

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 19th January 2024 at 10am.

Present:-

Members:-

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

Other Members:-

Councillors Derek Bastiman, Paul Haslam and George Jabbour

Apologies

Apologies for absence were submitted by Councillor Jack Proud

Officers:-

Steve Loach and Dawn Drury (Democratic Services), Caroline Skelly - Planning Policy Manager (Selby), Tracey Rathmell – Head of Delivery and Infrastructure, Andy Clarke - Public & Community Transport Manager, Graham North - Strategy and Performance Officer (Rail) and Jos Holmes – Climate Change Strategy Manager

There were 11 members of the public present.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

40. Minutes

Resolved -

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 21st September 2023, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

41. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest at this stage of the meeting.

42. Appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies

Resolved –

- (i) That the Area Constituency Committee ratifies the appointment of the following 4 members to the Development Plans Committee:-

Councillor Andy Paraskos
Councillor Andrew Lee
Councillor Bob Packham
Councillor John Cattanach

- (ii) That the results of the review of Outside Bodies be awaited before appointments are made to any current vacancies

43. Public Questions or Statements

Question from Caroline Rowbottom, Tadcaster

The question from Mrs Rowbottom related entirely to the item later in the meeting, Minute No. 44 - North Yorkshire Council's Petition Scheme - Objection to the development of the Central Area Car Park in Tadcaster for housing and was taken at that time.

44. North Yorkshire Council's Petition Scheme - Objection to the development of the Central Area Car Park in Tadcaster for housing

The following petition exceeded 500 signatures, and, as such, would be considered at today's meeting:-

"I disagree with the plan to build houses on the Central Car Park in Tadcaster and urge Selby District Council (now North Yorkshire Council) to remove this proposal as a preferred option from the Selby District Plan"

At the meeting the petition organiser (Councillor Patrick Tunney – Tadcaster Town Council) was given five minutes to present the petition. The public question/statement by Mrs Rowbottom was then delivered. An officer of the Council then provided a brief response (Caroline Skelly - Planning Policy Manager (Selby))

The petition was then discussed by councillors for 15 minutes. A decision on how to respond to the petition was agreed at the meeting, in line with the remit of the petition scheme.

Mr Tunney addressed the meeting outlining the following:-

The petition contains the original names of members of the public who have objected to the development of the Central Area Car Park in Tadcaster for housing. The names of all the objectors have been collected via either, a paper petition which was circulated throughout the town and also by an online petition which was organised, on behalf of the petition group, by Change.org. There are in total of approximately 3100 objectors names on the lists.

The purpose of the petition is to remind the Council, and the elected representatives of Tadcaster's residents, of the strength of public feeling on this matter and urge the Council to remove the proposal to build an underground car park as an alternative to replacing the Central Car Park with housing from the Local Plan. The proposal to build an underground car park does not solve the town centre car parking needs. It does not provide a 'like for like' alternative. It will cost too much; is going to be a Civil Engineering nightmare; will cause untold damage to the economy of the town during any archaeological excavation, ground works and construction period; will potentially pose a risk on listed buildings and cause excessive disturbance, noise, dust, pollution and traffic dislocation for an unseemly period. The expected 'whole life costs' will leave Tadcaster with a 'millstone' legacy. The Central Area Car Park is the 'beating heart' of Tadcaster and heavily used on a daily basis. It is an essential community asset, very

useful to residents, workers, shoppers, businesses and visitors. The central location provides easy access to many of the town's small businesses. It has the capacity for large events at the Riley Smith Hall, the town's churches, the Annual Christmas Market and other local celebrations and activities, such as the Remembrance Day Parade. The unanimity of responses to the petition against the proposal demonstrates that there was never a mandate sought from the community prior to putting forward the proposal to build an underground car park in Tadcaster or to develop the Central Area Car Park for housing. The Selby Local Plan option to build houses on the Central Area Car Park, as it stands, is neither a feasible, viable or deliverable proposition and is not in the long term interests of the town. The scheme should be dropped before any more monies are wasted in taking it any further. The regeneration of Tadcaster will happen one day. Central to this will be a requirement to provide more homes and shops and better facilities for visitors and residents including more town centre car parking. Caroline Rowbottom, Tadcaster asked to address the Committee in relation to this item as part of the Public Questions/Statements item. Mrs Rowbottom was unable to make contact with the meeting, therefore her statement was read out by the Clerk. Her statement was as follows:-

1) Is the Central Area Car park petition legitimate? A petition was submitted to Selby District Council, the details of which were included within an online Change.org petition that was started on 7 October 2021 (attached). I do not feel this petition was fair because it did not include all of the information needed for the person signing the petition, to make a fully informed decision.

