



Summons and Agenda for the
Council Meeting

to be held on
**Tuesday, 27 September
2022**

at
6.00 pm





To: All District Councillors

cc: Chief Officers

You are hereby summoned to a meeting of the Council to be held in the Council Chamber - Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby, YO8 9FT on **TUESDAY, 27 SEPTEMBER 2022** starting at **6.00 pm**. The Agenda for the meeting is set out below.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Janet Waggott".

Janet Waggott
Chief Executive

Recording is allowed at Council, committee and sub-committee meetings which are open to the public, subject to:- (i) the recording being conducted under the direction of the Chairman of the meeting; and (ii) compliance with the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at meetings, a copy of which is available on request. Anyone wishing to record must contact, prior to the start of the meeting, Democratic Services via democraticservices@selby.gov.uk - any recording must be clearly visible to anyone at the meeting and be non-disruptive.

AGENDA

Opening Prayers.

1. Apologies for Absence

To receive apologies for absence.

2. Disclosures of Interest

A copy of the Register of Interest for each Selby District Councillor is available for inspection at www.selby.gov.uk.

Councillors should declare to the meeting any disclosable pecuniary interest in any item of business on this agenda which is not already entered in their Register of Interests.

Councillors should leave the meeting and take no part in the consideration, discussion or vote on any matter in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.

Councillors should also declare any other interests. Having made the declaration, provided the other interest is not a disclosable pecuniary interest, the Councillor may stay in the meeting, speak and vote on that item of business.

If in doubt, Councillors are advised to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer.

3. Minutes (Pages 1 - 8)

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 17 May 2022.

4. Communications

The Chairman, Leader of the Council or the Chief Executive will deal with any communications which need to be reported to the Council.

5. Announcements

To receive any announcements from the Chairman, Leader or Members of the Executive.

6. Petitions

To receive any petitions.

7. Public Questions

To receive and answer questions, notice of which has been given in accordance with rule 10.1 of the Constitution.

8. Councillors' Questions

To receive and answer questions submitted by councillors in accordance with rule 11.2 of the Constitution.

9. Reports from the Executive (Pages 9 - 24)

The Leader of the Council, and other members of the Executive, will report on their work since the last meeting of the Council and will respond to questions from Councillors on that work.

10. Reports from Committees (Pages 25 - 32)

To receive reports from the Council's committees which need to be brought to the attention of Council. To receive questions and provide answers on any of those reports.

11. Motions

To consider any motions.

12. Adoption of Conservation Area Appraisals for Selby Town, Tadcaster, Appleton Roebuck, Brayton, Cawood, Hemingbrough, Monk Fryston and Riccall (C/22/4) (Pages 33 - 80)

The Council are asked to consider report C/22/4 and adopt the Conservation Area Appraisals attached at Appendix 1.

Appendix 1 must be accessed by clicking on the link below, as it is too large to be included in either the electronic OR printed agenda packs.

Please note that due to the large size of the Appendix 1 file, it may take longer to download than usual.

[Click here to view Appendix 1 – Conservation Area Appraisals](#)

13. Updated Local Development Scheme and drawdown of £186k of funding from the contingency reserve to support the completion of the Local Plan (C/22/5) (Pages 81 - 94)

The Council are asked to consider report C/22/5 and to agree that the updated Local Development Scheme be brought into effect, and the drawdown of £186k of funding from the contingency reserve to support the completion of the Local Plan.

14. Independent Person Appointments to 31 March 2023 pursuant to the Localism Act 2011 (C/22/6) (Pages 95 - 98)

The Council are asked to consider report C/22/6 and agree to the appointment of Independent Persons with immediate effect until the abolition of the Council on 31 March 2023.

15. Urgent Action

The Chief Executive will report on any instances where she has acted in urgent or emergency situations under the functions delegated to her in the Constitution.



