1 year taking place during the night/ Access to our properties during this construction phase/ Traffic Data Modelling** Data and how this was worked out for an increased volume of traffic into the area onto small roads such as Mount Parade.
- **Residents have all raised individual and collective concerns. Even requesting for a Public Meeting, which was refused.**
- **As a Landscape Architect** I requested to see the **EIA- Environmental Impact Assessment** at the start. I was led to believe there was one- however, we discovered they never undertook this important process. Through a FOI request we found that English Heritage had requested one too. Due to the Conservation Area status of the town and where we live.
- **An EIA would have identified most of the resident's concerns at the start,** which would have held the scheme drivers to have some form of accountability as to what this project presented. Perhaps this is why it never got done and they kept quiet about this.
- **We have requested Air quality monitoring to get a baseline reading- this has been ignored and deemed unnecessary.** An EIA would have given an air quality baseline to work with. We later found out from the planners that the only

place they are conducting air quality monitoring is at the far end of Station Parade, beyond Waitrose.

- **The Beech Grove LTN, caused a similar redirection of traffic causing congestion** on Cold Bath Road area. Weston County Primary School managed to install an air monitor, the findings were worrying- the levels of air pollution were above the acceptable levels. Caused directly from this scheme- of re-directing large volumes of traffic which then caused congestion. Mirroring the proposed redirection of town traffic onto the residential area where we live.
- **Traffic Orders schedule 1/ Column 2 FOR Cheltenham Mount and LTN 1/20 - Local Transport Notes-provides guidance of traffic management issues for local authorities-when implementing new cycle infrastructure.**
- Should meet objectives set out the statement of reason- *“avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising”, or “facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any other class of traffic”*,
- **Therefore the ‘Traffic Order’ would be likely to increase congestion and cause problems for pedestrians.** Both from a safety perspective and air pollution from the higher volumes of traffic (estimated to be an extra 6 cars/per min equivalent to 360 cars per hour. Not to mention weekends, events in Harrogate and holiday periods of increasing traffic)
- **Pedestrians’ ability to cross any of our local roads** could be difficult for any type of pedestrian user.
- **The crossing of Cheltenham Parade our local pedestrian route into the town**, will also prove very difficult with the layout and configuration of the design. With three different lanes to negotiate when crossing- a cycle lane, bus lane and a car lane. Not only is that daunting there will be raised kerb type edging defining each lane.
- **A few issues to consider in this equation are-** the width of the road for three lanes- is this wide enough? What if a cyclist falls from their bike? Will they fall into the pedestrian or the bus lane?
- Re-cap Air quality/ congestion/safety/ Access/parking.
- Finally, the people who have imposed this scheme on Harrogate- do not live here. The Executive Committee that drove this scheme to go ahead, only one of the people lives in Harrogate.

The following public statement was read out by Martin Mann:

Many thanks for the opportunity to be involved in the discussion around the Harrogate Station Gateway.

- Harrogate District Chamber of Commerce has represented the views of the business in and around the town for over 125 years, and currently has a membership of 124 businesses ranging from sole traders to some of the largest employers in the town representing well over 3000 employees in the town.
- Whilst the Harrogate District Chamber (HDC) is broadly in favour of active travel, we cannot support this Gateway Project as it currently stands. We have received measurable feedback from our membership twice throughout the lifecycle of this proposal, and on both occasions our membership has come back with a resounding No to the project in its current format.
- We believe that although the project is well intentioned, it is badly timed and based upon out of date 2016 data which does not reflect the changes to retail over the last 8 years, nor does it take in to account the precarious position many businesses in town find themselves following Covid.

- A few figures from our members:
 - Are you in favour of the Station Gateway proposals, taking in to account the recent proposed changes? - 75% against
 - Will the Station Gateway proposals encourage you or your team to participate in more active travel? - 65% replied No.
 - How do you think the proposals will affect business in the town centre? - 60% replied 'Worse'
- Is your business located in Harrogate town centre? 48% replied Yes
- Active Travel projects have been heralded in both Cambridge and abroad in Holland, both flat cities, and both have a far younger demographic. Harrogate has an older population, and attracts an older visitor, very many of whom cannot or will not cycle, and if they feel that Harrogate is a cycle destination then they will spend time and money elsewhere.
- This project should be paused in its current form and brought back to the table once the data has been brought up to date, and a complete town plan has been developed, instead of the piecemeal approach currently being considered. It does nothing to encourage residents or visitors from the outlying villages to visit more, nor does it tackle the congestion on Skipton Road or Wetherby Road. A wider town plan should reconsider the need for Park & Rides – a missed opportunity in my opinion at the Dunlopillo site adjacent to Pannal railway station and the route of the 36 bus. And any future project must start with accessibility and improved safety for all, starting with those who may have limited mobility and work out from there. Similarly, the 'Northern Relief Road' was nothing more than a paper project designed to fail by the then NYCC. The Northern and Western Bypasses were identified as necessary in the 1980's should have been pursued more vehemently at the time, as we are now suffering the result of NYCC's failure to build infrastructure for the future.
- Harrogate deserves more, and we have been let down by the predecessors of North Yorkshire Council in a variety of ways. HBC and NYCC have failed to deliver on the Otley Road cycleway, only completing 1/3rd of the proposal, and only seeming to improve the junction from Otley Road to Harlow Moor Road and the Harrogate Spring Water site.
- Similarly, the pedestrianisation of Oxford Street and Cambridge Street have not achieved greater footfall, nor fewer shop closures, nor a safer environment throughout the day or night. Should pedestrianisation continue, there needs to be an acceptance by the new NYC that we need to use better quality street furniture, better quality materials, and have better governance over the utility companies that fail to repair the road surface after their works. The Station Gateway Project is by its very nature a 'low maintenance' public realm area and does nothing to create an attractive first impression for those few travellers arriving by train.
- It is widely believed that by businesses in the area that the narrow strip of land adjacent to the station carpark will be developed in to a tower block overshadowing Station Parade and the redeveloped public realm. Along with this, there is understood to be a major infrastructure project about to be started by Northern Powergrid which again will cause major disruption in the area. Given the co-ordination between NYC and City Fibre, I suspect the same failure to co-ordinate the works will be the same with this project.

This is not just a 12 month project to redevelop one area, this is the start of possibly 2-3 years of disruption for the benefit of a few and to the detriment to the future of our town, our residents, and our employers. Given the amount of money spent so far by the tax payers throughout North Yorkshire, isn't it time to stop wasting money on this project and focus on projects that will benefit everyone and not just a few?

The following public question was read out by Austin Leaver:

Can the NYC please categorically state that no financial charges will be brought to private vehicle owners due to the implementation of LTN'S, AQMA'S and CAZ'S in the Harrogate area in the future, with ANPR cameras being used for enforcement?

In response Richard Binks explained that low traffic neighbourhoods Air Quality Management areas and clean air zones our well-established tools so managing the impact of motorized traffic on the local environment and as such the Council may wish to utilize these measures in the future where there was an identified need. Any considerations relating to Associated matters such as Financial charging and Camera enforcement would be considered at that time.

4 Traffic Regulation Orders – Harrogate Transforming Cities Fund:

Considered -

The Report of the Corporate Director – Environment, Traffic Regulations Orders Transforming Cities Fund. Councillor Keane Duncan, Executive Member for Highways and Transportation and officers Richard Binks (Head of Major Projects and Infrastructure), Tania Weston (Transforming Cities Fund Programme Manager), and Matt Roberts (Economic & Regeneration Project Manager) undertook a joint presentation.

Councillor Duncan stated that the Executive was seeking the views of the Committee before making a decision. He explained that Harrogate was facing problems relating to congestion, air quality and road safety. There were challenges for town centre retail and Harrogate could do better on public transport, walking and cycling. The “status quo” was not sustainable and that the Gateway offered an opportunity although not perfect to transform the town centre, improve transport access, revitalise Harrogate as a destination and is a potential step to address the issues facing Harrogate at present and in the future. There are strong views both for and against demonstrated through the consultation and at the meeting with the public split down the middle. He emphasised the importance of the funding that had been secured and the ability to use it and that the council was seeking to find a way forward within the context of strict funding and deadline criteria set by government. There was limited time before the Executive decision on 30 May and this would be used to make a strong case with the benefit of the views from the meeting. There were a number of areas raised by members of the Committee already:

- The Odeon roundabout cycling infrastructure – Full details of the options considered will be provided and the design will be reviewed in advance of the meeting on 30 May.
- The wider sustainable and active travel infrastructure – Gateway includes significant public transport, walking and cycling improvements how does Gateway integrate effectively into the wider town? How the Gateway could be

a catalyst for further sustainable travel Improvement in the wider town will be set out by 30th of May, if it proceeds

- Congestion – The project proposes improvements to signals and Pelican Crossings in the immediate area to ensure better coordination but what about the impact impacts on the wider area. The actual Gateway project is fixed however cannot be looked at isolation. By 30th of May it will be outlined how the review of the Junctions immediately before the Gateway area along the Ripon Road and on King's Road will be undertaken. There will be a commitment of funds from existing budgets to look at feasibility works and a report could be brought forward to the ACC as soon as possible.

