



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 19 MARCH 2024 AT 7 PM IN THE ARK

PRESENT:	CHAIRMAN	D Bowgett
	COUNCILLORS	G Butcher, S Cobb, F Greig, G Lodge, D Mackay, C Metcalfe, K Poskitt, R Sweeting, & P Tunney.
	CLERK	Present
	DEPUTY CLERK	
	ALSO PRESENT	D Harry- North Yorkshire Council, D Gluck – Tadcaster Rural CIC - & 3 members of the public.

C213 APOLOGIES – (Item 1) - To receive, record and approve apologies for absence, J Chiswick, C Stephenson.

C214 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST – (Item 2) - To receive and record declarations of interest at this point or at any other point on the agenda - None.

C215 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 resident reported that he had emailed the Council questioning minute C140 of the minutes of Council meeting 22 November 2022, he reported that he had not asked why the land on London Road including the Heineken Car Park – utilised by Tadcaster Community Sports Trust, had been taken out of the Selby Local Plan but that he vehemently disagreed with the inclusion of the London Road Site and Heineken Car Park being in the plan, this should be taken out, Tadcaster Town Council should object to the site being included in the plan. At the 22/11/22 meeting SDC Andrew Lee had understood the point and stated that it should be up to the occupiers of the land to make the complaint about its inclusion.

D Bowgett asked for clarification from the resident as the minutes of the 18 October 2024 state that “P Emmott questioned why the larger site on London Road was in the plan as it couldn’t be used due to local landowner.”

The resident clarified that his email had referred to 22 November 2024 minutes.

D Bowgett reported that Council minutes could be changed after six-month period if agreed by Council.

RESOLVED - Following a majority vote members agreed for the wording of Minute C140 to read: - P Emmott disagreed with the Heineken Car Park and Tadcaster Community Sports Trust being included in the Selby Local Plan.

ACTION – Clerk to deal.

A resident read out a statement as follows: -

- *A large section of the local public have lost all faith in the accuracy and validity of Council Minutes – to accurately and unbiasedly give account of the discussions and determinations of the Council, with many aspects of the meeting missing, incorrect or misleading. Or the publication of entire meeting not available to the public.*
- *This view is supported by current and recent Ex Town Councillors.*

Minutes of the Council Meeting 19 March 2024

- *Many items are not mentioned in the minutes although many of these items are directly pertinent to the Councils proceedings i.e. Councillors who have resigned (outside of a Council Meeting) but in later discussions about vacancies in a Council meeting makes no mention about resignations.*
- *On occasions against normal (accepted procedure) part of the minutes are written by Councillors, not an officer of the Council; so not necessarily a record of what was discussed, but rather a version of what that particular Councillor wished had been discussed and agreed!*

The suggestion - to try regain some form of confidence of the Tadcaster Townsfolk is that the minutes should be written within 48 hours of the meeting taking place. Then the minutes must be circulated to all Councillors who can then make comments before the next appropriate meeting – at which time the comments can be discussed by Councillors to ensure an accurate version of the events/discussions are determined.

D Bowgett reported that the Council had recently agreed a Minute Taking Protocol, following a training course attended by the Deputy Clerk and Councillor Lodge`s knowledge of minute taking.

G Lodge reported that the Council would need to see how the protocol worked going forward in terms of capturing minutes.

R Sweeting reported that all Council minutes were compliant, he suggested that the matter be taken to the Staffing Sub Committee for discussion.

P Tunney reported that he had previously had issue with the minutes and felt that somehow there should be a deadline for minutes, he was unsure if the suggestion of 48 hours of the meeting taking place would be feasible.

C Metcalfe reported that 48 hours was not feasible, no Authority produced minutes in 48 hours including larger authorities, there needed to be realism regarding the capacity of staff.

P Tunney felt that discussion was required regarding the feasibility of the earlier production of minutes.

R Sweeting reported that it had always been Council protocol that the minutes were circulated to members a week prior to a Council meeting. The minutes had always been approved at the next Council meeting at which time members were able to discuss and agree changes.

K Poskitt reported that the Deputy Clerk had been writing Council minutes for a very long time, were excellent and always an accurate record of meetings, minutes were not required to be verbatim. There were currently a lot of contentious issues in the town.

