



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 JULY 2024 AT 7 PM IN THE ARK

PRESENT:	CHAIRMAN	R Sweeting
	COUNCILLORS	G Butcher, S Cobb, J Chiswick, G Lodge, D Mackay, C Metcalfe, K Poskitt & P Tunney
	CLERK	Present
	DEPUTY CLERK	Present
	ALSO PRESENT	D Gluck – Tadcaster Rural CIC (Part) & K Ickeringill Environment Agency - Tadcaster FAS
		1 member of the public.

C28 APOLOGIES – (Item 1) - To receive, record and approve apologies for absence – D Bowgett & F Greig.

C29 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST – (Item 2) - To receive and record declarations of interest at this point or at any other point on the agenda - none.

C30 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.

Residents raised the following matters: -

- A resident reported on three separate occasions over the last year she had been subject to unsocial drug related intimidating and threatening behaviour in the Rosemary Row Spring Hill area of the town. She had also fortunately narrowly missed a stabbing incident. The incidents were reported to the police. She felt Tadcaster used to be a nice place to live but had changed over recent years and getting worse. Behaviour was unacceptable a plan to tackle antisocial behaviour was required. Residents were not abiding by housing rules. Why was Tadcaster housing residents from other areas? was Tadcaster a soft touch? A multiagency approach was required.

K Poskitt shared the above concerns, she was working closely with Police and NYC Housing Officers and had been for a long time. It may feel that “Vulnerable Residents” were housed in Tadcaster; however, all Housing applications were considered through the same process. Due to the increase of Vulnerable Resident incidents in the town, properties in sensitive areas were now sensitive lets, resulting in vulnerable residents not being housed in these areas for some time to give breathing space. She encouraged the above resident to attend Community Drop Ins and to report all incidents to the Police, theses would be logged and help to build evidence leading to police action.

Resolving the above issues would not be a quick fix.

P Tunney agreed that reporting to the police was important. He sought assurance that the above stabbing and drug incidents were not related, and the Individuals involved would not be rehoused in Tadcaster.

K Poskitt reported that the stabbing was an isolated incident. NYC Housing made decisions regarding housing. The hotspots in the town were now sensitive areas, the above vulnerable residents would not be rehoused in present properties to let in these areas.

C Metcalfe had confidence in the police however he felt that the NYC Housing Officers and Police should be invited to a Council meeting to openly discuss public and Council concerns, he suggested that an awareness campaign could be away forward. The above resident would be welcome to attend.

J Chiswick felt there should be increased Police presence.

S Cobb agreed.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 July 2024

C Metcalfe felt that Police presence did not necessarily solve the problem whereas intelligence by means of reporting incidents and gathering evidence did. Members questions could be collated prior to the above meeting.

A resident felt that CCTV cameras would help identify anti-social behaviour.

D Mackay felt the Police needed to get priorities right.

- A resident thanked the Clerk for recent help regarding Calcaria House notice board.
- A resident reported that he had attended many Council meetings and was a felt proud of several Council achievements. He had suggested several improvements, including a Pétanque court, which was to be discussed at the Environment Committee meeting. He had contact details of Pétanque organisers in other areas. He had a form for members to sign should they be interested in supporting the above idea.
- A resident was disappointed at the lack of progress by the Council regarding the Friend of Tadcaster Viaduct initiative.

The Deputy Clerk reported that in order to proceed a Grade 2* listing was required.

C Stephenson offered to look at the resident's information.

C31 REIMPOSE STANDING ORDERS – (Item 4) –

R Sweeting put forward C Metcalfe's proposal to invite the Police and Housing Officer to the Council meeting on 13 August 2024.

RESOLVED – The above representative be invited to the Council meeting on 13 August 2024.

ACTION – Clerk and K Poskitt liaise and to deal.

C Metcalfe felt that it was important the above invitees be informed of the reasons for their attendance including understanding an issue that was impacting on people's lives and to seek reassurances, they were not being invited to be criticized.

R Sweeting proposed that the Friends of Tadcaster Viaduct be raised at the Environment Committee meeting on 1 October 2024.

