

North Yorkshire County Council

Selby and Ainsty Area Constituency Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the Selby and Ainsty Area Constituency Committee held at Selby District Council Offices, Selby on 13th January 2023 at 10am.

Present:-

Members:-

County Councillors Karl Arthur, John Cattanach, Mark Crane, Melanie Davis (Chair), Stephanie Duckett, Tim Grogan, Mike Jordan, Andrew Lee, Cliff Lunn, John McCartney, Bob Packham, Andy Paraskos, Jack Proud, Steve Shaw-Wright, and Arnold Warneken.

Virtual attendees:-

County Councillor Carl Les – Leader of the Council

Gary Fielding (Corporate Director – Strategic Resources), Karen Iveson (Assistant Director Strategic Resources and Chief Finance Officer Selby DC)

Howard Emmett – Assistant Director, Strategic Resources, Amanda Newbold – Assistant Director, Education and Skills, Jane Le Sage – Assistant Director, Inclusion and John Lee – Strategic Planning Officer

Officers:-

Sharon Fox (Area Highways) Tom Jenkinson (Stronger Communities) and Steve Loach (Democratic Services).

There were five Members of the public present.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

26. Welcome and Apologies

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the Meeting.

Apologies were received from County Councillor Kirsty Poskitt

27. Minutes

Resolved -

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 19th October 2022, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

28. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

29. Budget Briefing

Gary Fielding (Corporate Director – Strategic Resources), Karen Iveson (Assistant Director Strategic Resources and Chief Finance Officer Selby DC) provided a presentation on the 2023/24 budget position and medium term forecast, highlighting the following:-

- Latest Budget Position
- Breakdown of Other adjustments
- Estimated Reserves
- Council Tax Options
- Sticky Issues
- Next Steps
- Local Issues
 - Schools
 - Adult Social Care
 - Infrastructure
 - Selby District Council

Following the presentation Members discussed the details and highlighted the following:-

- A Member reminded officers that the Committee also represented Ainsty and details from that area should also be provided where possible. This was acknowledged.
- Details of the schools in financial difficulty were discussed and it was stated that Selby had one of the lowest proportions in respect of this in the County. It was clarified that Colleges were not included in the figures but the Sixth Forms of maintained schools were.
- In terms of Adult Social Care it was stated that sustainability requests were on the increase, with a number of care providers requiring additional resources to undertake the care services that they have been contracted to provide to the County Council. It was noted that a number of providers were now going to the market to achieve higher rates for their care service provision and were moving away from the Council contracts, which was causing issues in terms of service provision and budgeting accordingly. A Member asked whether the increased requirement for resources was being mirrored by increased wages for those carrying out the care, or whether the companies were simply taking this. In response it was stated that this issue would be investigated as part of the due diligence process, prior to contracts being awarded.
- A Member referred to the Government's plans to block book care beds, and felt this was inappropriate given the unavailability of beds in the area, and suggested that additional resources were required to make this plan viable. In response it was acknowledged that there were issues in relation to care and the delivery of care and a number of innovative ideas were being considered to try and provide more capacity, including provision via family, or in hotels, but this was a difficult matter which would require multiple solutions. It was also noted that it was possible for families to make 3rd party contributions but recognised that was unlikely to assist the higher price for Council contracts.

Karen Iveson (Assistant Director Strategic Resources and Chief Finance Officer Selby DC) outlined the local budgetary issues, highlighting the following:-

- Infrastructure
- Renewable Energy business rates
- Regeneration
- Leisure Services
- Internal Drainage Boards
- HRA

The following issues were highlighted:-

- It was asked whether there were plans to let out the Leisure Centre, or any other community buildings owned by Selby DC. It was confirmed that there were plans to enable this to take place.
- A Member suggested that the presentation should have been circulated prior to the meeting to provide an opportunity for questions to be pre-planned.
- Issues relating to the Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs) were discussed.

