

North Yorkshire Council

Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 16 September 2025 commencing at 11.00 am.

Councillor Carl Les in the Chair. Councillors Gareth Dadd, Richard Foster, Michael Harrison, Simon Myers, Heather Phillips and Malcolm Taylor.

In attendance: Councillors Steve Shaw-Wright, David Chance, Andy Paraskos, Keane Duncan (remote), Paul Haslam (remote) and Janet Jefferson (remote).

Officers present: Richard Flinton, Karl Battersby, Stuart Carlton, Gary Fielding, Nic Harne, Barry Khan, Daniel Harry, Elizabeth Jackson, Louise Wallace, Gareth Bentley, Kim Robertshaw, Hugh Clear Hill (remote) and Kerry Russett (remote).

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

At the commencement of the meeting the Leader invited the Executive Member for Highways and Transportation to provide an update on the Selby Station Gateway project. The project would regenerate the area around Selby Station, provide sustainable travel options and contribute to economic growth for the town. Work on site was due to start next month.

737 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Mark Crane, Janet Sanderson and Annabel Wilkinson.

738 Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 August 2025

Resolved

That the public Minutes of the meeting held on 19 August 2025, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and confirmed by the Chair as a correct record.

739 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

740 Public Questions and Statements

Three public statements had been received in relation to Minute 741 – Review of Maximum Hackney Carriage Fares, which were dealt with at that Minute and are detailed below.

1. Statement from Richard Fieldman – read out at the meeting

Dear Councillors

Today you are going to be asked to determine this year's tariff charges, as requested by

the trade back in January/February, to which at this current time, is fourteen months since our last increase, back in July 2024, and by the time today's decision is made and implemented, it will be fifteen months.

For more years than I can remember now, the trade and the licensing department have relied on a fare formula used by Transport for London, to determine any increase that the London taxis are awarded annually, it is totally independent and impartial, with all figures taken into account of the increase in cost of living, fuel prices, insurance prices, the cost of new and used vehicles, as well as the increase in maintenance charges ,ie, garage labour and parts costs, and kicks out a percentage increase needed to keep the trade in a profitable situation, this formula however, does not take into account the wage needed for the driver. I asked Mr Bentley to run this formula last February to give the trade an idea of where we needed to be in requesting a tariff increase, it produced a figure of 8%, so therefore as I was constructing an increase request, I aimed my target at 5%, feeling that this was both fair for the trade and public alike.

You have before you the results of a consultation that was conducted by the licensing department, asking members of the public how they felt about taxi charges in the area, well guess what? No surprise that they think they are too high, and in true human nature, if each and every one of us is asked what we think about the costs of any of the services, or products we use, with a view to the possibility of the price increasing, we are going to say we think they are already too expensive. So the outcome of that survey is somewhat inevitable, but the fact remains, the taxi industry needs to not only be able to afford the high standards expected by the council, but needs the ability to maintain their vehicles to a high standard, as well as make a decent living to keep up with the cost of living.

It is true to say that a small percentage of the trade do not want an increase in the tariff rate, and that is mainly down to the influx of Uber into the area, however, Uber drivers have a massive distinct advantage over us, they are being licensed by much less expensive councils than ours, are running older vehicles, are not maintained to the levels ours are, and are backed up and supported financially by a huge company. We cannot nor must not, try and compete with Uber as far as tariffs are concerned, that is a road to destruction, a route we can never win, so the answer is not to try to compete with their fares, but be allowed to run profitably, or we will not have a business to compete with.

The other issue that must be taken into consideration is, if we are not given an increase this year, then we start to get to a stage of having to play catch up further down the line, meaning a bigger increase next year, and the year after, which disgruntles the public even more, and has more of a detrimental effect.

Last year the council did not increase the night time and public holiday rates, which saw us lose time and a half and double time rates, rates that the normal working person gets when working unsocial times and public holidays, this has led to a decrease in drivers working these times, as they are not being suitably paid for it, leaving members of the public struggling to get taxis during these times, this needs to be reinstated, time and a half, and double time of the day rate, as everyone else is allowed to earn in their occupation.