ACTION – Clerk to deal.

P Tunney felt that the Viaduct was big issue for the town, a strategy going forward was required.

C32 POLICE REPORT – (Item 5) -

a. Members noted the Police report.

C Metcalfe suggested members noted the report but felt that smaller crimes required police investigation alongside larger.

G Lodge agreed and questioned why incidents of ASB were not recorded on the Police Reports.

Members agreed to ask the above question at the Council meeting on 13 August 2024.

b. Members noted the June 2024 North Yorkshire Police Community Newsletter.

C33 ENVIRONMENT AGENCY – (Item 6) -

a. An Environment Agency representative in attendance to update members regarding Tadcaster Flood Alleviation Scheme.

K Ickeringill reported that the TFAS planning application was in the final stages and was to be submitted end August 2024. Slight delays were due to comments received from NYC Rights of Way Officers. Public Rights of Ways would require diversions or be put back to their original state.

A Flood Risk Assessment was ready to submit.

He was to visit Newton Kyme to carry out spot level testing to be sure that the Tadcaster Scheme would not affect upstream at Newton Kyme.

He reported that Newton Kyme residents were concerned regarding selling of properties as they were included in the EA Flood Zones, houses had never flooded in these areas. He was working to alter maps to reflect true flooding. He suggested that the Council liaised with the residents regarding Zone maps and insurance.

Planning permission was expected by December 2024, the EA had worked closely with NYC planning, and he was not expecting any NYC push back.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 July 2024

Members were urged to support the planning application where possible, support for the application was paramount. Should planning be taken to Judicial Review evidence of support for the scheme would be vital. He would notify the Council prior to submission.

P Tunney assumed that to submit the planning application, costings and engineering designs would need to be in place.

K Ickeringill reported that the above was not required at the Planning Application stage, costings were his responsibilities.

P Tunney asked how the EA know that what was being submitted would be achievable if costings were not known.

K Ickeringill reported that he had received larger than expected BAM costings of £29 – £30 million, the EA were working to reduce costings. All costings were being explored and questioned line by line. Other funding sources were being explored. All schemes were struggling as material costs were increasing.

Once costings and contract wording have been agreed further funding streams would come into play. If a cost could not be agreed with BAM then it could go out to tender, this would cause a delay.

R Sweeting thanked the TFAS team for works to date.

P Tunney reminded members that the previous Government had put forward £65 million for flooding, Tadcaster could spend up to half.

K Ickeringill had questioned the above funding. Systems in Government were based on risk. He had foreseen issues, he explained further works needed as a result, and the extra funding required. He was working hard to reduce costs.

P Tunney asked how far the EA were away from agreeing costs, he believed there was already money in the allocation and could he share the number with the Council.

K Ickeringill declined to share the above numbers and felt it would be of no relevance to the Council. He was in contact with local businesses regarding funding.

The more damage historically experienced by Tadcaster the more money would be available. He explained funding ratios, if funding could not be found then the scheme would be shelved until policies changed.

P Tunney felt that the Council should invite the Flood Minister to Tadcaster. If there was any chance that the scheme would be shelved the Council needed to act and make Tadcaster the priority.

K Ickeringill reported that the Flood Minister was well aware of the Tadcaster Scheme.

C Metcalfe felt that the process so far was sequential if planning is passed then the scheme can move to the next stage. Focus on planning was essential.

K Ickeringill agreed that if planning was passed it would be a huge step forward. Once passed there would be openings for further planning options. He was confident that planning would be passed.

K Poskitt reported that a Teams meeting with the Flood Minister had been arranged but due to the calling of the General Election was cancelled. She assured members and was confident that allies were fighting for the Tadcaster scheme. She had a meeting set with the MP.

P Tunney withdrew the proposal for the Flood Minister to be invited to Tadcaster until a planning decision had been made later in the year.

b. Ancient Monuments & Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended) section 2 control of works

– Application for scheduled Monument Consent – Tadcaster Motte & Bailey Castle – Members noted.

