



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 16 JANUARY 2024 AT 7 PM IN THE BARN, ST JOSEPH'S STREET

PRESENT:	CHAIRMAN	D Bowgett
	COUNCILLORS	S Cobb, F Greig, G Lodge, D Mackay, K Poskitt, C Stephenson, R Sweeting, & P Tunney.
	CLERK	Present
	DEPUTY CLERK	Present
	ALSO PRESENT	2 Police Representatives, K Ickeringill - Environment Agency, D Gluck – Tadcaster Rural CIC - & 52 members of the public.

C162 APOLOGIES – (Item 1) - To receive, record and approve apologies for absence, J Chiswick.

C163 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.

C164 POLICE REPORT – (Item 5) -

a. Members noted and discussed the Police report.

A Police representative reported that they did not cover Tadcaster but would answer any questions raised by members or members of the public.

SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS

A resident reported that cars were parking on pavements causing obstruction in Wetherby Road areas at peak school times.

A Police representative reported that this was a general problem, it would be reported to PC Woods. Pavement parking could be reported to 111 at the time of the incident, when warnings could be issued.

K Poskitt reported that the Police report had contained the Boxing Day Tadcaster murder incident, she was working closely with the North Yorkshire Fire & Crime Commissioner.

Members asked if there had been an increased Police presence following the above incident.

Police Representatives assured members that the incident was an isolated case and there had been increased policing.

There was a Police and Community Drop-In scheduled for 7 February 2024 details to be confirmed.

R Sweeting reported incidents of Anti-Social Behaviour at The Riley Smith Hall, nuisance youths were entering the building during functions.

Police representatives were to pass on the above report to local Police.

A resident asked if there was a Police Anti-Social Behaviour Team.

Police representatives reported there were no Police ASB Teams in North Yorkshire.

b. Members noted the North Yorkshire Community Newsletter – Tadcaster January 2024.

Members agreed to discuss Item 6a – Planning 29/23 – Eleven Arches – Land off Wetherby Road at this stage of the meeting.

C165 29/23 - Eleven Arches Land off Wetherby Road - Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) for a development of up to 410 dwellings (Use Class C3) including 40% affordable housing: up to 5.100sqm of specialist older persons accommodation (Use Class C3) mobility hub including

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 January 2024

school drop off Zone; Structural planting and landscaping; informal public open space and children's play areas; surface water flood mitigation; and vehicular access points and associated ancillary works. All matters reserved except vehicular access.

D Bowgett asked for all meeting attendees to be respectful during the item.

D Bowgett reported that the outline planning application item was for the Council to agree comments and observations to the Eleven Arches Outline Planning Application to be sent to North Yorkshire Council.

The following proposed Draft Motion was read to members: -

Tadcaster Town Council makes the following observations/objections with respect to the Eleven Arches outline planning application:

- So long as the Selby District Local Plan remains in active development, and the possibility of developing new houses on brownfield sites within the town remains, the special circumstances required for developing on Green Belt land would not appear to apply. However, we strongly emphasise the need for the proposals within the Local Plan to be workable, deliverable, and to meet the needs of the town.
- Concerns have been raised by Yorkshire Water that the town's sewer system cannot handle the extra volume of waste that would be generated by the development. We are particularly concerned that this may lead to raw sewage flowing into the river, which would have detrimental effects on wildlife and river users. The planning documents also indicate an increased risk of localised scouring from the increased water flow – it would be desirable to know that this would not undermine the foundations of the viaduct.
- The North Site heavily relies on the riverside parkland area for its allocation of open space. However, this land is prone to flooding, which would leave the area unusable for large parts of the year.
- The proposed open space fully changes the character of the riverside, directing users to follow paths and necessitating wetlands throughout. Maintenance of the public space following flooding events such as the necessary and timely clearing of paths and removal of silt and debris deposited by the floodwaters is not addressed.
- In recent months, the site of the proposed attenuation basin (Sustainable Drainage Systems; SuDS) has been submerged for prolonged periods as a result of multiple river flooding events. As the attenuation basin is designed to capture and maintain run-off at pre-development rates, this could be compromised should the basin's capacity already be utilised by flooding from the river (as could be predicted based on recent incidence and magnitude of flooding in that area). Whilst the aspect of flooding in general will be considered by the relevant authorities, it should be considered whether the numerous flooding events of recent times (which are becoming increasingly frequent) mean that the current zones attributed to the proposed site remain appropriate. Furthermore, it is widely acknowledged by relevant bodies, including the Met Office, that climate change is impacting the frequency and nature of rainfall events with more intense rainfall that will increase the frequency and severity of both surface water and river flooding. It is suggested that the flood risk assigned to the site be reassessed and consideration is given to the potential future worsening of the flooding situation. It should be ensured that any plans should be impact assessed against the EA work on the flood alleviation scheme.
- Whilst the attenuation basin is proposed as a flood mitigation measure it should be noted that such features also carry inherent risks. Whilst incidences of serious harm are rare through slipping and submerging incidents, the standing water can provide a suitable environment for various algae, bacteria and insects that can cause ill health. This may be mitigated by treating potential pollution and contamination at source and routine inspection, operation and maintenance practices.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 January 2024