I ask you all today to think very carefully before accepting the officers recommendation, and to think as business people, by allowing the trade to keep their businesses up to date with the ever increasing costs, and to also earn a decent living.

Please remember, not all taxi drivers are in the same boat, not all work for companies and are supplied with a constant supply of jobs, many are independents, relying solely on the taxi ranks, where in some cases you can sit for nearly two hours without a job. If you do not want an increase in the tariff rate for whatever reason, you are under no legal obligation to have your meter altered to reflect the new rate, but it is vitally important that those drivers that do need it, are allowed the privilege of having it.

Thank you for listening.
Richard Fieldman

2. Statement from Lisa Ridsdale – read out at the meeting

Dear All

I would like to thank Richard for his significant contributions to this matter. I am also inquiring about the status of an email I previously sent, which requested an increase in representation for over 50 licensed drivers in North Yorkshire. That email included the badge numbers of all relevant drivers, and I have not seen any reflection of this request.

Following the merger of all seven districts, Ryedale experienced a 20 percent decrease in the running mile, a rate at which we have been operating since. We believe it is unjust for our fares to remain unchanged given the substantial increase in minimum wage.

If we do not receive a fare increase, we will unfortunately be forced to reduce our number of drivers, as sustaining their wages will become unfeasible. The Take Me group employs over 100 drivers in North Yorkshire, and we are concerned that a refusal to increase fares will impact our ability to provide essential public service.

We concur with Richard that a 5 percent increase is a fair adjustment. Drivers who prefer not to charge the metered rate will retain the option to charge less.

Many thanks,
Lisa Ridsdale

3. Statement from Kevin O'Boyle – statement previously circulated by email so was not read out at the meeting

1. On 1st April 2025, Integrated Passenger Transport at North Yorkshire Council, without any request from the trade whatsoever, gave a 3% increase to vehicles carrying out their school runs. This was based on expense increases from January to December 2024. One would assume from this that the Council recognise that the trade overall is justifiable in asking for a fare increase.
2. Survey. I feel that this was flawed. If one was to ask any member of the public, "do you think this price is too high?", irrespective of what it was for, under the current financial climate the answer would be "yes". Regarding drivers in Harrogate (which is the only area I can speak about) we have a very high percentage of drivers who virtually work part time to top up their pensions. We have others that do it for a hobby. We have a large number of drivers who only work five days a week -Monday to Friday. Personally, I would not call these people taxi drivers. There are also many drivers who never work weekends, or bank holidays, and take a fortnight off at Christmas. These people are commenting on surveys that do not directly affect them.
3. Cost of Living. As well as cost of living expenses that we share in common with everyone else, we have the added burden of the minimum wage increasing by 6.7% this year, plus national insurance and pension contribution increases. I would also ask where Mr Bentley gets his diesel from at £1.34 per litre? The price in Harrogate ranges from £1.40 to £1.45 per litre.
4. Night time rates. There has been no fare increase since 2023, when the new tariff 2 rate was introduced. However, due to rising costs, I find that we are delivering this service at a very much reduced income. This following the same path as

above - increases in NMW, pension and national insurance contributions.