P Tunney disagreed with the above comment as he had an issue to be raised later in the meeting.

C Metcalfe suggested the matter be discussed by the Staffing Sub Committee, where the issue of the publication time of minutes could be discussed. Members were not in a position to discuss the matter at this meeting as they didn`t have full knowledge of office functions and requirements of staff.

He took exception to the above residents` comments implying that Councillors wrote Council Minutes. In all his experience he had not known of Councillors taking minutes with exception of a meeting where the Clerk was ill, members had agreed for the Chairman to take the minutes.

D Bowgett reported that he had taken minutes of a Staffing Sub Committee meeting as there could have been discussions not appropriate for the Clerk to be present.

A resident reported that on occasions minutes had been written by Councillors, on the 18 April 2023 C274 Councillor Metcalfe had offered to assist the Clerk, he knew exactly what he was doing which went against everything he stood for, a former Councillors he had asked for the item to be deferred to another meeting as he was unable to attend, but the item went ahead, the item was quashed and it was agreed never to be raised again.

C Metcalfe insisted he had never written any Council minutes.

The Clerk confirmed categorically that Councillor Metcalfe had never written minutes.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 19 March 2024

The only reason a Councillor would be asked to help would be to discuss wording discussed at a meeting.

R Sweeting reported that Councillors had never written minutes, the only input a Councillor may have could be in response to a letter or communication.

C216 REIMPOSE STANDING ORDERS – (Item 4) -

C217 POLICE REPORT – (Item 5) -

a. Members noted and discussed the Police report.

P Tunney felt encouraged that local police were dealing face to face with offenders and their families. Police Reports were satisfactory, and Police were making themselves available in the community.

K Poskitt reported that good work and engagement was ongoing regarding youths and Anti-Social Behaviour. The next Community Drop in to be attended by herself PC Woods, and an NYC Neighbourhood Officer was 3 April 2024, members and the community were welcome to attend.

F Greig felt Drop ins show that Councillors and Police took resident matters seriously.

b. Members noted the March North Yorkshire Community Newsletter.

c. North Yorkshire Messaging – Members noted Drop – in Residents meeting 3 April 2024 6 – 8pm at The Kelbar Centre.

C218 PLANNING – (Item 6) - Members noted and commented as required on the following applications received from North Yorkshire Council: -

Amended Planning Applications

a. **16b/23 - Tadcaster Bus Station** – Erection of extension to include 1 No changing places facility, 1 No staff toilet following demolition of existing extension, replacement of existing bus shelter roof and refurbishment of existing bus station, move existing canopy structure and replacement of existing metal fencing – Members to note retrospective comments on the amended plan agreed at the Council meeting on 20 February 2024.

b. **National Highways** – Former railway bridge – Rudgate near Newton Kyme - Retrospective planning application -

C219 CORRESPONDENCE – (Item 7) - members noted and made comments as required: -

a. **NALC** – Chief Executive`s Bulletin 15 January 2024, 29 February 2024, 7 March

b. **YLCA – Law and Governance – December & 6 March 2024**

c. **YLCA** – White Rose Bulletin – 16 February, 1 March 2024.

d. **YLCA** – Breakthrough Communications Training Courses 2024 – Members to note.

e. **NALC** – Briefing on Council Email Addresses – The importance of using official Email addresses.

f. **North Yorkshire Council** – Home to School Travel Policy – Consultation – closing date 12 April 2024 – Members to reply on an individual basis.

g. **North Yorkshire Council – Health & Wellbeing Board** – North Yorkshire Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy Consultation 8 January – 31 March 2024 – Members to consider a reply to the Consultation – members to reply on an individual basis.

h. **North Yorkshire Council** – Let`s Talk Food Campaign – Live until 1 April 2024 - members to reply on an individual basis.

i. **North Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner** – Notice of “Have Your Say” Consultation on North Yorkshire`s all-age draft substance use strategy launched 2 February 2024 ending 30 April 2024 - members to reply on an individual basis.

j. **North Yorkshire Council** – Webinar – update for Town & Parish Councils on Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) for North Yorkshire and York Tuesday 26 March 7.00pm – 8.00pm.

k. **Resident Email** - regarding historical Council Minutes – this item was discussed at minute C215.

