



Tadcaster Town Council

The Ark, 33 Kirkgate, Tadcaster LS24 9AQ

01937 834113

clerk@tadcastertowncouncil.gov.uk

www.tadcastertowncouncil.gov.uk

Open Monday to Thursday 9.30am to 12.30pm

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 21 February 2023 AT 7 PM IN THE ARK

PRESENT:	CHAIRMAN	D Bowgett
	COUNCILLORS	S Cobb, J Chiswick, P Emmott, F Grieg, D Mackay, M Middlemiss, C Metcalfe, K Poskitt, C Stephenson & R Sweeting.
	CLERK	J Crowther
	DEPUTY CLERK	J Mottershead
	ALSO PRESENT	PC N Woods, Sergeant J Wateron & PC Dunn
		D Gluck Tadcaster Rural CIC, K Ickeringill Environment Agency, 12 members of the public

C199 APOLOGIES – (Item 1) - To receive, record and approve apologies for absence, P Grasby.

C200 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST – (Item 2) - To receive and record declarations of interest at this point or at any other point on the agenda – None.

Members agreed to discuss item 5 at this stage of the meeting.

C201 POLICE REPORT – (Item 5) - Members noted and discussed the Police report.
PC Woods introduced Sergeant 294 Wateron & PC 629 Dunn

C Metcalfe joined the meeting

PC Woods read out and updated members on the Police Report.

He highlighted the importance of reporting incidents of crime to the North Yorkshire Police as soon as possible this can be via the 101 number or anonymously online via Crimestoppers.

Police were aware of the 6 caravans parked in the Britannia Car Park. Assessments had been completed by Selby District Council and Police were engaging with the occupants.

A Risk Assessment had been carried out and a long-term solution was being sought. The Police did not have the powers to move the caravans on unless a crime had been committed. SDC did have powers should they be required.

R Sweeting joined the meeting

PC Woods reported that if anyone had any concerns, they should be relayed to SDC and any criminal activity reported to the Police.

R Sweeting apologised for being late for the meeting. He reported that he had been in contact with SDC Chief Executive with regard to the caravans, who had stressed that if there were any concerns these should be relayed to SDC.

SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS

A resident felt it should be a priority to move the caravans on as they were parked in a public car park which was impeding visitor and resident parking.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 21 February 2023

R Sweeting reported that the matter had to be done by the book.

D Mackay reported that there needed to be complaints in numbers before action would be taken.

R Sweeting reported that the caravans were due to move on 2 March 2023.

A resident asked if barriers could be placed at the car park to stop large vehicle access.

R Sweeting reported that there had previously been barriers, these had been removed as coaches were unable to park which was stopping visitors to the town.

REIMPOSE STANDING ORDERS –

C202 TADCASTER GREENBELT PROTECTION GROUP (TGPG)– (Item 6) -

a. Members to discuss an email received from Tadcaster Greenbelt Protection Group (TGPG) regarding the Eleven Arches proposal for development of land at Kelcbar Hill, Tadcaster.

D Bowgett read out a statement as follows: -

At the full council meeting on August 17th, 2021, Tadcaster Town Council listened to a presentation by Gladman relating to a development, now referred to as Eleven Arches, that is being proposed to take place on land off Wetherby Road. This presentation was purely an opportunity for councillors to learn and ask questions about the scheme. At the time, the Selby District Local Plan was at a very early stage of development, and town councillors thought it best to be as informed as possible on something that may have been presented by Selby District Council as an alternative in case their preferred options in the Local Plan did not pan out.

Tadcaster Town Council's position on Eleven Arches remains one of neutrality, and until we are asked by the local planning authority to comment on any application associated with the scheme, there is no meaningful action we are able to take with respect to it.

The town council made representations as part of the Selby District Local Plan consultation in 2021 and 2022. We made comments on various concerns and observations we had with the plan, in the same manner that the majority of town and parish councils across the Selby District did, but we did not advocate developing on green belt land in either response.

We have received questions over why we have had communications with Grimston Park Estate with regards to our neighbourhood development plan. Any individual or organisation who owns land that falls within the Tadcaster parish is legally entitled to make representations to the NDP process, and they may comment on any aspect of the plan, regardless of where in the parish the land they own is located, or what intention they may have for it. However, it is the decision of the steering group as to whether these representations will be incorporated into the plan, and it will be up to the residents of Tadcaster, via a referendum, whether the NDP as a whole will be adopted.