- a. May I point out that there are less than 5% of drivers willing to work full night shifts. The reason for this is a decline in the night time economy in Harrogate. As well as there being many decent honest folk, we also have a large number of what can only be described as scum. We have to deal with drunks, people being sick in the cars (or worse). Although there is a soilage charge incorporated in the fare structure, at times actually getting this from the customer proves impossible. We have people who blatantly have no intention of paying the fare, and "do a runner". Going to the police proves pointless. Their first argument is that it is a civil, not a criminal matter - it is actually theft. If one does try to pursue this, one can spend 2-3 hours making a statement, knowing full well that no action will be taken
- b. There is also a major problem in Harrogate with drugs. Through the night there is a huge amount of toing and froing of passengers delivering or buying drugs. They obviously don't tell the driver what they are doing, but it is not hard to work out. The driver then runs the risk of, if stopped by the police, that these passengers could secrete their packages in the vehicle. If found, the driver could be prosecuted for possession of drugs, consequently receive a criminal record and losing his taxi licence.
- c. In 2023 the minimum wage was £10.42 per hour. It is now £12.21. An increase of £1.79 per hour. It is now becoming impossible to absorb these costs. If we do not get some kind of increase to help us, my company would have to look at withdrawing our night time service, and I know that other companies in the area feel the same.
- d. I do personally feel that the alterations to the start and finish of tariff 2 - 2200hrs to 0700hrs, to be harsh on the public. I feel it would be much fairer to revert back to 2300hrs to 0600hrs.
5. Subsidies. As you are possibly aware, we receive no help from government or anybody else, but we are an integral part of the public transport industry. I read that a bus company recently received 12Million to buy electric buses. All their fares are subsidised - from bus passes to cheap day travel, subsidies for runs that would normally be unprofitable. Because of the equalities act, we are actually subsidising disabled passengers.
6. Comparison of Fares. The fare comparison for a 2 mile journey - York charge the same as us, and are due for a review imminently, Leeds are 40p dearer and are also due for a review, Lancaster, Redcar, Durham, Kirklees, Bradford, Sheffield and Wakefield are all shortly due for a review.

I obviously don't know individual Council members' backgrounds but can assume that some of you have owned your own businesses. I do however know that you are all intelligent people. I hope that I have convinced you that a fare increase is required, and that a 5% increase will not by any means meet the increased expenses we are incurring, and that we will still be absorbing some of the increases ourselves. I hope that you feel that our 5% request is reasonable for both customers and the trade.

Response from the Executive Member for Managing our Environment:

We would like to thank members of the trade, including Mr Richard Fieldman, Ms Lisa Ridsdale and Mr O'Boyle, for their detailed submissions and continued engagement throughout this process. Their input highlights the financial pressures drivers and operators face in general, reflecting the challenges of operating within the current market conditions. We can also confirm that Ms Ridsdale's initial email was received and considered as part of the fare review.

Mr Fieldman referred to the Transport for London (TfL) formula, which suggested an 8% uplift to existing fares. While the TfL index can provide a useful benchmark, it is designed for a very different operating environment and, as Mr Fieldman himself noted, does not take account of all associated costs. Relying mechanically on a formula would introduce rigidity, risk overlooking the views of the public and the trade and fail to reflect local market factors such as competition from ride-hailing services. For these reasons, the licensing authority exercises discretion to consider all relevant factors and reach an informed decision rather than being bound by mathematical calculations. Local decisions must reflect local evidence. Factors such as cost of living and fuel prices have been included and sourced from the Office for National Statistics and the AA. Mr O'Boyle refers to the rise in minimum wage and national insurance contributions. These would normally refer to Private Hire Operators offices which employ staff, whilst the fare review focusses exclusively on Hackney Carriages. The Council does not regulate the fares charged for Private Hire Journeys.

Recent comparisons with neighbouring authorities indicate that, for many journeys, fares in North Yorkshire are already high in relative terms. Applying a formula to dictate annual increases would only widen the gap between taxis licensed by North Yorkshire Council and those licensed elsewhere, particularly where there is no expectation of annual increases. This disparity can encourage the public to pre-book taxis from outside the county as a cheaper alternative.

It is also important to note that the evidence does not indicate an across-the-board increase in operating costs. Paragraphs 3.6.1 and 3.6.4 of the report confirm that the price of fuel and the overall cost of running a vehicle have decreased since the last review, although other costs, such as insurance, may still present challenges.

