

North Yorkshire 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 28th April 2023 at 10am.

Present:-

Members:-

Councillors John Cattanach (Vice-Chair in the Chair), Karl Arthur, Stephanie Duckett, Mike Jordan, Andrew Lee, Cliff Lunn, John McCartney, Bob Packham, Andy Paraskos, Kirsty Poskitt, Jack Proud, Steve Shaw-Wright, and Arnold Warneken.

Other Members present:-

Councillor Carl Les – Leader of the Council
Councillor David Chance – Executive Member
Councillor George Jabbour - observer

Virtual attendees:-

David Kirkpatrick - Traffic Engineering Team Leader
Andrew Dixon – Strategic Planning Manager – Education and Skills
Howard Emmett – Assistant Director, Strategic Resources
Amanda Newbold – Assistant Director, Education and Skills
Janet Crawford – Assistant Director, Inclusion

Officers:-

Tom Jenkinson (Stronger Communities Delivery Manager), Steve Loach, Camila Maciel and Gina Muldering (Democratic Services), Paul Jones and Nigel Everard (Selby Area IDB's Engineer and Clerk), Inspector John Aldred (North Yorkshire Police).

There were two Members of the public present.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Chair welcomed everyone to the Meeting.

Apologies were received from County Councillors Mark Crane, Melanie Davis (Chair) and Tim Grogan

2. Minutes

A Member referred to Minute No.32 of the 13th January 2023 - Local Bus Services – Reductions in Service – Discussion – in relation to the issues raised by Parish Council Chair, Gillian Ivey on Community Transport. He stated that resolution (ii) in relation to that item “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” was incorrect as had actually requested details of what the AVS was doing with available funding to assist with the provision of bus services.

Resolved -

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 13th January 2023, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the amendment as outlined above.

3. Declarations of Interest

Members declared the following non-disclosable/non-pecuniary interests in relation to items on the agenda:-

Councillor John Cattanach – Chair of Derwent IDB
Councillor Karl Arthur – Council representative on Selby AVS
Councillor Cliff Lunn – Member of Selby IDB
Councillor Arnold Warneken – Member of local IDB
Councillor Kirsty Poskitt –
Councillor Stephanie Duckett – Member of Ouse and Derwent IDB

4. Public Questions or Statements

There were no public questions or statements.

5. North Yorkshire Police - Policy on Fixed/Average Speed Cameras; local priorities and initiatives

Inspector John Aldred of North Yorkshire Police attended the meeting to discuss the current policy on Fixed/Average Speed Cameras, including local priorities and initiatives. He initially outlined his background and noted that his area of responsibility covered Selby and York.

He stated that, currently, there were no fixed/average speed cameras operating in North Yorkshire. Mobile Units continued to be utilised throughout the County. The deployment of the Mobile Units was based on road traffic collision (RTC) data and as a response to complaints of speeding. Intelligence is gathered in terms of the placement of the units, to ensure their use is of maximum benefit.

A discussion on these issues was undertaken with Members of the Committee and the following issues and points were raised:-

- A Member, whilst acknowledging the current position, requested that a review be undertaken as he considered that fixed/average speed cameras were required in North Yorkshire. He noted their deployment in neighbouring areas and how these assisted in the reduction of speeds on those roads. He asked how many complaints had been received in respect of speeding on the Selby by-pass. In response it was stated that the details requested would be provided to the Member.
- It was noted by a Member that a local Parish Council was operating an ANPR camera in their locality and asked whether such cameras were allowed to be used when they were not the property of the Police. In response it was stated that the camera was likely the result of a project involving the Police. It was stated that the collected information could be utilised by the Police for intelligence purposes, but this would need to be verified. A Member raised concerns in respect of a Parish Council operating ANPR cameras, in terms of

data protection, particularly if that information was to be shared with other bodies. It was noted that ANPR technology was fairly new to North Yorkshire Police with only a few vehicles operating this.

