

North Yorkshire Council

Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 20th June, 2023 commencing at 11.00 am.

Councillor Carl Les in the Chair. plus Councillors Gareth Dadd, Derek Bastiman, Michael Harrison, Janet Sanderson, Keane Duncan, Greg White and Annabel Wilkinson.

In attendance: Councillors Paul Haslam, Kevin Foster, Lindsay Burr MBE, George, George Jabbour, John McCartney and Andrew Murday.

Officers present: Karl Battersby, Stuart Carlton, Gary Fielding, Nic Harne, Barry Khan, Richard Webb, Melanie Carr, Daniel Harry, Amanda Newbold, Abigail Barron, Aimi Brookes, Michael Leah, John Lee, Barbara Merrygold, Andrew Dixon and Howard Emmett.

Other Attendees: .

Apologies: Simon Myers and David Chance. .

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

253 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors David Chance and Simon Myers, and from Richard Flinton – Chief Executive Officer

254 Minutes of the Meeting held on 30 May 2023

Resolved –

That the public Minutes of the meeting held on 30 May 2023, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and confirmed by the Chairman as a correct record.

255 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Greg White declared an interest in Agenda Item 9 – CIL proposals submitted by Ryedale District Council, as his wife was a Trustee of Ryedale Learning Trust.

256 Public Participation

There were a number of public participants registered to speak on Agenda items 5, 7 and 9. The Chair agreed to hear from those participants as part of consideration of the relevant agenda item.

257 Proposal to amalgamate Caedmon College Whitby and Eskdale School.

Considered – A report of the Corporate Director for Children & Young People's Service providing information upon which to determine the proposal to amalgamate Caedmon

College Whitby and Eskdale School, resulting in the technical closure of Eskdale School and the Eskdale site and an increase in the planned admission number for the amalgamated school, from 1 September 2024.

Councillor Annabel Wilkinson introduced the report and drew attention to the scale of the consultation responses. She also acknowledged the difficult nature of the decision to be taken, given its impact on the residents of Whitby, and noted that everyone present wanted the best for the young people of Whitby. She suggested that the proposal offered the opportunity to address the low pupil numbers, significant financial challenges at both schools and the imperative to secure the best education and curriculum for the young people of Whitby.

It was noted that six public submissions had been received, as follows:

1. Mr David Bradley

I am writing to you again because I honestly do not believe that the above proposal is in the best interest of young learners and the wider community. I have lived near Whitby for thirty-two years and been privileged to serve as a secondary headteacher for nearly twenty years - fourteen at Eskdale School. I have a strong network of ex-colleagues and friends who believe that this plan is ill-conceived and fundamentally flawed – a view which is strongly endorsed by the very recent “Vision for Whitby” survey.

Everyone that I have spoken with accepts the fact that the current situation of surplus places cannot continue. However, putting all the 11-16 cohort onto the oldest site with the smallest playing fields and adjacent to one of the busiest roads in Whitby is not the best or safest option. In my opinion, other options have not been properly considered. A very small number of ‘federated’ governors, assisted by officers of the local authority, have devised a plan which solves the current financial problems but, will undoubtedly store up significant issues in the medium and longer term. I call upon our elected members to be brave enough to halt this process immediately before we sleepwalk into another short-term solution.

The current situation in Whitby is intolerable for children, parents, and staff. North Yorkshire Council need to transform it, not follow the example of their predecessors. As a new unitary authority, they should grasp the opportunity to make ambitious, inventive, and innovative decisions which are a force for good. A variety of options should be explored and presented to our young people, many of whom will be the parents of tomorrow in this community. These options must be costed and future-proofed, unlike the current proposal. We have not been given the financial value of the three sites. We have not been given costings to upgrade the former Whitby School. We have not been given the cost of escorting students across Mayfield Road and we do not know the cost to the environment of buses being parked on the main road.

We do know that there is £10 million available for the maritime hub. Surely, this should be factored into overall provision for the secondary sector. If more people do move into the Whitby area, which seems likely, how will we accommodate them in a 1920s building with a ‘ragbag’ collection of buildings and very few eco-friendly attributes as well as a distinct shortage of playing fields? If the Sixth Form numbers stay the same or dwindle, there is little chance of the revenue budget being able to maintain the buildings at the former Caedmon School. How long will it be before buildings here need to be mothballed, shut, or sold?

Frankly, the proposal offered by the Federated Governing Body is not fit-for-purpose and should be rejected without any more hesitation

2. Mrs Terrie-Ann Jones

I sit here again, last time I had hope that the people in this room would see the big picture of Whitby Secondary Education, this time I know the decisions made in this room aren't

about the evidence, aren't about the people's voices. It's about money you will walk out of here like you did in April and not give the decision a second thought.

You don't have to look at staff who are emotional and mentally drained, who have no idea what their futures hold. You don't have to tell a child who has escaped their bullies that they will have to see them every day or travel 30 mins every day so they can escape. You don't have to tell the child with SEND that their safe place that the teachers they are attached to will be changing but you have no idea what will happen because the governors have not thought that far ahead.

The reports you have in front of you, are not the full picture. The 6th form, which is at the centre of this proposal has already had £600,000+ of public funds spent on it. What impact has this had on Education and attendance? Where are the guarantees that closing Eskdale will boost 6th form number and all 11-16 education in Whitby will not continue to fund it. That only one option was discussed and decided on in September 2022. The consultation was a tick the box exercise, our children our committee never stood a chance.

Did you know that the split site funding stops, if they don't acadamise quickly the drop in budget has to be covered by NYC?

The Governors have refused to engage with stakeholders including the town council since January. Transparency, Honesty two things seriously lacking. - we can show you every piece of raw evidence we have - we have nothing to hide. We have parented, worked, and dedicated the last 6 months to getting the best for our children, and the future of Whitby. This will affect generations Unlike you we can't walk away and forget. We will have to deal with the aftermath, we have to pick up the pieces.

I have 5 questions for you:

How many of you have visited the schools, spoken to staff and Children?

How many of you have done extra research into this subject considering, the Town Council have asked for the governing board to step down - for lack of interaction.

If this is the all singing all dancing solution, why aren't the governors and NYC shouting it from the roof tops, with glossy images course models, staffing models??

Why did NYC and The Governors Defer Caedmon's Ofsted? - when it could prove it was a good school, with strong leadership and a brilliant base for an amalgamated school.

Who is Education For?

