

Extraordinary Council

Venue: Microsoft Teams - Remote
Date: Thursday, 5 November 2020
Time: 6.00 pm

Present: Councillor D Mackay in the Chair

Councillors J Duggan (Vice-Chair), K Arthur, D Brook, D Buckle, J Cattanach, I Chilvers, J Chilvers, M Crane, S Duckett, K Ellis, K Franks, T Grogan, M Jordan, A Lee, C Lunn, J Mackman, J McCartney, M McCartney, R Musgrave, W Nichols, R Packham, C Pearson, N Reader, J Shaw-Wright, S Shaw-Wright, R Sweeting, M Topping and P Welch

Officers Present: Janet Waggott (Chief Executive), Dave Caulfield (Director of Economic Regeneration and Place), Suzan Harrington (Interim Director Corporate Services and Commissioning), Karen Iveson (Chief Finance Officer (s151)), Alison Hartley (Solicitor to the Council and Monitoring Officer), Leanne Cahill (Communications Officer) and Palbinder Mann (Democratic Services Manager)

Public: 6

20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ellie Jordan. The Council sent congratulations on the birth of her baby daughter.

21 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that all Members had been granted a dispensation in respect of the disclosable pecuniary interests Members had declared to her.

The Chief Executive stated that as well as being appointed by Members as the Chief Executive at Selby District Council, they appointed her as Assistant Chief Executive at North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) for one day a week. To manage the risk of any potential actual or perceived conflict, she had not been involved in the Local Government Reform submission by NYCC and

had taken no part in the Management Board at NYCC since July 2020.

The Chief Finance Officer declared that as well as being the Chief Finance Officer for Selby District Council, she was an Assistant Director at NYCC had not been involved in the Local Government Reform submission by NYCC therefore did not have any conflict of interest.

Councillor Nichols declared that she was an employee of NYCC however had been granted a dispensation by the Monitoring Officer in respect of this disclosable pecuniary interest and so could take part in the discussion and vote in the meeting.

22 LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM IN YORK AND NORTH YORKSHIRE

The Chief Executive introduced the report which presented the York and North Yorkshire Local Government Reorganisation Case for Change.

The Chief Executive explained that the proposal has been a collaboration between the seven District Councils in the area alongside KPMG who had been commissioned by the authorities to write the report. Council was informed that following consideration of a number of different options, the District Councils had settled on the idea of an east/west model outlined in the report.

The Leader of the Council explained that the Government had wanted Local Government reform to achieve devolution in the area. Council was informed there had not been any clarity from the Government regarding the requirement for a maximum or minimum population under a proposal with different figures being quoted.

Members discussed the report and the following comments were made during debate:

- Although some Members were not supportive of the District Councils submission, they felt both proposals should be submitted to the Government to allow them to have options when making a decision.
- Some Members felt there should not be any change to the local government structure in the area however reluctantly would support the submission so that all possible options were considered by the Government.
- Some Parish Councils had highlighted that the NYCC proposal could affect local level decision making. For example, the NYCC proposal would include one local plan for the whole area which could make it difficult to take into account local planning issues.
- The District Councils' submission had considered all possible options whereas the NYCC proposal had only considered one option in detail

and there had been no consideration to the inclusion of York in their proposal, which was more central to the area than Northallerton.

- Some concern was raised that this was the wrong time to undertake such a review with issues such as the Covid-19 pandemic still affecting all local authorities. It was felt that the process must not be undertaken carelessly and must be given serious consideration despite the difficult positions local authorities were in.
- One Member stated that consideration should have been given to splitting Selby to its nearest authorities such as those in West and South Yorkshire.
- Some Members stated that the NYCC proposal was unacceptable due to the size of the possible authority. It was queried how York would fill their developments for housing due to issues with land in their area.
- One Member said that the NYCC proposal should be favoured due to it already having services such as children's and adult social care already set up and running. If the District Councils submission was accepted, these services would need to be set up from the beginning again.
- Concern was raised that any proposal accepted would be a cost cutting exercise by the Government.
- NYCC already had local services set up in Selby which would be a benefit if their proposal was accepted.
- There could be a reduction of Councillors in the NYCC proposal which would impact local areas detrimentally. Additional issues such as the Covid-19 pandemic and Brexit would impact local areas as well.

The Chief Executive explained the Government had been asked by the District Councils to defer the current process however the Government response received last night was that it would not be deferred.

In line with Council Procedure Rule 19.4 (b) a recorded vote was requested on the recommendations.

For the proposal: 25

Councillors K Arthur, D Brook, D Buckle, J Cattanach, I Chilvers, J Chilvers, M Crane, S Duckett, J Duggan, K Franks, M Jordan, C Lunn, D Mackay, J Mackman, J McCartney, M McCartney R Musgrave, W Nichols, B Packham, C Pearson, N Reader, J Shaw-Wright, S Shaw-Wright, M Topping, and P Welch.

Against the proposal: 4

Councillors K Ellis, T Grogan, A Lee and R Sweeting.

RESOLVED:

- i) To determine that the function of responding to the invitation from the Secretary of the State pursuant to the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 is a function for the Council; and**
- ii) To note the letter from the Secretary of State and the issues as set out in this report; and**
- iii) To agree the submission to Government of the Case for Change set out in Appendix 1; and**
- iv) To agree to delegate authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council to make the initial submission, in line with the decision above, within the Government's timescale, i.e. by 9 November 2020; and**
- v) To agree to delegate authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council to make any necessary changes to the initial submission and to submit the final submission in line with relevant government guidance within the Government's timescale, i.e. by 9 December 2020.**

REASON FOR DECISION

To ensure that the proposal set out at Appendix 1 is submitted in accordance with the MHCLG timescales to include such further information as required following receipt of the letter dated 9 October 2020.

The meeting closed at 7.01 pm.