(County Councillor Arnold Warkenen declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of an IDB)

Members suggested that a full report was required on the work and responsibilities of IDBs to determine their value for money, with details provided on the areas they cover. A Member noted that IDBs had been established by an Act of Parliament and their establishment could only be altered through Parliament, however, he agreed that it would be useful to have a detailed report on the issues highlighted. A discussion took place on the purpose and service delivery of the IDBs in the area and Members agreed that it would be useful to have a detailed report for consideration at a subsequent meeting. It was noted that a budget increase of around 4% for Selby DC area IDBs had been estimated for 2023/24.

- The Chair raised concerns regarding the use of resources generated by the development of reusable energy sources in the area, with promises made that these would be used to enhance council house facilities, however, the resources had subsequently been diverted into the general pot, despite the areas concerned having to suffer the detrimental effects of these industrial power generators. She also outlined concerns regarding the internal management issues in respect of the Housing Trust and their use of funds. In response it was stated that the Trust was an independent charity. Selby DC had loaned the trust the funds to develop their homes and the money paid by the council for the homes would be used to repay the loans.
- A Member referred to the potential increase in Council Tax for people in the Selby District following the unitary process. It was clarified that this was likely to be at £145.59 per month for band D properties. Members also noted the planned introduction of charges for the collection of green waste, alongside the rise in Council Tax.

(County Councillor Stephanie Duckett declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Housing Trust.)

At this stage of the meeting a problem occurred with the equipment providing remote access to the meeting for officers which meant that they could not be heard, however, it was agreed that the issues had been appropriately covered.

Resolved –

That the presentation and responses to the issues raised be noted.

30. Public Questions or Statements

The Chair stated that there were three public questions/statements for the meeting. Two of those related to agenda items, and would be taken when those items were considered, and the following question/statement from Mrs Mary Spink of Cawood:-

(A small petition from local residents was also submitted in relation to the issues raised, however, there were insufficient signatures to trigger a debate under the County Council's Petition Scheme, therefore, this was taken as a public question.)

I have just moved to 35 Sherburn Street, Cawood.

The amount traffic on such a narrow medieval street is totally unacceptable and dangerous. Outside my house is a give way leading to a single lane. Vehicles go on the path to get past. A man was killed there some years ago.

The motor bikes speed and rev with decibels above the legal limit.

The Parish Council feel they cannot do anything and NYCC are only concerned with expense.

I am campaigning for a single system with traffic from the A19 diverted to Thorpe Lane. I have got lots of signatures and people on the street feel the noise, amount of traffic, fumes and damage to the old buildings has gone on long enough. A 20mph would help, and a number of residents have printed 20mph signs and placed them in their windows, but a diversion or single system would be a better idea.

Mrs Spink circulated two photographs to demonstrate the problems occurring on the road.

The following response had been provided by the Area Highways Team:-

Many streets suffer from 'rat-running' or high volumes of traffic and it is acknowledged creating one-way streets is one way of solving this problem, however there are also disadvantages to altering the direction of traffic flow in this way.

- Some through traffic will simply be diverted onto other, less suitable streets
- The new one-way street may attract more traffic, albeit in the remaining direction
- Residents may have to access their street by an alternative and less convenient, route, which may involve the use of other neighbouring streets
- Traffic speeds may increase due to drivers' perception that there is no on-coming traffic
- Without physical traffic calming, there may be an increase in accidents and their severity
- Some short sections of one-way street are likely to be contravened by drivers – which may require police enforcement.

To make a one-way street legal, the council has to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). A TRO is a legal process which involves the full statutory consultation procedure and can be a lengthy and resource-intensive process. The cost of implementing the scheme would be high, for instance, all signs associated with the scheme would need to be illuminated and traffic calming features would have to be introduced to ensure vehicles speed remain low, there is also the cost of the TRO.

Therefore, based on the location and the disadvantages, the County Council do not have any plans to introduce a one-way system on Sherburn Street, Cawood.