R Sweeting reported that an email had been received by the Council regarding a damaged stone on the bridge parapet, it was thought that the damage was due to Anti-Social Behaviour and the need for CCTV in the town.

K Ickeringill reported that following investigation damage to the stone had been caused by water damage and erosion over time, the stone had been pushed into the river below and was not felt to have been malicious vandalism. Photos of the parapet stone in 2023 was shown to members, erosion was present at that time.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 July 2024

Members felt that CCTV could be raised at the Council meeting 13 August 2024.

ACTION – Clerk to reply to the above resident to explain bridge damage and inform that the Police and NYC officers were to attend the Council meeting 13 August 2024 where CCTV could be raised.

C34 PLANNING – (Item 7) - Members noted the following applications received from North Yorkshire Council: -

Granted Applications -

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.

1/24 - JBA Consulting, The Old School office building - St Joseph's Street - Remove the existing modular ancillary storage cabin and replace it with a new timber clad steel shed, to be used for ancillary storage, at the rear of the Old School House office building.

C35 CORRESPONDENCE – (Item 8) - members noted and make commented as required: -

a. YLCA – White Rose Bulletin – 7,21,28 June 2024

b. YLCA – Information Bulletin - 14 June 2024.

c. YLCA – Training and Discussion Forum Bulletin - 8 & 18 July 2024.

d. YLCA – Law & Governance Bulletin – June 2024.

e. NALC – Chief Executive Bulletin – June 2024

f. North Yorkshire Council Standards Bulletin – June 2024.

g. Email – received from Tadcaster Rural CIC.

G Butcher felt an apology letter should be sent to the above as the Council had not acted in a proper manner.

C Metcalfe reported that the above TRCIC representative had mentioned at the Council meeting 18 June 2024, that the Council had just noted the TRCIC report, it was at the discretion of the Council to discuss or note reports.

K Poskitt reported that the above representative had been insulted and the above TRCIC report was merely noted. She felt an apology was required for the manner in which the meeting had been conducted prior to the TRCIC item.

P Tunney felt that the above email had been critical of the Council.

K Poskitt felt the Council had not behaved appropriately at the start of the item and the representative had not been treated fairly.

S Cobb agreed with the above.

P Tunney could not see how the above TRCIC representative could have taken exception to the behaviour as he had retracted his comments at the meeting 18 June 2024 following clarification that Suspending Standing Orders were not required for invitees.

R Sweeting agreed that a letter of apology and an explanation of noting reports by members at Council meetings was required.

RESOLVED – Following a majority vote members agreed for the Clerk to send an apology letter for the manner in which the meeting had been conducted to the above TRCIC Representative including an explanation that it is at the Councils discretion whether reports are noted or discussed.

ACTION – Clerk to deal.

h. North Yorkshire Council – Let's Talk Rubbish Consultation – 8 July 2024 – 16 September 2024.

P Tunney reported that there was no mention of Green Bins in the Consultation.

C Metcalfe reported that the Consultation was regarding Rubbish and not Green Waste. There had previously Consultation regarding Green Waste.

C36 COUNCIL AGENDAS AND STANDING ORDERS – (Item 9) -

a. Members update of the procedure for Council Agendas.

The Deputy Clerk reported that following a query at the Council meeting on 18 June 2024 regarding the revising and timings of agendas, questions had been sent to the YLCA to ask for clarification.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 July 2024

A further question had been raised by P Tunney which was circulated to members and the YLCA. The YLCA reply stated that the Council were carrying out Agenda procedures correctly. Three clear days were required, the Council presently sent agendas on a Wednesday prior to the following Tuesdays meeting which was four clear days.

P Tunney reported that following clarification he was satisfied that the Council were following the correct procedure.

b. Members to discuss and consider an addition to the Council Standing Orders regarding Agendas
This item was not required.

C37 TOWN CENTRE DERELICT BUILDINGS TADCASTER – (Item 10) – Members noted update received from North Yorkshire Council regarding derelict buildings in Tadcaster.