Councillor Duncan confirmed that he wanted to work with the Committee prior to the Executive meeting and that all comments from members would be considered prior to the production of the Executive report. The Committee was being requested to endorse the Gateway as a potential solution to address Harrogate's issues and for ongoing input as local councillors.

Richard Binks introduced the Gateway project and the officer team. He stated that the presentation would identify the economic drivers, the Strategic drivers and the scheme itself. This would also include technical considerations such as traffic modelling and the Traffic Regulation Orders.

Matt Roberts introduced the first part of a presentation to the Committee. He confirmed that this would be the first real investment in 30 years and would seek to address what was the current reception to visitors of Harrogate in terms of railings, dual carriageways and tired public realm. The following was identified:

- The project was supported/incorporated within local strategies, the local plan, the Town Centre Master Plan, the economic growth strategy, local transport plans including Harrogate transport Improvement package and emerging climate change strategies. It was also well established government policy.
- The intention was to seek a balanced approach to travel around the town with a genuine choice of options supported by infrastructure
- In 2019 the biggest response ever to a consultation was received with 77% responding that cycling and walking facilities should be improved and 75% stating that smarter choices should be encouraged
- The local cycling walking investment plan identified that the average Journey length in Harrogate town was 2.6 kilometres and that currently 0.5% of people access Harrogate station by bike. This was in the context of around one and a half million entries and exits to the busiest station in North Yorkshire.
- It was reported that 79 000 people live within 20 minutes of the station
- Over a five-year period to 2019 CO2 emissions on the district's A roads reduced by four percent that was below both sub-regional and regional levels. It was also reported that more residents in Harrogate compared to similar authorities cycled with nearly two percent of residents cycling at least three times a week in 2020
- Hosting major cycling events has meant the town is recognized for championing cycling, demonstrated by a strong cycling retail sector
- People wanting to cycle is growing. Recent survey suggests that of office workers who do not currently cycle would consider it as part of their commute there were safer cycling routes
- The Harrogate district is worth four billion pounds in economic value and there are over six million Leisure visitors. Sustainable economic growth is being suppressed by local transport property and demographic conditions. Six of the lower super output areas within the project area boundary rank among the third most deprived areas in the country. The aim is to link some of these areas to the town centre and onwards to major employment centres and education

centres in a sustainable and affordable way. If access to the town is not improved for those traveling other than Private Car the growth diversity and subsequent resilience of Harrogate's economy will be severely impacted

- It is forecast that between 2021 and 2031 there will be a six percent decrease in the traditional working age population, there is an outward migration of the younger people potentially as a result of a lack of an environment that supports a sustainable workforce
- Driving licenses amongst younger people peaked in 1994 and there is a changing workforce, by 2025 between three and four workers will use the car less
- There was a 12% decline in the number of retail units in the town between 2013 and 2021 this trend may increase with the use of permitted development rights
- Town centres are changing and people want a more rounded experience when visiting therefore adaptation and diversification to support the visitor economy is required. The view is that the status quo is not sustainable, a recent report by KPMG suggests that 16% of jobs in Harrogate are expected to continue being done from home post Covid and that accelerated online retail adoption could result in the loss of 28% of total retail offering
- There are studies that highlight the value of better public realm and people who walk and cycle to the High Street tend to make more visits and spend more. In 21 other areas where similar town centre changes have taken place such as Stratford upon Avon, Bath and Bury St Edmunds evidence suggests that proposals will support a sustainable future for the town

Tania Weston explained that this is a national capital funding program so the funding must be spent on physical infrastructure and cannot be spent on things such as improving bus services. It comes from the Department for Transport and administered by the West Yorkshire Combined Authority. It was considered that the aims aligned with those of the former Harrogate Borough Council and North Yorkshire County Council in terms of the overarching vision for the town and connecting people to economic and education opportunities through affordable sustainable transport.

The Harrogate TCF is not just a cycling scheme it's very much about accessibility. It is also not about preventing people from driving it's about giving people wider options. It aims to reduce the dominance in the use of cars, to lower traffic speeds and to provide safer spaces for the most vulnerable users. This means those who are walking or cycling and particularly looking at improving accessibility for those with disabilities. Some of the design takes that into account improving public spaces as well as improving sustainability. It creates spaces that promote social interaction and encourages people to stay and provides space for events.

The funding requires projects to fit within a proximity to station hubs so there is a geographical constraint in terms of what the council can and can't use the funding for. Cycle infrastructure must meet the current government guidelines in terms of public realm.

The Station Parade part of the project reallocates space rather than stopping the road completely. There have been three rounds of consultation undertaken, it is recognized that some of the consultations did take place during Covid in lockdown conditions but there were face-to-face sessions and drop-in days as well as online. Over the three rounds of public consultation there were increased numbers of responses. In the final consultation 45% of people felt negative about the proposals however positive and neutral comments accounted for 54% of responses.

There are concerns around potential business impacts and there will be construction impact as well. If the scheme were to go ahead the council would work with the contractors to minimize disruption.

Richard Binks explained that a component of this project is focused upon the allocation of road space on station parade and it goes from a dual casual to a single carriageway. A substantive desktop study in terms of computer modelling has been commissioned with at least 15 live count surveys with an extended period over a number of years indeed:

- The study suggests that the proposals are accurate and validated particularly as the worst case scenario has been chosen to model against, that being the 2018 survey results that was pre-pandemic when vehicle usage was at a peak
- The level of vehicle usage is declining, about four percent less over the last five years.
- The model does not take into account the successful outcome of this project as the aim is to develop a switch of choice from the vehicle to public transport, cycling and walking.
- The model assumes continuation of current usage based on the worst case scenario.
- The model supports future investment opportunities coming forward in terms of potential growth on the network and achieves a very high level of validation against national transport standards

The model covers a substantial part of the town centre from Ripon Road all the way through which in the car is about a 15-minute Journey at present. It is predicted that there will be a slight increase in that Journey time with walking and cycling having marginal gains:

- From King's Road up Cheltenham parade and onto station parade there are eight sets of signals, three of those are pelican Crossings that are not coordinated particularly well at the moment
- There are accessibility issues and of the eight signals five of them are captured within the red yellow boundary of the scheme to coordinate better with new software and increasing the opportunity for green waving
- Everything can be linked and coordinated better
- The main blocker to free flow is the controlling signals ensuring free flowing traffic.

The Traffic Regulation Order is an enabler to the wider design proposal. There are various orders:

- A parking and waiting order that effectively controls the kerbside space in terms of the ability to park your vehicle, loading, etc.
- The loss of 40 spaces across the red line boundary of the scheme
- A move in taxi space from James Street and reallocation to the western side of Harrogate
- On the northern portion of station parade two loading Bays are being introduced
- The potential relaxation of wait and load restrictions
- In James Street a reduction in the physical length of the loading bay by 14 metres
- A one-way system on the northern section of station parade
- A one way system in the southbound direction down to Bower Street to accommodate the new bus lane
- A fourth consultation for the traffic regulation order

- 35 statutory bodies have been consulted none of which reported negatively against the project
- The consultation has resulted in 41 public objections to the order with themes including loading and parking loss
- A one-way system in Cheltenham Mount will result in a small increase in vehicles heading northbound of two to three vehicles per minute
- A bus lane is proposed to be introduced on station parade north
- A bus lane has been taken out of Cheltenham Parade as the modelling indicated no actual journey gain

The business case has been successful in securing funding, it is a strong economic driver, supports a vibrant, sustainable economy and recognises the climate emergency

The Chair thanked the Officers and the presentation was followed by questions from the Members.