C220 SELBY LOCAL PLAN – (Item 8) - Members to discuss and agree a reply to the Consultation on the Pre-Submission Revised Publication Selby Local Plan from 8 March 2024 – 4.30pm on 19 April 2024.

D Bowgett reported that the plan had remained largely unchanged from the previous submission.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 19 March 2024

K Poskitt reported that D Gluck and M Dando had read the revised submission as part of the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Development Planning Process and recommended that the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Development Plan Consultant M Dando be asked to look over the plans and make comments on conditions on the sites.

D Bowgett asked if there would be any financial cost for the above Consultant advice.

K Poskitt reported that there would be a cost and suggested that D Gluck obtained a quotation for the above Consultant advice.

SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS –

D Gluck reported that TNDP Consultant, M Dando, was being paid through NDP Locality Groundwork funding, who had scoped the Local Plan. The Council would be asking for advice and comments regarding a reply to the Pre-Submission Publication, this work was beyond scoping. TNDP funding could be used for this purpose however he warned that there could a short fall in funding at the end of the TNDP process. He was unsure of Consultancy timescales required and suggested that he be asked if he could help in a reply and decipher timescales.

P Tunney reported that he had read the document, little had changed, he asked K Poskitt if there were any specific changes.

K Poskitt reported that she was not an expert. One change was that each of the allocated sites now had site requirements and had referred to the design codes, which were also in the TNDP, she felt it was important that the Council responded with the help of a consultant.

C Metcalfe felt that the Consultant should be asked what he can add to a response and costs involved.

ACTION - D Gluck to contact M Dando to ascertain what value he could bring to the above reply and seek costings.

D Bowgett reported that an email had been received from a member of Tadcaster Green Belt Protection Group regarding March 2020 consultation on green belt review, in particular the meaning of the statement "tightly drawn western greenbelt".

C Metcalfe clarified that the above statement referred to the western boundary of the west riding greenbelt and sits in relation to the Selby District. Tightly Drawn meant right up to the boundary of the district.

K Poskitt felt that as C Metcalfe had information in relation to the above email and statement that he contacted the above member of TGPG to clarify the question.

C Metcalfe explained that in 2015 Selby District Council, using consultants, had defined development possibilities in Tadcaster, there were options in Tadcaster for development of two/ three sites that could be particular development sites, the current contentious site was identified by consultants in 2015. SDC had experienced difficulties at the time with development limits around Fairburn and were looking at the potential of a review, it was agreed there was no requirement. It was said that if it could be proven that if allocated land could not be delivered then there may be a case to develop on greenbelt, this was stated clearly in the report of 2021. He felt the email question was a play on words. The Local Plan clearly defined in 2021 the Wetherby Road/Kelcbar land as greenbelt, there was sufficient land in Tadcaster to meet the housing needs of the local plan and there was no need to use greenbelt.

F Greig was unsure what tightly drawn meant.

C Metcalfe reported that it meant right up to the boundary, he could reply to that effect.

P Tunney reported that there was the issue of Special Circumstances, he felt it would be Special Circumstance, that would determine whether or not an Inspector agrees or disagrees with the greenbelt being retained. The case of Special Circumstances was going to be raised.

SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS -

A resident asked how P Tunney knew Special Circumstances were going to be raised.

P Tunney reported that he was planning on raising Special Circumstances as a personal contribution.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 19 March 2024

D Bowgett reported that Gladman had already made a case for Special Circumstances in their Eleven Arches Planning Application.

REIMPOSE STANDING ORDERS -

C221 TADCASTER NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN – (Item 9) -

a. Members approved as a correct record the Minutes of the 26 February 2024.

b. Members to discuss and approve the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Draft.

SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS –

D Gluck reported that the draft submission had been completed except for London Road land and Housing, these were to be considered following the Selby Local Plan Consultation.

Comments could still be made at this stage, once approved the Plan would be on the Councils Website. He would be willing to take questions and comments at any stage of the process.