Nevertheless, the potential health risks from the attenuation basin do not appear to be discussed or mitigated.

- The proposed “grid” layout for the North Site does not seem appropriate. Such layouts are typically made with pedestrian-focused estates in mind, as per the Department of Transport’s Manual for the Streets and are generally found in larger cities which have the appropriate infrastructure to support them. However, Tadcaster’s status as a commuter town, along with the infrequent 492 bus service on Wetherby Road, will likely lead to a high level of car usage. This design also does not fit the character of Tadcaster. None of the other estates in the town, or any recent developments in the wider Selby District or the nearby rural parts of the Leeds City area, use such a design.
- The North Site could have potentially serious issues with its internal traffic flow, as a result of the criss-crossing street design that has been proposed, with there being no obvious main route through the site. This may lead to restricted visibility at road junctions within the site, and potential road and pedestrian safety issues.
- The aforementioned design and layout issues appear to be the result of a housing density that, while in line with the national guideline for new development, is inappropriately high for this particular site, bearing in mind the geography and road access issues. While the final layout would be decided in a subsequent reserved matters application, it would not seem possible for such an application to significantly deviate from this design without putting houses further down towards the river, where the risk of flooding would greatly increase.
- The projection in the planning documents once the site is fully built is for a 38.6% increase in peak-hour traffic on Wetherby Road, which already suffers congestion issues during school drop-off times.
- There is no mention of how the drop-off area will be enforced, which could lead to it becoming an overflow car park for residents of Kelcbar and Wetherby Road who normally park on the street. This would result in the drop-off area not fulfilling its purpose, still leaving potential congestion issues at school drop-off times. It should be noted that residents have highlighted that schoolchildren from the youngest age group need to be escorted by a responsible adult into the building meaning that it is necessary for these vehicles to park for greater periods of time.
- Poor visibility – which will be made worse by buildings on the eventual South Site – around the access roads to both sites, due to the combination of hill and blind bend, which could potentially leave cars and pedestrians exposed to speeding vehicles. The proposed speed mitigation measures do not seem like they would sufficiently reduce these risks.
- Concerns have been raised, particularly by North Yorkshire NHS, that the town’s current infrastructure cannot support the 1,027 extra residents that Gladman predict will occupy the new housing. Gladman argue that the infrastructure can be built with the roughly £2.7 million in CIL that would be raised. However, actually building this infrastructure could potentially run into the very same land ownership issues that have caused Gladman and Grimston Park to pursue development on green belt land in the first place.
- R Sweeting supported the motion as it highlighted planning concerns including building on Green Belt and the requirement for housing in Tadcaster. If the Local Plan was to come to fruition there would be no requirement for the use of Green Belt.
- K Poskitt supported the motion. She was aware that the plans were contentious, her role was to listen to everyone’s viewpoints regarding the outline plans. Her areas of concern were recent flooding in Brayton, and the size of the plans.
- C Metcalfe reported that on the surface he could not object to the motion. He questioned if the motion was observations or objections? careful wording would be required. He reported that the outline planning application for residential development sits within the current green belt.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 January 2024

The purpose of an outline application was to consider if the Council agreed in the principle to the development based on information put forward by the developer and members local knowledge.