3. Peter Graham

Action should have been taken long before the occupancy of Secondary schools in Whitby got as low as 60%. The main reason for the problem is the 6th form at only 28.4% which would have been worse if £664k had not been spent reducing its capacity to 483 from 550 with little or no return on the investment yet. How are the numbers going to treble quickly to make it viable?

How much is it costing for energy for this school year? - There has been a 500% increase for schools with a poor fabric due to the current energy crisis. My estimate is £208k similar to Eskdale or over £1500 per student 3 x that of Eskdale. By looking at the Government websites for both schools there is only ONE school that has significant financial challenges.

In July 2017 Caedmon had £885k in the bank and 5 years later this had reduced by £1.28m to - £394k despite making a sudden profit of £211k in 2021-2. Eskdale in the same period moved from a small negative to £44k an improvement of £68k despite a sudden loss of £71k.

The 3 main areas of concern to me suggests not only has Caedmon grossly overspent, it's starting to milk Eskdale dry.

	Eskdale.	Caedmon.
Full time teachers salaries.	+£660k. 27.8 to 28.3	-£480k. 65 to 47.
Bought in Prof Services.	+£ 77k.	-£ 24k.
Education Consultancy.	+£ 42k.	-£ 22k.

Both schools got New Headteachers in September and the Governors recruited a very expensive Executive Head to oversee BOTH schools - what happens when one closes?

North Yorkshire Council and the school Governors have not only refused to give information out but deliberately blocked requests for it even when freedom of information requests were put in - why?

The 2 public meetings at Whitby Pavilion weren't advertised by the organisers with only Whitby Network and the protest group giving the event publicity - why?

When I viewed the Executive Committee making its unanimous decision to go ahead with the proposal after what had been said, written and read out as were hundreds of pages of statements and questions not one defence of any accusations or indeed warning if not true, I realised your all in it together.

A letter read out was sent in by "A" Mr David Bradley apparently, a gentleman who knows more about Secondary Education than anyone at the meeting having been Head Teacher at Eskdale when it and indeed the original Caedmon were in the top 10% nationally - that's what healthy competition creates. He also experienced the pitfalls of running a split site school in Northallerton prior to retiring. How many people sat round the table have ever been involved in Education and do most always look disinterested when attending - were 3 of them playing with or using their laptops relevant to a very important meeting in my eyes.

In summary without a valid explanation as to why the proposal has to be what it is I will presume you all have something you have to protect.

4. Mrs Alison Hume

I would like to express support for the families with children with special needs and disabilities who have fought so hard to save Eskdale School from closure. As a parent who has faced the challenges of finding the right schools for my son with complex disabilities my heart really goes out to those who had found their right school in Eskdale and now have to contemplate a future without it.

Nobody likes change and for children with SEND and mental health needs, and their families and carers, it can be completely overwhelming. Should the Executive decide to adopt the Governors' proposals today I would ask that targeted and individualised extra support is put in place for children with SEND and identified mental health needs as soon as possible to prepare for the transition.

I would also like to ask a question about the help available for families who will struggle to afford the cost of a new school uniform due to the very high cost of living. At a meeting of the Scarborough and Whitby Area Constituency Committee on 24th March, my local councillor Cllr Neil Swannick proposed that the Local Authority allocate funding to put in place support measures, including financial support for such extra costs such as uniforms, to assist parents and students during the transition. This response was approved.

I refer you to the minutes of the Executive Meeting of 18th April, 2023 where the recommendations from the Area Constituency Committee were noted along with the observation that the Executive will be required to consider the recommendation in conjunction with these proposals at the appropriate time if the proposals are published and this returns for a decision to close the school on 20 June 2023. That day has now arrived and therefore I would be grateful if the Executive might consider making a financial

support package available to help families in the event of a decision to close Eskdale School and rebrand Caedmon College.

5. Su Crossland

My name is Su Crossland and I am co-chair of governors for the Whitby Secondary Partnership as well as a parent of a child at Eskdale School and I spoke at the last meeting about the exciting opportunity we feel this amalgamation could be.

Today I also want to acknowledge the fact that this has been a difficult and emotive process for many people. I don't think anyone will disagree with the fact that Eskdale has been a wonderful experience for many students over the years and letting go of that is hard. But that doesn't mean that we can't create something as good, if not better, for our students.

Despite accusations of impropriety, everything we have done as governors is always with the best interests of the students first and foremost. We have nothing to gain from this process yet have poured our hearts and souls into it to ensure the current and future students of Whitby get the best secondary education possible. We fully believe this is the best option to achieve that and will continue to do everything we can to this end.

Can I please say thank you to everyone who has been involved in this process for your input. This can be an exciting opportunity for everyone involved and I hope that whatever the decision, we can work together as a community to ensure we provide the best education and opportunities for our young people because, at the end of the day, that's what matters

6. Miss Tallulah Jones

My name is Tallulah Jones, I'm in year 5 at West cliff Primary school. Your decision today doesn't have an effect on your life, BUT it does mine. The decision today maps out my future.

Me and my friends will be the first to try this NEW school, YET mum and her friends have asked for plans for things to show how this will work. but you won't give them... WHY? This makes them sad and angry - they want what's best for us.

I was scared to go to big school, but even though the governors were planning this they let me and my friends look round the schools and make decisions about our futures.... Why if they wanted to close Eskdale? I felt safe at Eskdale, I know that's the school for me, like every other child who has chosen it before. My big sisters went there, one's at uni and one's going into the police, it's not just bricks it's a feeling, it's the teachers, it's special.

I have decided if I can't go to Eskdale I won't go to Caedmon, I will travel 30 mins to another school, mum's not happy but she says she will do it so I'm happy.

Who is Education for? It's for me, my friends, my little brother and all the children in Whitby now and in the future... we need a choice in schools as at one school we might be fish who can't climb trees. Yet at the other we are embraced for the brilliant swimmers we are.

Every school like every child is different and the right match gets the best results - we want our right to choose. Adults make mistakes like us children.... We get told off for covering them up ... don't ruin my future to cover their mistakes. Thank you.

Cllr Annabel Wilkinson thanked Tallulah Jones for coming to the meeting and for sharing her thoughts and ideas with the Executive. She also acknowledged how difficult it was to have changes being talked about at the same time as when Miss Jones was thinking about choosing a new school.

She was pleased to note the positive things Miss Jones said about Eskdale School and confirmed that the Governors of both schools were proud of their pupils and staff. She confirmed that some parts of the planning for the new school had needed to wait until a final decision was made and suggested that if the Executive decided to approve the new school, senior staff at both schools would make sure that pupils and parents knew what was going on next year, and beyond.