P Tunney asked if under the Localism Act could the TNDP not be able to choose where they want housing to be developed as allocations for sites. He felt that when allocated sites were included in Selby Local Plan, that would be the time to fit in the spirit and intension of the Localism Act in allowing local people to determine where housing was to be allocated.

D Gluck reported that Allocated Sites were not included in the TNDP, the TNDP supported the Selby Local Plan and the allocated sites, the TNDP supported the Local Plan and the sites it was proposing. The difference with having a TNDP and not, was that the SLP would be adopted, and you would not have a say if the TNDP was objected to in the future Referendum.

There was an opportunity to support the strategic direction of the SLP. SLP was due in winter 2025, the TNDP would not be very far ahead.

A resident reported that they would be interested in what the Tadcaster NDP was to say about the London Road site. He gave a few facts: - the land was not owned by Sam Smiths Brewery, the majority of the land was owned by Heineken and was their car park leased to Tadcaster Magnet Sports Club, the remainder of the site was owned by SSOB and a local landowner. One disturbing aspect in the current SLP was the suggestion that the area had a rural character and should be retained as far as possible throughout the lay out and design of the scheme as a whole which could be achieved by concentrating new buildings to the north. The suggestion was housing on the car park. Heineken were the biggest employer in the town and had never been consulted at any stage by SDC or NYC. NYC had made dispensation to reply to Magnets Sports Club stating that they could retain most of existing land, but they may lose the football pitch and Cricket Pitch. The Council should not ignore the blatant incorrect facts in the SLP.

REIMPOSE STANDING ORDERS –

RESOLVED – Members approved the Tadcaster Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Draft.

ACTION – Clerk to include the draft plan on the Councils website.

c. Members update of TNDP – As above.

C222 ENVIRONMENT AGENCY – (Item 10) - An update received from the Environment Agency regarding Tadcaster Flood Alleviation Scheme.

The Clerk reported that there were no updates from the Environment Agency, a representative would attend the Council meeting on 16 April 2024.

S Cobb reported that he had an update on the scheme – Costings and spend were under consideration, engineers had been commissioned the EA were consulting on prices, work would, as previously stated commence in 2025. The EA were optimistic going forward.

C223 BANKING HUB – (Item 11) - Members update of a Town Banking Hub.

P Tunney reported that he had been disappointed with Link`s response and were purely interested in cashpoints and circulation of cash. The thought of for the banking hub in the town was wider. He reported that Otley had a Banking Hub, he was unsure how or why.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 19 March 2024

D Bowgett reported that Wetherby also had access to a Hub he would seek information and report back. Banks were not under any obligation to provide banking.

Members were informed that Post Offices offered banking facilities.

D Gluck reported that M Dando lived in Otley and maybe able to supply information.

G Lodge suggested seeking further detail on why Tadcaster was not considered.

P Tunney reported that he was not optimistic that Link could provide further answers. Many banking services were not available by The Post Office.

ACTION – D Bowgett to seek Banking Hub information from a Wetherby contact and report back to Council.

C224 NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL – (Item 12) - Councillor K Poskitt to update members regarding North Yorkshire Council.

K Poskitt reported that there was a meeting regarding the Bus Station due in the near future.

There was an Election for North Yorkshire Mayor on 2 May 2024.

C Metcalfe noted in the Corporate Plan that there was 4.5 million pounds planned for Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn through the Revitalising Towns Project, what was the criteria, had the money been earmarked or spent?

K Poskitt reported that she did not have an answer she would pursue and report back to Council.

P Tunney reported that he had a meeting on 22 March 2024 with Karl Battersby to discuss items raised at the Environment Committee Meeting.

C225 FINANCE – Payment of Accounts – (Item 13) - Two Councillors approved and signed the Payment Schedule sheet to be paid by electronic payment. Schedule to be circulated at the meeting.