We acknowledge that there have been delays in publishing the minutes of past council and NDP steering group meetings. We regret that this has happened, and apologise for any misunderstandings that may have resulted, but we emphasise that these issues are not the result of a desire to hide anything from the public, but rather the result of staffing issues that had been ongoing since last July, and which we are currently making every effort to rectify. We would also like to emphasise that the minutes are not intended to be an exact record of the meeting and are intended to give the flow of the meeting and any outcomes.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 21 February 2023

Tadcaster Town Council welcomes input from all sections of the community, and we will always try to represent the broadest possible section of the community as best we can.

C203 PUBLIC SESSION – SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS – (Item 3) - To allow members of the public to speak on any matter as it relates to the town – Members of the public are asked to submit any questions in advance of the meeting to the Clerk.

A Tadcaster Greenbelt Protection Group (TGPG) representative read out a statement and raised questions as follows: -

The following points and questions have been raised because there are concerns about the minutes from the council meeting held on 22 November. Under item C134, our questions were included, but relevant issues within discussions that followed were not. We felt that the minutes were politically ambiguous and didn't include an acknowledgement of Council failings.

The government is now scrapping compulsory house building targets and we feel the Greenbelt land at Kelcbar is a text book example of how pushing for more development is unnecessary and it can significantly and negatively change the character and heritage of an area. Thankfully we've just heard back from Historic England, they have responded to the Environmental Scoping application and they've concluded that the development proposal is against policy.

The Town Council wants housing above the yield for Tadcaster which I believe is 372 (reduced from 447). This target should be met within the Local Plan but we allege that there are individuals, with prior knowledge of Rural Planning who had already decided the Greenbelt land at Kelcbar was fair game because it was privately owned. We feel there is a preconceived, biased and under researched approach towards development on this Greenbelt land. Unlike the sites within the Local Plan we cannot find an example of the Council considering the many negative impacts to be caused by the Eleven Arches development. In contrast they appear to have encouraged it. An isolated concern can be overlooked but there a consistent lack of community engagement and worrying responses from members of the Town Council. Collectively these behaviours could be viewed from the outside as being deliberately obstructive and potentially driven by the desire for excessive housing numbers. The Council could have tried to reach out to people who use that land at any time within the 15 months before the Gladman promotion landed on their doorsteps. Instead their Statement of Community Involvement pledge dated April 2020 fell short. We feel the lack of fair balance within the minutes of 22 November is another example of these behaviours.

The council were elected to represent the whole community so engagement has to be at the heart of everything they do. Council proposals within the Local Plan mean nothing unless they have properly engaged with the community. We intend to scrutinise the Localism Act as we feel a Town referendum is pointless unless the Council has fully engaged with the community throughout the whole Neighbourhood Development Planning process. All concerns will be reported to the independent examiner.

R Sweeting reported that the time for Tadcaster Greenbelt Protection Group (TGPG) to raise concerns would be when a planning application had been received by the Planning Authority for Tadcaster. Selby District Council, from 1 April 2023 this would be North Yorkshire Council.

The Kelcbar Hill area was not in the Local Plan.

The Selby Local Plan required support to ensure that development happened in the town.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 21 February 2023

The Town Council considered and had the opportunity to make representations, comments, and views when Planning Applications were received. It would be at this stage that voices could be heard.

So the first point to raise from the minutes relates to the following response from David Gluck that:

1) the 21 March 2022 minutes were yet to be completed.

We feel this response lacks an acknowledgment of Council failings as generally speaking missing minutes & vague agendas are unacceptable – Missing minutes should have been published before there was an offer from David to discuss our aspirations – For the benefit of the whole community can the council now acknowledge past failures and commit to improving this for the future and can such a response be officially noted in the minutes of tonight’s meeting?

TGPG acknowledged that the Council regretted missing minutes and apologised for any misunderstandings that may have resulted.

2) D Gluck reported that Tadcaster Neighbourhood Development Plan did not allocate sites in the town, it provided polices on what future sites in the town look like.

This is agreed - the NDP do not allocate sites within the Town so we feel that the NDP should not have been involved with the promotion of privately owned Greenbelt land at Kelcbar. The minutes dated 26 January 2022 stated that a call was made to the landowner. This has now been retracted by David Gluck as its one matter to listen to stakeholder proposals but it’s quite another to actively encourage it especially when it goes against National Policy. Development can run its course between the land owner and the developer so we continue to question why is the NDP involved with this at all?