For example:

a) There is reference to 'the Town Council were recently presented with a scheme to build a further 500 new homes on the NW edge of the town'. I can confirm that the agenda item advertising this Town Council meeting dated 17 August 2021, did not accurately describe the location of the land under discussion. It did not even reference green belt land and was titled 'Selby District Local Plan – Preferred Options'. The land in question was rejected during site assessments due to its green belt status and was not a preferred option. Also, I can confirm that the minutes resulting from this meeting were not published on the Town Council website for 15 months. Many people who signed this petition would not have done so, had they known that it could result in privately owned green belt land being under increased threat.

b) There is no reference regarding the alternative underground car park that has been proposed, in collaboration with the Brewery.

2) I would like to question the quantity of spaces required in this location for the following reasons:

a) There is alternative parking at several locations in close proximity to the town centre amenities. Often overlooked is the car park at Sainsburys, very close by which has a very generous 4 hour time restriction.

b) I would like to question the needs of the people predominantly using the Central car park. The car park is very large. It fills up very early on a morning, without much activity during the day. It is my suggestion that the car park is mainly used by commuters. Some of these people may travel from surrounding villages to hop on to the Leeds/York Coastliner bus, whilst enjoying the benefit of free all day car parking. The bus stop is directly outside the pedestrian Bridge street exit from the car park. Local commuters, based in Tadcaster itself may be more inclined to walk/cycle if this site was instead used for much needed housing.

c) Have any time restrictions been considered for people using the Central car park? If for example a 2/3 hour time restriction was implemented, for a reduced number of

spaces, you would potentially deter commuters using free all day parking. This would still provide a facility for people using local shops/amenities. It would also allow ample time for those attending an event at Riley Smith Hall or a church service at St Marys. Although it is nice to be able to continue to offer an excessive amount of free car parking spaces, there is a greater need for housing sites which do not involve the needless destruction and sacrifice of alternative, highly protected green belt land. It is clear to see from the volume of vehicles parked here, and the lack of footfall within the town, that the many people using these spaces are not using Tadcaster's central amenities.

Also people who signed this petition may do so because they are enjoying the luxury of the free all day parking. I do recognise the importance of providing a limited amount of parking facilities for those with mobility difficulties; however I feel more discussion and research is needed so that we can reach a compromise and fully utilise this land in the most effective way, in order to satisfy the NPPF, Chapter 11, 124d (National Planning Policy Framework) and also provide essential facilities to the community.

Caroline Skelly - Planning Policy Manager (Selby) provided a brief statement in relation to the issues raised by the petition noting that these had been picked up by the public consultation on the Selby Local Plan, with the Plan being subject to further consideration later in the meeting.

Members considered the issues raised by the petitioner and the public question and the raised the following:-

- The Divisional Member stated that she was fully aware of the issues raised in respect of this matter. She was aware that the Central Car Park was well used and the benefits that the facility brought to the local economy. She also recognised the need for additional housing in the area. She stated that there was no simple solution to the issue and understood the strength of feeling from both sides.
- A Member considered that there may be a covenant on the car park to ensure parking remained free but evidence was yet to be provided in relation to this.
- In terms of the suggestion of the provision of an underground car park for Tadcaster it was noted that previous discussions in respect of this had indicated to Members that Sam Smiths Brewery would be willing to pay for this, however, subsequent discussions resulted in the project having to be wholly funded by Selby District Council, which was unviable, therefore, this never materialised.
- The provision of free parking in Tadcaster would now be for North Yorkshire Council to determine, and whether this would remain the case at the Central Car Park.
- A Member stated that the situation created a dilemma for the Committee as there were two distinctly opposing views and both could not be satisfied. He emphasised that Tadcaster required new housing and that development on the outskirts would be difficult as the town was surrounded by green belt. He considered that the Central Car Park was appropriate for development and that car parking provision should be elsewhere in the town. He noted that there were some areas where this could be provided but the Sam Smiths Brewery objected to these, which made the situation difficult. He stated that the issue had been a dilemma for Selby District Council which had carried over to North Yorkshire Council.
- Members agreed that this was a contentious issue with clear factors raised in support of the differing viewpoints. In view of this it was considered inappropriate for the Committee to take any direct action other