The consultation, which received 292 responses, showed that many residents feel current fares are already too high, particularly for night-time and festive periods. Comparative analysis supports this view, showing that North Yorkshire's fares are among the highest regionally, especially for shorter journeys and during unsocial hours. It is also relevant that many respondents (both from the public and the trade) expressed a preference for no increase in maximum fares. While there is no obligation on drivers to charge the maximum rates, any increase would be visible to the public and could influence their willingness to use taxis. Trade members opposed to a fare increase would therefore likely be affected by such a decision in any case.

While concerns have been raised about consultation bias, it is only one of several factors considered alongside cost data, trade feedback, and fare comparisons with neighbouring authorities. This approach ensures that decisions are based on a rounded view rather than any single source.

Mr O'Boyle refers to an increase in contractual payments given by the Integrated Passenger Transport Team for school and social transport. These payments are governed by the terms of a contract and are entirely separate from the setting of maximum fares for general journeys.

Mr O'Boyle also refers to customers carrying drugs in licensed vehicles. Evidence of this should be passed to North Yorkshire Police. The Council is happy to assist with this and will take a strong line where a driver's involvement can be evidenced.

Finally, it is worth noting that the maximum tariff sets an upper limit only. Drivers remain free to charge less if they wish, providing flexibility for operators to respond to local market conditions.

We are grateful for the constructive input from the trade and can confirm that all views have been carefully considered as part of this review.

741 Review of Maximum Hackney Carriage Fares

Considered – A report of the Corporate Director Environment in relation to three requests to vary the Council's Hackney Carriage Table of Maximum Fares. The current table of fares came into effect on 1 July 2024 following consultation and consideration by the Executive. Three requests had been received from the hackney carriage trade to review the table of current of fares which were set out at section 3.1 of the report. A public consultation had taken place, and a summary of the responses was provided in section 3 of the report, along with the full responses at Appendix C. Information in relation to maximum fares of neighbouring authorities, fuel prices, cost of living and costs of running vehicles was also provided.

The Executive Member for Managing our Environment, Councillor Richard Foster, presented the report, stating that fares were high across North Yorkshire in comparison to neighbouring areas and online apps. These higher fares were putting pressure on the public to use taxis from outside the area, and in some cases vehicles were not licensed to the same standards as for North Yorkshire. The Executive Member therefore recommended that no change be made to the current Hackney Carriage Table of Maximum Fares.

Resolved (unanimously)

That no change be made to the current Hackney Carriage Table of Maximum Fares.

Alternative options considered

The Council is not legally obligated to set the maximum rates of charges. However, the vast majority of licensing authorities do set maximum fares to provide certainty, consistency and, particularly in relation to occasional passengers, protection from unfair or unreasonable charges.

Reasons for Recommendations

The Council is expected to set and regularly review the maximum fares to be charged by hackney carriage drivers with a view to protecting the public and ensuring that licensees are fairly rewarded for their work.

The research carried out confirms that:

- Over 70% of the trade and over 92% of residents, visitors or businesses who responded to the consultation felt that current fares were just right or too high for all three tariffs.
- On average, fuel prices have decreased by 8.5% since the last review.
- The latest annual cost of living rate shows an increase 4.1% over the last 12 months.
- The cost of running a petrol or diesel vehicle has decreased by 3% in the last 12 months (includes the change in fuel price).

742 Regulatory Services Fixed Penalty Notice Policy

Considered – A report of the Corporate Director Environment in which approval was sought to harmonise all existing Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) charges within the remit of Regulatory Services. The report provided information on the introduction of Penalty Notices for various animal health and welfare offences and smoke control offences and sought approval for their use. A Penalty Notice Policy was proposed for adoption and it

was proposed that the new Fixed Penalty Charges and Penalty Notice Policy be implemented from 1 October 2025 if adopted.

In introducing the report the Executive Member for Managing our Environment, Councillor Richard Foster, explained that the proposed FPNs would be a useful tool for responding to some offences, whilst still having the ability to proceed straight to court for more serious offences.