D Bowgett reported that Grimston Estates had the authority to present plans to anyone including Councils and related Committees. The Council had listened to Gladman’s proposal plans on several occasions over many years and had felt that the update from Gladman by means of a presentation in a Council meeting 17 August 2021 was appropriate.

Where did TGPG feel that the Council or Tadcaster Neighbourhood Development Scheme had promoted Green Belt Land?

TGPG reported that as the Council and TNDP had accepted invitations from Gladman that they were involved in promoting the Gladman/Eleven Arches Plans.

R Sweeting reiterated that Greenbelt Land had not been included in the latest Selby Local Plan and Tadcaster Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Selby District Council and a Local Landowner had negotiated, and this had been a reason why Greenbelt had not been included in the Local Plan. He hoped that the Landowner would support the Local Plan.

C Stephenson was concerned that TGPG had referred to the Council as “Promoting Greenbelt Land”. The Council had not promoted Greenbelt land and had never sold the notion.

R Sweeting reported that if the Council had promoted Greenbelt land at any time it would have required a members vote.

D Bowgett reported that the Council had never voted on the use of Greenbelt land in Tadcaster.

R Sweeting reported that Councillors could act as an individual and have their own views, but any Council decision would be resolved by a vote. Until a planning application came to Council members were unable to comment.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 21 February 2023

TGPG reported that it had been the advice of “Your Place Your Plan” to make objections early and prior to the submission of Planning Applications.

The missing minutes of the 17 August 2021 where a proposal of plans for the development of Greenbelt was discussed had been too much of a coincidence.

3) In relation to the minutes dated 17 August 2021 (which included the Gladman presentation). The Council confirmed that the above Minutes and Agenda was on the Councils Website. The agenda didn't specify the location of land being discussed and the minutes were not on the Council website, they were 15 months late after we raised the issue. Therefore we feel this response is ambiguous and does not acknowledge Council failings. As with the first point, for the benefit of the whole community can the council please acknowledge this failing in the minutes of tonight's meeting and again commit to improving for the future?

The Deputy Clerk reported that the oversight of the missing Council minutes of 17 August 2021 had been purely an administration error and had in no way been a conspiracy by the Council.

TGPG reported that as the group were unaware of the Gladman Council meeting on 21 August 2021 they had been unable to react to the plans as advised by Your Plan Your Place.

C Metcalfe acknowledged that in hindsight the wording of the Gladman Agenda item for the 17 August 2021 meeting and the omission of the Minutes on the website could have looked like a conspiracy however he reassured the meeting that this had not been the case.

D Bowgett reported that the Minutes of the 17 August 2021 had been approved by Councillors at the Council meeting on 21 September 2021.

4) K Poskitt reported that she had stated facts only to the Tadcaster Greenbelt Protection Group and it had been unfair to say she was lying and misleading about Eleven Arches proposals.

The main concern here relates to a misleading message that a member of our group had received from Kirsty in which she said she 'only found out about Eleven Arches last week, the same as most other people' but this was not mentioned in the minutes. It later transpired that Kirsty had been aware of potential development on the land for several months and we feel her response should have acknowledged this – Can the Council explain why this was missing and can a record of this please be included in the minutes from tonight's meeting?

D Bowgett read out a reply received from Councillor K Poskitt as follows: -

I was elected in May 2022. I was invited onto the NDP steering group post-election and attended my first meeting in June as stated. That meeting was an opportunity for me to get up to speed on the NDP, which is a long and complex document involving a lot of information.

The Kelbar site was discussed and if I remember correctly there was a conversation about greenbelt land and what the legalities are around building on it. There is likely to have been a conversation where Gladman's were mentioned in a historic context as the planners that had previously approached the council.