With regard to revving motorcycles and speed, I can confirm that there isn't a sign in the 'The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016' (TSRGD) that covers/advises motor cyclists to stop revving their engines, however any speeding or noise issues that causes alarm, distress or annoyance is a matter for the police to address as they have powers under the Police Reform Act 2002 to take action so I would urge Mrs Spink to report the matter of noise and speed to the police.

The Parish Council and County Councillor have raised concerns regarding speeding in Cawood, please follow the link below to the 20mph speed limit introduced earlier this year:-

[20mph Speed Limit and Zone Policy | North Yorkshire County Council](#)

Ms Spink makes comment that the Parish Council feel that cannot do anything, having checked our records I have found no reference to a request for a 20mph speed limit and we can only consider requests that are made, supported by the Parish Council, County Councillor.

As the highway authority the County Council have a statutory duty to manage, maintain the network and only a desire to improve but unfortunately due to budgetary cuts we must prioritise spending the limited funding available at locations where there is a need to improve safety, reduce personal injury. To enable us to do this we carry out annual and in-year assessments of collision data recorded by North Yorkshire Police to identify collision cluster, high risk sites, routes and I trust it is accepted that it is those locations where resources are targeted.

Having checked collision history in this location there has only been 1 recorded incident in the last 23 years so the site is therefore not deemed 'high risk'. The fatal was in May 1995, the causation factor was not recorded but the driver tested positive for alcohol.

Mrs Spink had also written in following a temporary closure and access only for Sherburn Street when YWA needed to carry out emergency repairs to mains water burst. The advertised diversion was Thorpe Lane and Mrs Spink has requested that consideration be made for Sherburn Street to be Access Only. This suggestion will not be progressed as it would require Police enforcement without physical obstacles to make no through route and it is expected residents would object, also the route proposed by Mrs Spink goes past the school.

The response would be provided to Mrs Spink.

The local elected Member stated that he had shared correspondence with the questioner. He disagreed with the majority of the issues she had set out to the Committee and considered that creating a one-way system would create further problems, including additional pollution. He considered that the photographs were not a problem related to the two way system, but resulted from a vehicle being too big to use the mini-roundabout.

A Member emphasised that there were difficulties with traffic throughout the District related to inadequate policing and poor infrastructure, which all needed addressing.

31. 20s Plenty

Members undertook a debate, based on the following motion from County Councillor Arnold Warneken:-

The Selby and Ainsty ACC wishes the executive to be advised that we would like to be included in the proposed pilot scheme as detailed in the proposal below approved by Harrogate and Knaresborough ACC -

“The Executive be advised that the Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee wishes a 20mph speed limit to be piloted throughout the area towns and villages in the constituency where a benefit has been identified and that the Transport, Environment, Overview scrutiny Committee when it considers the County Council’s 20mph speed limit and zone policy on 19th January 2023 to consider appropriate amendments to the existing policy to enable the pilot to be introduced.”

Initially the public question related to 20s Plenty, which had been previously circulated to Members of the Committee, was outlined as follows:-

Question/statement from Matt Burton – Monk Fryston

Monk Fryston Parish Council supports the 20s Plenty for North Yorkshire campaign and its aim for all urban and village streets in North Yorkshire to implement 20mph as the default speed limit.

Monk Fryston is dominated by the A63 which runs through the heart of our village. The current speed limit on the A63 through Monk Fryston is 30mph.