The Corporate Director Environment, Karl Battersby, reported that creation of a new council had brought a number of regulatory teams together, creating a wider group of staff with the ability to use FPNs. The council was taking a zero-tolerance policy approach across the county with a standard £400 fee for smaller offences up to £1000 maximum fee. There would also be a name and shame approach when cases were taken to prosecution.

Resolved (unanimously) - that

- 1) The proposed Fixed Penalty Notice charge levels, as detailed in Appendix A, be approved.
- 2) The use of Penalty Notices under the Animals (Penalty Notices) Act 2022 and the Animals (Penalty Notices) (England) Regulations 2023, for animal health and welfare offences, be approved.
- 3) The use of Penalty Notices under the Environment Act 2021, for smoke control offences, be approved.
- 4) The Penalty Notice Policy, detailed in Appendix B, be adopted.
- 5) The agreed Fixed Penalty Notice charges and Penalty Notice Policy to be implemented from 1st October 2025.

Reasons for recommendations

The level of fixed penalty charges for relevant offences should be harmonised across the North Yorkshire Council area and reflect the severity of the offences. Fixed penalties provided enforcement agencies with an immediate, cost effective, and visible way of responding to low-level environmental crimes, and the Government encouraged their use by local authorities.

Alternative options considered

Alternative options had been considered in relation to harmonising the level of FPN charges, taking into account the variances across the Council area:

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Option 1 (Recommended): | Align each FPN to the current highest locality, with a moderate increase for some offences. | This appears to be a reasonable and proportionate option at this time. Any reduction in FPN rates in a particular locality may be reported without an explanation of the overall picture for North Yorkshire. This could potentially give the wrong message in those areas. |
| Option 2 | Align each FPN to the current lowest locality. | This would prevent existing lower charges being subject to a sudden large increase. This would mostly affect littering and householder duty of care. However, the result in some areas would |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | be a reduction, as highlighted in Option 1 above. |
| Option 3 | Set all FPN's at the maximum permitted level. | This may give a message that the Council are 'serious' about these offences but is not a recommended approach at this time. If the charges are set too high, the risk is an increase in non-payment rates, particularly in less affluent areas. It is proposed to keep FPN charges at a moderate level while the new Environmental Enforcement Team are established and have a better standard of data on all aspects of enforcement. |

743 Report of the Crustacean Deaths Working Group

Considered – A report of the Corporate Director Environment presenting the report of the Crustacean Deaths Working Group (CDWG) following its investigation into the mass mortality event along the north east coast of England in late 2021. The CDWG was chaired by Redcar and Cleveland Council and comprised member representation from Hartlepool, Middlesborough, North Yorkshire and Stockton Councils. The delegates on the working group were Councillors Derek Bastiman, David Chance, Carl Les OBE, with Hugh Clear Hill acting as the link officer for NYC, and the Leader thanked them for their work on this.

The Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee (TEEE OSC) had reviewed the final report of the CDWG on 11 July 2025 and supported the recommendations as set out at paragraph 3.3.1.

The Executive Member for Managing our Environment, Councillor Richard Foster, presented the report, acknowledging the severe economic impact of the mass die-off on the fishing industry. No definitive reason had yet been found for the die-off and it was important that environmental testing work continued.

Councillor David Chance referred to the complexity of the investigation and the lack of conclusions following work by the government on this. He supported the recommendation of TEEE OSC that it reconsider the peer-reviewed research once it was available.

Resolved (unanimously)

That the Executive endorse the final report of the Crustacean Deaths Working Group.

Reasons for recommendations

It is felt important to seek formal endorsement of the final report at each of the five local authorities represented as part of the Working Group, so that it can be forwarded to relevant stakeholders and government agencies, with a request to consider how the proposed report recommendations might be implemented.

744 Draft Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2025 to 2030

Considered – A report of the Corporate Director Community Development presenting the

draft Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2025-2030 for recommendation to full Council for adoption.

