



Tadcaster Town Council

The Ark, 33 Kirkgate, Tadcaster LS24 9AQ

01937 834113

clerk@tadcastertowncouncil.gov.uk

www.tadcastertowncouncil.gov.uk

Monday to Thursday 9.30am to 12.30pm

Minutes of the Extraordinary Council Meeting TADCASTER TOWN COUNCIL

Date: Tuesday 7 October 2025

Time: 6pm

Venue: The Old Boys Sunday School, Kirkgate, Tadcaster LS24 9AD

In attendance: Cllr R Sweeting (Mayor), Cllr Bowgett (Deputy Mayor), Cllr G Butcher, Cllr J Chiswick, Cllr F Greig, Cllr D Mackay, Cllr C Metcalfe, Cllr K Poskitt, Cllr C Stephenson and Cllr P Tunney.

In addition: Five representatives from the Environment Agency, Paul Stockhill (Area Flood and Coastal Risk Manager for the North East), Mike Dugher (Area Director of Yorkshire), Nick Appleyard, Karl Ickeringill, Marilyn Sanderson

Thirty four members of the public and two members of the press.

Officers: J Crowther, Town Clerk. G Brown, Deputy Clerk.

The meeting opened at 6pm

Minutes of the Meeting

FC/26/77	APOLOGIES a) To receive and record apologies for absence. Apologies were received in advance of the meeting from Cllr G Lodge. Cllr S Cobb was not present. b) To resolve to approve reasons for absence. Resolved: to accept and approve the reasons for absence received in advance of the meeting from Cllr Lodge. Unanimous.
FC/26/78	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST & DISPENSATION REQUESTS a) To note any written requests for dispensation the Clerk may have received from members. None. b) To consider any new dispensation requests. None. c) To receive Declarations of Interests from members not already declared under the members Code of Conduct or members Register of Interests, in any business to be transacted. None
FC/26/79	PUBLIC SESSION – The Chair with members permission stated he wished to leave public session until the next item and proceed immediately with the Tadcaster Flood Alleviation Scheme. Unanimous.
FC/26/80	Tadcaster Flood Alleviation Scheme (TFAS) The Chair explained the order of the meeting. Members of the Environment Agency would speak first, followed by suspension of Standing Orders, allowing

members of the public to speak. Guidance was given that there were people recording the meeting and taking notes. Anyone not comfortable with this was asked to inform the meeting or take a seat away from the cameras.

The Chair invited Paul Stockhill (Area Flood and Coastal Risk Manager for the North East) to speak first, followed by Mike Dugher (Area Director of Yorkshire).

Paul Stockhill stated that the decision made to halt the scheme had not been taken lightly and had not changed their commitment to delivering the scheme, however more time was needed to work through some more concerns to ensure the scheme had the best possible chance of success in obtaining planning permission.

Planning was submitted in December 2024, and a number of objections and issues had already been navigated. Some of these concerns have been worked through with key stakeholders with an agreement on the way forward, but they feel they now need to pause to work through some unresolved issues from a key stakeholder. This is not a decision which has been taken lightly, however they have asked for a planning extension of three months in order to address some concerns. They wanted to reassure everyone that they have done this for what they feel are the right reasons.

They were working towards a decision date in October for planning, and have received over a thousand letters of support, for which they thanked people. They have a target of one month to work through the concerns in principle and aim to have answers in early November.

Mike Dugher thanked people for their support and explained the need to pause the scheme to try to resolve some outstanding concerns which they wanted to do now, rather than risk delaying things in the future. He stressed the team are very committed to the scheme.

The Chair mentioned that Sir Alec Shelbrooke, MP, had sent his apologies and that a representative from his office was present if anyone wished to speak to him after the meeting.

Resolution: to suspend Standing Orders 2(f) to allow members of the public to raise items of interest in the public session. Unanimous.

The EA representatives were thanked for attending the meeting. They responded accordingly to the following questions.

What was the main objection and is it in the public domain? Also, what are they expecting the outcome of the meeting in November to be?

An EA representative stated there were further concerns and that they were working with a stakeholder to try to 'adjust our scheme' to work through those concerns. The meeting in November will hopefully tailor some outlines to their proposals which they hope to share with stakeholders and get some early comments.

	Is there a specific objection, a new or outstanding objection and will it appear on the public portal? An EA representative responded that some objections are on the planning portal, some are not, but will be on in due course. Who is the stakeholder(s)? An EA representative responded that the formal objections are on the portal and confirmed they are still working with a key stakeholder regarding some concerns/objections. Is this concern available to the public and what is this new concern? It was understood that from January that concerns had been resolved. An EA representative stated that this pause offers the best opportunity to obtain planning consent and work through the concerns now. If they did not do this the planning application would be less likely to be successful, therefore they have asked for this extension to work around these concerns. A member of the public stated this situation appeared similar to previous planning applications for the scheme, which have been deferred and withdrawn. It was asked what reassurance can the EA give that this time they will really drive this scheme forward? An EA representative stated the scheme is paused, not withdrawn, with no intention to withdraw it. Why is the EA not able to say what the concern is? An EA representative stated that stakeholders are entitled to have conversations in private. They would like to find a mutually acceptable way to progress, hence the need to take a pause. Who made the decision to pause the scheme? An EA representative stated the decision was made by the EA Project Board for Tadcaster of which he was a member. This single objection was first raised in June. This council was told since that time that conversations were taking place, by the EA representative, with the key stakeholder to resolve the issues outlined in that objection. We were told previously that they had been addressed, now we are being told they require further time. In terms of funding arrangements regarding the cut off of April next year, we would like reassurance that the money for the scheme will be ring-fenced. How confident are the EA that funding can be secured for the flood defences for Tadcaster? An EA representative stated that Tadcaster would be assessed alongside other schemes. They cannot ring-fence money and would need to bid for funding. At present there is no scheme until it has gone through planning, so at present there is no actual funding. No schemes are ring-fenced; all schemes must have a special business case. The commitment to the scheme is still there and their commitment to trying to get funding remains. The objection came in June, and we were assured that all objections had been finalised. Had there been another objection or gone back on what was agreed?
--	---

	An EA representative responded that the objection in June was not fully worked through and there were other concerns. The planning application also had some amendments, so there is a need to work through those too. Concern was raised that there could be a number of objections and continual delaying tactics and wondered whether the delay was due to a potential judicial review. An EA representative stated that it was important to work through concerns, and they were trying to get through planning permission without any legal proceedings. It was confirmed that there were no outstanding Yorkshire Water objections and that members of the public were encouraged to keep the momentum of the scheme moving. Resolved to: reimpose Standing Orders 2(f). Unanimous. The Chair asked for any comments from Council. Several councillors extended their thanks to the EA team for their commitment and for attending the meeting and that whilst the news is extremely disappointing and upsetting, we must remain committed to the scheme. It was hoped the EA would inform us of progress in a month's time. The Chair, on behalf of the council, also thanked the EA representatives for attending and for their time and input, but stressed that a lot of livelihoods and businesses were at stake. Everyone was thanked for attending the meeting.
	To note date, time, and location of next meeting - 21 October, 7pm, The Ark. The meeting closed at 19.00.