We are supportive of reducing this speed limit to 20mph, for reasons including the following:

- 20mph is significantly safer for pedestrians in our village. The UK Department for Transport estimates that a speed reduction of 1mph in built-up areas reduces casualties by 6%. The implementation of 20mph schemes typically lead to up to 20% fewer casualties.
- Our village has no pedestrian crossing or any other pedestrian-friendly features (in contrast to other towns and villages in our area). This makes it extremely difficult for Monk Fryston residents to cross the A63 safely, which they must do so to access key village facilities such as the school, church, post office and community centre. A speed limit reduction would be a welcome pedestrian-friendly initiative in a village currently devoid of pedestrian-safety measures.
- According to data downloaded from our Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS), in excess of 10,000 vehicles travel through our village each day. We estimate from previous traffic surveys that at least 10% of this traffic is HGVs. With a speed limit of 30mph, no pedestrian crossing, and this quantity of traffic, Monk Fryston is not a sufficiently safe environment for residents (particularly children and our elderly population).
- In July 2021, Selby District Council published their Monk Fryston Conservation Area Appraisal (produced by Alan Baxter Associates in conjunction with Selby District Council). The Appraisal acknowledged that the A63 is a “substantial negative feature” of the village, and also noted that there are “no traffic calming measures or formalised crossing points across the A63”. The Appraisal goes on to conclude that traffic through Monk Fryston is “extremely heavy” and it is “challenging to cross the road”. The Appraisal makes a very strong recommendation, stating that it is “essential... that the situation is ameliorated through traffic calming and formal pedestrian crossings”. Suggestions made in the

Appraisal include the introduction of a 20mph speed limit and the installation of traffic calming measures.

Additionally on the topic of conservation, it has previously been reported and evidenced that that the vibrations caused by fast-moving HGVs through Monk Fryston have caused damage (e.g., broken windows) to properties adjacent to the A63. This has included damage to listed buildings in the village.

- A reduction in speed limit to 20mph would have further health and environmental benefits for Monk Fryston.
28 million people in the UK live in areas where the highway authority supports 20mph. Counties such as Oxfordshire and Lancashire in England, have agreed 20mph for every settlement, as has Wales. Scotland has decided to offer 20mph widely and places like Warrington have 20mph in all their satellite villages. Well over 100 North Yorkshire parish councils have voted for default 20mph. 20mph is popular. Government and other surveys consistently find 70% support in residential streets which rises after 20mph limits are introduced. 20mph saves lives, reduces severity of injuries, CO2 and NOX emissions, improves quality of life, is quieter, very cost effective, costing £3-£5 person with payback in a few months thanks to fewer casualties. It means fewer potholes, a major cost saving, and is sustainable, encouraging more people to walk and cycle. It has little impact on journey times. It is enforceable like any speed limit. Valuable speed reductions occur, even without regular police enforcement. The DfT says for every 1% reduction in average speed there are 6% fewer accidents. Making 20mph the norm does not require humps and chicanes. Signed schemes and public engagement offer seven times better value for money than heavily-engineered schemes.

Members acknowledged the issues raised within the public question/statement and highlighted the following in relation to the motion:-

- A Member highlighted that many were against the 20s Plenty initiative as it was considered to be unenforceable. He emphasised, however, that there were great benefits to having such a scheme, with many being to the advantage of non-vehicle users, and there was huge support for reducing speed in many areas.
- Whilst supporting the proposal in principle, a Member considered that it was unlikely to solve the issue of speeding through local villages, as the 20mph limit would be ignored, as it was not enforceable. He considered that a change of policy from North Yorkshire Police was required to allow fixed, or average speed cameras, to be put in place, allowing speed limits to be enforced. This would also free up the portable resources to operate in other parts of the District.
- A Member supported the motion, and also considered that North Yorkshire Police should change their policy regarding speed cameras. He considered that there would be fewer accidents involving vehicles travelling at 20mph, ensuring that local communities, particularly outside local schools, were safer, and agreed that enforcement, via cameras, was the most effective way of ensuring speed limits were adhered to.
- A Member further endorsed the call for a change of policy in respect of speed cameras. He stated that he had tried to travel to the meeting at 20mph and had found it extremely difficult. He considered that enforcement of 30mph speed limits within local communities, by the use of cameras, would be much more achievable and would make them safer. He did not agree that 20mph limits brought great benefits, but agreed with them being introduced around schools.
- It was suggested that the issues of 20s Plenty and Speed Cameras were related but completely different issues. In terms of 20mph limits consideration had to be given as to where these could be applied, for example it would be totally inappropriate for these to be applied to A Roads, but were suitable for around schools.