She drew attention to the very important focus on bringing together all the good things that were already happening at Eskdale and Caedmon into one new school. She suggested the new school would have many of the same staff and children –and many of the positive feelings that Miss Jones had talked about.

Cllr Wilkinson recognised that:

- Everyone wanted schools to be welcoming so that young people could feel happy and safe.
- If you felt comfortable at school and had the best support, then you could achieve more.
- Everybody was different, and school staff tried their best to make sure they supported everyone.
- Education was for young people
- Everyone at the meeting wanted education in Whitby to be the best that it could be

Finally, she stated her hope that whatever decision was made, Miss Jones would continue to be as interested in her education and the decisions that affected it.

In response to the other five public submissions, Stuart Carlton – Corporate Director Children & Young People's Service drew attention to the Executive report dated 18 April 2023 and the report for this meeting and noted:

- The report to the Executive on 18 April 2023 clearly set out the other options that had been considered and the reasons that the proposal had been brought forward for consultation.
- Through the extensive consultation process conducted in February and March 2023, the statutory representation period in May, and the public statements delivered at the meeting, no viable alternative option had been identified that would address the pupil numbers, finances and provide a sustainable model to deliver the best education to the young people of Whitby.
- The Council had complied with the legislation for publishing the statutory proposals and with regard to consultations being carried out. It had adhered to the government's consultation principles including a full pre-publication consultation process. The public meetings were advertised and well attended, and the number of responses submitted indicated the considerable level of engagement with the consultation.
- The consultation set out the projected finances for both schools and the proposed amalgamated school. As part of the implementation of the proposal, the Council would work with school leadership to identify the amalgamated school's capital priorities.

- The Whitby Secondary Partnership shared several staff and other resources across both schools within the federation and consequently there was a need for a transfer of funding between the two school budgets in respect of these shared resources. The Council considered that the federation has used their public finances appropriately.
- The sixth form provision in Whitby was emotive and the consultation had shown there were those for and against retaining the provision. Governors had stated their vision for secondary education in Whitby was the continuation of education for 16–18-year-olds as part of an amalgamated school.
- Closing the sixth form would have no impact on the Eskdale School budget and would therefore do nothing to address its significant projected deficit.
- By introducing the proposed change from September 2024, there would be a year for school staff to plan and prepare for implementation. The wellbeing of pupils and the support made available for all pupils would be a key priority. Part of the proposal was for a larger resource for pupils to access, with dedicated members of staff responsible for pupil welfare, inclusion, and targeted and specialist support in the newly amalgamated school. However, it is recognised that should a decision be taken to amalgamate the schools, there was much work for school leaders to do to ensure the transition process for existing students was comprehensive and clear for parents and children.
- As part of the planning for the proposal and through the Equalities Impact Assessment it was acknowledged that the period of transition would require support for *all* pupils but particularly those with Special Educational Needs.
- Governors and leaders wanted to establish a pupil-centred inclusive school, where pupils were individuals and part of a school community. They had further identified that the proposal for one amalgamated school would see the work of the SEND Teams, Alternative Provision and the Targeted Mainstream Provision come together as part of an Inclusion Hub, which would provide intervention and ongoing support for all pupils but specifically those identified with more personalised needs.
- The federated governing board had prioritised inclusion as part of their transition planning, building on the joint Caedmon and Eskdale Special Educational Needs Coordinator meetings. For every child with an Education, Health and Care Plan naming either of the two schools, the amalgamation would be considered at the point of their annual review. Any queries or concerns could be discussed either with the School Special Educational Needs Coordinator, North Yorkshire Special Educational Needs Information Advice and Support Service (SENDIASS), or with the Council's SEND and Inclusion services if required.
- At the Scarborough & Whitby Area Committee, 24 March 2023. the committee had resolved that: *“If the statutory organisation proposals for amalgamation of Caedmon College & Eskdale School & technical closure of Eskdale school consultation results in amalgamation, the Scarborough & Whitby Area Constituency Committee recommends to the Executive that the Local Authority will allocate funding to put in place support measures, including financial support for such extra costs as uniforms, to assist parents and students during the transition.”* As part of their planning for the potential implementation of that proposal, school leaders and governors had considered the uniform requirements for a newly amalgamated school. If the proposal was approved the school leadership would finalise their plans and consider what support the school would be able to offer to implement their proposed changes to uniform. The costs of any proposal would be considered as part of the ongoing dialogue regarding the financial position of the federation, and the local authority will review any proposal in line with the Notices of Financial Concern, the North Yorkshire Scheme for Financing Schools and de-delegated funding arrangements. School leaders and governors were

clear that the financial cost of the implementation to parents must be minimised in line with the department for education's statutory guidance on the cost of school uniforms.

In regard to Ofsted, Stuart Carlton confirmed Caedmon College Whitby had been contacted by Ofsted in reference to a section 5 inspection. The school had been preparing for the inspection for over a year and had been working on the actions outlined in the monitoring visit that took place in 2022. However school leaders, upon receiving notification call and discussing the timing of the inspection with governors and the local authority, submitted a request for deferral to the Ofsted Lead Inspector. This request was subsequently accepted, and the Ofsted's regional director decided to defer the inspection.

Finally, on behalf of the Chair of governors Stuart Carlton paid tribute to the governors of the Whitby Secondary Partnership, who have worked incredibly hard to develop the proposal. He recognised that schools relied on governors to work voluntarily to ensure schools were led and managed effectively and that children achieved well, were safe and that money was well spent. He thanked the governors of the Whitby Secondary Partnership for their determination and commitment during the consultation process, and also *all* governors across North Yorkshire schools and academies that continued to give their own time to support the county's children and schools.

The public participants were all given the opportunity to ask a supplementary question, and in response to those questions the following was confirmed:

- The Ofsted inspection had come at a difficult time for the school given the ongoing public consultation and that was seen by Ofsted's regional director as a legitimate reason to defer the inspection.
- The capital needs of the school moving forward would be considered, in line with the Authority's capital requirement and work programme for the whole school estate across the county.
- The school's position alongside a busy road was nothing new. Pupil numbers had been higher in the past therefore it was not now a deciding factor.
- The previous investment in to the sixth form was fully disclosed at the time and was a decision of the Opportunity Area Board and the Authority. Stuart Carlton, as a statutory officer of the Council confirmed he was responsible for education, and therefore his involvement in that previous decision was correct and proper.
- The dates of the public meetings were included in the consultation document circulated in February 2023. It was shared with parents, Whitby primary schools (to share with parents) and all identified stakeholders. The numbers attending the meetings showed the level of interest and confirmed the advertisement had worked.
- The governors decided very early on to give an extra year to any transitional arrangement, with the purpose of slowing the process down and providing the necessary support in a measured way over a longer period. The school would only start working on what that support would look like once a decision on the proposed amalgamation had been taken. The transitional work for those pupils with SEND would start as early as possible.
- The Authority would work with the school to provide financial support to ensure the impact on parents was minimal.
- The intention behind the proposal was to provide a one site school that was big enough to provide a depth of curriculum and quality of education that all Whitby children deserved.