- Councillor Walker highlighted his concern about the amount of spend and the possibility of costs running over due to such factors as inflation. He asked when the financial business case had been revisited and how any potential shortfall would be funded.
 - Richard Binks confirmed that the outline business case had been developed and a full business case was to be presented to the Executive on the 30 May.
 - The funding is capped therefore the budget cannot be exceeded and in terms of costs there was an inbuilt quantified risk assessment that took account of factors such as inflation built into the business case
 - The Council is working with a contractor and receiving monthly market valuations, including potential construction costs prior to the final tender price
 - The budget for the project would be closely monitored and the team was working with partners to ensure the project delivered on cost and quality
- Councillor Mann highlighted public questions and statements about a possible deterioration in the air quality in the centre of town if there was slower moving traffic on Station Parade
 - Matt Roberts confirmed that air quality impact had been measured with diffusion tubes measuring nitrogen dioxide along Station Parade. The last prediction was that although idling can increase CO2 levels the scheme is beneficial to air quality along the stretch of the project area
- Councillor Harrison asked a question regarding buses that currently go up Cheltenham Crescent to station parade and then into the bus station. It was confirmed that there would be two lanes leading up to the bus station with one being the bus lane that fed buses straight up and into the station.
- Councillor Harrison sought clarification about the two sets of traffic lights that are outside of the scope of this scheme on the junction of Kings Road and Cheltenham Parade and the King's Road Parliament Street
 - Richard Binks confirmed that as the traffic lights are outside of the red lane boundary the Transforming Cities Fund money cannot be used. They will be considered as part of the report to the Executive and a way forward will be outlined for both of those junctions in terms of potentially using the highways capital programme funding money

- Councillor Schofield highlighted his concern that there had been an economic assessment report but not a business impact report or business impact assessment undertaken. Why had this not been undertaken in consultation with all local businesses within the town centre? He was aware that business within Harrogate particularly independent businesses all offering individual services that can't be found online were concerned about future business. In addition there are other recent schemes that require to be revisited such as the Otley road cycle path.
 - Richard Binks confirmed that a business impact report for a scheme like this is not normally undertaken. In addition the indirect impact on businesses is difficult to quantify reliably. The aim is to encourage more people to enter the town walking cycling and remain in the area. A full economic appraisal is included within the report looking at similar types of schemes in other areas and the profile of the local economy in Harrogate. He confirmed that there were various reasons why other schemes, for example, the Otley Road scheme had not been taken forward that was more to do with design considerations rather than any business impact assessment.

- Councillor Aldred asked the following questions:

Would the scheme cause more traffic possibly backing up all the way to Ripley?

Would any of the work be conducted at night?

Was an environmental impact assessment carried and if not why not?

Did we refuse a public meeting with the residents of the Granville area?

 - Richard Binks confirmed that in terms of the traffic impact any queueing would be contained within the station parade Cheltenham Mount area there would be no backing up beyond the limit of the project. There was no planned night time working.
 - Tania Weston stated that environmental impact assessments are specific to certain planning applications and the local planning Authority had deemed that if the planning application was not one that required an environmental impact assessment. In response to the question about meeting residents in the Granville area it was noted that this may have been a reference to potential meetings with Don McKenzie and Andrew Jones.

- Councillor Marsh sought clarification about the connection to educational establishments and employment areas mentioned in the report.
 - Matt Roberts stated that these were from Hornbeam Park onwards to Leeds and York via cycling routes up to Cardell Park, the largest employment centre in Harrogate. It was also for people in the town centre to use bus and rail for forward opportunities to education and employment across the sub-region

Members discussed the following:

- Concerns that the project only delivers landscaping solutions such as trees, paving and a cycle lane with no onward connection. It did not fit within a wider strategic plan and that there were few people that would visit the unique areas of Harrogate. Investment was welcomed but it must support the heritage and environment. There was reference to funding to address issues in Knaresborough.

- The scheme did not deal with congestion and increases car journey times and there were no changes to average walking or cycling times
 - A clear strategic plan was required for active travel across the constituency, with the positioning of the Gateway within the plan
 - There was reference to the delivery of the scheme and increasing costs
 - The advantages and disadvantages of a park and ride scheme
 - There was a need to do something with the Gateway and accepting that it was not something that everyone would agree on it is the only one at present and that there is a commitment by the Executive to look at possible adaptations and changes. It could be used as a starting point to move forward
 - Difficult decisions have been made previously in Harrogate recognising that there is some opposition at the time. It is recognised that the scheme has some opposition but that should not stop the council from making an important decision
 - Some of the objections to the scheme have been addressed such as concern about increased car journey lengths and potential gridlock. The work has been done to address these concerns and the information is in the report.
 - The Committee had been informed that the traffic signals on King's Road and the bottom of Parliament Street were not part of the scheme however would be looked at
 - The scheme had advantages and disadvantages however once finished would make the town more welcoming to residents, visitors and new businesses
 - The project would rejuvenate the town centre and underpin the future of Harrogate Convention Centre
 - If the council rejects the funding from the government then this may impact future improvement funding/schemes in the future
- Councillor Haslam endorsed the recommendations in the report, he stated that the vision for the master plan had been set in 2015 and had been continually reviewed. The Gateway is the next investment in the programme and will create a transport hub with the opportunity to transition from one transport mode to another. The services will be inclusive and accessible to all, with better public transport and easier, safer active transport. The prioritisation of buses will improve reliability with only small increases in car journey times. It will also support tourism and the conference industry. Business difficulties are recognised but the town must do things to create new experiences. He stated that no project was perfect however the Committee has been informed that Officers will be flexible and work to make sure the project works.

Councillor Haslam proposed the recommendations in the report

Seconded by Councillor Mann

Members discussed the following:

- The consultation undertaken was appreciated however it needs be undertaken at the very local level to understand the pressure that the scheme could put on businesses
- The impact of traffic lights at other junctions
- The impact of other schemes that had not gone as well
- The pedestrianisation of James Street
- A recognition of the need for coordinated investment in the town centre particularly near the station

- The need for shopping centre improvements
 - A potential alternative cycling solution with cycling infrastructure such as bike racks/stores
 - Air pollution due to idling traffic
 - The impact to pedestrians with prioritising crossings for car users
- During the debate on the tabled motion, Councillor Lacey put forward some wording that constituted a different but substantially similar motion to that already proposed. Upon consideration of Councillor Lacey's wording, the proposer and seconder of the original motion withdrew that motion in support of the following proposal:

This committee believes that Harrogate needs a vibrant, prosperous, safe, attractive and accessible town centre and would welcome further investment in it to achieve that goal through a Gateway scheme, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the genuine concerns of individuals and groups continue to be listened to, debated and responded to where possible within the constraints of the scheme funding.
 2. That the ACC has a meaningful role in the implementation of the scheme, including the above mentioned conversations, and that a full report on progress is received at its meeting in the Autumn.
 3. That a rigorous monitoring system for expected and actual impact on traffic flows, the environmental, active travel take-up and businesses in the area of the scheme is put in place pre-shovel and made open and transparent from day one.
- Councillor Lacey explained the need for a strategic vision over the long term and the current state of the town centre. It is recognised that there are some groups that feel they have not been listened to and that the council can do better. The proposal gives the ACC a meaningful role in representing residents to deliver the best possible scheme.

Proposed by Councillor Lacey

Seconded by Councillor Haslam

Members discussed the following:

- Parts of the scheme such as One Arch, bus lanes, pedestrianisation, alternative cycling routes and links to other areas
- The offer of discussion prior to the Executive meeting on 30 May and any potential input over the summer period to bring the report back to the Committee
- The recognition that there are genuine concerns and the ability to make some changes however substantial changes would mean rejecting the scheme. There are things, therefore, that can be altered to a certain extent within the scheme as presented
- A change to the wording in the proposal was suggested to include the words sustainable and healthier

The amendment to include the words sustainable and healthier was proposed by Councillor Gostlow

Seconded by Councillor Lacey

- Councillor Duncan confirmed that all suggestions that had been raised at the meeting would be taken on board for the report on the 30th of May. It was recognised that the timescale was tight to meet the meeting deadlines but this was the start of that conversation and would be an ongoing discussion with the ACC as the key forum for information, liaison and scrutiny throughout this process.
 - Any suggestions that come forward will be considered in terms of how they might fit with criteria, budget and timelines.
 - The three core areas identified at the beginning of the meeting would be considered as part of the report together with any issues identified at the meeting
 - There are time constraints to produce the report taking into account the suggestions/comments received and this will be undertaken
 - The Executive would have to make a decision on the 30th of May to ensure that the scheme can be delivered in line with the Department for Transport requirements. This means that most of the spend takes place by the end 2023/24 there can be some spend into the subsequent Financial year but the majority has to be in 2023/24
 - The proposal being considered at the meeting will be worked on. There will be a decision on 30 May in principle around the decision of the submission of that business case to the West Yorkshire Combined Authority. This will be on the basis that the ACC is content that it has been given a full opportunity to be consulted on the traffic regulation orders that underpin the scheme, the formal part of the consultation
 - The ACC would be actively involved as the scheme is progressed and have oversight of any subsequent discussions around delivery, construction, etc.