than to recommend that the issue be considered through the appropriate statutory process in respect of Local Development Plans.

Resolved –

That the issues raised by the petitioner, and the public question in respect of the petition, be carried forward into the statutory Development Plan process, and further considered during that process.

45. Selby District Local Plan - Revised Regulation 19 (Publication version) draft plan for public consultation

Members considered the report of the Assistant Director Planning – Community Development Services setting out the options which have been considered in progressing the Selby District Local Plan and setting out the recommendation to undertake a further consultation on a revised Regulation 19 Publication Local Plan.

The report highlighted the following:-

- The four options which had been considered for progressing the Local Plan for the former Selby district area based on recent Counsel advice and making a recommendation to undertake a six-week consultation on a revised Publication Local Plan (PLP).
- The revised plan removed the proposed new settlement known as Heronby, added three further site allocations, including revisions to policies in response to comments raised as part of the previous consultation stage and any changes required following the publication of the revised National Planning Policy Framework in December 2023.
- A consultation on the Publication Local Plan took place between August and October 2022. In total 409 individual responses were received to the consultation, with 202 in relation to a new settlement proposal at Heronby.
- The majority of responses to the Heronby New Settlement proposal were objections based on adverse traffic impact on the A19 and the wider local highway network, impact on the ancient woodland, impact on climate change, the loss of agricultural land and development of greenfield land. Concerns were also raised about the lack of access to employment opportunities and assertions that new housing should be sited in the more affordable areas of the district. City of York Council (CYC) raised concerns based on the highway modelling undertaken stating that the duty to cooperate had not been fulfilled, National Highways had raised concerns in relation to the A19/A64 trip rates, internalisation rates within the site and phasing of infrastructure improvements.
- As a result legal advice was sought from Counsel on the options available to the Council in relation to the Selby Local Plan in the light of objections which had been made to proposals for a new settlement.

The four options considered were:-

- Option 1: Proceed to submission of the Plan in its current form with inclusion of Heronby
 - Option 2: Proceed to submission of the Plan in its current form but on the basis that NYC would propose the removal of Heronby as a Main Modification
 - Option 3: Undertake further Consultation on an amended PLP which does not include Heronby
 - Option 4 Not proceed with further work on the Selby Local Plan and instead to address the need through NYC's own Local Plan
- In order to progress the Local Plan with Heronby included as an allocation the City of

York Council concerns on highways matters would need to be satisfactorily addressed.

- Further discussions had taken place and the views of both NYC and CYC highways were that they were unable to support the scheme based on the information that was currently available. This did not mean that issues could not be adequately addressed in the longer term, however it was the view of officers that in order to make good progress on the Selby Local Plan that this site should be deleted.
- The Revised Publication Selby Local Plan, therefore, would remove the proposed New Settlement at Heronby but would add the following sites in response to additional information submitted through the previous consultation which demonstrated that they were deliverable;
 - Land West of White House Farm, Low Eggborough Road, Eggborough (114 dwellings)
 - White House Farm & Manor Farm, Hambleton (128 dwellings)
 - Land North of A163, North Duffield (40 dwellings)

The inclusion of these additional sites ensured that the Local Plan provided sufficient land to meet the housing needs of the former Selby district area up to 2040.