Councillor Gareth Dadd noted it was always going to be a difficult decision and sympathised with those living in the Whitby community who were fearful of change, recognising that not everybody liked change.

Councillor Janet Sanderson noted the public contributions. She acknowledged that for those pupils with SEND, change was always difficult, but she also recognised that the

proposal brought with it opportunities for the future that might otherwise not materialise for those children with mainstream targeted needs.

Having noted the report and all of the contributions at the meeting, the Executive all voted in favour of the recommendations in the report, and it was

Resolved – That:

- i. the issues listed in section 9 of the report had been satisfied and there could be a determination of the proposals.
- ii. Eskdale School and Caedmon College Whitby be amalgamated through:
 - Ceasing to maintain Eskdale School from 31 August 2024.
 - Increasing the published admission number of Caedmon College Whitby to 240, from 1 September 2024.

258 Recommendations following consultation on de-designation of Children’s Centres

Considered – A report of the Corporate Director – Children and Young People’s Service providing a summary of the consultation response on a proposal to close five designated Children’s Centres and seeking approval to de-register and close those Children’s Centres.

Councillor Janet Sanderson introduced the report and drew attention to an error in paragraph 1.1 of the report where Nidderdale had incorrectly been listed twice and Eastfield omitted. She also drew attention to the consultation responses and noted there no responses relating to three of the Centres – Kirbymoorside, Eastfield or Wensleydale, and of the sixteen responses received, only three were not supportive of the proposals.

It was noted the proposal was about property rationalisation as part of the CYPS savings plan and attention was drawn to the potential savings at paragraph 6.1 of the report.

Councillor Andrew Murday spoke about the Nidderdale Centre at St Cuthbert’s School in Pateley Bridge which was not currently in use and nor would the school find any future use for it. He questioned the costs associated with delivering the service through domiciliary visits and suggested it might prove less useful in identifying other issues such as domestic abuse. He drew attention to the services provided by Nidderdale Plus and suggested the use of the facility would enable an extension of their services and therefore asked that it not be de-designated.

In response Stuart Carlton, Corporate Director – Children and Young People’s Service confirmed that de-designation was a technical requirement of the primary legislation still in place in regard to Children’s Centres, even though other elements of the legislation had since been removed, such as Ofsted inspections. Once de-designated the Centres would no longer be recognised as Children’s Centres on the DfE’s database. However that would not prevent the buildings from being used for similar purposes in the future and welcomed future discussions with interested stakeholders.

Councillor Michael Harrison recognised it was a technical event that would not prevent costed plans coming forward.

Having considered the report and the discussions at the meeting, the Executive

Resolved – That the five named Children’s Centres be de-registered and closed.

259 Selby Area Garden Waste Service

Considered – A Report of the Corporate Director – Environment seeking approval for the introduction of a subscription-based garden waste service in the Selby area in line with the rest of North Yorkshire at the harmonised rate. The proposal was that subscriptions would open from 3 July 2023 with the charged service beginning w/c 28 August 2023, and a pro-rata rate of £29 be charged for 2023/24.

The report also proposed that further harmonisation of the garden waste service across the North Yorkshire Council area including charging periods, subscription periods and winter close down be agreed based on the proposals for the Selby area.

Councillor Greg White introduced the report and confirmed that the collection of garden waste was not a statutory service, and whilst all the former District/Borough Councils did offer to collect it, only Selby District Council did so without any charge. He noted the proposal in the report would deliver a harmonised service.

There was one public submission received from Mrs Gillian Ivey, who was unable to attend the meeting. Her submission was therefore read out on her behalf as follows:

'As one of the lead Councillors who was responsible for the introduction of Green Waste Collection in the former Selby District Council Area, I have taken a keen interest in the results of the recent consultation on charging for Green Waste Collection.

I note that over 50% of responders have stated that they will simply put their green waste in the grey bin instead. This was not allowed under the scheme run by the former Selby District Council.

So my question to Executive members is this; are residents who do not wish to pay a charge for a green bin now allowed to put green waste in their grey bin ?

Although the paper presented today states there is no evidence of a major increase in weights of household waste following the introduction of charging in other areas, I do not see any facts and figures to back up this statement or an indication of where this was the case. I suggest to you that based on previous experience and also the responses to the consultation question, that a different scenario may play out in the Selby area.'

In response Councillor Greg White confirmed 3,580 consultation responses had been received which equated to less than 9% of properties in the former Selby District Council area. Whilst the consultation response indicated that 51% of respondents would put garden waste in residual bins that equated to less than 2,000 properties. He also noted the following:

- Information from the other garden waste collection services across the rest of North Yorkshire suggested households that did not subscribe to the service tended to either compost their garden waste material at home or take it to their local home waste and recycling centre.
- Crews would not be checking refuse bins for garden waste and had never done so in the area.
- Residents would be advised to compost or take their garden waste to the household waste recycling centre if possible.
- Sharing garden waste bins with neighbours was another good option for residents to consider if they had smaller amounts of garden waste.
- Composting at home was an easy and environmentally friendly way to deal with garden waste and residents can find out more at: www.northyorks.gov.uk/bins-recycling-and-waste/reduce-and-reuse/composting There were also instructions on how to turn an old wheelie bin into an efficient home composter.

Councillor John McCartney questioned whether it was about harmonisation, as he suggested the level of service received would depend on where in North Yorkshire a resident lived. He confirmed residents in his area were not happy with the proposal as it was seen as a 25% cut in service level, and he expressed concern that the service might be removed in the future if subscription take-up was low.

In response to his concerns and questions, Councillor Greg White confirmed the proposal to limit the service period was based on evidence of lorries coming back empty at certain times so the year. It was also confirmed that green bins would be removed on request from those who did not subscribe to the new subscription-based garden waste service, and they would either be re-used or recycled. Finally he confirmed he had no concern about the long term sustainability of the service, noting that approximately 40% of households across other areas of the county made use of the services on a chargeable basis.