C38 BRIDGE CLOSURE COMMS PLANS – (Item 11) - Members update of the final draft of Tadcaster Bridge Protocol for enacting and communication closure of Tadcaster Bridge during flood related events. K Poskitt reported that the NYC Protocol had been consulted on and discussed at length and was ready for publication.

P Tunney could not understand why NYC could not accept the wording in the paragraph included in the consultant proposals which included an AOD measurement.

The Deputy Clerk reported that an email sent by P Tunney requesting that his email regarding the Bridge Protocol be sent to others, this could not be forwarded as the Clerk was not authorised to send messages from individual Councillors, Council authorisation would be required.

K Poskitt reported that any correspondence required Council approval prior to sending.

P Tunney reported that he would wait to see how the Protocol performed during any future flooding. C Metcalfe reiterated that the Protocol was an NYC document, it would be their decision regarding the final draft.

C39 VEHICLE SPEED INFORMATION – (Item 12) -

a. Members update of Vehicle Activated Signs in the town.

The Deputy Clerk reported that TMW had been informed of matters raised at the 18 June 2024 Council meeting there was no reply to date.

C Stephenson reported that the Leeds Road sign was flashing at any speed.

P Tunney reported that the Wighill Lane sign had been visited as it was performing differently to other weeks.

ACTION – Clerk to report the above and chase an update.

P Tunney felt that there was a lot of disinformation on Social Media regarding the veracity of VAS signs in the town. The Council had responded to requests for VAS by funding two signs at six locations in the town to be rotated as per NYC regulation, data to be shared on the Councils website. Static cameras could not be used in Tadcaster as there were no statistics. He felt there was a deliberate charge against the Council, which was no good for the community as the Council had acted within NYC restrictions for the benefit of the community.

K Poskitt reported that the above social media action was by a very small group of the community all processes had been followed, relevant authorities were aware of the above Social Media disinformation.

S Cobb reported that cars for sale were parked on grass at the junction of Garnet Lane and Leeds Road which was obscuring the view for drivers.

K Poskitt reported that she was aware of the situation which was ongoing.

P Tunney asked how some areas had permanent VAS signs?

K Poskitt reported that in North Yorkshire permanent signs were only located in areas where there had been a speed related injury, a collision history, fatality and where all other measures had been tried and not successful, and only used as a last resort, very few were located in North Yorkshire. This information had been shared on social media.

b. Members update of Tadcaster traffic incident information.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 July 2024

The Deputy Clerk reported that following Local Police advice a Freedom of Information request had been sent to the Police on 9 July requesting any Killed or Seriously injured locations in Tadcaster, a reply was due within 20 working days.

C Metcalfe reported that the illuminated curve in the road sign and signs at the pedestrian crossing on Leeds Road were obscured by overgrown trees and foliage. The anti-skid surfaces in the area of the Pedestrian Crossing were worn.

K Poskitt reported that she was dissatisfied with grass cutting and overgrown hedges in Tadcaster, which she had reported to NYC on many occasions.

ACTION – K Poskitt to report the above to NYC and chase outstanding requests.

c. Tadcaster Community Speed Watch Group - Members update.

G Butcher reported that following a resident concern regarding speeding on Wetherby Road near Riverside School, she had contacted the police to ask for a speed /van cameras to be used in this area, she was informed that they could not be located on Wetherby Road due to the road layout and there was no safe location/layby for Police vans. She was advised to set up a Speed Watch Group, these groups had been successful in other areas.

A Speed Watch Group has been set up online and few had signed up, she encouraged members to sign up.

Local Police were to be informed; training would be provided by the Police or other approved Speed Watch Groups. Data was recorded which included registration plates, letters would be sent to identified drivers' fines could not be issued, warnings would be included in letters.

K Poskitt reported that VAS did collect data but not registration numbers.

P Tunney asked how the group would be supervised.

G Butcher reported there was no specific supervision requirement, there would be online training which had to be completed to be accepted on the programme, High Vis would be worn, and a minimum of three people to be present at all times.

C40 TADCASTER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – (Item 13) - Members update of Steering Group meeting 10 July 2024.