Members highlighted the following in relation to the report:-

- A Member requested the legal details that had been provided by Counsel in respect of the objection to the Heronby proposal from City of York Council be shared with Members of the Committee, as he had concerns that a neighbouring Local Authority could interfere with the North Yorkshire process. It was also stated that further details were required in relation to the nature of the objection. In response it was stated that it would be checked how the legal details could be shared with Members.
- Whilst agreeing that the highways issues made Heronby a difficult prospect a Member considered that a new settlement was the best solution to the housing issues in the area. He noted that the extension of Burn had been mooted as a possible alternative to Heronby but was ruled out because of flood risk, however, the further extensions of Hambleton and Eggborough were continuing despite the flood risk at those locations. He also had concerns regarding the continued expansion of these local villages and considered a new settlement to be the best solution to this, therefore, Heronby with a highways' solution would be the best way forward. Other Members echoed this view emphasising the need to avoid turning local villages into small towns. It was also noted that the forthcoming Mayoral Authority would have a say in the highways situation, which could help to alleviate the current impasse with City of York Council.
- A Member referred to the proposals for Eggborough and raised concerns regarding the ambiguity and contradiction contained within the policies.
- The Member also raised concerns regarding the amount of affordable and social housing that was being provided in the area. He noted that the minimum figure for these was outlined to developers, but, in nearly all developments, this was the maximum achieved, with many well under the minimum requirement. He emphasised the need for affordable and social housing to prevent young people from leaving the Selby area due to housing costs. Other Members agreed and felt the provision of new settlements, with guaranteed levels of social and affordable housing included, would address this issue, however, concern was raised that any movement by the Committee to insist on this could delay the implementation of the Selby Local Plan. Moving forward without a Local Plan could leave the area open to piecemeal, uncoordinated development, with at least 5 years to wait until the overarching North Yorkshire Plan was in place. It was suggested therefore that the recommendation to

support the Plan should be approved with a message that levels of affordable and social housing required a substantial increase.

- Thanks was given to officers to the answers provided following a number of concerns was raised in relation to the Heronby proposal. The Member suggested Heronby should be removed from consideration altogether due to its potential impact on the already busy junction of the A19 with the A64. However, as he felt it important that the Local Plan he suggested that the proposal should be agreed at this stage, with further discussions around the inclusion of Heronby in the North Yorkshire Plan undertaken at a later stage.
- A Member stated that he was supportive of the inclusion of Heronby in the North Yorkshire Plan provided that appropriate steps were taken to alleviate the traffic problems on the A19. He outlined his disappointment that the Environment Agency had blocked the potential Burn development for potential flooding issues when the other areas earmarked for development had similar issues.
- It was clarified that the legal advice was provided by the King's Counsel.
- In relation to the issues raised in respect of social and affordable housing the Member proposed the following motion, which was seconded:-
"The Selby and Ainsty Committee is concerned about the lack of affordable housing, both social renting and starter homes that enable young families to get on the housing ladder, in the emerging Selby Local Plan. We call upon the Executive to delay the decision to put the plan out for consultation whilst the percentage of affordable housing, currently 13%, is looked at by senior officers and the Selby district councillors."

Concern was raised that this may create an undue delay on the implementation of the Selby Local Plan. There was also concern around the 13% figure within the motion with regards to whether this was accurate, and whether Members could vote on this matter without having taken account of the full, and corroborated details for this. In relation to this it was noted that the adoption of the Plan had still to go through further processes, including public examination, therefore, the details would be checked and corroborated as the process moved forward.

A Member stated that affordable and social housing proposals often featured in the plans submitted by developers, but were watered down to a minimum level when the development actually took place. He emphasised that strong evidence was required that this type of housing was being built and that developers were maintaining their original proposals to provide an appropriate level of social and affordable housing.

Members agreed that the provision of social and affordable housing was important to the area but reiterated their concerns that the motion may cause an undue delay to the implementation process for the Selby Local Plan. Officers outlined the process and noted that any delay could mean it is overtaken by the development of the North Yorkshire Plan. The examination of the Selby Local Plan would provide an opportunity for issues such as this to be raised prior to implementation, however, delaying the current process could be problematic.

The Member who submitted the motion suggested that this provided a good opportunity to determine whether the Plan provided sufficient social and affordable housing and that position could be easily tested. In view of the remarks from other Members he agreed to add, "without unduly delaying the implantation process" to his motion. This was accepted and again seconded

Resolved –

- (i) The Selby and Ainsty Committee is concerned about the lack of affordable housing, both social renting and starter homes that enable young families to

get on the housing ladder, in the emerging Selby Local Plan. We call upon the Executive to delay the decision to put the plan out for consultation whilst the percentage of affordable housing, currently 13%, is looked at by senior officers and the Selby district councillors, without unduly delaying the implantation process.