The Council was a consultee to the process and were requested to put forward their opinion to the planning authority, any agreement by the planning authority to give consent to the outline application was not consent for development. The specifics or Reserved Matters including traffic highways, sewage systems etc would be considered in a detailed application which the applicant would submit at a later date for approval.

Observations would send a clear message to the developer giving a chance for concerns to be addressed.

The contentious element was that the area sits within Green Belt and was bound to be controversial, development in Green Belt was not unlawful but national planning guidance sets a high bar before permission is granted. The bar referred to is "very special circumstances" Local Plan is a reason for special circumstances. He felt very special circumstances for building on green belt could be met even when a Local Plan was in place.

He felt that should the observations became a proposal then the Council would be required to agree in principle to support development on green belt.

- F Greig agreed with the motion and felt that the Council had an opportunity to have a say.
- G Lodge thanked members for the motion as it caught the Councils views on the outline plans and took objection out. The principle of special circumstances should not be the driver for building on green belt.
- C Stephenson reported that there were Special Circumstances outlined by Gladman in their Planning Statement these neither appeared to constitute Very Special Circumstances nor did she consider that they were sufficiently demonstrated. Whilst ever the Local Plan remained a viable option she could see no justification for the proposed development in its current form, that outweighs the potential harm to Green Belt.

Meeting the need of older people - whilst the proposed plans included provision of "specialist older persons` accommodation" the policy surrounding this indicates that this should only be in a location accessible by local transport or within walking distance of essential facilities. As public transport was significantly limited, residents without cars would be required to walk a distance to access critical services. Therefore, the lack of accessible public transport makes the location unsuitable for "older people".

- P Tunney reported he had looked at social media and taken Councillors comments, he felt that the Town Council at the outline planning stages should be seeking to produce a response to the application based on the principle of development. At this high level the Council should be looking at what kind of development was needed. Observations on key issues that fitted with the principle were required.

The proposed housing density figures fell below some of the dwellings per hectare in some of the Local Plan i.e. Mill Lane and Central Area Car Park figures.

He reported that if Yorkshire Water information regarding sewage systems coping with capacity in the town was taken per se then there could be no further development in the town.

He would like to see development in the town centre and on brown belt sites, however the Council needed to look at how development could happen, the proposal was on green belt but here was a developer willing to supply housing in the town.

- K Poskitt read out the latest Local Plan update received from North Yorkshire Council as follows: -
Statement on the Selby Local Plan

At Full Council in February 2023 we approved the continuation of the 'Selby Local Plan' due to the advanced stage it had already reached in its preparation.

The Local Plan sets a framework for future development in the former Selby district area up to 2040. We will use it to guide decisions on planning applications and to support work with developers.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 January 2024

Consultation on the latest version of the plan, known as the Publication Local Plan, took place in late summer 2022. In order to fully address the responses to this consultation, we will recommend that further engagement takes place on a revised Publication Local Plan to fulfil the requirements of Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) prior to its formal submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

This recommendation will be presented to our Executive Committee on 6 February 2024, which would then need to be approved by Full Council on 21 February. Should councillors approve this decision, consultation will take place on the amended Publication Local Plan early in the spring.

Tadcaster Town Council made comment on the Selby Local Plan on 26 October 2022.

- A resident felt that the Council's observations were negative and biased towards the plans not being a good idea. He felt there would be benefits for the plans including transport improvements and increased housing stock.
- A resident raised concerns and stated that it was green belt land that was being discussed.
- A resident believed that Gladman felt green belt was not relevant. A question had been sent to Council with no answers.

The Clerk reported that the residents' comments had been forwarded to NYC Planning it had been recommended that the resident also contacted North Yorkshire Council to make comments regarding concerns.

- R Sweeting reported that the plans were outline plans, observations had been proposed and the Council were required to agree or disagree the Motion.
- K Poskitt reported that all views regarding the plans should be respected and put forward in a respectful manner. As North Yorkshire Council Councillor she had heard many viewpoints, her opinion would be diplomatic, her personal view was irrelevant.

The question to be answered by members at some stage was, do they support the Eleven Arches Plans?

As the plans presently put before the Council were outline plans, she felt a decision regarding a Council decision would be appropriate at the full planning stage.

- C Metcalfe felt that sites in the proposed in Selby Local Plan had no chance of completion as a local landowner was adamant that the Central Area Car Park be developed. The Eleven Arches plans were an opportunity for development in the town.