The Deputy Clerk reported that a meeting had been held on 13 July 2024, work to further update the Plan following Consultation comments were discussed and agreed, the final draft would be brought to Council to for approval in due course.

C41 BUSINESS AND EFFICIENCY GROUP – (Item 14) - Members to discuss and agree a recommendation from the Finance & General Purposes Committee meeting on 2 July 2024 regarding Council Reserves.

G Lodge reported - The BEG group met on June 12th to review in-year issues around Council reserves and any anticipated shortfalls in the allocated revenue budgets for this Financial Year. Essentially the costs and calls on the Revenue Budgets have and will increase annually while the income available to the Council decreases relatively. For several years the gap has been met by creative use of Reserves, but the result was the depletion of Reserve budgets – at Financial Year End 2023/24 reserves had diminished by c£50K. A particular case is the Cemetery where income from interments had declined hugely this year with the result that the Reserves had shrunk to less than £3K. In addition, there were expected shortfalls across other budget headings which would need to be covered.

In the Reserves currently there was £71723 allocated to the Viaduct and £80000 allocated to a Projects Reserve (in effect the defunct Riverside project). The likely costs involved should anything serious require work on the viaduct will far outstrip that level of reserve. Anticipated costs relating to formal inspections of the viaduct over the next few years will require some substantial funding to be available. In regard to the Projects Reserve, there is unlikely to be any serious call on that for large-scale projects in the near future and to hold that level of funding in an inactive account, given the difficult financial position of the Council, would seem a luxury.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 July 2024

The BEG recommended:

- £40K is reallocated from the Viaduct Reserve with £20k going to Cemetery Reserve and £20K to General Reserve
- £80K is reallocated from the Projects Reserve to the General Reserve.

This should provide some flexibility in meeting shortfalls from the General Reserve for this FY.

The upcoming budget setting round for 2025/2026 would provide some major challenges to ensure that reserves were not depleted further in support of the Revenue Budget.

C Metcalfe felt that the above was unsustainable and had always been a problem for the Council in what it can afford to do and what it desired to do, the reality was that the income from band D properties went up and down fractionally, which was a sign that the town was declining and until housing numbers increased the Council would be unable to sustain the ambitions of the Council. The budget needed scrutinising. A 5% increase to the Council budget would be very little in real terms. The Council would need to think carefully regarding General Budget spend going forward.

G Lodge reported that the income budget for 2023/2024 was set at £28.500, the actual was £18.000, this could be a blip or a trend.

P Tunney reported the budget decline had been happening year on year and was unsustainable. He would like to see heads of costs, he felt that essential and variable costs required thought and needed to change going forward.

R Sweeting reported that budgets would be considered and agreed later in the year during the budget process.

P Tunney reported there was a NYC planning application for Edgerton Lodge had been submitted some time ago, he did not understand the delay, the development could bring funding to the Council. There had been no development in the town since the start of NYC.

R Sweeting felt the above could be discussed during the budget process and at a further Council meeting.

RESOLVED – following a majority vote members agreed.

- £40K is reallocated from the Viaduct Reserve with £20k going to Cemetery Reserve and £20K to General Reserve
- £80K is reallocated from the Projects Reserve to the General Reserve.

ACTION – Clerk to deal.

- C42 COUNCIL POLICIES – (Item 15)** - Members to consider and approve the revised Persistent and Vexatious Policy as a recommendation from the Finance & General Purposes Committee meeting 2 July 2024.

The Deputy Clerk reported that a recommendation from Finance & General Purposes Committee was to circulate the above revised policy to members for comment and for approval at the Council meeting on 16 July 2024.

A Comment was received from G Lodge which was sent to D Bowgett to update the policy, this would be circulated when completed.

G Lodge reported that the changes were minor and suggested that the Council approved the Policy subject changes.

RESOLVED – Members approved the above Policy subject to minor changes.

- C43 REMEMBRANCE SUNDAY – (Item 16)** - Members to discuss and approve Remembrance Sunday Documents previously circulated to members.