Voting on this motion was as follows:-

8 for

7 against

- (ii) That the report be noted and the recommendation outlined within the report be submitted to the Executive, alongside the comments of the Committee, with a recommendation for approval.

Voting on this was as follows:-

9 for

5 against

1 abstention

46. Maltkiln New Settlement – Submission of the New Settlement (Maltkiln) Development Plan Document

Members considered the report of the Assistant Director Planning – Community Development Services requesting Members:-

To consider the content of the Regulation 19 Draft New Settlement (Maltkiln) Development Plan Document (DPD) and accompanying submission documents and seek renewed agreement for submission to the Secretary of State for public examination; and

To agree the process of decision making during the Examination in respect of agreeing modifications to the Plan and responding to questions from the Inspector (including the provision of supporting statements and documentation).

The report highlighted the following:-

- The development of a new settlement known as Maltkiln was a key part of the Harrogate District Local Plan's growth strategy, providing much needed homes and jobs in a sustainable location along the York-Harrogate-Leeds rail line.
- The broad location of the new settlement was established in the Harrogate District Local Plan (adopted 2020), but the Plan states that the boundary, form and nature of the new settlement would be set through a development plan document (DPD).
- A draft DPD had now been prepared setting a thirty-year vision for Maltkiln and a policy framework to guide how it is developed, underpinned by evidence base work, community involvement and public consultation.
- The next and final stage of the DPD process was submission to the secretary of state for an examination in public, allowing independent scrutiny of the DPD and allow a further chance for communities and stakeholders to influence the process and the final DPD.
- If adopted, the DPD would provide a robust framework for the Council to guide and manage the long-term development of Maltkiln.
- The former Harrogate Borough Council in September 2022 published a Regulation 19 consultation and submitted the DPD for examination following that. The decision

still has legal standing, but given the time that has elapsed for the reasons set out in the report it was felt prudent to seek re-confirmation of that decision. This report also provided an opportunity to present and agree the final submission documents.

- The draft DPD set a clear and ambitious vision for Maltkiln and a policy framework to guide how it is developed creating a mixed-use settlement, where people have access to homes, a range of employment types, local services and facilities, public transport and open spaces, focussed around the Cattal rail station and the new local centre enabling the residents to benefit from key walking, cycling and public transport corridors.
- Preparation of Development Plan Documents is governed by planning legislation and progression of the DPD through the final stages of the process would allow the Council to give increased weight to the Plan in the determination of planning applications. If adopted, full weight can be given to DPDs allowing the Council to drive development of the new settlement in a comprehensive manner.
- Upon submission, the Secretary of State appoints an Inspector to carry out an independent examination of the DPD, dealt with by the Planning Inspectorate. The process was detailed in the report.
- Resultant modifications would be for Full Council (with prior consideration at Development Plans Committee) to agree before the Plan is adopted.

Members highlighted the following in relation to the report:-

- It was clarified that the new settlement was located within the Constituency Area, which was why it was being considered by the ACC, before ultimately being considered by Full Council. It was expected that the Plan would be submitted for Public Examination in March 2024, with hearings anticipated to take place in the Autumn of 2024.
- A Community Liaison Group has been established to feed into the planning of Maltkiln and the dialogue through this has been useful.
- A Member asked whether Counsel's Advice was available to be shared with Members, in a similar position as for the Selby Local Plan, in respect of the amount of affordable housing to be included in the settlement and the potential CPO process required. In response it was noted that the overall legal advice for both Maltkiln and the Selby Local Plan was contained in one document, and the most appropriate method of sharing that information would be discussed with legal officers.
- In terms of the provision of affordable housing the remit of the Local Plan set an expected delivery target of 40% however it was emphasised that this could be challenging in the earlier phases of delivery.
- A Member asked about the potential cost of undertaking CPOs to acquire the necessary land. He stated that he would like all such issues to be addressed through the sharing of the legal advice and through disclosure by officers, before the Plan was progressed. He raised concerns regarding the potential costs having to met by the Council unless the position was clarified beforehand.
- A Member stated that, whilst understanding the concerns of the Member, there would always be issues to resolve in terms of providing new settlements. He considered that this proposal had come too far to drop at this stage due to the concerns outlined, and asked that this be moved forward appropriately as it was a good example of a new settlement which provided the much needed experience for the Council of such a development, going forward.