The first direct contact I had with “Eleven Arches” was an email on the 27th October 2022. There was nothing on the body of the email that referenced Gladman's, the email address and signature didn't contain the word Gladman's. The email had a leaflet attached to it and a letter addressed to me that when I opened it did mention Gladman's. This was the first point I made the connection between Gladman's and the Eleven Arches scheme.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 21 February 2023

On the 5th November I received an FB message from TGPG stating that the “community want to fight the proposed building of 500 houses” I responded stating that I had heard arguments for and against it and then shared some facts on what I had been told re flood zone etc. I encouraged to take part in public consultation and explained that I was sure it would go to judicial review. At this point she stated that it was unfair that “councillors you vote for are for it (the scheme) that’s not representing the people whose life’s are effected” (sic) I went on to share that councillors can have personal opinions but do not speak for the council on the whole and our job is to hear and represent all in the town. TGPG then stated that they had heard that “someone in the council said it had already been decided before the letter went out” The tone of this exchange then changed as TGPG felt that she needed to seek advice elsewhere.

On the 5th November I received a text from TGPG asking if I had heard about the Eleven Arches plans and that the residents are opposed to it.

I responded saying Yes I had a full briefing on Eleven Arches by the planners and the land owner. I know a member of TFPG who has volunteered at the Barn and her daughter did some of her Duke of Edinburgh volunteer award here. This is relevant as I believed that I was speaking to a parent I knew relatively well so was being helpful and supportive of their plight. The tone of this exchange changed when she stated that the council were clearly supportive of the scheme.

On the 6th November TGPG began sharing texts that said “the council are behind the whole thing” This particular text exchange was lengthy. My last direct contact with TGPG was the 11th November.

The accusation is that I was lying to TGPG that I found out about Eleven Arches the week before she contacted me. This is not the case. Whilst TGPG states that the name of the development is irrelevant, I disagree, as someone inexperienced and new to the NDP group, to planning and development in the town I did not make the link that Gladman’s and the Kelcbar site discussed in the June NDP meeting was to become the Eleven Arches scheme. I suspect the name Gladman’s has been reduced on most of the documentation due to the bad publicity they have received.

TGPG put the above conversations down to misunderstandings lost in translation.

5) D Gluck reported that the selection method used to formulate the group had followed procedures and they were all volunteers.

There are still concerns relating to how the Steering group was formed. Within item NDP20, during a meeting on 17 December 2020 D Gluck was to contact potential members of the Steering Group – We wanted to know more about David’s selection criteria for those who volunteered and ask if there were any due diligence checks for these members? For example, Fiona Greig completed a Register of Members’ Interests on 17 May 2022. Within part 2 she does not declare ‘Other Interests’. However she has been a Director of Tadcaster and Rural Community Interest Company since 21 March 2018 for which David Gluck (NDP Chairman) is the CEO. This could present an issue in the future if developers invest in community projects. Can the Council accept why this omission could present a conflict of interest?

F Greig reported that she had been elected on to Tadcaster Neighbourhood Development Group in her capacity as a Town Councillor. It is now included in the Register of Interest Form that she is a member of the Board of Directors for Tadcaster Community Interest Company and a member of the Councils Tadcaster Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group.

It was clarified that the house she owned and resided in had no connections to Grimston Park Estate.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 21 February 2023

6) K Poskitt reported that NDP Consultation information had been delivered to all Tadcaster residents.

There are still impartiality concerns. The NDP Consultation will tackle sites within the Local Plan. The first part of this question is, If the NDP reduces the number of dwellings within these sites, then will this strengthen the argument to build on greenbelt? For example the NDP have requested less dwellings in the Central Car park but more space for cars to account for people visiting residents. If these changes result in the Local Plan falling short of the housing yield target of 372, then will this push development out of the built up areas and put the greenbelt at greater risk?

D Bowgett reported that the number of dwellings within sites had been taken from Selby Local Plan and Tadcaster and following advice included in Tadcaster Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Greenbelt land was a separate matter.

7) *A resident suggested that it may be advantageous for us to contact the landowner to express views and concerns.*

We took this advice on board and tried to contact Grimston Park Estates immediately following the meeting on 22 November– We initially spoke to a representative and left a message but there was no response and sadly this was no surprise – For the benefit of the whole community can this be included in the minutes of tonight’s meeting.

The Council acknowledged that TGPG had contacted Grimston Park Estates and had not received a reply to date.

8) *A resident reported that the plans were not in a flood zone but on allocated park land.*

There is evidence stacking up that the land which is either on or very close to the actual housing site has been flooded several times a year and is progressively getting worse – most recently on 11 January 2023. This is not a once in a lifetime event as originally communicated by the Council. Building on this area of absorbent land will only increase the flooding risk. Evidence to support this is being reported to the Environment Agency but it’s Important for the community who don’t use the land to be aware of the full extent of the flooding on the Eleven Arches site, as they could be effected further upstream. For the benefit of the whole community can mounting concerns regarding flooding on the actual housing site itself please be included within the minutes of tonight’s meeting?