Councillor Michael Harrison reflected on when a chargeable service was introduced in the Harrogate area and confirmed that the same concerns were raised at that time but were proven to be unfounded. Councillor Derek Bastiman confirmed the same experience in the Scarborough area when the service was introduced there. He noted that the initial take up had been good and had since increased.

The Executive all voted in favour of the recommendations, and it was

Resolved – That:

- i. A subscription-based garden waste service be introduced in the Selby area in line with the rest of North Yorkshire at the harmonised rate.
- ii. Subscriptions open from 3 July 2023 with the charged service beginning w/c 28 August 2023, and a pro-rata rate of £29 be charged for 2023/24.
- iii. Further harmonisation of the garden waste service across the North Yorkshire Council area be undertaken, including charging periods, subscription periods and winter close down, based on the proposals for the Selby area.

260 Care Market Proposals for Craven

Considered – A report of the Corporate Director – Health & Adult Services updating on ongoing work to support the development of the care market in Craven to ensure it could continue to meet the emerging needs of the locality and the strategic intentions to develop new accommodation-based services in Craven and seeking approval for the replacement of Neville House Elderly Person's Home with new accommodation-based services.

Councillor Michael Harrison introduced the report and noted the proposals were for an expansion of the Authority's extra care model and investment in the Gargrave area, and the associated closure of Neville House.

He acknowledged that Neville House was a much-loved facility, providing good care to its seven residents. However he noted it was no longer fit for purpose in its current form. He suggested the timing of the proposal was as good as it was going to get, and that the forward thinking and enthusiastic workforce would be redeployed.

He was pleased to note the Authority's successful extra care programme was nationally recognised and that the proposal would provide an opportunity to procure smaller schemes to transform the programme in a way that would previously have been impossible. He also noted that the deterioration of Neville House did not allow time for the provision of a new extra care facility in Gargrave ahead of its closure, and the risk of a

forced closure continued to increase.

Councillors Carl Les and Derek Bastiman was both pleased to note that Neville House residents and the staff would be looked after, noting it would lead to improved living standards for those residents.

Councillor Gareth Dadd acknowledged a difficult decision taken at this time would lead to a better result in the medium term. He also noted that in the Thirsk area the introduction of the extra care model had proved very successful.

Councillor Michael Harrison reiterated his commitment to the residents, their families and staff of Neville House, and confirmed residents would only be moved when it was right for them with no fixed closure date.

Having considered the report in full, the Executive voted in favours of the recommendations, and it was

Resolved – That the following be noted:

- i) The care market development work undertaken in Craven to support the Council's strategic priorities in embedding a home first approach that enables people to remain independent and remain in their own homes for longer, reducing reliance on residential care.
- ii) The intention to replace Neville House with new Extra Care Housing in Gargrave, subject to a successful procurement exercise, and the associated closure of Neville House in Autumn 2023.
- iii) The wider work to develop supported accommodation for people with a range of care and support needs, including younger adults, across Craven.

261 To consider the CIL proposals submitted by Ryedale District Council on 29 March

Considered – A report of the Corporate Director of Resources seeking consideration of the recommendations to award Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding to a number of community schemes as requested by Ryedale District Council on 28 March 2023.

Councillor Gareth Dadd introduced the report and provided a factual summary of where the Council was at as of June 2023.

He noted a number of public submissions had been received, as follows:

1. Mark McCandless - Chief Executive Officer, Ryedale Learning Trust

He firstly drew attention to an email received from Gary Fielding on 9 June 2023 at 17.13 which stated:

The report recommends that your request for grant funding is not supported. The recommendation in the report is that CIL is earmarked for school buildings works in the former Ryedale area. The report includes the following excerpt relating to your particular proposal.

We would expect other funding routes to be exhausted prior to any request for CIL including from DfE contribution as this is an academy. Strong sports related project, with community benefit which levered in substantial match funding and had the support of the Football Foundation. Positive scheme but lower priority than the proposed educational use.

He went on to state:

'Thank you for the feedback provided on our application, which I will refer to. We absolutely understand the pressure on NYC in terms of funding and being able to demonstrate delivering value for tax payers' money.'

For clarity, we would like to highlight that the 3G project at Ryedale School has the highest amount of matched funding in place in terms of the schemes being considered today and requires the lowest intervention rate (16%). It has received the support of the Football Foundation, other grant awarding bodies and the general public living in the community as this facility is much needed in the Ryedale area. In terms of value for money, this council has the opportunity to help deliver a project (worth in the region of £1M) that is desperately needed in this part of North Yorkshire, for an investment of 16%, equating to £125k. All funding routes were exhausted (and with significant success) prior to this request for CIL funding, including DfE contributions (the CIF process makes clear that this project will not qualify for funding, and currently this is the only route open to us to bid for DfE capital funding). The match funding already secured for this project will be put at significant jeopardy if we do not receive the investment requested from NYC, and therefore it is highly unlikely this project will go ahead, resulting in over £800k of secured investment being lost for the Ryedale community.'

In terms of our project being lower priority than the proposed educational use of the CIL funds, we are very aware and supportive of the funding being put into Welburn Hall Special School. Our understanding is that the funding earmarked for the refurbishment at Welburn Hall will not provide the school with additional and adequate sporting facilities, which the school requires. As part of our application to the Football Foundation for funding and consultation process, Welburn Hall (as referenced in our application for CIL funding) came forward as a partner organisation due to their lack of suitable sporting facilities on the school site, the lack of opportunity and access their students currently have to integrate with mainstream schools and sport, and the proximity of their site to Ryedale School (2.3 miles).'

Within our usage plan, Welburn Hall have been allocated curriculum and non-curriculum time on the 3G pitch and with access to our PE specialists. To demonstrate our partnership working with Welburn Hall, we have recently agreed that Welburn Hall will use our school kitchen and work alongside our catering staff to prepare and distribute meals back to students at Welburn Hall for the duration of the refurbishment works (2 years from October 2023). This facility would give Welburn Hall students access to sporting facilities which are not deliverable at Welburn Hall due to financial pressures.'

This facility would significantly benefit schools, students and the communities in the Ryedale area of North Yorkshire. NYC's support for this project would therefore demonstrate joined up thinking and deliver strong value for money for the tax payers of this, the former district of Ryedale, and the county. For these reasons, we ask for your support for this project.'