Resolved:-

That the report be noted and the recommendation outlined within the report be submitted to the Executive, alongside the comments of the Committee, with a recommendation for approval.

Voting was as follows:-

10 for

2 against

2 abstain

46. Update on Local Bus Services

Members considered a report providing an update on local bus services within the Selby and Ainsty Area Constituency Committee, highlighting the following:-

- Selby and Ainsty local bus service update
- National £2 fare cap scheme
- Funding from central government
- Community Transport

Members highlighted the following in relation to the report:-

- A Member raised concerns regarding the impact a lack of sufficient bus services was having on those seeking to obtain employment in the area. He considered the current provision to be neither strategic nor sustainable, and, noting that further funding was being provided by the Government for passenger transport through Levelling Up, asked how much of this would be utilised in the Selby area. In response it was stated that work was taking place to return services to previous levels, however, the time from receiving the additional funding had been insufficient for this to have taken place yet. The Member highlighted that there were a large number of services operating cross-border, from other areas, but much fewer in the opposite direction or within North Yorkshire, in comparison to other local areas. He considered that the issue was unlikely to change under the new Mayoral Authority unless cross-border initiatives were established with consideration given to a Yorkshire and the Humber connected bus service, with bus services funded accordingly. Other Members agreed that a co-ordinated cross-border service would assist in levelling up bus service provision in the region.
- It was stated that the £2 fare cap was creating problems for the residents of Tadcaster as the bus services were regularly running through the town full, due to the popularity of the scheme. Officers noted this issue.
- A Member stated that he was pleased to see that officers were working closely with businesses in Sherburn-in-Elmet, and that it would be beneficial for everyone in that area to have an appropriate bus service operating to and from the business park and to sections of the new estate.
- It was asked if the additional funding from the Government, highlighted earlier, would be lost if it was not spent in the next financial year. This was confirmed. It was asked whether Members would be involved in the process for allocating the funding. It was stated in response that the process had not

been developed as yet with guidance expected shortly, however, it was expected that Members would be part of that process.

- It was noted that the procurement process for bus services had yet to be completed which was impacting on a number of community groups, and it was asked when this was expected to be finished. In response it was stated that the process would be completed imminently, with operatives offering services in the very near future.

Resolved –

That the report be noted.

47. Update on Rail matters

(Councillor Karl Arthur declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item in relation to him being an employee of Network Rail)

Members considered an update on all rail matters within the geographical area covered by the Selby and Ainsty Area Constituency Committee highlighting the following:-

- Selby Station Gateway and Access for All scheme
- Stations - Sherburn in Elmet, South Milford, Church Fenton, Ulleskelf, Hensall and Whitley Bridge
- Station Usage
- Punctuality / Performance
- Network North Announcement
- Transpennine Route Upgrade and Transport Works Act Orders
- Leeds - Goole Line

Members highlighted the following in relation to the report:-

- Work was taking place with Network Rail in respect of the stations located in Ainsty on the York to Harrogate line.
- A Member thanked the officer for the update regarding the upgrade at Sherburn-in-Elmet station and the work being carried out alongside the Business Forum in respect of this. Issues relating to difficult disabled access at the station were highlighted. It was also asked whether trains were to resume utilising the station when travelling south, but it was noted that the issue was complex and would be discussed with the Member outside of the meeting. Another Member noted that he regularly used the service and could not understand why Sherburn station was missed, with him having to take busses from other nearby stations. In response it was stated that the issue was the length of the trains in comparison to the platform at Sherburn but work was being undertaken with the rail providers to try and address the situation. Members agreed that the development of Sherburn South would alleviate a number of issues in the area, including parking problems at South Milford station, and would provide access to Selby and Leeds.
- It was noted that a further attempt would be made to complete the bridge work at Church Fenton either during Easter or May Day bank holidays.