The Executive Member for Culture, Arts and Housing, Councillor Simon Myers, presented the report and strategy, which highlighted the work done by the Housing team in connecting with other teams within North Yorkshire Council and external partners to deal with the problems of homelessness and rough sleeping. The Executive Member thanked the Housing team of Nic Harne, Andrew Rowe and Kim Robertshaw for their work on this and set out the main points of the strategy, which included:

- Increasing the provision of suitable accommodation, particularly taking into consideration the withdrawal of private landlords from the market
- Building new social housing – the second homes council tax premium was being spent on housing and strategies to bridge the affordability gap
- Providing pathways to supported housing
- Reducing rough sleeping and providing more supported accommodation for rough sleepers
- Early engagement with tenants at risk of losing their homes

Executive Members expressed their support for the Strategy. Councillor Michael Harrison referred to the work of the Harrogate Homelessness Project, who were supportive and were aligning their own strategy to this. In response to a question Councillor Simon Myers advised that council house voids were reported quarterly.

Resolved (unanimously)

That the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2025-30 be recommended for adoption by Full Council.

Reasons for recommendation

The recommendation to full council for adoption of the strategy. The strategy was a legal requirement and supported positive outcomes for vulnerable individuals while ensuring effective resource use.

745 Brierley Homes independent Review and Funding Update

Considered – A report of the Corporate Director Resources setting out the outcomes of an independent review into Brierley Homes requested by the Council as Shareholder. Approval was requested for additional loan facility headroom to Brierley Homes of £2m at the market rate of interest of 6% above base rate. Any drawdown on the additional loan facility would be subject to evidence of need and approval of the Corporate Director of Resources in consultation with the Leader, Deputy Leader and Chief Executive.

The Corporate Director Environment, Karl Battersby, introduced the independent review making the following key points:

- The review had been undertaken by Tony Dodds, an experienced real estate professional who had previously set up and led two local authority owned housing companies.
- The operating model of the company was considered alongside its structures, financial position and options going forward.
- The review had concluded that Brierley Homes was based on a sound operating model with achievable aims of building new homes for profit. The company had

diversified and was building a high proportion of affordable homes and delivering construction in different ways.

- The company had a positive impact on the County in addition to its core aim of generating Shareholder Value. The company could continue to provide a valuable contribution to the economy and environment of the area.
- The review made a number of recommendations and paragraph 4.7 set out the responses and actions of the Shareholder and company which were being progressed to ensure the company would continue to evolve and meet the council's housing needs.

The Corporate Director Finance, Gary Fielding, then referred to the financial implications and reported that the company had reported a £3.2m loss for 2024/25 which was due to slower than expected house sales. There was an existing loan facility of £25m at a commercial rate of interest, with an additional facility of £1.4m at base rate to enable the delivery of affordable homes above policy. The proposed additional £2m facility would be at a commercial rate of 6% above base. The company was currently well within its existing facility, however agreeing the facility now would avoid having to ask again should further funding be needed to support the supply chain, and a series of further approvals would be required. The Corporate Director confirmed that the Shareholder was now receiving a weekly cashflow statement from the company.

Councillor Gareth Dadd reported that the Brierley Group of companies was successful with an overall profit of £3m. It was confirmed that sensitivity analysis was undertaken for cash flow for the company and the principal sensitivity was housing sales.

Resolved (unanimously)

- 1) That the conclusions and recommendations of the independent external review that has been carried out be noted.
- 2) That approval be given to an additional loan facility headroom to Brierley Homes of £2m at the usual commercial rate of interest to be reviewed after 6 months to ensure Brierley Homes has appropriate cashflow over the short term. Approval of draw down on this additional loan facility to be delegated to the Corporate Director Resources in consultation with the Leader, Deputy Leader (Executive Member for Finance) and Chief Executive and is subject to evidence of need being demonstrated.