- A Member considered that the mobile and fixed cameras had different features, with mobile best used between settlements and fixed within settlements. A major problem currently was speeding within settlements, therefore, consideration should be given to a change of policy and the implementation of fixed cameras. He failed to understand the reluctance of North Yorkshire Police to use these given that they were so effective in other areas. The call for fixed cameras was acknowledged and it was stated that the Road Safety partnership were currently undertaking a review to determine whether a change in policy was required. The Partnership was engaging with universities across the UK on this matter. Members emphasised the need to ensure that North Yorkshire residents were consulted.
- It was stated that a Mobile Unit was almost permanently located on the A64 near to Tadcaster, therefore, it would surely be more economical and allow better use of the Mobile Unit, to have a fixed camera there. In response it was stated that the criteria for the placement of a fixed camera was not known and that information would be obtained and provided to Councillors, however, it was emphasised that the road had seen some particularly horrendous accidents which was why the mobile unit was positioned there.
- Concern was raised that the representative of North Yorkshire Police had attended the meeting without the information required to discuss the issues requested. It was noted that many local communities were feeling frustrated as they were unable to obtain VAS as the Police advised them that they did not meet the necessary criteria. There was also a problem of speeding within communities around the M62 junction, however, the Mobile Unit was never placed at that location. The use of fixed/average speed cameras would resolve these issues and could be utilised on the A Roads in the area, allowing the mobile units to be deployed in other locations. The main focus for today's item was to consider the policy and why there was a reluctance to provide fixed cameras, unfortunately the representative did not have the appropriate information available to provide an answer. The issues raised were acknowledged and Insp. Aldred stated that he seek appropriate advice from the departments involved and ensure that was fed back to Members as soon as possible. In terms of the cost of providing the fixed cameras it was considered that the Road safety Partnership should liaise with the Council, Parish Councils and local communities to determine whether they were willing to invest in these to protect their local areas. It was suggested that local representatives could submit further pleas to the NYPC&FC with a view to changing the policy on fixed cameras.
- Noting that the NYP representative had, until recently, worked for West Yorkshire Police, who did deploy fixed/average speed cameras, a Member asked how the two areas compared in terms of speed issues. Highlighting his personal view Insp. Aldred stated that fixed cameras slowed traffic when they were being passed, but the traffic speeded up again when they had passed these. Drivers also became aware of where these were positioned and knew when to slow down, therefore, they were not keeping people safe. With the deployment of mobile units drivers were unaware as to where these were located. The Member considered the signs warning of speed cameras were a deterrent as people would slow down when seeing these. It was agreed that the provision and tactical location of signage can have an impact on speeding traffic.
- A Member highlighted the positive effect that average speed cameras have had on the A66 near Penrith. He asked that further reports on this matter provide a comparison of speeding issues of areas with no cameras to those with cameras. It was noted that a review was being led by the Council and the

Partnership and would be a thorough piece of work, taking account of all issues. The Safety Camera Partnerships would feed into that review providing the necessary details. It was noted that funding for schemes considered by the Safety Camera Partnership could be obtained from speeding fines and speeding awareness courses.

- The Department of Transport were responsible for setting the criteria for the deployment of speed cameras, based on KSI statistics.
- A Member highlighted the work of the Humberside Safety Camera Partnership and how they raised over £1m per year to self fund the cameras and assist with the detection of crime through fines obtained by use of the cameras. He suggested that the use of average speed cameras on the “A” roads, rather than in local communities would be of great benefit, with local villages making use of fixed cameras and mobile units. He considered that the use of speed cameras would reduce speeding traffic throughout North Yorkshire and help to reduce KSI statistics. He urged North Yorkshire Police to reconsider their policy and allow the use of fixed/average speed cameras.

Resolved –

That the issues raised be noted, and further information on the issues raised be sought and submitted for Members’ consideration at a subsequent meeting.

6. Civil Parking Enforcement -Service Level Agreements

David Kirkpatrick - Traffic Engineering Team Leader outlined details of the service level agreements currently in place in respect of Civil Parking Enforcement for the North Yorkshire Council area, with specific details on the Selby and Ainsty ACC area. He provided details of the background to Civil Parking Enforcement, which were set out in the written report, together with the current information of their operations in the area.

In terms of Selby the areas with the greatest need for enforcement were identified and operations were carried in respect of the parameters set, again detailed in the report. There were two CPE Officers working in the area each on 37 hours per week. They operated in off-street car parks and on streets throughout the area. The role of CPE Officers is to ensure compliance with parking restrictions and ensure the local community is able to park appropriately. Any funding obtained through fines was utilised for highways and transportation services. As the services would now operate under the umbrella of the Unitary Authority, this provided an opportunity for a review of the service to be undertaken, but, initially these were being delivered as before LGR, to ensure that a continuous, safe and legal service was being delivered. The review would commence shortly and was expected to take around 18 months.