Resolved –

That the report be noted.

48. Selby Climate Change Action Plan – Funding

Members considered a verbal report outlining the following:-

Legacy funding from former Selby District Council was available for the implementation of the Selby Climate Change Action Plan. This amounted to £239K and was included in the capital programme as 'low carbon projects'.

In order to allocate funding to projects the following had been undertaken:

- A review of the Selby Climate Action Plan and discussion on the use of the funding with the climate officers from across North Yorkshire and the Assistant Director Environment and Waste Services
- A consultation with the portfolio holder for climate change.
- An open request to officers to bring forward suitable projects.

The following projects had been identified, in order of preference and approximate figures at this stage:

- i. £50K towards a programme of tree planting on public open space in the former Selby District Council area. All the areas had been surveyed and planting plans drawn up. (This enabled a successful application to the Coronation Woods Living Heritage fund for micro woods in Selby and Tadcaster which were in addition to this programme.)
- ii. £50K Installation of an EVCP (not for public access at this point) and EV Pool Car at Selby Civic Centre. This HQ is the main locality office without at EVCP which meant that staff could not have access to an EV Pool car, which was instrumental to getting our fleet carbon emissions reduced.
- iii. Capital energy efficiency improvements at 4 library buildings in the former Selby District Area, starting with Selby Library. The investment figure available would depend on (ii) above.
- iv. Improvements for active travel from Sherburn in Elmet railway station to the nearby industrial estate. The investment figure available would depend on (ii) above.

The budget holder is the Director of Environment and a report would be prepared for him following the meeting to incorporate the views of Members.

Members highlighted the following in relation to the report:-

- A Member, as outlined during the previous item, welcomed the potential support for the upgrade of Sherburn-in-Elmet train station to support disabled people.
- It was requested that details of the costs for EVCP be provided, together with details as to how well used these are at other authorities as there were concerns that the proposal was very costly for a provision that was open to NYC staff only. It was explained that the provision would become part of the LEVI programme that was delivering charging points around North Yorkshire, which would ensure that access was enabled for local communities. Discussions had been held regarding use of the local NHS EVCP but this had been funded for the use by their staff and ambulance provision. Members

emphasised that provision of the EVCP for NYC staff would need to ensure that this was used appropriately otherwise the public may see this as a vanity project. In response it was noted that there were ten electric pool vehicles available for staff to use, which they would be encouraged to use for work related matters. The charging unit would enable use of these vehicles for staff located in Selby.

- A Member noted that, originally, it had been suggested that the electric vehicles to be used by North Yorkshire Council would be vans as these would be more versatile. Also, should a vehicle be charged overnight, it was unlikely to need charging again until the next evening, therefore it was considered that the charging point was unnecessary, unless there was a charge put in place for the general use of it, as it would be under utilised. In response it was stated that evidence from elsewhere in the County indicated that the provision of a local EVCP for Council staff generated a net saving and was cost effective. It was expected that the provision would be utilised for further development projects, going forward.
- Concern was raised that Members had only recently been provided with the details in the report. A Member emphasised that there was a large amount of funding for the projects detailed with little, or no, contact with local Members prior to these being developed. He suggested that the projects lacked the impact required for the funding being used and that they were not cost effective or sustainable. In response it was clarified that Members views had been obtained at previous meetings and it was noted that, as the funding was ring-fenced for Selby it had to be used on suitable projects in the area.

Resolved –

That Members' comments on the proposed projects be submitted to the Director of Environment Services prior to final decision being made on these.

49. North Yorkshire Council's Climate Change Champion

The Council's Climate Change Champion, Councillor Paul Haslam, provided a presentation, highlighting the following:-

- How the climate change strategy can help inform the development of the local plan and how the local plan can help deliver the Council's climate change strategy
- North Yorkshire Council 2023 – 28 Critical implementations and a superpower
- We must all be Climate Change Champions now!
- As Climate Change Champion: I Champion Councillors to make a difference to climate change: I Champion the council's "power to convene" meetings and build partnerships with key strategic providers
- The Council's Officers have already started preparing with the Planning Policy Climate Change Day in July 23
- The local plan and climate change
- What has happened up to now on CO2 emissions
- North Yorkshire CO2 emissions - How can we help
- Planning and Climate Change - the Law