Reasons for recommendations

Additional loan facility was required in order to potentially allow the company time for sales to be received over the next few months and ensure Brierley Homes could continue to make all payments due to suppliers in the event of some delayed sales in the coming months.

Alternative options considered

There was an option not to approve any additional loan, but this ran the risk of some payments being unable to be made if there was any delay in sales income being received and the development pipeline of Brierley Homes being constrained.

746 Recharging for Scheduled Parish Elections

Considered – A report of the Assistant Chief Executive Legal and Democratic Services to seek a decision on whether North Yorkshire Council should recharge parishes for the cost

of all elections, both scheduled and unscheduled, including uncontested elections. Four options for recharging parishes were presented and should Executive be minded to implement a recharge Option 2 was recommended which would enable the council to recharge a parish in full for any costs associated exclusively with a parish election. Where an election was combined with a North Yorkshire Council election only the additional costs incurred by the parish election would be recharged.

The Executive Member for Corporate Services, Councillor Heather Phillips, introduced the report and advised that recharging would bring fairness across the county as some town and parish councils held frequent by-elections and currently this cost was spread across the whole county. In July 2023 Executive adopted a policy to recharge contested by-elections; uncontested elections and scheduled elections were not included in the policy at that time.

Resolved (unanimously)

- 1) That the Council continue to recharge parish council for by-elections.
- 2) That the Council recharges parish councils at scheduled elections (May 2027 + 4 yearly) for the additional costs solely attributable to the parish election, as per option 2 in Appendix A to form the basis of those recharges.
- 3) That the Council introduces the proposed recharges for uncontested parish elections from April 2026, as set out in appendix A.

Reasons for recommendations

To reduce the financial burden on North Yorkshire Council for parish election costs. Parishes becoming more financially responsible for their elections ensures affected electors are contributing towards the cost of parish democracy via specific area parish precept, rather than all electors across North Yorkshire paying for parish elections in the entire area.

Alternative options considered

Option 1 in Appendix A: To continue recharging parishes for by-elections and introduce recharges at scheduled elections (May 2027 + 4 yearly) for both the costs solely attributable to the parish election (i.e. ballot papers and postal vote packs if dispatched separately) in addition to the shared element costs such as venue hire, staffing fees.

Option 3 in Appendix A: To continue with parish recharge arrangements in place since April 2024, only recharging for the cost contested by-elections.

Option 4 in Appendix A: To not recharge at all for any parish elections

747 Closure of Wentworth Street and Back of Micklegate Public Conveniences

Considered – A report of the Corporate Director Environment in relation to the provision of public toilet facilities.

The Executive Member for Managing our Environment, Councillor Richard Foster, introduced the report and advised of a change to the recommendations as printed in the report. An overview and scrutiny review of public convenience provision was planned and therefore it was proposed that decisions on closures be deferred until after the review.

Councillor Steve Shaw-Wright advised that should Back of Micklegate, Selby, public conveniences close permanently there was no suitable alternative provision. Councillor

Keane Duncan spoke on the Wentworth Street, Malton, public conveniences advising that the local members and the signatories to a petition had objected to the closure. Councillor Duncan referred to the decision-making process to close the toilets and expressed support for the amended recommendations.

Resolved (unanimously)

- 1) That a decision on the potential closure of Wentworth Street, Malton public conveniences be deferred until the refurbishment of the Market Place facilities has been completed and to take into account a review of public conveniences which is to be undertaken by overview and scrutiny.
- 2) That a decision on the permanent closure of Back of Micklegate, Selby public conveniences, which are temporarily closed, be deferred to take into account a review of public conveniences which is to be undertaken by overview and scrutiny

Reasons for recommendations

To enable decisions on public conveniences to take account of an overview and scrutiny review of public conveniences.

748 Forward Plan

Considered – The Forward Plan for the period 5 September 2025 to 30 September 2026 was presented.

Resolved

That the Forward Plan be noted.

749 Date of Next Meeting - 21 October 2025

The meeting concluded at 12.38 pm.