K Ickeringill (Environment Agency - Tadcaster Flood Alleviation Scheme) reported that when a development was put forward the Environment Agency would run models which had recently been completed as part of Tadcaster FAS, and plans would be Risk Assessed. Any planning application would have to consider both current flood risk and future Climate Change impacts shown by a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

Flood Risk Assessment should use the Flood Map for planning and any historic information on flooding held by The Environment Agency.

A Flood Risk Assessment would need to demonstrate that plans would not cause flood risk up steam or downstream of the river.

Plans would have to include water run off facilities.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 21 February 2023

The EA is a statutory consultee and would receive any planning application to review and comment on prior to any planning decision.

Tadcaster River was heavily monitored and would have enough data thanks to the introduction of the new model.

P Emmott reported that he had attended the recent Gladman/Eleven Arches presentation and talked to an expert on flooding who had explained that plans would include a slow water release mechanism that would improve the likelihood of flooding, he had been happy to accept the explanation.

He was adamant that there was no Council conspiracy and the Council had encouraged development in the Selby Local Plan.

9) A resident reported that an overwhelming number of residents present at the Eleven Arches Drop In were in favour of development in the town.

This comment was included within the minutes however there was a counter argument that was not. As stated on 22 November there are also lots of people against Eleven Arches as a solution to housing has already been provided within the local plan. For the benefit of the whole community can the counter argument please be included in the minutes of tonight's meeting?

D Bowgett reported that previous minutes had been approved by Council and could not be amended.

10) The Council said there were no planning applications for the Town Council to consider.

This is agreed but there are also no planning applications on any of the other sites within the local plan. This has not prevented the Council supporting those against development on sites within the local plan. Where is the evidence that the site at Kelcbar, which is highly rich in heritage has been thoroughly considered by the Council before there was involvement with the Land Owner and Developer?

D Bowgett reported that The town Council had replied to Selby District Council Local Plan and had not at any stage commented on Greenbelt in Tadcaster. The Town Council would only be able to make comments at the Planning Stage of any application.

C Metcalfe reported that the District Council as the Planning Authority had an obligation to plan over ten years to supply sufficient business and housing needs. Numerous Surveys including Housing Needs had been completed as part of the Local Plan processes. Selby District Council had deliberated housing numbers and made a call for sites, Kelcbar could have been included at this stage but was not.

The local landowner had come forward with sites to be included in the Local Plan which would deliver houses, business land, green environment, recreation etc. There had been changes to Local Plan Law, whereas In the past there had been a call for sites and land the local landowner had refused to develop this had changed and now the Planning Inspector would ask the question, was the Plan deliverable? The Plan would be rejected if it was not.

If the Inspector felt, there was insufficient evidence of regeneration over the ten years the Plan would be refused, which could consequently in exceptional circumstances open the door to a potential use of Greenbelt land. Selby District Council had a duty to make sure that sites were deliverable and ensure that the Plan would be passed by the Planning Inspectorate.

The Local Plan did not preclude a landowner from tabling development plans on Greenbelt land as this could be considered should the Local Plan not be delivered.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 21 February 2023

TGPG reported that had the Group known about Gladman proposals following the meeting on 21 August 2021 they would have been better informed.

C Metcalfe reported that the Council had known about proposals for over ten years, the Council had not supported Green Belt sites as there were sufficient Brown Field sites in the town.

The TFGP were as up to date as the Council regarding Eleven Arches Proposals.

A resident asked if there was a timetable for delivery of the Local Plan?

C Metcalfe reported that it would depend on future negotiations, there would be no control over timescales, it was likely to be one or two years away.

A resident reported that delays to the Local Plan had been kept quiet, information regarding future Consultations was due in the coming weeks. It had been SDC principle to attain Green belt land.

He encouraged everyone to take part at Local Plan Consultation stages.

11) During the above discussions there were several heated exchanges between Tadcaster Greenbelt Protection Group and Council members and D Gluck that were not made through the Chairman.