Comments in the Council's proposed draft motion were negative. The Local Plan was the sensible way forward but would not happen unless the Central Area Car Park was developed.

- K Poskitt reported that the town had not seen development for many years and would like to see something happen, for this to be taken forward NYC would need to work closely with the local landowner. Uncertainties regarding a Local Plan Timeline was making it easier for Gladman to challenge.
- C Stephenson reported that there were no timelines for progression of the Local Plan, Gladman plans would take 6 years to construct resulting in a stretch of the riverside area being a construction site.
- P Tunney felt a sustainable solution for development was required, finding a balance would be difficult.
- C Metcalfe reported that the purpose of an outline plan was to seek local knowledge and discuss and comment on the application.

The application was for a mix of 410 residential properties with a provision to meet local demand for people to downsize and free up larger family homes. To provide 40% affordable homes to enable young local people to get on the housing ladder, thus keeping young families in the town creating future sustainability.

The proposal would bring infrastructure improvements including a drop off zone at Riverside School, a mobility hub to support other modes of transport, new bus stops, improved road safety

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 January 2024

management for Wetherby Road, public open space, a children's play area, a new riverside park, footpath connectivity to the town centre, planting and landscaping, providing a good place to live and supported overall well – being.

The site was bounded by a disused railway track, a disused quarry and a riverside park all ensuring that the openness of the wider green belt was secure.

He believed that the development would not be welcomed by some sectors of the community, he believed it provided sustainable housing of all types and ensured that the town would continue to fulfil its role as a service centre for the north of the Selby District.

The proposed development would not impact on the adoption of the Local Plan for Tadcaster, both could work together and create long term sustainability for the town.

C Metcalf felt that the Council should support the plans.

- R Sweeting was concerned that if green belt was developed it would set a precedent for further green belt development. He was against the plans.
- A resident reported that as proposed housing would have riverside views the cost would be high and unaffordable to the young.
- A resident felt that as the proposed School Drop Off Zone was for a primary school, many pupils walked to school and would not be utilised.
- A resident agreed that development was needed in the town centre the Eleven Arches plans were not sustainable and urged people to get behind and support the Local Plan.
- A resident reported that all had seen the Local Plan and the related procrastination in delivery, North Yorkshire Council had made excuses for delays, the Selby Local Plan was not to be put before the Chief Executive until autumn 2024, the town was living in a mess, he urged people to get behind and support the Local Plan.
- A resident supported the Gladman Plans which gave a variety of new buildings in Tadcaster, he was concerned regarding the Council's negative views regarding the plans. The plans were a possibility for development and bring benefits to the town which was presently stagnant.
He realised that building on green belt was not liked by some, he felt that Tadcaster was a small town surrounded by open land and looking at the bigger environment was to be encouraged.
- A resident questioned why the Local Plan had not progressed? And questioned why there were 2 empty properties in the town centre owned by NYC.
- K Poskitt reported that had the Local Plan been further down the line the situation could be different. A resident/ former Councillor had been involved and commented on the last Local Plan Consultation during 2022.
She felt that Selby District Council should not have purchased the above 2 properties.
The Town Council had discussed the Local Plan over previous years; however, the Council could not make decisions regarding the Plan.
- A resident felt that the Council were forgetting that Local Plan Policy was against developing on green belt.
- A resident felt that the Town Council should be pushing NYC for development of the two empty properties and considering the purchase of ex The Salvation Army building on Chapel Street as a community venue.
- A resident enquired as to why the empty buildings on St Joseph's Street had remained empty for many years?
- C Metcalfe reported that the above properties, owned by a local landowner had purposely remained empty as there had been plans for the widening of the street to allow 2-way traffic, and close Chapel Street and Kirkgate to traffic. Following public consultation, the scheme was not supported, the landowner was still keen to see progression of the plans.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 January 2024

The empty properties in the town were the responsibility of property owners. North Yorkshire Council were in the early stages of merging 7 areas into one, empty property legislation was not secure, there was no guarantee of a timeframe.

- A resident felt that empty derelict properties in the town centre were taking away the town's identity.
- A resident felt that her question raised earlier in the meeting regarding Gladman and green belt had not been answered.

P Tunney reported that he would take up the matter with the resident.