- It was noted that previously it had been suggested that parking on streets in local communities would reduce the speed of traffic, but it was acknowledged that speed cameras would have the same effect. Originally road engineering was designed to get the vehicle from A to B as quickly as possible, but now a combination of road engineering, speed cameras and education were required to combat speeding traffic. In isolation these methods would not work, which was also the case for a 20mph limit.
- Members considered that speed bumps were no longer a sufficient deterrent for speeding traffic, however, concern was again raised that 20mph speed limits could not be enforced and, therefore, would not reduce speeds effectively. It was considered that the example given in the public question of Monk Fryston would benefit more from a 30mph limit being enforced, than from a 20mph limit that was unlikely to be adhered to.
- The Member who raised the proposal emphasised that the benefits were not solely related to reducing speed, as less pollution was generated from vehicles accelerating to 20mph than 30mph. He also suggested that fixed cameras could be set to enforce at 20mph, should the policy be changed. He noted that a 20mph zone set up in Boston Spa had proved to be successful and had been welcomed by the local community. He also stressed the need to consider the issue from the point of view of pedestrians, cyclists, horse-riders, etc, rather than just that of the driver. He stated that something had to be done to discourage speeding traffic and emphasised the importance of road safety.
- It was suggested that the motion before Members should be considered with an additional recommendation that North Yorkshire Police be contacted to gain details on their current policy in relation to speed cameras, and whether these could be considered for future use in the area.

Resolved –

- (i) That the following be recommended to the Executive:-

The Selby and Ainsty ACC wishes the executive to be advised that we would like to be included in the proposed pilot scheme as detailed in the proposal below approved by Harrogate and Knaresborough ACC -

“The Executive be advised that the Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee wishes a 20mph speed limit to be piloted throughout the area towns and villages in the constituency where a benefit has been identified and that the Transport, Environment, Overview scrutiny Committee when it considers the County Council’s 20mph speed limit and zone policy on 19th January 2023 to consider appropriate amendments to the existing policy to enable the pilot to be introduced.”

- (ii) That North Yorkshire Police be contacted to ascertain their current policy in respect of fixed speed cameras, and to determine whether such cameras could be deployed in the area to address concerns regarding speeding traffic, with details submitted to a subsequent meeting of the ACC.

32. Local Bus Services – Reductions in Service – Discussion

The Chair invited the public questioner to submit her questions/statement to the meeting in relation to local bus services.

Councillor Gillian Ivey – Chair, Little Smeaton Parish Council – representing Southern Selby Villages

Following the loss of the 409 bus service which ran through the 4 villages of Stapleton, Womersley, Little Smeaton and Kirk Smeaton, en route between Pontefract and Doncaster, Arriva replaced the service with a 'loop' which ran from Doncaster as far north as Norton and back to Doncaster; and another 'loop' Pontefract to the Smeatons via Stapleton and Womersley, and back to Pontefract.

There is now no through route Pontefract to Doncaster and vice versa, and the last bus from Pontefract is 1.00pm.

It is also no longer possible to access Selby by bus, and Whitley residents cannot now travel to Askern/Doncaster by public transport

Action. Leaflets of explanation plus a survey of need, were hand-delivered to every house in Kirk Smeaton, Little Smeaton, Womersley and Stapleton; some 600 in total

Survey Results. Out of 48 responses received so far....