In response to a question Councillor Duncan confirmed that there is a clear indication from the Department for Transport that they expect most of the money to be spent in 2023/24. There is potentially some expenditure that could go into 2024/25 but the majority of the expenditure is required to be in 2023/24 that is a very tight time scale to achieve.

It was confirmed that the Committee would vote on the proposal as amended to include the words sustainable and healthier.

A vote was taken and 10 members voted for the motion, three voted against and there were no abstentions.

Resolved –

This committee believes that Harrogate needs a vibrant, prosperous, safe, attractive, accessible, healthier and sustainable town centre and would welcome further investment in it to achieve that goal through a Gateway scheme, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the genuine concerns of individuals and groups continue to be listened to, debated and responded to where possible within the constraints of the scheme funding.
2. That the ACC has a meaningful role in the implementation of the scheme, including the above mentioned conversations, and that a full report on progress is received at its meeting in the Autumn.

3. That a rigorous monitoring system for expected and actual impact on traffic flows, the environmental, active travel take-up and businesses in the area of the scheme is put in place pre-shovel and made open and transparent from day one.

The meeting concluded at 1:20 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

North Yorkshire Council

Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee

8 June 2023

Receipt of Petition 'For a maximum speed of 20mph on roads in south and west Harrogate to improve road safety'

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)

1.0 Purpose of the Report
1.1 To advise of a petition containing more than 500 signatures.
1.2 To ask the Area Constituency Committee to consider a response.

2.0 The Petition

- 2.1 A petition has been received by North Yorkshire Council. This is a paper-based petition with 920 signatures, all of which are of people who live, work or study in the county.
- 2.2 The wording of the petition is 'For a maximum speed of 20mph on roads in south and west Harrogate to improve road safety'.
- 2.3 The covering letter for the petition provided the following context (see *italics* below):
- 2.4 *The petition calls for North Yorkshire Council to deliver a maximum speed of 20mph across south and west Harrogate - covering Oatlands and parts of Pannal, Stray, Hookstone and St Georges areas in Harrogate (as outlined in red on the petition).*
- 2.5 *We want safer streets for the children, young people and wider community when travelling to school and other locations in the area, from their home to their destination.*
- 2.6 *Road safety has been of particular concern from school leaders, parents and carers of school children and local residents in Oatlands and the wider Harrogate area for many years.*
- 2.7 *A maximum speed of 20mph is now urgently needed to reduce road collisions, improve safety, reduce air pollution and create a better environment for walking, wheeling, cycling and scooting to schools, shops, workplaces and local amenities.*
- 2.8 *Two road collisions in early 2023 resulted in the serious injury of three school children walking to and from school and highlight the urgency and importance of a maximum speed of 20mph. Unless positive action is taken our children, young people and other members of the community will continue to be put at risk.*
- 2.9 *Over 4000 children and young people walk, cycle and travel by bus and car each day to the schools, colleges and early years settings in the area all of which are located on 30mph streets, including:*
- *Oatlands Infant School*
 - *Oatlands Junior School*
 - *St John Fisher's Catholic High School*

- *St Aidan's Church of England School*
- *Harrogate FE College*
- *Busy Bees nurseries at South Drive and Hornbeam Park*

2.10 *A further 5,000 children travel in, to and around the Pannal Ash Area: to Harrogate Grammar School, Ashville College, Rossett School, Rossett Acre Primary and Western Primary and Busy Bees Nursery- Pannal Ash.*

2.11 *This petition complements the similar initiative by Pannal Ash Safe Streets, also calling for 20mph.*

2.12 *Maximum speed limits of 20mph have been delivered in other rural and urban areas of Yorkshire and the UK including Calderdale, Cornwall, Oxford, Edinburgh, the Scottish Borders, London and in Wales (in September 2023). We want these improvements for south and west and other communities within Harrogate, which would deliver considerable positive impacts.*

2.13 *We hope in submitting this petition with over 900 signatures this issue will be scheduled for debate, at the next meeting of the local area constituency committee.*

2.14 [Link to petition](#)

3.0 The Council's Arrangements for Receiving and Responding to Petitions

3.1 The key features of the Council's arrangements for receiving and debating petitions, as published on the Council's website, are as follows:

- Receipt of the petition is published on the Council's website (which has been done in the case of this petition).
- If a petition contains 500 or more signatures (but less than 30,130 signatories), it will be scheduled for debate at the next meeting of the appropriate Area Constituency Committee.
- The petition organiser is offered the opportunity to speak for five minutes at the Area Constituency Committee meeting to present his/her petition. Subsequently, at the meeting, the petition will be discussed by Councillors for a maximum of 15 minutes and a decision will be made on how to respond to the petition.
- Possible responses by the Council to petitions, as shown on the website, are:
 - (a) to take the action requested by the petition;
 - (b) not to take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate;
 - (c) to commission further investigation into the matter, for example by a relevant committee; or
 - (d) where the issue is one on which the council Executive is required to make the final decision, the council will decide whether to make recommendations to inform that decision.
- The petition organiser will receive written confirmation of this decision. This confirmation will also be published on the website.

3.2 In accordance with the arrangements described above, the petition organisers have been invited to join today's meeting to present their petition.

4.0 Highways and Transportation Services Officers' Comments Regarding the Petition

4.1 The Highways and Transport team are aware of the received petition '*For a maximum speed of 20mph on roads in south and west Harrogate to improve road safety*'. It should also be recognised by the members that highways officers are actively engaging with the local campaign groups to understand additional measures that can be introduced in the

areas, this could be signing or lining improvements, the introduction of a new crossing point. This also includes working with the local Road Safety partnership to consider the 'softer' educational resource requirements in local schools and communities.

4.2 In addition, the then NYCC Executive approved the current 20mph Speed Limit and Zone Policy in January 2022, which was itself the subject of detailed and thorough review by the Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Twelve months on from its introduction, it was considered appropriate to see how the revised policy was bedding in and to consider what, if any, improvements should be made.

4.3 More recently, as part of the regular Area Constituency Committee feedback, Executive on 8 November 2022 considered the following resolution from the Harrogate and Knaresborough ACC from their October 2022 meeting:

“that the Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee wishes a 20mph speed limit to be piloted throughout towns and villages in the constituency area where a need has been identified, and that the Executive be asked to recommend the Transport, Economy and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee, when it considers the County Council’s 20mph Speed Limit and Zone Policy on 19 January 2023, to consider appropriate amendments to the existing policy to enable such a pilot to be introduced”.

4.4 Executive requested Cllr Duncan, as Executive Member for Highways and Transportation to investigate the resolution further in order to make an evidence-based assessment. This work was concluded before the end of May 2023 and the proposed changes are due to be presented at Executive on 20 June 2023.

4.5 The expectation is that the petition will be considered as part of the updated 20mph speed limit and zone policy. In setting any local speed limit changes the County Council works in partnership with North Yorkshire Police, who adhere to the guidance set out in circular 01/2013 Setting Local Speed Limits, which requires 20mph speed limits to be self-enforcing.

5.0 Recommendations

5.1 That the Committee notes the petition and considers a response.

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

Author of report:

Daniel Harry, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager, North Yorkshire Council

Background Document: North Yorkshire Council's petitions information and advice, a copy of which is on the Council's website [Petitions | North Yorkshire Council](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

North Yorkshire Council

Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee

8 June 2023

Receipt of “Gateway Opposition Petition”

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)

1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To advise of a petition containing more than 500 signatures.
- 1.2 To ask the Area Constituency Committee to consider a response.