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

- A Member suggested that it would be better for the operation of the Committee for officers to attend meetings in person rather than appear remotely.
- It was stated that the details provided were out of date as they did not reflect the position following LGR. It was acknowledged that this was currently the position and the forthcoming review would take account of that, however, the service remained safe and legal under these operational policies.
- A Member stated that he had emailed the officer in relation to the provision of CPE services throughout the Selby area and was awaiting a response. He noted that Selby Town Centre was the primary focus but this left unchallenged problems in the remainder of the district, with no tickets issued outside of the target area, despite there being parking issues in all local communities. He emphasised that local Councils and communities were striving to obtain parking restrictions, but this was to no avail, as these restrictions were not being

enforced. Unless the CPE was to move from town centres, and operate in local communities, it would remain ineffective. It was not expected that CPE officers would attend each community each day but a regular attendance would raise their profile and help to identify any significant issues. Many local communities felt that the introduction of CPE had provided the police with an opportunity to not respond to dangerous parking problems as they could now say it was not their responsibility.

- In response it was stated that the Council were committed to delivering parking enforcement and the new Council would assist the development of those services through the review. A different approach, specific to each area, would be considered to determine the best approach and the hours of commitment to those areas from CPE officers. Consideration was also being given to some traffic enforcement duties for CPE officers, with duties other than the issuing of fixed penalty tickets. The views of local Members would be taken account of when undertaking the review. Further details would be fed back into the ACCs as the review progressed.
- The representative of North Yorkshire Police provided some context to the issues raised in terms of the Police not getting involved in parking issues. He stated that where a vehicle was causing a clear obstruction then he would expect Police officers to act, either directly or by passing the information on, otherwise their duties were best directed to other priorities.
- A Member considered it positive that CPE were considering additional duties, however, he emphasised the need to ensure that towns were not prioritised over villages and smaller communities. Whilst welcoming the review another Member highlighted the current difficulties being encountered in local villages, noting that the increase in the number of vehicles per households was exacerbating the difficulties.
- It was asked the priority ratings for enforcement could be provided to Members, as it was stated within the report that Sherburn-in-Elmet was seen as a medium level area in terms of potential issues, but was a low priority for enforcement. A number of other local communities also had conflicting details in terms of priorities. In response it was stated that the information provided may not have been correct in terms of the priorities, however, the review would discover and rectify any discrepancies. The Member stated that it was clear that the area was treated as a low priority from the number of visits from CPE officers, which he considered to be very low for a population of over ten thousand people. He also welcomed the review. Another Member also welcomed the review with a view to services being provided evenly throughout North Yorkshire, with a focus on addressing the issues in all areas.

Resolved –

That the contents of the report and issues raised be noted, and the progress of the review being undertaken be reported back to subsequent meetings of the ACC.

7. Selby Area Internal Drainage Board - Work of the IDB and their priorities

The Selby Area IDB's Engineer - Paul Jones and Clerk – Nigel Everard provided details on the operation and priorities of the Selby IDB.

They invited Members to highlight issues in relation to the report. The following details were raised:-

- Clarification was provided as to the various classifications of symbols and colours detailed on the maps provided within the report.

- A Member asked whether there was a priority system for work to be undertaken, highlighting an issue with the car park at Selby College. In response it was stated that work was prioritised and CCTV was placed in the pipes every 5 – 10 years to monitor the water course.
- It was asked whether there would continue to be Councillor representation on the IDBs following LGR. In response it was stated that the IDBs had worked well with the District Councils before LGR and it was hoped that the liaison would continue with North Yorkshire Council representatives appointed.
- At a recent meeting of the ACC the financing of IDBs was discussed and it was noted that the Council may need to hold a referendum to increase the Council Tax in line with what was required. It was suggested that this would be an appropriate time for the lobbying of Central Government to allow IDBs to set their own precept and operate under their own budget. Members agreed with the suggestion. The value to the area of IDBs was outlined.
- The denomination of land areas and water flows were detailed, with the maps setting out the various land-owners. It was noted that where an obstruction to a water course occurred the land owner was responsible for dealing with that and was advised accordingly by the IDB. The current details were under review to ensure the correct land owners were identified.
- A Member stated that he had served on IDBs for over 30 years, but currently these bodies were struggling to attract representatives. He suggested that allowing Parish Council representatives to be appointed to the IDBs may help to resolve that issue. The Chair highlighted how this issue was affecting other IDBs. It was emphasised that the IDBs required representation from throughout the area to ensure the issues of all local communities were considered and a review would help to determine that. Members noted that there were Parish Councillors who were willing to be appointed to IDBs, currently.
- A review of the maps that IDBs work to was currently taking place and it was expected that these would be in place for the five years following the review.
- It was asked whether the IDB had been working alongside the companies that were proposing to provide Solar Farms in the area, to determine potential flood risk. It was confirmed that they had been consulted.
- The IDBs representatives stated that, going forward, they would like to work closely with North Yorkshire Council, to various share resources and ensure that essential works continue to be completed.

Resolved –

That Messrs Jones and Everard be thanked for their report, and their answers to issues raised, and the details raised be noted and acted upon where appropriate.