- 28 were from Kirk or Little Smeaton. 9 from Stapleton. 3 from Womersley.
- 7 people needed to use the bus on a regular basis to travel variously to/from Pontefract, Askern, Doncaster and one to come home from Selby. [2 of these were daily, 1 fortnightly, the rest weekly]
- 2 people had also complained verbally that they needed to go to Askern on a regular basis for healthcare, but did not complete the survey.
- 16 households stated that they needed to use the bus occasionally to/from Pontefract, Norton, Askern & Doncaster. [Note. 'occasionally' = less than once a week]
- 11 Households responded with a definite NO, that they did not need or wish to use the bus.
- 4 Households were cautious in saying no they were not using the bus service at present, but were likely to give up driving in the next few years due to their age.
- 2 commented that their children/grandchildren respectively would need a bus service in 'a few years time'

Community Transport

- 12 people said they would be interested to use a community transport scheme, 8 being from the 'Occasional use' responses, and 4 from the 'regular need' group. [for the other 2 in the 'regular need' group, community transport wasn't practical]
- 6 households expressed interest in becoming volunteer drivers but wanted to know more details, and about insurance, remuneration of fuel costs, whether CRB checks required etc.

All pointed out that they would only be available on an occasional basis.

5 were from the group who said no they did not need the bus, 1 from 'occasional' need.

Passenger Transport Services had also submitted the following update on local bus services which was read out by the Clerk:-

Recent changes in this area have been the withdrawal of Service 412 (Wetherby – Tockwith – York) as a commercial service but the timetable has been retained with funding from NYCC & CYC and the withdrawal of the X80 commercial school bus service from the start of January.

No further bus route changes have been announced at this stage and we expect current timetables will remain unchanged until at least April 2023.

The public transport team post details of all service changes on the NYCC website at: Bus service changes and news | North Yorkshire County Council

Please note that the government's national £2 bus fare cap scheme has now started and will run from 1 January to 31st March. For this period a single bus journey on most routes will cost no more than £2 single (£4 return). Further details are at: <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/bus-service-changes-and-news>

Members discussed the issues raised, highlighting the following:-

- The COVID assistance provided to bus companies would end in March 2023, potentially putting more services at risk. The issue was being further affected by cuts to NYCC funding for passenger transport and companies losing money on routes. There was a concern that providing a solution to the reduction in services would be difficult. Community and volunteer solutions could be explored, with funding via the AVS and NYCC, but there was no guarantee that these would be suitable in all areas. Further consideration was required to determine suitable solutions for local communities.
- A Member stated that, currently, local bus routes were out to tender, and that the funding levels for the provision of those services were much higher than he had expected. He raised concerns that further routes were to be cut as they were not seen as being cost effective. In terms of the non-commercial services that received County Council funding he stated that he would be using his Locality Budget to assist with the retention of services within his area and invited other Members to do the same, with each donating half of their budget to assist local bus services.
- A Member highlighted the issues he had been encountering with Arriva. Having written to them outlining concerns, as the Leader of Selby DC, he was yet to receive a response. He outlined his disappointment with their lack of response in respect of the lack of service being provided to local communities in the Selby District. He supported the call for Members to co-ordinate to provide bus services in local areas wherever possible and noted, with surprise, the budget for the home to school transport service.
- It was suggested that consideration should be given to the funding given to the AVS from NYCC and whether that could be better co-ordinated to enhance the subsidy provided for passenger transport. Other Members supported this and requested that the details be provided to a subsequent meeting. It was also suggested that a publicly owned bus service would be more conducive to providing what was required from bus services, however, this would need to be supported by the public using those services.
- It was noted that, following the cessation of a number of services in Selby Town, passengers, which were mainly concessionary pass holders, were no longer utilising bus services, and there had been a dramatic drop in the overall usage.

Resolved –

- (i) That the details outlined, including those of the public questioner, be noted;
- (ii) That details of the funding provided to the AVS from NYCC be provided to a subsequent meeting of the ACC to determine whether there was a possibility that some of this could be utilised for bus service provision;
- (iii) That Members consider pooling some of their Locality Budget funding to assist with the provision of bus services;
- (iv) That the issue of local bus services remain on the agenda of the ACC for further updates and consideration

33. Schools, educational attainment and finance

Due to a failure with the technology it was suggested that the item be deferred to a subsequent meeting, as officers appearing remotely were unable to be heard.