2.0 The Petition

- 2.1 A petition has been received by North Yorkshire Council. This is a petition on [Change.org](https://www.change.org) with over 2000 signatures, of which over 500 people live, work or study in the county. A paper version of the petition has been received.
- 2.2 It is a “Gateway Opposition Petition” the reason for the petition states that “The Harrogate Gateway Scheme and the building works that come with it, will be detrimental to the residents who live and work here. Shops and businesses will not survive this they are still recovering from the pandemic! Our voices have not been heard!!”
- 2.3 The information for the petition provides the following context:

“We the undersigned are totally against the Harrogate Station Gateway Project as proposed by North Yorkshire Council and supported by the Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee on 5th May 2023. Reducing the main A61 road through the centre of the town to a single lane, together with other proposals such as the partial closure of James Street, will hamper access by emergency vehicles, increase congestion and pollution, force cars and all other vehicles onto other roads and have an extremely detrimental effect on both the residential and business areas. The whole premise of the scheme is nonsense and will irreversibly damage Harrogate. Those who live and work in the town centre are not being listened to. Our voices must be heard. As a result we have no confidence in the Highways Executive of North Yorkshire Council and their officers who are leading on the Project.”

3.0 The Council’s Arrangements for Receiving and Responding to Petitions

- 3.1 The key features of the Council’s arrangements for receiving and debating petitions, as published on the Council’s website, are as follows:-
 - Receipt of the petition is published on the Council’s website (which has been done in the case of this petition).
 - If a petition contains 500 or more signatures (but less than 30,130 signatories), it will be scheduled for debate at the next meeting of the appropriate Area Constituency Committee.
 - The petition organiser is offered the opportunity to speak for five minutes at the Area Constituency Committee meeting to present his/her petition. Subsequently, at

the meeting, the petition will be discussed by Councillors for a maximum of 15 minutes and a decision will be made on how to respond to the petition.

- Possible responses by the Council to petitions, as shown on the website, are:-
 - (a) to take the action requested by the petition;
 - (b) not to take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate;
 - (c) to commission further investigation into the matter, for example by a relevant committee; or
 - (d) where the issue is one on which the council Executive is required to make the final decision, the council will decide whether to make recommendations to inform that decision.
- The petition organiser will receive written confirmation of this decision. This confirmation will also be published on the website.

3.2 In accordance with the arrangements described above, the petition organisers have been invited to join today's meeting to present their petition.

4.0 Highways and Transportation Services Officers' Comments Regarding the Petition

- 4.1 The Harrogate Station Gateway Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) project is one of 35 projects within the Leeds City Region area that were announced in March 2020. Since that time the project design has been developed in accordance with West Yorkshire Combined Authority's governance and assurance processes and HM Treasury's business case process.
- 4.2 The project has been developed by engagement with specialists, stakeholders and is the only TCF project to undergo three rounds of public consultation across the wider portfolio, which resulted in some changes made to the proposals following this engagement. Professional traffic and air quality modelling was used in order to understand the potential impacts on road users of various options. The current proposals were developed as the preferred option having taken a range of factors such as benefits, impacts, cost and deliverability into consideration.
- 4.3 The project strategic case recognises town centres and the high street face renewed pressures post pandemic together with the rise of online economies; uplifting the tired urban realm to the eastern side of Harrogate is designed to embellish the visitor experience, encouraging patronage of the town centre environment as a desirable destination. In turn the towns economic opportunities will be enhanced which is reflected in the positive Business Case Benefit Cost Ratio.
- 4.4 The traffic model indicates that a worst-case scenario (peak 2018 traffic volumes / no modal switch outcome / includes future local plan development network demand) would be within acceptable levels, and that this worst-case scenario would be unlikely to be realised. The highway network efficiency is not reliant upon the number of vehicle lanes in Station Parade; this is controlled by corridor traffic signal interaction. In this case the project introduces new modern signal upgrades to largely maintain network capacities in a single lane scenario. Other options modelled, such as East Parade suggested more impact on adjacent residential roads and were not considered acceptable very early in the project development period.
- 4.5 Emergency services have been consulted on the Harrogate Gateway proposals since the initial concept. Most recently emergency services were consulted about the specific Traffic Regulation Order(s) proposed and the advice provided has been taken into account, including relating to proposed road closures.

- 4.6 As the project enters the next stage of development and delivery the project team will engage further with those who live and work in the town centre, including the Area Constituency Committee, about what the next steps entail. A construction management plan will be developed that seeks to minimise construction impacts as much as possible.

5.0 Recommendations

- 5.1 That the Committee notes the petition and considers a response which rejects the project discontinuation call, while maintaining focus upon a successful deliverable outcome

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

Author of report:

Mark Codman, North Yorkshire Council

Background Document: North Yorkshire Council's petitions information and advice, a copy of which is on the Council's website [Petitions | North Yorkshire Council](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL
Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee
8 June 2023

Area Constituency Committees in the new North Yorkshire Council

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide a guide about Area Constituency Committees' ways of working for this next iteration of the committees.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 The County Council has six Area Constituency Committees (ACC) which are coterminous with the six Parliamentary constituencies within North Yorkshire. Each committee meets formally in public four times a year. The Terms of Reference for the ACCs were agreed at the meeting of the County Council on 22 February 2023, as stated in the Constitution for the new North Yorkshire Council. The Terms of Reference are at Appendix A.

3.0 ENGAGEMENT

3.1 This guide to ways of working has been developed in conjunction with the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the ACCs, the Executive member for Corporate Services and senior officers. The intention is to work through the practicalities of delivering upon the Terms of Reference.

3.2 An initial discussion was held at the meeting of the ACC Chairs and Vice Chairs meeting on 24 April 2023 to identify key issues and themes to feed into discussions with officers leading on key areas of work that are of interest to the committees. The discussion with officers took place on 9 May 2023. A further meeting was held with the ACC Chairs and Vice Chairs on 18 May 2023.

4.0 FIRST ROUND OF MEETINGS

4.1 The dates and times of the first round of meetings of the ACCs are as follows:

Committee	Date and time
Harrogate and Knaresborough ACC	10am on 8 June 2023
Richmond (Yorks) ACC	10am on 12 June 2023
Scarborough and Whitby ACC	10.30am on 9 June 2023
Selby and Ainsty ACC	10am on 15 June 2023
Skipton and Ripon ACC	10am on 1 June 2023
Thirsk and Malton ACC	2pm on 16 June 2023

4.2 Papers for the meetings will be published 5 clear working days ahead of the meeting itself.

5.0 MEETINGS

5.1 The ACCs are scheduled to meet four times a year. Additional meetings or working groups may be held and established as necessary, at the discretion of the committee chair.

- 5.2 The Constitution states: “The Chair of a Committee, or the Chair of the Council, may summon a special meeting of a committee at any time, and either of them shall summon a special meeting on the requisition in writing of not less than one quarter of the members of the committee. The summons shall specify the business to be considered at the special meeting, and no business other than that specified shall be considered at the meeting.”
- 5.3 The ACCs will determine where they are to hold their meetings. There is a strong case to hold meetings at the former district, borough and county council offices as there are facilities, staff and parking there. It may also be possible to record/broadcast and hold hybrid meetings at those sites using existing facilities. It is important, however, to have the flexibility to hold meetings in the area where a matter being considered is most relevant or of most concern.
- 5.4 A review is underway of options with regard to recording/broadcasting of meetings and holding hybrid meetings across the North Yorkshire Council estate.
- 5.5 Where a meeting is held as a hybrid enabling access for officers and members remotely via MS Teams, members who attend remotely will not be able to propose a motion, second a motion or vote. There is also an expectation that members make every effort to physically attend a committee meeting of the council so that they are able to fully participate in that meeting.

6.0 MID CYCLE BRIEFINGS

- 6.1 A Mid-Cycle Briefing (MCB), following a similar format to that of overview and scrutiny, will be held that enables chairs, vice chairs and group spokes to develop the committee work programme, review issues to see whether they are appropriate for a discussion at the committee and agree the agenda for the next meeting. The meetings to be held remotely using MS Teams and be scheduled in-between formal committee meetings.

7.0 CORPORATE DIRECTORS

- 7.1 A corporate director will support the work of each of the six ACCs. Their role will be to provide high level officer support to help facilitate the work of the committee and ensure that reports and papers are as requested by the committee and provided in a timely way.