REIMPOSE STANDING ORDERS –

RESOLVED – That following a majority vote members agreed to the above proposed Draft Motion compiled by the Chairman which included Councillor comments, subject to the following changes:

- **That reply be sent as Observations and not objections.**
- **That the CIL amount be removed.**

ACTION – Clerk to reply to NYC accordingly.

C166 PUBLIC SESSION – SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS – To allow members of the public to speak on any matter as it relates to the town –

Members agreed to discuss item 9f at this stage of the meeting.

9f Walkers are Welcome – Letter requesting Council funding.

A member of Walkers are Welcome Tadcaster reported that the group were experiencing difficulties funding bank and subscription charges and asked the Council if they would be able to assist.

G Lodge reported that the Town Council had previous involvement with the group.

ACTION –

• **Clerk to investigate the possibilities of a Far-Reaching Affiliation with Walkers are Welcome to enable the Council to consider help with costs for the group and to bring back to the Council meeting on 20 February 2024.**

Members agreed to discuss item 7 at this stage of the meeting.

C167 ENVIRONMENT AGENCY /FLOODING – (Item 7) -

a. Members update regarding Tadcaster Flood Alleviation Scheme.

K Ickeringill presented slides to members and explained the visuals for each section of Tadcaster Flood Alleviation plans. There would be further Drop in Events once visuals were completed. All accesses would allow disabled access.

Next Steps - Update on the scheme were as follows: -

- Initial Pre – Application responses received from the Local Planning Authority, all positive and points that been raised were to be reviewed and amended, additional information added to strengthen the application.
- Main areas were visualisations/viewpoints, Heritage impact, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), etc. develop information into the chapters required.
- Approval in principle had been received for Permitted Development for the Fish Pass to allow access and construction to commence Summer 2024. Working with Yorkshire Water, North Yorkshire Council and NY Bridges Team to work on diversions and additional requirements.
- Planning to be submitted June/July 2024 – Expecting discharge with conditions late September 2024.

C Metcalfe felt that TFAS were making progress and enquired regarding a final business case and related costings, as there would be increased requirements for funding for flood defences on a national scale.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 January 2024

K Ickeringill reported that although there was a slight risk regarding funding, he explained the cost evaluation figures system used for funding, he felt that the Tadcaster scheme in principle would go ahead. As Tadcaster had already received 9 million pounds this would be in the schemes favour.

C Metcalfe asked if there were to be viewing points as part of the scheme, he would be keen to see the footings of the temporary bridge adjacent to Tadcaster Albions Football Club used as a viewing platform as this looked towards the older part of the bridge.

K Ickeringill reported that there was presently no planning permission, the footings would be utilised in the scheme.

P Tunney raised concerns regarding delays to the scheme during the winter months.

K Ickeringill reported that sheet piling works could commence in any weather, and dressing of the scheme could be completed at a later date.

A resident enquired as to when funding would be secured.

K Ickeringill reported that funding could be reapplied for in April 2024.

C Metcalfe suggested a cycle path for disabled use to be included in the plans as they had been in previous plans.

P Tunney enquired regarding the impact of the bridge in the scheme as presently it was being closed when water reached the 2nd arch.

K Ickeringill reported there were no final decisions as yet regarding the bridge TFAS were working with NYC Bridges Section.

C Metcalfe thanked the TFAS team for the reassurance regarding completion of the scheme.

b. FAS – Infiltration Testing – Members noted Notice of intended entry onto Tadcaster Town Council owned land at land lying to the Northwest of Wharfe Bank Terrace Tadcaster after 8 January 2024.

c. Bridge Closures During High River Levels – Members update of North Yorkshire Council Bridge Closure during high river levels.

K Poskitt reported that she was working closely with the head of NYC Bridges, the EA and the former MP Assistant regarding protocol for future bridge closures. A first draft had been compiled, river levels and weight restrictions were to be reviewed. Any information received would be circulated to members.

d. Yorkshire Water surface water flooding – Members update of surface water flooding on Bridge Street.

K Poskitt reported that Yorkshire Water had acknowledged the present water pump was ineffective, a new higher capacity pump was to be purchased. Pressure by K Ickeringill had helped to provide a short-term solution.

She was in discussions with the MP and Yorkshire Water and would update members as appropriate.

SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS -

A resident reported that the 2017 NYCC Bridge Policy was contradictory to recent bridge closures.

K Poskitt felt that explanations regarding reasons for recent bridge closures were unsatisfactory, she aimed to seek answers, NYC were listening to her views.

P Tunney thanked K Poskitt for insisting the bridge remained open during the Christmas period, he queried reasoning for bridge closures in October and December as river levels were lower than Christmas. Why had research on the rebuild of the bridge not happened?

K Ickeringill reported that that bridges became buoyant if arches were submerged, the concern regarding vehicles crossing the bridge was that when heavy vehicles crossed at the same time this causes the bridge to bounce which could cause failure. He reminded members that not all piers were rebuilt in during the 2015 – 2017 rebuild. Investigations were ongoing regarding ways to help strengthen the bridge.

C Metcalfe was concerned that the 2017 Bridge Policy had not been seen by the Town Council.

K Poskitt reported that she would contact NYC Head of Bridges to request the document.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 January 2024

A Tadcaster Flood Action Group member was concerned that solutions to Yorkshire Water surface water flooding issues were no further forward, a pump replacement was purely a short-term solution. She suggested that the Council wrote to YW to highlight the Council's disappointment at the ongoing situation and make the Council's views known at a higher level.

K Ickeringill reported that any complaint to Yorkshire Water had to be replied to within two weeks, he would forward details of YW complaints system.

C168 POLICE REPORT – (Item 5) – This item was discussed at minute C164.

- a. Members to note and discuss the Police report.
- b. Members to note the North Yorkshire Community Newsletter – Tadcaster January 2024.

C169 PLANNING – (Item 6) - Members noted and commented as required on the following applications received from North Yorkshire Council: -

a. Planning Applications –

29/23 - Eleven Arches Land off Wetherby Road – This item was discussed at minute C165.

Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved) for a development of up to 410 dwellings (Use Class C3) including 40% affordable housing: up to 5.100sqm of specialist older persons accommodation (Use Class C3) mobility hub including school drop off Zone; Structural planting and landscaping: informal public open space and children's play areas; surface water flood mitigation; and vehicular access points and associated ancillary works. All matters reserved except vehicular access.

30/23 - 21 West Mount – First floor extension over existing kitchen, raising of eaves level and replacement roof to form extended loft bedroom with new rear dormer.

RESOLVED – Members had no objection to the application.

31/23 - 22 Willow Rise – Erection of single storey extension to east/side elevation.

RESOLVED – Members had no objection to the application.

ACTION – Clerk to reply to North Yorkshire Council accordingly.

b. Granted Applications –

24/23 - John Smiths Brewery – Additional CO2 Storage Vessel, roof mounted ammonia extract vents and alterations to existing water treatment building elevations.

25/23 - 9 Cedar Drive – Erection of single storey extension with flat roof.

27/23 - 1A Sandfield Terrace – Erection of two storey side and rear extension.

c. North Yorkshire Council –

i. Wetherby Road - Disabled Parking Bay – 25m from Westfield Crescent towards Station Road to Northeast for 4.8m – in operation from 21 December 2023.

ii. Edgerton Lodge – Recreational Open Space money – members to consider an alternative scheme other than improvements to the riverside for the funding.

Members agreed to move this item to the Environment Committee meeting on 6 February 2024.

C170 ENVIRONMENT AGENCY /FLOODING – (Item 7) – This item was discussed at minute C167.

a. Members update regarding Tadcaster Flood Alleviation Scheme.

b. TFAS – Infiltration Testing – Members to note Notice of intended entry onto Tadcaster Town Council owned land at land lying to the Northwest of Wharfe Bank Terrace Tadcaster after 8 January 2024.

c. Bridge Closures During High River Levels – Members to discuss North Yorkshire Council Bridge Closure during high river levels.

d. Yorkshire Water surface water flooding – Members update of surface water flooding on Bridge Street.

C171 SELBY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN – (Item 8) -

a. Members update – this item discussed at C165.

b. Members noted the North Yorkshire Local Plan Launch Event Presentation 5 December 2023 email.