The Chair suggested that Members submit any issues that required an urgent answer directly to offices, rather than wait for the item to return.

Resolved –

That the item be deferred for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

34. Cost of Living Crisis

Considered –

A report from Tom Jenkinson Stronger Communities Delivery Manager (Selby and District) on how the Stronger Communities Team was assisting local communities with the Cost of Living Crisis.

The report outlined the following:-

Direct support for households

- Household Support Fund Scheme (Government scheme)
- North Yorkshire Local Assistance Fund (NYLAF)
- Warm and Well North Yorkshire
- Free School Meals
- Holiday Activity and Food programme (HAF)
- NYCC Local Food Support

General support

Food Insecurity Specific Work

Fuel Poverty

Activities within Selby and Ainsty Constituency Area

(County Councillor Melanie Davis declared a personal non-pecuniary interest in respect of her being a member of the Citizens Advice Bureau which received a small proportion of funding from NYCC)

Members discussed the report and the following issues were raised:-

- The two Lower Super Output Areas in Selby town ward identified in the report, in terms of household fuel poverty, were outlined, and were seen as being very different. It was noted that there was a lot of evidence of people working together to address this situation.
- A member requested that the Stronger Communities Manager contact him outside of the meeting to discuss some concerns he had with details provided in the report.

Resolved –

That the contents of the report be noted.

35. Work Programme

Considered -

The report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) providing a Work Programme for Members to consider, develop and adapt.

Members discussed the following issues:-

- The list of areas of work for future meetings was considered to be too large by Members, with issues unlikely to be provided with an opportunity to be fully explored at forthcoming meetings. It was suggested that work be undertaken on the list to determine how these issues would be progressed. The Clerk stated that he would undertake a review of the list and submit a revised programme to the next meeting, with a more pragmatic approach to how the issues could be considered.
- It was stated that the issues discussed at this meeting, identified for further consideration, should be included on the Work Plan. These included:-
 - The policy in relation to fixed speed cameras and their potential deployment – North Yorkshire Police
 - Details of the funding provided to the AVS, how that is utilised and whether additional funding could be diverted to assist local bus service provision.
 - A full report on the work and responsibilities of IDBs to determine their value for money, with details provided on the areas they cover
- Members agreed to keep bus services on subsequent agendas as a standing item, to allow any progress made on providing services to be fed back as soon as possible.
- It was suggested that the item “Work Programme” had no need to be included on the list of issues for future meetings as this was a standing item.
- It was considered appropriate that in future the budget briefing be provided separately to a full ACC Meeting so as to better manage time constraints.

Resolved –

- (i) That the issues highlighted above be included in the future work programme and the work programme be adapted accordingly
- (ii) That a review of the Work Programme be undertaken in line with the issues raised above.

36. Report of Local Constituency MP, Nigel Adams

Considered –

The report of the Local Constituency MP, Nigel Adams, highlighting the following:-

The York and North Yorkshire Devolution Deal

Constituency Boundary change proposals

MP Inbox – The issues my constituents are raising

1. Help with the cost of living
2. NHS Dental services
3. Community Fibre Project completed. 105 homes in Eggborough can now order Gigabit broadband.

In discussing the report Members highlighted the issues relating to the delays in the development of a Free Special School in the Selby District. It was stated that the process for the development of the school was likely to recommence pushing the Member suggested that the matter should be development even further back. A

Member noted that it was likely that the school would not be provided now until two years time at the earliest. He stated that he would keep the ACC updated on the progress in respect of this. A Member suggested that issues around not wanting the school located in certain areas had delayed the process, resulting in the current situation. Members suggested that the issue should be raised with the MP.

Resolved –

That the MP be thanked for his report, the contents of which be noted and the issue in relation to the provision of the new Special School, as outlined above, be referred to him.

37. Next Meeting

Resolved -

That the next meeting of the Committee be held at 10am on Friday 28th April 2023 at a venue to be confirmed.

The meeting concluded at 12.30pm.

SML