Corporate Director	Area Constituency Committee
Karl Battersby	Selby and Ainsty
Rachel Joyce	Harrogate and Knaresborough
Stuart Carlton	Richmond (Yorks)
Richard Webb	Thirsk and Malton
Gary Fielding	Skipton and Ripon
Nic Harne	Scarborough and Whitby

8.0 PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS

- 8.1 Representatives of the local Parish and Town Councils will be able to attend the meetings of the committee and will also be able to submit questions or statements through the council's public participation scheme (see page 214-216 of the Constitution).
- 8.2 There is also an opportunity for Parish and Town Councils to raise issues of local concern between meetings of the ACCs directly with the committee chair, vice chair

and democratic services officer. These can then be considered for inclusion on the committee work programme and/or escalation or referral elsewhere.

- 8.3 There may be opportunities for issue-led engagement with a cluster of Parish and Town Councils, in response to a local issue of concern. Such a discussion could also include representation from a wider number of local groups who have expertise and insight to bring to bear.

9.0 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

- 9.1 ACC chairs and vice chairs will liaise as appropriate with overview and scrutiny chairs as issues arise to work out how scrutiny can best be managed in a complementary manner.

- 9.2 An example of where local scrutiny by the ACCs has worked well is the re-development of the Castleberg Hospital in Giggleswick, which was closed at short notice due to concerns over its structural safety. Local members were able to scrutinise the plans for and progress with the re-development of the site whilst the Scrutiny of Health committee was able to review the long terms plans for smaller, cottage hospitals in the county.

10.0 ESCALATION ROUTES

- 10.1 Where an issue has been considered that the committee resolves must be addressed then there are a number of routes by which this can be done. This includes recommendations and/or referral to: the relevant Assistant Director or Corporate Director or Executive Member; Overview and Scrutiny; or Executive.

11.0 FUNDING

- 11.1 The process for making recommendation to the Corporate Director of Community Development regarding allocation of the £50,000 'seed funding' aligned to each of the ACCs needs to be developed. There is no wish to develop an overly complex or bureaucratic system for making recommendations to the corporate director but there will need to be a structure and process in place that enables funding requests to be robust, aligned with local needs and the strategic priorities for the Council and justifiable.
- 11.2 A framework will be developed in conjunction with the relevant Executive members, the ACC Chairs and Vice Chairs and the Corporate Director of Community Development.
- 11.3 The funding could be used to support economic and destination development, particularly in ways that ensures that there is a pipeline of projects ready for grant and funding applications as and when they arise.

12.0 WORK PROGRAMME

- 12.1 The following have been suggested in addition to topics that have already been scheduled for individual committee work programmes.
- 12.2 Themes and topics that could be brought to the committees for 'strong recommendations':
- Local Plan development (including the links with the National Parks and AONBs)
 - Planning policy engagement (including the links with the National Parks and AONBs)
 - Community safety strategic plan engagement

- Local Transport Plan development
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy development
- Parking policy and strategy
- Traffic Regulation Orders
- How the services in the new council work – AD led
- Economic growth strategies – development and implementation
- Economic development projects that are in the pipeline
- Destination development strategies.

12.3 Annual reports:

- Work programme setting session
- Review of the Council Plan and how this informs the work of the committees
- Schools performance and budget report
- Adult social care performance and budget report
- Housing development
- Council budget report
- Stronger communities report
- Report from the Police Fire and Crime Commissioner.

12.4 Reports for circulation (only discussed where members have raised a specific issue):

- Community safety (Police and Fire)
- 1/4ly performance and finance report that goes to the Executive
- Grant funding and seed funding available to local communities.

13.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

13.1 The Terms of Reference of the ACCs were agreed at the meeting of the County Council on 22 February 2023. This report proposes a way in which those Terms of Reference can practically be applied. The report represents the outcome of a series of meetings with members and officers and includes a number of options for members of the committee to consider as they plan for the first 12 months of the new committee.

14.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

14.1 As referred to in paragraph 11.0, the process for making recommendation to the Corporate Director of Community Development regarding allocation of the £50,000 'seed funding' aligned to each of the ACCs needs to be developed.

15.1 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

15.1 The legal implications are set out in the body of this report.

16.1 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

16.1 There are no significant climate change implications arising from this report.

17.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

17.1 There are no significant equalities implications arising from this report.

18.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

18.1 The suggested ways of working are outlined as above to assist the committee in its first year of operation.

19.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

19.1 That the committee reviews the Terms of Reference and suggested ways of working.

Barry Khan
Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)
County Hall, NORTHALLERTON
23 May 2023

Report Author: Daniel Harry, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager.

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1 – Terms of Reference

Background documents: Constitution of North Yorkshire County Council - [New Council Constitutions \(northyorks.gov.uk\)](https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/council/constitutions)

Note: Members are invited to contact the author in advance of the meeting with any detailed queries or questions.

PLEASE ALSO NOTE THAT IF ANY REPORTS / APPENDICES INCLUDE SIGNATURES THESE MUST BE REMOVED / DELETED PRIOR TO SENDING REPORTS / APPENDICES TO DEMOCRATIC SERVICES. Appendices should include an Equality Impact Assessment and a Climate Impact Assessment where appropriate

This page is intentionally left blank

North Yorkshire Council

Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee

8 June 2023

Appointments to Outside Bodies

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To invite the Area Constituency Committee to make appointments, on behalf of the Council, to various outside bodies.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Subsequent to the creation of the new North Yorkshire Council on 01.04.23, the number of Outside Bodies that the Council now appoints to has increased as the appointments previously made by the seven District and Borough Council's now need to be made by North Yorkshire Council.
- 2.2 Appointments to Outside Bodies were made by the Area Constituency Committee's in May 2022 for the final year of North Yorkshire County Council and then for a period of 4 years from the start of the new Unitary Authority to May 2027.

3.0 APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

- 3.1 The Council's Constitution identifies various outside bodies to which this Area Constituency Committee is responsible for making appointments to, on behalf of the Council. The Constitution identifies three categories of outside bodies. Those to which this Area Constituency Committee appoints are in Categories 2 and 3 (known as Local Bodies).
- 3.2 Category 2 outside bodies typically operate across the geographic area of more than one Electoral Division. The Constitution states, with regard to Category 2 outside bodies, that:-
- those appointed should be Councillors;
 - some Officer briefing or other support may be provided;
 - any report back will be to the Area Constituency Committee (which may report to the Executive on it, if appropriate); and
 - expenses will be paid to Councillors unless they are payable by the body appointed to.
- 3.3 Category 3 outside bodies typically operate across a smaller geographic area, usually within a single Electoral Division. The Council's Constitution states, with regard to Category 3 outside bodies, that:-
- the person appointed is expected to be a member of the local community, but may be the local Member;
 - the local Member will make a nomination to the relevant Area Constituency Committee;
 - there will be no Officer support;
 - there will be no report back (unless the local Member deems it necessary) and any

- report back will be to the Corporate Director of Resources; and expenses will not be paid by the Council.

3.4 Members appointed by the Area Constituency Committee to the outside bodies listed in Appendices A and B, when acting on behalf of those other organisations, are covered by the Council's Indemnity Policy for Officers and Members.

3.5 Appendices A and B set out the table of appointments to outside bodies which fall to be made by the ACC, together with details of any Councillors already appointed to that body from their previous District or Borough Councillor position, these are noted in red. Appointments made by the ACC in May 2022 are noted in black, no further action is required for these appointments.

3.6 Category 2 outside bodies to which this Area Constituency Committee appoints are listed at Appendix A.

3.7 Category 3 outside bodies to which this Area Constituency Committee appoints are listed at Appendix B.

4.0 Term of Appointments

4.1 Past practice has been to appoint representatives to outside bodies to serve until the date of the subsequent Council elections.

4.2 In accordance with 4.1, it is recommended below that the appointments now made to Category 2 outside bodies should be "to serve until the Council elections in 2027".

4.3 With regard to Category 3 outside bodies, the alternative is for the Area Constituency Committee to appoint for the term "until a replacement is appointed".

5.0 Nomination and Appointment Process

5.1 At today's meeting of the Area Constituency Committee:-

- In respect of Category 2 outside body appointments, the Chairman will invite Members to announce nominations at the meeting. Nominees should be Councillors. Each nomination must be seconded. If the number of nominations for appointment to any outside body exceeds the number of vacancies on that body, Members will be asked to vote by show of hands to identify which Councillors shall be appointed.
- In respect of each Category 3 outside body appointment, the Chairman will invite the relevant local Member, listed in the last column at Appendix B, to announce the name of his/her nominee for each vacancy on that outside body. Nominees are expected to be a member of the local community but may be the local Member. Once seconded, Area Constituency Committee Members will be asked to vote to approve those appointments.