C172 CORRESPONDENCE – (Item 9) - members noted and make commented as required: -

a. NALC – Chief Executive's Bulletin 30 November 2023, 7,14, 21 December 2023

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 January 2024

b. NALC – Power to fund works to property relating to affairs of the Church or held for an ecclesiastical charity (England only)

c. NALC – Local Council General Powers (England) effective from 26 December 2023.

d. YLCA – White Rose Bulletin – 1,15 December 2023 & 5 January 2024.

e. YLCA – Law and Governance – December 2023

f. Walkers are Welcome – Letter requesting Council funding.

g. 20s Plenty – Videos for media.

h. Residents email regarding Sunday Times Tadcaster Article 3 December 2023.

Members agreed that the article was the opinions of individuals involved and not the opinion of the Council.

i. North Yorkshire Community Messaging – Have your say on funding of your Police & Fire Services survey open until midnight 21 January 2024.

j. Independent Domestic Abuse Services (IDAS) – Save Havens – Do you have a spare bedroom in your home? Could you make a difference to someone in need?

k. North Yorkshire Council – Free Home Upgrade – NYC Grant provided by NYC 1005 funding for households not using gas heating.

C173 TADCASTER NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN – (Item 10) -

a. Members approved the Minutes of the 6, 18 December 2023, 11 January 2024 to be approved at the Council meeting 20 February 2024.

b. Members update of TNDP – members agreed to move this item to Council meeting 20 February 2024.

C174 TADCASTER BUS STATION & BRITANNIA CAR PARK UPDATE – (Item 11)

a. Members update from North Yorkshire Council.

b. Members update Electric Charges Points in Britannia Car Park.

ACTION - K Poskitt to circulate an update to members.

C175 VEHICULAR ACTIVATED SIGNS – (Item 12) - Members update of Vehicular Activated Signs in the town.

The Clerk reported that the signs were in situ following a data collecting fault.

A way forward for VAS data was to be discussed at the next appropriate meeting.

C176 BIODIVERSITY POLICY – (Item 13) - Members to discuss and agree a way forward for a Town Council Biodiversity Policy.

Members agreed to move this item to the Environment Committee Meeting on 6 February 2024.

ACTION – Clerk to deal.

C177 NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL – (Item 14) - Councillor K Poskitt to update members regarding North Yorkshire Council – updates had been discussed earlier in the meeting.

C178 FINANCE – Payment of Accounts – (Item 15) - Two Councillors approved and signed the Payment Schedule sheet to be paid by electronic payment. Schedule circulated at the meeting as follows: -

	NET	VAT	TOTAL
Administration	6310.56	0	6310.56
B K Parnaby	8271.10	1654.22	9925.32
Calcaria Cleaning	65.63	13.13	78.76
Citizens Advice North Yorkshire	250.00	0	250.00
D Bowgett	100.00	0	100.00
Gordon Ellis & Co	1424.64	284.93	1709.57
N Power	14.18	2.84	17.02
Pullen Landscapes	185.00	0	185.00
SLCC	238.00	0	238.00
Tadcaster Boys Sunday School	58.50	0	58.50
Urbaser	345.74	69.15	414.89

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 January 2024

Vision ICT Ltd	50.00	10.00	60.00
YLCA (Training)	25.00	0	25.00
TOTAL	17338.35	2034.27	19372.62

Direct Debits

	Date	NET	VAT	TOTAL	
1	BT	1/01/24	195.96	39.19	235.15
2	Business Stream (Cemetery)	22/01/24	98.19	0	98.19
3	EON (The Ark)	26/01/24	4023.73	804.75	4828.48
4	EON (Cemetery)	21/12/23	112.97	5.65	118.62
5	Nycom	25/01/24	198.40	39.68	238.08
	TOTAL	4629.25	889.27	5518.52	

C179 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 – Tadcaster Flood Alleviation Scheme Visuals as appropriate.

C180 APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (Item 17) – Members approved as a correct record the Minutes of the following Council and Committee meetings subject to a word change in Council minutes C151: -

- a. Council Meeting**
held 5 December 2023
- b. Finance & General Purposes Committee Meeting**
held 5 December 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.

C181 CEMETERY TREES – (Item 18) – Members agreed to move the following item to the next appropriate meeting.

- a.** Members update of Cemetery Trees.
- b.** Quotation – members to consider a quotation received for Cemetery Trees.

ACTION – Clerk to deal.