2. Rob Williams – Headteacher, Malton School

'Why have NYCC Officers failed to make any comment in their report on the over £1million of lost external grant funding that will fail to come in to benefit the community and residents of Ryedale if their recommendation is approved by Executive Members today, and what comment would Executive Members like to make to the voting public about that significant loss if they decide to support this recommendation?'*

**Consisting of:*

- £220,000 – Malton Community Sports Centre
- £800,000 – Ryedale School

- £19,000 - Slingsby Sports and Social Club
- £20,000 - Malton Town Council
- £20,000 - Kirkham Henry Dance School
- £18,250 - Broughton Bank Safer Path

This amounts to nearly £1.1million and only includes information from the bids who have responded to my request to share information.'

3. Tim Johnson – Headteacher, Norton College

'Thank you for the feedback provided so far on our application. As a point of clarification, there is a discrepancy in the % intervention related to our application in Appendix A. One of the conditions of approval at the Ryedale District Council Full Meeting on 29 June 2022 was that the College would fund 10% of the scheme, which we expected, and is within our allocated budget.

All alternative funding routes have previously been investigated as noted in the Community Use Plan and previous in-depth communications with Ryedale District Council. As an Academy Trust we do have access to make applications to the DfE's Condition Improvement Fund, however this process is clear in that our requirements for this type of scheme would not qualify for funding.

The existing carpet needs replacing, and some work is required to improve drainage but the rest of the infrastructure surrounding the Astroturf pitch such as floodlights, parking, fencing is in place and requires no investment. The current surface is end of life and an eyesore in its state of disrepair. The finer detail in the application described how, by extending our overall community offer, and through achieving greater economies of scale, we would be able to extend and improve our community offer in addition to solving the known lack of bookable artificial grass pitch space in the Norton and Malton area. The new Astroturf pitch is one crucial element of the overall community offer and we feel that the pitch alone should not be viewed as the only output of the scheme. We feel this has not been properly considered by North Yorkshire Council.

Furthermore, our request for funding for the proposed new Astroturf that was originally submitted to Ryedale District Council on 26 May 2022. It was then considered by the Policy and Resources Committee on the 16 June 2022 where it was recommended for approval to the Full Council.

At the Full Council meeting on 29 June 2022, the funding request was approved. You will note this approval came a significant period in advance of the application round that closed on 30th November 2022 and should not have required further authorisation from North Yorkshire Council but instead should have been considered separately. As you will appreciate both the wider community, and school community believed, following approval at the Ryedale District Council meeting, that this would proceed. There is huge disappointment in the wider and school community to the delay.

Whilst we appreciate the funding pressures on North Yorkshire Council, we feel for the reasons described above, our application provides excellent value for money, and we would ask you to support the project.'

4. Ms Dinah Keal

'Please could the Deputy Leader state when the work required on Welburn Hall School was identified and how much the proposed work at Welburn Hall School will cost, when the work will begin and why this is not being met from the councils existing education budget?

Secondly, when does the council plan to build the proposed school at Norton Lodge? Does the council have plans drawn up for this school?'

5. Steve Arnold - Helmsley Town Councillor.

'Helmsley Town Council is exceedingly disappointed to learn that the CIL funding awarded to Helmsley Open Air Swimming Pool as recently as March this year may not actually be paid over. When the Pool's Trustees were told in March by RDC that the funding had been awarded this was celebrated.

The Pool Trustees and other applicants applied for the funds in good faith. All the supporting information requested was given. Once bids were in, work continued, sourcing suppliers, contractors and additional funding. After all, who would imagine that a grants scheme run by their local authority would be over-ruled by a successor authority for the same area? It was not for applicants to assess the risk that their efforts would be in vain.

The volunteers' work and enthusiasm to provide facilities for Ryedale should not fall victim to political point-scoring by the new North Yorkshire Council asserting its might if not its right. Volunteers' contributions should be valued and appreciated, they're evidence of a vibrant community striving to make Ryedale a better place to live, work and play. Many of the bids will benefit local people who it must be acknowledged lack the facilities and ways of getting to them enjoyed by those living in a less sparsely populated district.

The Pool's plan for improved facilities is an infrastructure project worthy of financial support with CIL monies received by RDC. Helmsley has not received any CIL funds except the payment to the town council for the most recent development, used for play equipment for the new families. The Pool project will benefit many children and families. Learning to swim is one of the most valuable skills a child can learn, the younger the better. Having a family-friendly pool in Helmsley is a Ryedale treasure that should be a priority for infrastructure funding. I will leave the argument about the sources and availability of funding for schools to others to show that using this CIL pot is unnecessary. This is North Yorkshire Council's chance to show it has the imagination and political courage to act in the interests of Ryedale's residents.'

As the Chairman of the Ryedale District Council CIL Grants Committee, I fully expected its decisions to be implemented. These CIL funds should be distributed to the grant applicants as awarded. Why are you not supporting your local residents and electors of Ryedale?

6. Ian Conlan - Chair of Malton Town Council

'Will this Executive consider setting aside this report and deliver what communities want, with mutual respect of democratic and lawful decisions of Ryedale District Council, or risk alienating whole communities and areas, undermining trust in our democratic institutions? Each organisation spent hundreds of hours applying and take a dim view of finger pointing rather than honouring decisions already taken by a sovereign authority. It was a demanding process, approved by democratically elected councillors and certified as legal and valid by officers of that authority and independent legal advisers.

If you don't approve all these schemes today, the loss is real, immediate, in lost hope, lost opportunities, a kick in the teeth for the poorest members of our community for assets they can access for free in our case, and many other schemes, or for an affordable low cost.

The as yet ill-defined CIL priorities of this council have not been scrutinised as this Council seeks to do retrospectively and given the current balance on the Council as I write could well change. CIL is NOT taxpayers' money, as has been suggested, but is money from developers, so this is absolutely not a loss to the tax payer, nor should it be used to plug gaps in capital school funding that is a taxation issue. If Norton requires funding for a new school, for instance, this comes out of the CIL charge for housing schemes precipitating that need in that area, not from robbing resources from other unrelated CIL monies.

The CIL schemes in front of you today which you can choose to approve, are for the very

things that the New Council plan seeks to support, helping reduce inequalities, community cohesion, boost health, wellbeing, and activity levels, with play, sports facilities, both inside and outside schools in our community, a cycle track, a swimming pool, a pump track, grants to help a charity for children with special needs, helping isolated elderly people with limited mobility access a building. Yes, it is the elderly too that have needs. The knock on effects will be lasting if this funding is lost, in opportunities and millions in match funding, and a massive loss in trust and goodwill towards a brand new Council. I urge you to have courage, and work with the communities you serve.'

7. James Milner

'Good morning, my name is James Milner and I am member of the management committee for Slingsby Sports and Social Club.