K Poskitt reported that she had worked with the Clerk to complete the Event Forms which were an NYC requirement, there was a possibility that the Clerk or herself may need to attend a SAG meeting.

RESOLVED – Following a unanimous vote members approved the above forms.

- C44 NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNCIL – (Item 17)** -

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 July 2024

a. Members update of The Revitalising Town Project funding.

K Poskitt reported that NYC were to update the Council in the near future.

ACTION – Update to be brought to the next appropriate meeting.

b. Councillor K Poskitt to update members regarding North Yorkshire Council – None.

C45 FINANCE – Payment of Accounts – (Item 18) - Two Councillors approved and signed the Payment Schedule sheet to be paid by electronic payment. Schedule circulated at the meeting: -

	NET	VAT	TOTAL
B K Parnaby & Sons	1565.17	313.02	1878.19
Calcaria Domestic Cleaning	78.75	0	78.75
D Bowgett (Yorkshire Day)	109.76	0	109.76
Living Landscape	1971.43	0	1971.43
Petty Cash	200.00	0	200.00
Pullan	4177.60	835.52	5013.12
Tadcaster Albion	250.00	0	250.00
TOTAL	8352.71	1148.54	9501.25

Direct Debits

	Date	NET	VAT	TOTAL
1 Business Stream (Credit)		8.98	0	8.98
2 Nycom	25/07/24	207.20	41.44	248.64
3 Eon	18/07/24	3099.60	619.92	3719.52
4 GDPR Data Protection	11/08/24	40.00	0	40.00
	TOTAL	3337.82	661.36	3999.18

Payments to Note:

	NET	VAT	TOTAL
Administration	6163.49	0	6163.49

C46 WEBSITE NEWSLETTER AND MEDIA ITEMS – (Item 19) - To suggest appropriate matters from this meeting to place on the website, Newsletter, Facebook and before the media.

K Poskitt suggested that a paragraph regarding NYC ruling on VAS be included on the website.

ACTION – Clerk to contact NYC for wording for the above and to include on the website.

C47 APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (Item 20) - Members approved as a correct record in compliance with agreed Protocol the following Council and Committee meetings: -

Council Meeting	held 18 June 2024
Finance & General Purposes Meeting	held 2 July 2024

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.

C48 STAFFING SUB COMMITTEE – (Item 21) - Members update from the Staffing Sub Committee and the Finance & General Purposes Committee meeting 2 July 2024.

The Deputy Clerk reported that as an action from the Council meeting 18 June 2024 the Clerk had been asked to contact the YLCA to ask if they could provide legal advice should the Council receive a solicitor’s letter. The Council had been advised that if a letter is received this could be forwarded to the YLCA who would forward to NALC for Legal Advice.

K Poskitt reported that The Clerk and herself had taken advice from NYC Assistant Chief Legal and Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer who felt there was no case to answer and advised sending a banning letter.

Minutes of the Council Meeting 16 July 2024

R Sweeting reported that a Council meeting could be suspended or abandoned if disrupted by the public.

K Poskitt reported that it was paramount that the staff were protected.

The Deputy Clerk asked for reassurance that staff would be protected legally and supported by the Council.

Members agreed to fully support staff, however legal protection would not be required as Clerks acted on Council instruction.

K Poskitt reported that NYC could not give legal advice but there was reassurance.

P Tunney felt the working conditions for staff in the Ark office required improvement, the heating and ventilation system needed installing as soon as possible.

R Sweeting reported that as the item was not included on the agenda that an item be raised at the Council meeting 13 August 2024.

ACTION – Clerk to deal.

C49 CEMETERY TREES – (Item 22) - Members update of Cemetery Trees.

The Deputy Clerk reported that two planning applications for felling of Lime Trees in the Cemetery had been received. There was a discrepancy in the application.

NYC are accepting all 16 Lime Trees had a TPO.

RESOLVED –

- **That NYC be contacted to seek clarification on identification of the above trees.**
- **That an extension to comments of the Planning Applications be raised as an agenda item at the Council meeting 13 August 2024.**

ACTION – Clerk to deal.