All discussions took place under item C134 and were raised in exactly the same manner. A disrespectful comment about residents at Kelcbar did not make it into the minutes despite us making a request to the Clerk that it should be. The community deserve to know about such remarks from an elected Councillor. For the benefit of the whole community please can the Council now rectify this by ensuring the comment is included in the minutes from tonight's meeting? A comment was made by a Councillor during the meeting dated 22 November 2022 which was felt to be untrue, inflammatory and disrespectful.

D Bowgett reported that alleged disrespectful comments had not been recorded in the minutes. If you believe that a Councillor had broken the Councillor Code of Conduct, you could make a complaint to the Monitoring Officer, Selby District Council by completing the complaints form on the Selby District Council website.

C204 REIMPOSE STANDING ORDERS –

Members agreed to discuss item 10e at this stage of the meeting.

C205 CORRESPONDENCE - 10e. Environment Agency – Bat Roust Assessment - Members considered a request for the entry of Ecology specialists on Tadcaster Town Council owned river side land. K Ickeringill reported that the Environment Agency would be carrying out numerous surveys. The non-obtrusive Bat Roust suitability assessment Survey was to be completed by Ecology Specialists.

RESOLVED - Following a unanimous vote members agreed to the above survey on Tadcaster Town Council owned land.

C206 ELECTION OF TOWN MAYOR/CHAIRMAN ELECT 2023/2024 – (Item 7) - To accept nominations and agree the Chairman Elect for 2023/2024.

Councillor D Bowgett was proposed and seconded and following a unanimous vote was elected for Mayor/Chairman Elect 2023/2024.

C207 ELECTION OF DEPUTY TOWN MAYOR/VICE CHAIRMAN ELECT 2023/2024 – (Item 8) - To accept nominations and agree the Vice Chairman Elect for 2023/2024.

C Metcalfe was nominated for Vice Chairman Elect 2023/2024

S Cobb was nominated for Vice Chairman Elect for 2023/2024

Following a majority vote members elected S Cobb for Deputy Town Mayor/Chairman Elect 2023/2024.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 21 February 2023

- C208 **PLANNING – (Item 9)** - Members noted and commented as required on the following applications received from Selby District Council: -
- a. **Planning Applications –**
 - 37/22 - Le Trayas, Inholmes Lane** – Conversion of loft area into one-bedroom en-suite and one bedroom plus store area and replace prefabricated garage with integral rendered block garage.
RESOLVED – Members had no objection to the above application.
ACTION – Clerk to reply to SDC accordingly.
 - b. **Granted Applications -**
 - 28/22 - The Brewery High Street** - Erection of an extension to the existing Draught Packaging Building to form a small, enclosed bay extension for a keg reject conveyor on the north east Elevation.
 - 30/22 - 18 Heatherdene** - Conversion of existing garage to form study and erection of single storey porch to front elevation.
 - 32/22 - Tower Brewery Wetherby Road** – Installation of additional external plant items forming part of the CO2 recovery project consisting of 2No Chillers and 1 No roof mounted CO2 condenser.
- C209 **CORRESPONDENCE** – members noted and make comments as required: -
- a. **Rural Services Network** – Rural Households Survey on the Cost of Living – Survey ends 31 March 2023.
 - b. **YLCA** – White Rose Bulletin – 3 February 2023.
 - c. **NALC** – Chief Executive Bulletin – 10 February 2023.
 - d. **Residents Picture/Calligraphy** – Members to note receipt of a hand painted calligraphy picture for the Council.
 - e. **Environment Agency – Bat Roust Assessment** - Members to consider and agree a request for the entry of Ecology specialists on Tadcaster Town Council owned river side land.
- C210 **TADCASTER NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN – (Item 11)** -
- a. Members approved the minutes of the 21 March 2022, 10 October 2022 & 18 November 2022.
- P Emmott left the meeting**
- b. Members update of meeting on 23 January 2023 –
D Gluck reported that the Steering Group were focussing on assessments of Local Green Space and working on mapping.
The Plan would then be at the Pre-Submission stage this would be before summer 2023 followed by a 6 Week consultation starting June /July 2023.
The next Steering Group meeting was 20 March 2023.
- C211 **NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL – (Item 12)** – Members noted the following items: -
- a. **North Yorkshire County Council** - Intension to pass a resolution at a meeting on 7 February 2023 in relation to adopting the provisions of Part II of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976. Confirming North Yorkshire Council as a “Controlled District” for the purpose of the 1976 Act.
 - b. **North Yorkshire Council Launch Campaign – Parish & Town Councils Communications Pack**
- C212 **COUNCIL MEETING DATES – (Item 13)** - Members to agree Council and Committee meeting dates 2023/24
- RESOLVED – Members agreed the above meeting dates.**
- C213 **REPORTS BY DISTRICT AND COUNTY COUNCILLORS – (Item 14)** - Members update regarding County and District matters.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 21 February 2023

County – K Poskitt reported that as a County Councillor she had received and accepted an invitation for an update on Communication responses received from the Gladman / Eleven Arches Consultation and to discuss the proposed plans as they stood.