Minutes

Council

Venue: Council Chamber - Civic Centre, Doncaster Road, Selby, YO8 9FT

Date: Tuesday, 17 May 2022

Time: 4.00 pm

Present: Councillor J Duggan in the Chair

Councillors D Mackay, K Arthur, D Brook, D Buckle, J Cattnach, I Chilvers (Vice-Chair), 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, R Sweeting, P Welch and G Ashton

Officers Present: Janet Waggott, Chief Executive, Alison Hartley, Solicitor to the Council, Suzan Harrington, Director of Corporate Services and Commissioning, Karen Iveson, Chief Finance Officer, Dave Caulfield, Director of Economic Regeneration and Place, Dawn Drury, Democratic Services Officer, Gina Mulderrig, Democratic Services Officer and Victoria Foreman, Democratic Services Officer

Public: 11

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M Topping, C Richardson and S Shaw-Wright.

2 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

3 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Nomination for Chairman

It was moved and seconded and agreed that Councillor I Chilvers be elected as Chairman of Selby District Council for the 2022-23 Municipal year.

RESOLVED:

To elect Councillor I Chilvers as Chairman of Selby District Council for the 2022-23 Municipal Year.

Councillor Chilvers chaired the meeting from this point.

Councillors A Lee and R Sweeting joined the meeting.

Retiring Chairman's Valedictory Address

Councillor Duggan gave his valedictory address. On behalf of Council, Councillors M Crane and R Packham expressed their thanks to Councillor Duggan for his two years in office.

The retiring Chairman was presented with a Silver Salver, tankard to mark his term of office as Chairman of the Council.

Announcement of Chairman's Consort

The Chairman announced that his wife, Councillor J Chilvers, would be his Consort for his year in office.

Newly Elected Chairman's Address

The Chairman made his address.

4 ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Nomination for Vice Chairman

It was moved and seconded and agreed that Councillor M Jordan be elected as Vice Chairman of Selby District Council for the 2022-23 Municipal year.

RESOLVED:

To elect Councillor M Jordan as Vice Chairman of Selby District Council for the 2022-23 Municipal Year.

Announcement of Vice Chairman's Consort

The Vice Chairman announced that he would have two Consorts for his year in office; his wife Mrs Sally Jordan and his daughter Ms Ellie Jordan.

5 MINUTES

The Council considered the minutes of the meeting held on 19 April 2022.

Two amendments to minute item 68 – Reports from the Executive were suggested. Firstly, that under the update from the Deputy Leader and Lead Executive Member for Place Shaping, that clarification should be made that the new Head of Development Management was an interim position. The

amended wording would therefore be as follows:

'He thanked the Development Management Team for their work and gave details of the new interim Head of Development Management.'

Secondly, it was noted that the attendance details for the meeting mistakenly omitted Councillor G Ashton, who had been present. Councillor Ashton would be added to the amended version.

Other matters were raised under the item relating to the administration of the energy payments scheme, in particular contact with vulnerable residents. Members requested they be supplied with figures of the number of residents without direct debits that have been contacted by the Council, preferably by Ward. The Executive Member for Finance and Resources confirmed that he would speak to Officers to find out if such information could be provided.

The two amendments were proposed, seconded and a vote taken.

RESOLVED:

To approve the minutes of the Council meeting held on Tuesday 19 April 2022 for signing by the Chairman, subject to the amendments detailed above.

6 ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairman announced that the charities he would be raising money in his year in office would be Yorkshire Cancer Research and Long Covid Kids.

The Leader suggested that after the meeting Members gather together for a photograph as it was the last Annual Meeting of Selby District Council.

7 THE LEADER'S REPORT ON THE EXERCISE OF EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS (C/22/1)

The Leader of the Council presented the report which informed Council of the way in which executive functions were to be discharged in the forthcoming year.

The Leader confirmed that there were to be no changes to the Executive Member portfolios for the 2022-23 year.

Members noted that for the 2022-23 year there would be new checks in place if the Council spent above a certain amount or was to dispose of large tracts of land; agreement of North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) would be required.

The Leader informed Council that he had recently met with the Leader of NYCC and no issues with the Council's spending plans had been identified.

To receive and note the report was proposed, seconded and a vote taken.

RESOLVED:

To receive and note the Leader's Report to Council on the discharge of Executive Functions.

REASON FOR DECISION:

To meet the obligations set out in the Executive Procedure Rules within the Council's constitution.

8 RECALCULATION OF POLITICAL PROPORTIONALITY OF THE COUNCIL AND APPOINTMENTS TO THE COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE 2022/23 MUNICIPAL YEAR (C/22/2)

The Chief Executive explained to Members that following recent changes in group membership on the Council, political proportionality had required recalculation by Officers. These changes would subsequently alter the number of places on the Council's committees for the 2022-23 municipal year. The Council was asked to note the changes to political groups and subsequent recalculation of political proportionality, and to approve the group nominations for the appointment of Councillors to Committees for 2022-23.