	NET	VAT	TOTAL
Barnes Associates	585.00	117.00	702.00
Blachere Illuminations	1161.20	232.24	1393.44
Calcaria Domestic Cleaning	113.75	0	113.75
Christmas Plus	405.00	81.00	405.00
Corporate Office Furniture LTD	75.00	15.00	90.00
Firesolve Ltd	95.15	19.03	114.18
Mike Dando (NDP)	3103.00	0	3103.00
Pullan Landscapes	185.00	37.00	222.00
TWM (VAS)	8197.70	1639.54	9837.24
Yorplan	250.00	0	250.00
TOTAL	14170.8	2140.81	16230.61

Direct Debits

	Date	NET	VAT	TOTAL
1 EON	21/03/24	84.28	4.21	88.49
2 N Power	7/03/24	214.85	10.74	225.59
3 Nycom	25/03/24	11.60	2.32	13.92
4 Nycom	25/03/24	203.90	40.78	244.68
5 NYC Rates Ark	01/04/24- 01/01/25	3692.60	0.00	3692.60
6 NYC Rates Cemetery	01/04/24- 01/01/25	4491.00	0.00	4491.00

Payments to Note:

	NET	VAT	TOTAL
Administration	6477.86	0	6477.86

Minutes of the Council Meeting 19 March 2024

- C226 WEBSITE NEWSLETTER AND MEDIA ITEMS – (Item 14)** - To suggest appropriate matters from this meeting to place on the website, Newsletter, Facebook and before the media - none.
- C227 APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (Item 15)** - Members approved as a correct record in compliance with the agreed Protocol the following Council and Committee meetings: -
- a. Council Meeting** held **20 February 2024**
- D Bowgett reported that P Tunney had suggested an amendment to the 20 February 2024 Council meeting to be changed to C185 as follows: -
- “P Tunney thanked Mr Battersby and Mr Tweed for attending the meeting and welcomed the circulation of the Tadcaster Bridge Closure Criteria – Briefing Document dated 31 January 2024. He was pleased to see that a new trigger point for bridge closures in future of 9.38m AOD had been adopted following a review. However, he noted that a weight restriction on No 3 arch of 13 tonnes had been imposed, when that arch is submerged. A bridge closure protocol could include allowing emergency vehicles to cross but imposing a weight limit would be difficult to police.”
- RESOLVED – Following a unanimous vote members agreed the above change.**
- b. Finance & General Purposes Committee Meeting** held **5 March 2024**
- Members thanked D Harry of North Yorkshire Council for his attendance at the meeting.
- D Harry reported that he had attended the meeting as an observer and as part of the new North Yorkshire unitary authority. The role was the responsibility of NYC to support and work with Town & Parish Councils, not taking place of the YLCA, and to update the NYC Clerk Data Base and Councillors Registers of Interest.
- He had observed public involvement which was a good thing.
- D Harry reported that he would be willing to attend future meetings if required.
- 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.**
- C228 CEMETERY TREES – (Item 16)** - Members to discuss and consider a recommendation from the Finance & General Purposes committee meeting on 5 March 2024 and the Cemetery Sub Committee on 13 March 2024 regarding a way forward for Cemetery Trees.
- D Bowgett reported that a recommendation from Finance & General Purposes meeting on 13 March 2024 had been for the reduction to both the Oak & Lime tree. Insurers had since put in writing that they would prefer removal of the Lime Tree.
- The Clerk reported that a 50% reduction of the Oak Tree had been recommended at F&GP and for Council approval.
- RESOLVED – Following a unanimous vote members agreed for a 50% reduction and reshaping of the Oak Tree.**
- ACTION – Clerk to make necessary arrangements.**
- The Lime tree recommendation had been for a 2 3rds reduction.
- The Clerk explained the options for the Lime Tree.
- RESOLVED – to await a response from the Insurance Company and progress following advice.**
- C229 THE ARK HEALTH AND SAFETY – (Item 17)** - Members to discuss and consider the following: -
- A recommendation from the Finance & General Purposes Committee on 5 March 2024 for the use of a professional body to update the Councils Health and Safety and Fire Safety requirements.
- Members to consider a quotation received for the above.
- RESOLVED – Following a majority vote members agreed the above quotation.**
- ACTION – Clerk to deal.**
- C230 MERIT AWARD – (Item 18)** - Members considered a request for a Community Council Merit Award.
- RESOLVED – Members agreed the above Merit Award.**

Minutes of the Council Meeting 19 March 2024

ACTION – Clerk to deal.