C Metcalfe raised concerns regarding K Poskitt’s invitation to the Gladman’s update and questioned why this had not been raised earlier in the meeting.

K Poskitt accepted C Metcalfe’s concerns above and stated that the contents of the meeting were to be shared during her County Council report, which members of the public would then be able to ask questions on any aspects of the report.

She updated members as follows: -

K Poskitt raised concerns at the meeting including Issues brought to my attention by Tadcaster Greenbelt Protection Group including the following matters: -

- Loss of Greenbelt.
- Biodiversity and Wildlife impact.
- Potential ground impact of the build and how it affects the Ings.

The next Consultation would be mid-March 2023.

Gladman had expressed an interest in approaching the Town Council to discuss proposals.

There was to be Public Consultation - Have Your Say - about the future of the green waste collection service in the Selby District. Presently there were no charges for a Green Bin provision in the Selby District, the remainder of the North Yorkshire Council area were being charged in the region of £40 per year for the provision.

There were to be 30 Community Networks across the North Yorkshire Council area. These would be led by a Chairman and include members from Council, the business sector and local community.

D Bowgett asked when the Plan Selby website would be available on the North Yorkshire Council Website.

R Sweeting reported that there he was unsure regarding timings of the above webpage.

C214 FINANCE – (Item 15) -

a. Payment of Accounts – Three Councillors approved and signed the cheques and stubs. Schedule to be circulated at the meeting and approved Direct Debit payments: -

		NET	VAT	TOTAL
10029	Darren Simpson Cleaning	110.00	0	110.00
10030	Pullan Landscapes	185.00	0	185.00
10031	Calcaria Cleaning x3 Invoices	105.00	0	105.00
10032	D Bowgett (Zoom) x4 Invoices	57.56	0	57.56
10033 - 10036	Administration	5285.16	0	5285.16
10037	Calcaria Cleaning	35.00	0	35.00
10038	BK Parnaby	667.55	133.51	801.06

Direct Debits

RICOH	19/01/23	150.00	30.00	180.00
RICOH	19/01/23	134.89	26.98	161.87

Minutes of the Council Meeting 21 February 2023

RICOH	3/02/23	146.31	29.26	175.57
NYCOM	25/02/23	42.00	8.40	50.40
EON	7/02/23	1553.45	310.69	1864.14
BT	3/01/23	165.97	33.19	199.16

b. Council Online Banking – Members update.

The Clerk reported that online banking was accessible and electronic payments would go live in March 2023.

There would be payments sheet list to be signed by two Councillors at Council meetings, payments would then be approved online by two of the following agreed Councillors: D Bowgett, F Greig, M Middlemiss, R Sweeting & C Stephenson.

c. Tadcaster Town Council Electronics Payments Policy – Members to approve the Policy.

RESOLVED – Following a unanimous vote members approved the above Policy and for all payments to be made bay BACS.

R Sweeting left the meeting.

C215 WEBSITE NEWSLETTER AND MEDIA ITEMS – (Item 16) - To suggest appropriate matters from this meeting to place on the website, Newsletter, Facebook and before the media - None.

C216 APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (Item 17) – Members approved as a correct record the Minutes of the following Council and Committee meetings: -

a. Council Meeting	held	17 January 2023
b. Environment Committee Meeting	held	7 February 2023

To consider exclusion of the press and public by virtue of the Public (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 due to the confidential nature of the business to be discussed at the following agenda items only.

C217 CEMETERY TREES – (Item 18) - Members update of trees in the Cemetery.

The Clerk reported that two tree reports had been sent to Barnes Tree Associates to be reviewed.

C218 CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINT – (Item 19) - Members update of A Code of Conduct Complaint.

The Clerk reported that a complaint against a Town Councillor had been received and Selby District Council Monitoring Officer was dealing with the matter.