8. Schools, educational attainment and finance

The report was deferred for consideration from the previous meeting of the ACC due to a failure with the technology as officers appearing remotely were unable to be heard. It was noted that there had been no significant changes to the report since it had previously been presented. The report provided details on the following:-

- Local educational landscape
- Summary of schools' status – December 2022
- School standards
- School Ofsted judgements
- Uneven impact of the pandemic on 2021/22 performance data
- Attainment overall
- Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP)
- Key Stages 2 and 4
- Not in education, employment or training

- Suspensions and Permanent Exclusions
- Suspension incidents
- Permanent exclusions
- Special Education Needs and Disabilities
- Targeted Mainstream Provision- Reshaping of SEN Provision in Selby & Ainsty over the 2020/21 Academic Year
- SEN Statistics for Constituency Area
- Elective Home Education
- School Finance
- 2021/2022 School Revenue Balances
- School Budget Projections - Based on 2022/23 Start budgets
- School Finance and Funding Issues
- Local Authority Support for Schools in Financial Difficulty
- Schools Financial Position – Selby and Ainsty
- Planning school places
- School sustainability
- Collaborative working
- Pupil rolls – current and future
- Planning Areas and forecast surplus/shortfall school places

A Member asked if an update could be provided on the delayed project which was looking to provide a Special School to benefit the Selby Area. In response it was stated that the Department for Education were leading on this proposal, therefore, the officers were unable to give an update on this issue. Members emphasised the need for this issue to be expedited as soon as possible.

Resolved –

That Officers be thanked for the report the contents of which be noted.

9. Stronger Communities Update

Considered –

The report of Stronger Communities Delivery Managers for the Constituency area, presented by Tom Jenkinson, Stronger Communities Delivery Manager for Selby. He highlighted the following key points:-

Community Support Organisations (CSOs) & Community Response

Future Opportunities for CSOs

Community Grants

Wider Stronger Communities' Programme Work, including:

- Holiday Activities and Food Programme for free school meal eligible children (Department of Education funded)
- Household Support Fund - awards to low-income households (Department of Work and Pensions funded)
- Homes for Ukraine Programme (Home Office)
- Wellbeing and Prevention investment – Stay Healthy, Independent and Connected
- Digital Inclusion
- Cost of living
- UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF)
- Mental health programmes (NHS)
- Local Government Reorganisation (LGR)

Children and Young People

Capacity Building

Planning for the future:

Independent Evaluation

The Learning Review Evaluation (2018 – 2022)

Local Area Information

Community Support Organisations

General VCSE developments

- Sherburn Visiting Scheme
- Tadcaster Volunteer Car and Services Association
- Selby Business Awards
- Selby District AVS - relaunched as Up for Yorkshire
- Green Hammerton - Library Outlet

Cost of Living Initiatives

Community Mental Health Transformation (CMHT)

Moving Forward

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

- A Member stated that he had considered a similar report at the Harrogate and Knaresborough ACC and commended Stronger Communities for the work they were carrying out to assist local communities.
- Selby AVS were looking to expand throughout North Yorkshire, hence their change of name, but they would still be based in Selby.
- A Member raised concerns regarding Selby AVS. He noted that late last year a number of Parish Councils had collaborated to develop a community transport scheme for their areas following cuts to bus services. They contacted Selby AVS to assist with delivering a volunteer car service but were told there were no resources or funding to assist. The Member had sought further information on this matter, and had received some response, but the details had been inadequate. He noted that the details he had been given indicated that the AVS budget allocated to Community Transport was £28k, with only £4k committed. He was surprised therefore that they had stated that they were unable to assist the Parish Councils. He was also concerned that the AVS had approached the Council for further funding to assist with the scheme despite having a balance of £24k available. He had been advised by the AVS that they were developing a strategy in respect of Community Transport provision but details were yet to materialise. He highlighted his disappointment that the AVS had stated that they were unable to help despite their balances and that they had approached the Council for further funding, with no checks being carried out in relation to this. He emphasised that the AVS was designed to assist local communities and he would have expected them to help. He noted that

Community Transport came under BES and he asked that their representatives meet up with him outside of the meeting to discuss his concerns and consider how best to meet the needs of the Parish Councils. The Corporate Director, BES, present at the meeting stated that he would contact the Member directly to consider how the issues raised could be addressed. The Member considered may be worthy of a Special Meeting of the ACC given the concerns he had raised and the potential for further cuts to local bus services, going forward. The Corporate Director stated that he would investigate whether the funding given to the AVS had been utilised for the correct purposes and would provide the details to Members. Another Member stated that he had also raised concerns with regards to the operation of the AVS, and felt that they were looking to expand, rather than assisting the local communities in Selby. He considered this to be a very serious issue and that the AVS, as currently operated, was not fit for purpose. County Councillor Chance, present at the meeting, with the Executive Portfolio that includes Stronger Communities, stated that he would assist with the investigation of the issues raised. A Member highlighted a volunteer car and community transport scheme operating in his area, which had been assisted by the AVS, that was well used and had been a success. He considered, however, that a full review of the work of the AVS would be beneficial, given the concerns raised, and that representatives of the AVS should be invited to a subsequent meeting to discuss these issues.