As a result of the changes to groups, membership of the Council was now as follows:

Conservative: 17

Labour: 9

Independent Group: 3

Unaligned Members: 2 (ungrouped)

The amended group membership required the number of committee places to be re-evaluated to satisfy Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, which placed a duty on local authorities to allocate seats on Ordinary Committees of the Council between the political groups, in accordance with the following principles:

- a) That not all the seats on the body to which appointments are being made are allocated to the same political group;
- b) That the majority of seats on each committee are allocated to a particular political group if the number of persons belonging to that group is a majority of the authority's membership;
- c) That subject to (a) and (b), when allocating seats to a political group, the total number of their seats across all the ordinary committees of the Council, must reflect their proportion of the authority's membership; and
- d) Subject to (a) to (c), that the number of seats on each committee is as far as possible in proportion to the group's membership of the authority.

To accurately reflect these requirements and the political balance of the Council, Officers had altered the number of committee places available to as follows:

Planning Committee: 9 (no change)
 Licensing Committee: 11 (no change)
 Scrutiny Committee: 7 (reduction in 1 place)
 Policy Review Committee: 7 (reduction by 1 place)
 Audit and Governance Committee: 7 (reduction by 1 place)

Nominations for the appointment of Councillors to Committees for the 2022-23 municipal year were given in full by Members at the meeting and noted by Officers. These appointments were proposed, seconded and a vote taken.

RESOLVED:

1. To note the changes to the membership of political groups on the Council and the subsequent recalculation of political proportionality on the Council's Committees; and
2. to approve the group nominations for the appointment of Councillors to Committees for the 2022-23 municipal year, as set out below:

Executive (no change)

Leader (Conservative)	Councillor Mark Crane
Deputy Leader (Conservative)	Councillor Richard Musgrave
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Cliff Lunn
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Tim Grogan
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor David Buckle

Planning Committee (9 places)

Chair (Conservative)	Councillor Mark Topping
Vice Chair (Conservative)	Councillor Charles Richardson
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Keith Ellis
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Ian Chilvers
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Georgina Ashton
Councillor (Labour)	Councillor Bob Packham
Councillor (Labour)	Councillor Paul Welch
Councillor (Labour)	Councillor John Duggan
Councillor (Independent)	Councillor Don Mackay

Licensing Committee (11 places)

Chair (Conservative)	Councillor Richard Sweeting
Vice Chair (Conservative)	Councillor Judith Chilvers
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Ian Chilvers
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Chris Pearson
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor John Mackman
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Mike Jordan
Councillor (Labour)	Councillor Paul Welch
Councillor (Labour)	Councillor John Duggan
Councillor (Labour)	Councillor Stephanie Duckett
Councillor (Independent)	Councillor John McCartney
Councillor (Unaligned)	Councillor John Cattanach

Scrutiny Committee (7 places)

Chair (Labour)	Councillor Steve Shaw-Wright
Vice Chair (Labour)	Councillor Wendy Nichols
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Andrew Lee
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor J Chilvers
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Richard Sweeting
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Keith Ellis
Councillor (Independent)	Councillor John McCartney

Policy Review Committee (7 places)

Chair (Conservative)	Councillor Chris Pearson
Vice Chair (Conservative)	Councillor Mike Jordan
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Charles Richardson
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Karl Arthur
Councillor (Labour)	Councillor Bob Packham
Councillor (Labour)	Councillor Jennifer Shaw-Wright
Councillor (Independent)	Councillor Mary McCartney

Audit and Governance Committee (7 places)

Chair (Conservative)	Councillor Karl Arthur
Vice Chair (Conservative)	Councillor Georgina Ashton
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor John Mackman
Councillor (Conservative)	Councillor Andrew Lee

Councillor (Labour)	Councillor Keith Franks
Councillor (Labour)	Councillor John Duggan
Councillor (Unaligned)	Councillor Neil Reader

REASON FOR DECISION:

To meet legislative requirements and to enable the proper functioning of the Council in the 2022-23 municipal year.