We, like the other organisations affected, are incredibly disappointed of the decision of this council not to release the allocated CIL funds to allow us to progress the Slingsby Sport for All Project at this time. The project will make a huge difference to our local community by transforming the facilities that are available to members of the community with disabilities and mobility problems who currently find it difficult to engage with and socialise with others and risk isolation as a result.

The enhancement to the sporting and changing facilities will encourage more people, particularly younger members of our community, to participate in sport with all of the health, both physical and mental, that exercise brings.

The benefits of the project to Slingsby Community Primary School are also significant by providing the children with changing facilities on the site of the field that they use for sports rather than having to get changed at the school and walk across.

Despite our disappointment with not receiving the funds allocated by Ryedale District Council we were heartened to hear that North Yorkshire Council "would wish to work with us and others in order to progress the proposals where supported, by looking at alternative funding sources". We were also very pleased to hear the positive comments with regard to our project which were shared with us in the email that we received from Gary Fielding prior to the release of the report into CIL funding.

We have worked incredibly hard to raise the match funding that was identified as part of the original scheme but £19,000 of this funding is dependent on being able to commence the project in this financial year and failure to do so would run the risk of us having to refund that money. We would therefore ask what the alternative funding sources are likely to be, what are the criteria for being able to access those funding sources and what are the time frames?

We are willing to meet and discuss the options at the earliest opportunity in order to progress a project that is ready to start delivering positive benefits for the local community.'

Councillor Lindsay Burr declared an interest as a previous Ryedale District Councillor and went to state:

'The Executive were privileged to have overall power on the decisions which were really important for the local area and could choose to uphold a sovereign council's previous decisions. The CIL grant process was fair, well thought out and most importantly scrutinised, verified and evidenced by officers. It was cross-party decisions with only one member who did not vote in favour. When the new unitary was muted never expected money to be denied. They expected fair decisions from the new Authority. The CIL money was earned by the local area for the local area. These grants can lever in £1000's of matched funding. I refer back to the 2020 campaign for the unitary – stronger together, locals must be at the hear of the new Council, and local people and communities will be at its heart. Is turning down the CIL applications right – these projects will keep these

organisations alive and ensure matched funding is secure. Think of the 1000's that will benefit. I don't feel the officer's recommendations are the right decisions – why do you feel you cannot support the Ryedale CIL applications?'

In response to the submissions made at the meeting, Councillor Gareth Dadd first confirmed the decision the Authority had to make had to have an eye on the medium term and the rest of the Authority area. He noted how unfortunate it was to have come to this position and confirmed that Ryedale District Council was advised that their CIL Community Grant Scheme was an unwise venture and would raise expectations unduly within the community.

He confirmed North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) had pointed out that Section 24 Consent was required, as set out in the report, and that it was unlikely to support such a scheme given the need for larger scale community infrastructure. He was therefore not surprised to be in this position and sympathised with the community organisations who applied for funding and had written the public questions.

He also confirmed Ryedale District Council had assured NYCC that all applicants had been made fully aware of the need for NYCC to provide Section 24 Consent in order for grants to be approved. Community organisations should therefore have been aware of this additional requirement or Ryedale District Council had inadequately communicated the terms within which any proposals could be considered. He again expressed sympathy with community organisations if that information had not been relayed sufficiently. As the responsible Executive Member, he pointed out that both he and the Leader had made clear that they did not approve of the scheme proceeding and there had been significant coverage about the difference of opinion between Ryedale District Council and the then County Council.

He noted it has been said that the process undertaken by Ryedale District Council was a demanding one and that significant time has been invested by community organisations, all possibly to no avail. He understood the point and again had sympathy. However, he suggested the process was flawed as it did not consider broader community infrastructure needs or engage sufficiently with officers from the then County Council given the imminence of vesting day and the creation of a new unitary council. He highlighted that bidding for external funding was also never straight forward as it required applications to comply with the funder's terms and conditions and, as in the case of many of the applications, they needed to match up with those of other external funders. The outcomes of such funds were never guaranteed, and each applicant therefore needed to consider all eventualities and provide for contingency arrangements in the event of one of more funders declining an application. The CIL situation was no different other than Ryedale District Council had created undue expectation by maintaining that it was their sovereign choice to undertake the community grant scheme.

In regard to the issue of sovereignty, Councillor Gareth Dadd drew attention to section 2 of the report, and noted that:

- Ryedale District Council was a sovereign body, but all sovereignty was restricted by law.
- On 10 May 2022 the government issued a direction under Section 24 which placed restrictions on Ryedale District Council in recognition of the unique nature of a transition from the eight councils in North Yorkshire to a single unitary council. Ryedale District Council was therefore never in a position to be able to approve any applications in its own right and it was extremely disappointing that a notable number of Members of Ryedale District Council disregarded this clear point of law.

He could not help but presume that a CIL Community Grant Scheme was an opportunist attempt for Members at Ryedale District Council to spread some financial largesse without any consideration for the longer term future of the tax payer of Ryedale and North

Yorkshire Council. He also recalled that the last democratic elections held in Ryedale were in May 2022 when North Yorkshire Councillors were elected to represent their divisions in the new unitary council – something they were exercising now.

He highlighted that North Yorkshire Council faced significant shortages in Capital Funding across the board and referenced the two Education Capital Schemes set out in the report which are likely to need significant amounts of investment. Given the shortage of Capital Funding, particularly in education, he suggested the Authority must be prepared to make difficult decisions in order to ensure both value for money and that Community Capital Infrastructure was fit for purpose over the longer term, and drew attention to some headlines:

- North Yorkshire's School Condition funding allocation for 23/24 stood at £6m. This was for the maintenance of school buildings, compliance, suitability, or to address modernisation and strategic priorities. This funding pot covered 194 of the 215 maintained schools for which the LA was responsible.
- The total maintenance backlog (i.e. condition life has expired or where there are major condition defects) was conservatively estimated at c.£22m with a further planned maintenance requirement of £75.5m. The total maintenance requirement, therefore, stood at c.£100m
- There was separate funding for basic need (additional school places) of £29m including developer contributions. However, there were two new schools planned for North Northallerton and Knaresborough with up to a further 5 new mainstream schools expected to be required in the next 4-5 years.
- North Yorkshire was the lowest funded local authority in the country in terms of high needs capital funding per head of pupil population.

Councillor Gareth Dadd was pleased to say that given the creation of a unitary council the Authority would now be able to avoid the folly of the past which would ensure that the needs of community infrastructure were established across all tiers of local government and better evidence based decisions could be made.