- Members paid tribute to the work of the Stronger Communities Team in their delivery of the wide ranging programme in their local communities. A Member highlighted the grant that had assisted in the development of coffee mornings at Eggborough Village hall, which was now being utilised to generate other community groups.

Resolved –

- (i) That the issues raised in relation to Selby AVS (now Up for Yorkshire) be investigated and subject to further consideration at a subsequent meeting of the ACC, with representatives of the AVS invited to attend;
- (ii) That the content of the report be noted.

10. Local Bus Services – Update

The following update from Passenger Transport Services had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting:-

“Arriva made some changes in the Selby area on 17th April affecting routes 64, 401, 476, 616 and 641. Full details at: [Selby Bus Service Changes 17 April | Arriva Bus UK](#)

Service 412 (Wetherby – York): a longer term contract is now in place up until March 2025, jointed funded by NYC and CYC.

Also there are improvements to the Service 42 (Selby – York) Saturday timetable planned from 20th May. Some additional morning and afternoon capacity will be provided to deal with overloading issues on journeys into York. This has been a project jointly supported by Arriva, NYC, CYC and Cllr Cattanach.”

Members highlighted the following issues:-

- The Chair paid tribute to Mary Welch of Passenger Transport Services for the tremendous help he had received in respect of the provision of some additional services to his area, as detailed above and noted that agreement

had now been given for some additional Sunday services. Another Member also praised Ms Welch for her recent work in sorting out timetable glitches, and noted that she was always helpful when assistance was required.

- The 412 service was now safe for the next 2 years. Further discussions had been held local groups and representatives and a view had been submitted to the operator that an additional service on Saturdays would be of greatest benefit. A response on this was awaited and discussions with the operator would be welcomed to address the issues raised.

Resolved –

That the update, and issues raised, be noted, and any action be undertaken, accordingly.

11. Report of Local Constituency MP, Nigel Adams

It was noted that the MP had been unable to submit a report on this occasion.

Members discussed the submission of a report, by the MP, to ACC meetings and the following issues were raised:-

- A Member noted that the day ordinary meetings of the Committee were held had been altered to accommodate the attendance of the MP. He suggested that as the MP was no longer attending that the day and timing of the meetings should be altered to encourage community engagement. Other Members outlined that the Committee, and the previous Area Committees, had operated at different times, on different days and had met throughout the district, but this had little impact on public attendance, unless there was something that was significant to the public's interest. The Member who raised this issue considered that further consideration should be given to the day, time and location for future meetings for the sake of community engagement, given that a new Council was now in place. He also suggested that agendas should reflect the issues important to local residents, going forward. It was noted that the dates and times for ordinary meetings of the ACC were now set in the calendar, and could only be changed in exceptional circumstances, however, the Committee were able to organise additional and special meetings in whichever format they wished, on a day, and time and location to suit their needs.
- Councillor Chance stated that the attendance of the MP at ACC meetings had been discussed recently at a meeting of ACC Chairs and Vice-Chairs, and the consensus had been that there was no need for them to attend every meeting, but arrangements should encompass an opportunity for the local public to meet the MP. It was stated that the attendance of MPs was also dependent upon their commitments. A Member noted that the initial meeting of the ACC had voted to ask the MP to not attend future meetings, with a written report requested instead, as that was considered to be sufficient.

Resolved –

That the issues raised be noted.

12. 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:-

- It was requested that the following issues be considered at forthcoming meetings:-
 - The future of the ACCs – how they relate to the Council overall, their relationship with local communities, understanding of what local powers are available, their inter-relation with various local policies, how they will inter-relate with the local community networks.
 - Anti-Social Behaviour – how this is being addressed in local communities
- 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.
- Further consideration be given to additional meetings, themed meetings, special meetings and virtual meetings to discuss issues pertinent to the local Constituency.

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.

13. Next Meeting

Resolved -

That the next meeting of the Committee be held at 10am on Thursday 15th June 2023 at Selby Civic Centre.

The meeting concluded at 12.15pm.

SML