9 COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES 2022-23 (C/22/3)

The Leader of the Council presented the report which sought approval of the Council's proposed representatives for 2022-23 on Outside Bodies.

It was noted that there were two vacancies on the Outside Bodies. The vacancy on the National Association of Local Councils would be filled by Councillor G Ashton.

The second vacancy was on the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB). There were no proposals to fill the CAB vacancy for 2022-23.

RESOLVED:

- i) To approve the appointments to outside bodies for the 2022/23 municipal year as outlined at Appendix A.**
- ii) To appoint Councillor G Ashton as the Council's representative on the National Association of Local Councils.**
- iii) To authorise those appointed to act on behalf of the Council in accordance with the legal and constitutional requirements of both the Council and the outside body.**

REASON FOR DECISION:

To ensure the Council is represented on Outside Bodies as necessary in 2022-23.

The meeting closed at 4.45 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9



Councillor Mark Crane - Leader of the Council **Report to Council 27 September 2022**

This report covers the period from 19 July 2022. During this period, and in most recent weeks there has been significant national and worldwide change. It has been a period in our history we will remember.

I would like to record my sympathy to His Royal Highness King Charles III on the death of his mother Her Royal Highness Queen Elizabeth II. Her Majesty will be greatly missed by people across the Selby district, throughout the country and around the world. She has been, for many, the only monarch known and has been a constant and reassuring presence in an ever-changing world. With her death another Elizabethan era fades. We join people around the world in our grief, but also in giving thanks for her contribution to our nation.

I would also like to congratulate King Charles III on his accession to the throne and on behalf of Selby District Council wish his Majesty a successful reign.

I would also like to congratulate our new Prime minister Liz Truss and look forward to working with her government. The country faces many challenges not least the cost-of-living crisis and we continue to be ready to help and support residents and businesses.

Local Plan

Consultation on the Publication Local Plan is now underway. The consultation is a significant milestone in progressing a new Local Plan for Selby District and we encourage local residents and businesses to submit their comments. The consultation was due to finish on 7 October, however following the passing of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II we postponed the consultation events which were scheduled to take place during the period of national mourning. In order to give people sufficient time to respond we have extended the Publication Local Plan consultation period until 5pm on 28 October 2022.

The Pre-submission Publication Local Plan is the version of the Local Plan that the Council proposes to submit to the Secretary of State for Examination. We will consider the responses received at this stage in detail before determining whether the plan should be recommended for Submission to the Secretary of State for formal examination.

A referendum on the Escrick Neighbourhood Plan is due to take place on Thursday 6th October, if there is a positive outcome the plan will be recommended for formal adoption and will become part of the statutory Development Plan for Escrick.

Development Management

In the period between 1st June 2022 and 31 August 2022, 90% of major applications were determined within the statutory period or agreed extension of time period. This equates to

10 applications determined, 2 within the statutory 13 weeks, 7 within the extension of time period agreed and 1 out of time.

The figure exceeds the national designation target set by the Government for majors which is 60%.

In the same period, 75% of minor applications were determined within the statutory period or agreed extension of time period. This equates to 73 applications determined, of which 18 were within the statutory 8 weeks and 37 within the extension of time period agreed.

The figure exceeds the national designation target set by the Government for minor applications which is 70%.

83% of minor other applications were determined between 1st June 2022 and 31 August 2022 within the statutory period or agreed extension of time period. This equates to 131 applications determined of which 47 were within the statutory 8 weeks and 62 within the extension of time period agreed. The figure significantly exceeds the national designation target set by the Government for minor other applications which is 70%.

In addition to the above, during this time period, 131 applications were dealt with that are not reported to DLUHC which include the following types of application:

HENS (Larger household extensions), Agricultural Prior approvals, Prior Notifications, Telecommunications, Discharge of Conditions, Minor Amendments, Works to Trees, County and other Consultations, Scoping reports and Screening opinions for EIA applications.

There were also 38 Permitted Development Enquiries were dealt with and 12 Certificates of Lawfulness determined.

With regards to performance at appeal, in the period 1 June 2022 to 31 August 2022, a total of 14 appeal decisions were received of which 9 were dismissed and 5 were allowed.

The Planning Enforcement Team received 105 new cases and closed 112 cases during the same time period.