He noted that all of the applications reviewed were schemes that provided some value to the broader community which the Authority would like to be able to support. However, given the range of demand across the board there was a need to prioritise. He confirmed the Authority wanted to work with community organisations to try and do its bit to help secure other funding where that was possible. He accepted the perils of external funding were always such that applicants needed to have a plan B which the Authority would aim to support them on. He suggested there were a number of practical things that could be done which included the deployment of specialist staff to work with those community organisations (including an external funding officer); a review of the possibility of accessing the Shared Prosperity Fund; working with the Stronger Communities Team; and considering whether there were merits in supporting any proposals from core service budgets.

In response to the specific questions within the public submissions, Councillor Gareth Dadd confirmed the following:

- The Ryedale School scheme as set out would provide valuable enhancement to the facilities that could be enjoyed by Welburn Hall Special School and others. However, Welburn Hall Special School would fail to function at all unless circa £5m could be found in order to deal with the significant problems that it faced. The rise of education and health care plans was well documented and the provision of places at special schools was critical to meet demand. The Council had a plan to deliver a further 350 places across the county and could ill afford to lose places from its existing setting.
- It was noted that the Ryedale Learning Trust had been successful in securing significant amounts of match funding. The reduction in the funding request was therefore welcomed but the Council still needed to consider the relative merits of a

contribution towards a scheme that enhanced facilities as opposed to other schemes that were delivering core community infrastructure as described at Welburn Hall Special School and / or at Norton Lodge should there be a need to build that school.

- The Authority would aim to work with Ryedale Learning Trust in order to identify any other sources of funding and it would also be a matter for Ryedale Learning Trust to establish whether or not they were able to access their own funds as a Trust.
- In regard to the Norton College Scheme, as welcome as much of the scheme was, it was still competing with the provision of core education infrastructure. – Cllr Gareth Dadd accepted that that Ryedale District Council did request Section 24 Consent for that particular scheme sometime before the launch of their CIL Community Grant Scheme. However Section 24 Consent was not granted, because there was a risk that further requests would come in of a similar nature in a piece meal fashion and NYCC was advised that Ryedale District Council was considering the launch of a broader community scheme which led to this consideration today. He confirmed he belief that it was correct to defer a decision on that particular scheme so that the Authority was able to make a decision about the best use of public money alongside all other proposals, for the benefit of the North Yorkshire tax payers.
- In regard to the question from the ex-Leader of Ryedale District Council, Councillor Gareth Dadd suggested that if Ryedale District Council had worked collaboratively with NYCC it would have been better informed about the extent to which need for capital investment far outstripped the supply of capital funding for schools, which had emerged over the last six months.
- The information relating to Welburn Hall School was set out in the report where it was indicated that the cost was circa £5m. Work would begin shortly following tendering.
- The decision to build the new school at Norton Lodge will be made based upon need and the timing of developments in the Norton area. This had been communicated to Ryedale District Council throughout and that was why CIL funding was being requested. To be clear, there was still a possibility that Norton Lodge may not go ahead but if it did then funding would be required. This was a point that seemed to have not been understood by some Members at Ryedale District Council who seemed keener on the dash to splash the cash rather than financial responsibility.
- If the funding was not to be needed for the two schemes highlighted in the report, then the funding would continue to be available for projects that complied with the Infrastructure Funding Statement 2022 and the former Regulations 123 list.

Finally, Councillor Gareth Dadd again offered his sympathies to those community organisations who have put forward requests for CIL Grants, whom he believed had been led up the garden path by Ryedale District Council. He suggested that the leadership of Ryedale District Council owed them an apology for putting political opportunism above responsibly decision making, and was pleased to note the situation would not arise again now that unitary council was in place, and could prevent such nonsense re-occurring and could pull together a sensible and evidence based approach to CIL across the whole of North Yorkshire.

A number of the public participants suggested there had been a lack of respect shown towards former Ryedale District Councillors. Each public participant was given the opportunity to ask a supplementary question, and in response to those questions the following was confirmed:

- The applications had been reviewed based on the approach detailed in paragraph 4.1 of the report, and it noted it was possible to have strong projects but still establish that they were either not a could fit with CIL and/or there were higher priority demands on the funding.
- It was not the fault of the Community bidders that they had ended up in the position they were in with their applications, nor was it a reflection on the quality of the bids put forward. The fault laid with the former Ryedale District Council.

- Where there was high demand, the monies to be put forward by other parties were taken into consideration when determining where to allocate the scarce resources, to ensure best value for money relative to priorities.
- The Chief Finance Officer Group were asked to consider 10 of the 11 bids on 28th March 2023. The Norton College bid was received significantly earlier. However they needed to be considered on mass and the Group were aware there was the potential for a CIL Scheme being launched so they did start to merge in to one. Consent was not declined but it was decided they needed to be considered in the round otherwise there could have been a whole sequence of potential bids coming in which would have resulted in a loss of coherence and created a precedent.
- North Yorkshire County Council did not withdraw the Section 24 process prior to vesting day but it did make it known it was not welcoming any more Section 24 requests, whilst still providing a mechanism for any urgent issues that arose. This was in light of the number coming through and the new unitary council being imminent. The Norton College bid was considered prior to the email being issued confirming Section 24 requests were no longer welcome.
- CIL and tax were both means to fund core capital infrastructure, and neither was ringfenced. It was the job of the Authority to look at the totality of demand and the totality of funding and make decisions based on relative value for money.
- The exemplary manner in which Slingsby Sports & Social Club had conducted themselves throughout the process was noted.

Finally, Gary Fielding - Corporate Director of Resources reiterated that the recommendations within the report were not a reflection on the quality of the proposed schemes but on the priorities the new Authority faced.

Having taken the report and the contributions at the meeting in to account, the Executive voted in favour of the recommendations, and it was

Resolved – That:

- i. The totality of CIL funding transferred from Ryedale DC be retained, rather than approving the grants as proposed by Ryedale DC
- ii. The CIL funding of £3m be allocated to education capital schemes in the former Ryedale district
- iii. Work be undertaken with local groups where possible to assist in other funding opportunities
- iv. The intention to progress an approach to CIL for the Council as part of the transitional arrangements be noted with a report brought forward to the Executive for consideration at an appropriate time.

262 Forward Plan

Considered –

The Forward Plan for the period 12 June 2023 to 30 June 2024 was presented.

Resolved - That the Forward Plan be noted.

263 Date of Next Meeting - 4 July 2023

The meeting concluded at 1.34 pm.