- Environment Act New Duties
- Building Regulations and code for sustainable homes (CFSH)
- The fundamental considerations of any Local plan
- Houses – ideas
- Social housing
- Growth strategy - Use our Natural assets – Food security is crucial
- Tourism
- Other industries that our natural assets lend themselves to
- Infrastructure: Roads that support our plans, not inhibits them
- Infrastructure – Transport Freight
- Infrastructure: Rail that supports our plans, not inhibits them
- Infrastructure: Public Transport that supports our plans, not inhibits them
- Transport - where is it hurting us
- Infrastructure – water security that can support our plans without polluting our county
- Water Security – Sewage

Members highlighted the following in relation to the presentation:-

- A Member raised concerns regarding a number of planning applications that were currently being submitted in relation to changing land use from agriculture to energy generation through solar panels and the effect that would have on food security. Members echoed these concerns suggesting that there were more appropriate ways of developing solar farms rather than using agricultural land, including fitting these to existing buildings. It was emphasised that there was a need for re-skilling to enhance the workforce required to enable the mass retrofitting of solar panels required.
- It was suggested that the current carbon footprint of the Council was higher than it should be due to the number of officers working at home and their individual use of energy and resources, rather than a collective use in the office. In relation to this it was noted that the current building assets held by the Council were due to be reviewed and an assessment of working from home would be undertaken following that.
- Councillor Haslam was thanked for his presentation, which was recognised as a vital issue that spanned many areas and it had to be ensured that the Council carried out appropriate action on the issues raised.

Resolved –

That the presentation, and issues raised, be noted.

50. North Yorkshire Councils role in responding and recovering to emergencies

Resolved –

That this item be deferred for consideration at a subsequent meeting in view of the presenting officer being unable to attend the meeting.

51. SEND Provision Selby - Selby Special Free School Update

The Chair provided feedback from a public meeting that she had arranged involving concerned parents, pupils and school staff from the local area in relation to the difficulties caused by the delays to the provision of this school in the area.

She stated that she would circulate the notes taken at the meeting to all Members of the Committee.

Resolved that this be noted.

52. Update on the £50k per ACC seed funding pot for economic development

The Clerk read out the following update to the Committee:-

- The process for progressing and approving proposals for the ACC £50k annual fund had been slightly updated following discussion with all of the ACCs and was awaiting sign off. Details would be shared with the ACCs in the near future.
- In the meantime, officers had asked for an informal meeting with the Selby and Ainsty ACC to discuss potential projects and seek views on prioritisation of these. This could take place as soon as it could be arranged and all members of the ACC were welcome to attend. If it wished, the ACC could request that only members with a particular interest attend the informal discussion – but proposals would need to be agreed that reflected the priorities of the ACC.
- The informal discussion would include discussion of the proposal made by Cllr Jordan and provide an update about current work that related to these issues.

Members considered they had not been satisfied with the initial discussions in relation to how the funding could be used and would welcome further discussions in relation to this. It was hoped that this could also clear up whether the funding could be carried over into the next financial year.

Resolved –

That arrangements be made for an informal meeting on this issue.

53. 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 suggested that 2.00pm on a Friday afternoon was an inappropriate time to hold the ACC meeting and future meetings should be moved to 10am when appropriate.

- Concern was raised regarding recent rumours regarding the possible merger of ACCs, including proposals for Selby and Ainsty to merge with Harrogate and Knaresborough. Members emphasised the need for areas to maintain their own identity and would prefer to see a return to the District based Area Committees rather than this merger. It was suggested that this opinion from the Selby and Ainsty ACC should be submitted into that any further discussions in relation to this matter.

Resolved –

- (i) That consideration be given to the use of a variety of meetings to assist with delivery of the Work Programme;
- (ii) That further consideration be given as to the items to be considered at the next meeting of the ACC at the forthcoming mid-cycle briefing.

54. Next Meeting

Resolved -

That the next meeting of the Committee be held on Friday 26th April 2024 at 10am at Selby Civic Centre.

The meeting concluded at 5.00pm.

SML