5.2 Local Members are asked to provide, to Daniel Harry following today's meeting, the contact details (ie, postal address, email address and phone number) of the local members of the community who the Area Constituency Committee appoints to Category 3 outside bodies. Such information is required for forwarding to the Secretary of the outside body

6.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

6.1 There is an option not to appoint to all or some of the existing outside bodies, however this was discounted on the basis that it is beneficial at this time to keep all the existing appointments to provide local support by Members. For the future there will be a review of the number of all outside bodies as this currently stands at approximately 218. This will be within the next 12 months. At this stage the working assumption is that the number of outside bodies appointed to by North Yorkshire Council may be reduced to better align with the strategic and operational priorities of the Council. The approach to this review is being worked up and a further update will be provided in due course

7.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

8.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

9.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no equalities implications arising from this report.

10.0 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no climate change implications arising from this report.

11.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 Appointments to outside bodies are made by the Area Constituency Committee's as per the Council's Constitution

12.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

i) With regard to each Category 2 outside body vacancy listed at Appendix A, that the Councillor, to be nominated and selected at today's meeting, be appointed to represent the Council on that outside body, to serve until the Council elections in 2027.

ii) With regard to each Category 3 outside body listed at Appendix B, that the nominee for each vacancy, to be nominated at today's meeting by the relevant local Member, be appointed as the Council's appointee on that outside body, to serve until a replacement is appointed.

iii) That the appointments previously made at District and Borough level are ratified and continue as a North Yorkshire Councillor appointee, subject to the individual Member approval. These appointments are noted in red.

iv) That a review of Outside Bodies takes place within the next 12 months.

APPENDICES:

Appendix A – Table of Appointments for Category 2 Outside Bodies

Appendix B – Table of Appointments for Category 3 Outside Bodies

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

North Yorkshire Council Constitution. [Constitution](#)

Barry Khan
Assistant Chief Executive Legal and Democratic Services
County Hall
Northallerton
8 June 2023

Report Author – Christine Phillipson Principal Democratic Services and Scrutiny Officer

2. LOCAL BODIES (appointments by Area Constituency Committees)

- ◆ Those appointed to these bodies should be Councillors.
- ◆ The appointments will be made by the Area Constituency Committee(s) concerned.
- ◆ Some Officer briefing or other support may be provided.
- ◆ Any report back will be to the Area Constituency Committee (which may report to the Executive on it, if appropriate).
- ◆ Expenses will be paid to Councillors unless they are payable by the body appointed to.

Harrogate & Knaresborough	No of seats	
Bond End Air Quality Steering Group (NYCC)	1	Vacancy
Fairfax Community Centre	1	Cllr Chris Aldred
Harrogate District Community Safety Local Delivery Team	1	Cllr C Aldred
Harrogate International Festival Board of Governors	1	Vacancy
Harrogate White Rose Theatre Trust - Board	2	2 Vacancies
Jennyfield Styan Community Centre Joint Management Committee	2	2 Vacancies
Knaresborough Community Centre Committee	1	Cllr H Gostlow
Nidd Gorge Advisory Partnership	6	Cllrs Phillip Broadbank, Paul Haslam
Nidderdale Strategic Partnership	3	3 Vacancies
Pateley Bridge Quarry, Greenhow - Board of Trustees	1	Vacancy
Renaissance Knaresborough Management Committee	1	Cllr H Gostlow
Starbeck Community Fund	3	Cllrs Chris Aldred, Phillip Broadbank, Pat Marsh
The Local Fund	1	Vacancy

This page is intentionally left blank

LOCAL BODIES (appointee expected to be a member of the local community (but may be the local Member) nominated by the local Member)

- ♦ The person appointed is expected to be a member of the local community, but may be the local Member.
- ♦ The local Member will make a nomination to the relevant Area Constituency Committee.
- ♦ The relevant Area Constituency Committee will make the appointment.
- ♦ There will be no Officer support.
- ♦ There will be no report back (unless the local Member deems it necessary). Any report back will be to the Corporate Director of Resources.
- ♦ Expenses will not be paid by the Council.

NB: The following outside bodies are not Partnerships for the purpose of Partnership Governance as they do not meet the relevant criteria.

	No of seats	
Harrogate & Knaresborough		
King James's Foundation at Knaresborough H&K	1	Cllr M Walker
Prince Henry's Grammar School, Otley	1	Vacancy
Richard Taylor's Educational Foundation Trust H&K	1	Cllr P Haslam

This page is intentionally left blank



**North Yorkshire Council
Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee
8 June 2023
Committee Work Programme**

Purpose of Report

To ask Members to consider, amend and add to the Committee's work programme.

1. Remit of the Committee

The remit of the Area Constituency Committees is detailed in Appendix 1 of the ACC Ways of Working report.

2. Work Programme Items

The intention is for the Committee to develop a work programme that:

- is owned by the Committee
- has items on it that are important locally but relevant at a strategic, county level
- evolves over time and is not static.

The Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the Democratic Services Officer will keep the work programme up to date and determine which items need to be considered at a public committee meeting and which could be picked up elsewhere.

Alternative ways of dealing with issues that come to the Committee could include:

- Referral to an officer at the Council for a response;
- Referral to the Democratic Services Officer to conduct further research to ascertain whether it was appropriate for the committee to review;
- Referral to Council Overview and Scrutiny;
- Referral to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to consider, outside of a formal committee meeting;
- Referral to the appropriate Executive Member to consider.

3. Follow up to meetings

a. The following has been circulated after the meeting on 16 March:

- Harrogate Active Travel Strategic Project Map
- Response from Yorkshire Water to questions from the Committee

*It was also agreed that a visit for members to Bilton Treatment Works would be arranged.

The following further work has been identified since the meeting:

- Yorkshire Water be invited to attend a meeting of the Committee once a year, prior to the end of 2023 with technical (engineer) representation
- The Environment Agency be invited to attend a meeting of the Committee to consider water quality in the river Nidd
- Defra be invited to a meeting of the Committee to consider proposals to help clean up the river Nidd

b. The following has been circulated after the special meeting on 5 May

- Further information received from Harrogate District Cycle Action about Harrogate Station Gateway

4. Potential Future Work

- **Community and Voluntary Sector in the Town of Harrogate** - To be introduced by Councillor Chris Aldred

At the ACC on the 16th March, following an update from NYC Stronger Communities, it was noted that the Community and Voluntary Sector in the Town of Harrogate faced particular challenges in the transition to new arrangements as a result of the absence of a Town Council and the need to co-design the role and function of any future Community Anchor organisation. Cllr Peter Lacey and Cllr Sam Gibbs committed to consult with other members of the ACC to set out a proposed terms of reference for this group. Having met with Cllr Pat March, Cllr Chris Aldred, Cllr Mike Schofield and with input from Liz Meade (Stronger Communities), as well as receiving expressions of interest from other Harrogate Town ACC members, the following proposal is now being made.

- That a working group of the ACC is established with the following terms of reference:
 - To assure itself, and thereby the ACC, that funding for community and voluntary sector organisations serving the residents of the Town is not jeopardised by the absence of a Town Council.
 - To engage with any voluntary sector organisation that it considers to be at particular risk.
 - To receive progress reports from Stronger Communities on the process to design and establish a Community Anchor function for the Town of Harrogate.
 - To consider how the ACC and its members can best support grass-roots community groups within the Town during this transitional period
 - To learn from existing good practice within the ACC and wider to inform the development of a stronger community and voluntary sector for the people of the Town in the future.
- It is proposed that the working group is made up of five Councillors representing Harrogate Town Divisions and proportional to political group representation and that it meets at least every six months, or more frequently if the proposed agenda requires. The terms of reference and continuation of the group would be reviewed in the light of any decision to establish a Town Council for Harrogate in unparished areas.

5. Historic work programmes of the former District and Borough Councils O&S Committees

In January 2023 the collation of items from the former District/Borough Council O&S Work Programmes was undertaken. This would enable them to be brought to the attention of the relevant new NYC O&S Committees and/or Area Constituency Committees as appropriate for consideration. Any matters relating specifically to O&S Committees have been referred to those Committees (See below). The former Harrogate Borough Council Overview and Scrutiny Commission had agreed not to undertake larger reviews in the final year prior to reorganisation. It had previously expressed an on-going interest in some areas where perhaps in depth reviews in the work programme may be appropriate in the future. The Commission therefore maintained a “watching brief” as part of the work programme on the following and Members were provided with relevant updates:

- Local bus provision - *Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Scrutiny Committee*
- Sports pitches - *Scrutiny of Health or Corporate and Partnerships or Transition Committee*
- Use of agency workers - *Corporate and Partnerships (If service specific – i.e. looking at Children’s Social workers could be an item for a specific Committee, e.g. Children and Families)*
- Contract tendering/procurement - *Corporate and Partnerships*
- Double taxation/parish precept - *Scrutiny Board or Corporate and Partnerships*

6. Informal Briefings

The following informal session is proposed:

- Local Transport Plan - 29 June 2023 at 10.30 am

7. Work Programme

The Committee’s work programme is at Appendix 1.

Recommendation

Members are asked to consider, amend and add to the Committee’s work programme.

Democratic Services
North Yorkshire Council

Background documents: None

This page is intentionally left blank

Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee Work Programme

1. Meetings and identified Items

Special Meeting Friday 5 May 2023, 10.00am at Harrogate Civic Centre	
Traffic Regulation Orders - Harrogate Transforming Cities Fund	Written Report from Corporate Director - Environment. Attendance of County Councillor Keane Duncan (Executive Member).
Thursday 8 June 2023 at 10am at Harrogate Civic Centre	
ACC Guide to Ways of Working	Written report from Democratic Services
Any appointments required by this ACC to new outside bodies	Written report from Democratic Services.
Petition for a maximum speed of 20 mph on roads in south west Harrogate	Petition from members of the public
Petition in opposition to Harrogate Station Gateway	Petition from Harrogate Civic Society/ Harrogate Independents/ Granville Road Residents/ Harrogate Residents Association/ Stray Defence Society/ Chamber of Commerce.
Thursday 14 September 2023 at 10am at Harrogate Civic Centre	
Otley Road Phase 2 Sustainable Transport Package. (This item is 'likely for early summer, subject to confirmation'.)	Written report from Highways Officers.
Youth Council Update	Oral update by representatives of the Youth Council on issues of importance to the Youth Council.
Thursday 23 November 2023 at 10am at Harrogate Civic Centre	
Update from the Member of Parliament for the Harrogate and Knaresborough constituency (subject to the MP being invited and accepting the invite to this meeting)	To receive an update from the Member of Parliament regarding issues of key concern in the constituency.
Schools, Educational Achievement and Finance	Annual report about schools, educational achievement, and finance.
Friday 12 January 2024 at 10am at Harrogate Civic Centre	
Annual Council Budget Review	To review the annual Council budget
Thursday 14 March 2024 at 10am at Harrogate Civic Centre	
<i>No specific business is allocated to this meeting yet</i>	

2. Items identified - Dates to be agreed

Other work items that the Area Constituency Committee wishes to discuss, although the precise meetings have not yet been identified:-

- Harrogate Transport Improvements Programme – Stage 2 Findings and Recommendations – Report from Highways Officers – For a meeting to be held in 2023.
- Harrogate Bid to be invited to an ACC meeting to express its views.
- Antisocial Behaviour – To invite the Youth Service and the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner to attend an ACC meeting to give an account of the measures they are taking to address youth-related ASB in a collaborative way across the constituency.
- Support for small businesses – To invite the business community to advise the ACC how it can best be supported.
- Update on Beyond Carbon – A briefing on how this impacts the Harrogate and Knaresborough constituency area.
- Feedback from the Scrutiny of Health Committee on the results of its scrutiny work concerning wait-times for ambulances, NHS dentistry, and GP services.

3. Informal Briefings

The following informal briefings have taken place to support major work items:

- 20 April 2023 Harrogate Station Gateway

AREA CONSTITUENCY COMMITTEES

Membership

The Council will appoint the Area Constituency Committees in accordance with Article 10.

Quorum

The quorum will be not less than 3 Members.

Substitute Members

Substitute Members are not permitted on the Area Constituency Committees.

Terms of Reference

1. In relation to Area Constituency Committees, see also Article 10 of the Constitution.
2. Area Constituency Committees should not make decisions which significantly affect parts of North Yorkshire outside the Committee's area.
3. Area Constituency Committees shall provide for visible local democracy and accountability for Division and Executive Members through public meetings held in each of the Constituency Committee areas.
4. The Area Constituency Committees shall act as a forum for local issues to be raised by the public and/or Community Networks through questions and statements.
5. The Area Constituency Committees shall empower and enable delivery of Community Area Action Plans and other local priorities brought to its attention by Division Members, Town and Parish Councils, Community Networks and members of the public.
6. The Area Constituency Committees shall engage in cross boundary discussions whenever appropriate

Delegated Powers

1. To act as consultees in major decisions affecting their area and to influence policy development and the strategic agenda of the Council.
2. To provide meaningful scrutiny of local issues within their area, complementing the strategic work undertaken by the Council's six Overview and Scrutiny Committees.
3. To receive corporate performance information and to hold the Executive to account by constructively challenging performance data or service delivery in respect of issues with local significance.
4. To engage upon, receive reports and be consulted on, major educational health care and leisure issues affecting their locality.
5. To engage throughout the year with the 6 North Yorkshire MPs to develop a shared understanding of key local issues and opportunities affecting the area.

6. To engage with relevant partnerships and partner organisations in identifying potential areas for support and issues to challenge and to join up relevant partners in areas of shared interest.
7. To advise the Council on boundary consultations.
8. To monitor and act as a consultee in relation to major projects within the Area Constituency Committee boundary.
9. To make appointments to outside bodies in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 3 of Schedule 5 to Part 3 of the Constitution.
10. To exercise, within the approved budget and policy framework, the following powers and duties:
 - *(a) aspects of the Private Street Works procedure for which objections have been received;
 - *(b) the making and enforcement of new street Byelaws and Orders;
 - *(c) the stopping up or diversion of highways (other than public rights of way) where an objection is received from any person or body entitled under the relevant statute;
 - *(d) the stopping-up and provision of access to premises from highways;
 - (e) the promotion of road safety information, advice or training;
11. To act as a consultee on Traffic Regulation Orders where it is considered by the Corporate Director of Environment in consultation with the relevant Executive Member(s) that a proposed Traffic Regulation Order meets the criteria for having a wide area impact.
12. To respond to any consultation under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, Section 3.
13. To consider other matters referred to it by the Council, the Executive or overview and scrutiny committees.
14. To make recommendations to the Corporate Director of Community Development in respect of 'seed funding' or match funding for projects to be allocated from any delegated Area Constituency Committee Budget the Director may have.
15. To lead, consider and make recommendations concerning the promotion of economic development within the Area Constituency Committee area.
16. To promote and encourage enterprise and investment in the Area Constituency Committee area and to maintain and sustain the economic well-being and regeneration of the area.
17. To develop a climate where businesses and individuals can innovate, compete and contribute to the economic development and regeneration of the area, and excellence in local business.

18. To encourage the growth of existing businesses in the area and access to the skills and training necessary to support them.
19. To consider and make recommendations relating to the promotion, maintenance and enhancement of the vitality and viability of shopping centres / market towns within the area.
20. To make recommendations to the Corporate Director of Community Development on the expenditure of Community Infrastructure Levy and appropriate section 106 expenditure.
21. To consult with the Chamber of Commerce, Federation of Small Businesses, residents and other interested third parties.
22. To promote and encourage tourism and heritage, arts, leisure and culture, and to scrutinise progress of plans and proposals related to this and also decarbonisation, agriculture, transport and the care sector.
23. To consider making recommendations in relation to parking (off street provision in Council owned / leased off street parking places).
24. To consider and review crime and disorder and community safety.
25. To check upon the working of double devolution deals within the ACC boundary.
26. With the agreement of the Chair of the Area Constituency Committee, to make recommendations to the appropriate officer and/or body regarding the following matters as they affect the Area Constituency Committee's area:
 - a) Housing
 - b) Transport
 - c) Estate needs for North Yorkshire Council
 - d) Climate change and environmental issues

NB: Items marked * are delegated to Area Constituency Committees by the Council; other items are delegated to Area Constituency Committees by the Executive.

This page is intentionally left blank