Leisure

Members will be aware that we agreed a licence extension for the use of the Summit building as a vaccination centre until December 2022. We have also agreed that the blood transfusion service can utilise the facility for three blood donor sessions, the first was held on 16th August with two further sessions on 3rd November and 6th December 2022.

Mark Crane, Leader of the Council and Lead Executive Member for Leisure, Strategic Matters, Place Shaping and External Relations and Partnerships



Councillor Richard Musgrave, Deputy Leader of the Council
Report to Council on 27 September 2022

Repairs

Work is continuing to address the backlog of repairs resulting from the Covid lockdowns and resource shortages experienced earlier in the year. Overall, 91.09% of the original backlog has now been cleared and there are currently 2,173 open repair entries within the Council's repairs management system. On average, the Council operates with an ongoing repair rate of approximately 1,850 'live' repairs; hence there are currently 373 more open repair entries in the system than usual.

The recent success in recruiting additional resources to the team following implementation of the service restructure is however now starting to have an impact and open repair numbers are slowly starting to reduce as our new staff become fully conversant with their roles.

Voids

The number of voids being received continues to see high levels within the refurbishment category which significantly impacts our ability to bring these properties back in to use in a timely manner. Notwithstanding, performance at the end of Q1 remained within targets with a total of 31 voids having been handed back and all categories delivering within agreed Key Performance Indicator targets.

Planned

The primary focus of the Council's capital investment programme in the HRA stock for this year is around compliance related works to ensure we can deliver a 'safe and legal' portfolio to the new council for North Yorkshire on day one.

To this end, we have now issued over 2,000 stock condition surveys and electrical tests to our contractor who is making good progress completing them. The programme is being issued in batches of circa 500 to ensure it remains manageable for the contractor and our available resource.

We have recently agreed a programme of energy efficiency improvements to be installed in 30 non-traditional construction bungalows in Sherburn in Elmet. These measures, which are tailored towards improving the overall thermal efficiency of the properties, will help to ensure these properties remain affordable for the residents living there.

Edgerton Lodge

Following extensive marketing of Edgerton Lodge, Tadcaster earlier this year and completion of a sealed bids tender process, I am pleased to be able to report the Council

has now accepted a bid to sell the property to a locally based property development company.

Officers are now working with the successful bidder and respective solicitors to progress the sale of the property as swiftly as possible; with exchange of contracts scheduled to take place before the end of September.

Councillor Richard Musgrave, Deputy Leader and Lead Executive Member for Housing



Councillor Cliff Lunn, Executive Member for Finance and Resources - Report to Council on 27 September 2022

Financial Results and Budget Exceptions Report to 30th June 2022

My report for the 1st quarter of the year showed forecast full year revenue outturn surpluses of (£382k) for the General Fund (GF) and a £28k deficit for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), before application of the national pay award. Should the pay award offered by the employers be accepted the GF surplus would reduce to (£45k) and the HRA deficit would increase to £184k.

The key financial issues are cost pressures from price inflation mainly on utilities, off-set by relatively buoyant income streams (planning, waste and investment income) but with growing uncertainty over future inflation impacts.

Housing rents were forecast at £102k below budget due to voids.

The £195k saving in the Housing Revenue Account for the housing system, carried forward from 21/22 remains at risk of non-delivery with further delays to implementation of phase 2 and impacts of LGR.

At the end of June, the GF capital programme was forecast to be spent by year end but £3.5m of the HRA housing development programme is proposed for deferral to 23/24 as planned schemes are not viable.

The report appendices also highlighted growing cost pressures impacting on the HRA capital programme and whilst these are currently being managed within budget there is a growing risk of overspend – more detail will be reported at Q2.

The Programme for Growth showed a forecast net underspend of £1.7m in 22/23 largely as a result of some rephasing of Burn Airfield, TCF, and towns projects.

Projects spend was £658k in quarter 1 including £224k on staffing costs, £165k on the Transforming Cities Fund project and £122k on the Tadcaster business flood grant scheme.

The report also included a paragraph at 2.17 relating to Sherburn in Elmet, Low Street project. The proposed scheme will result in a minor ongoing revenue cost to the Council of £2,000 p.a. The previous approval was subject to there being no revenue implications hence the need for Executive to approve the proposed permanent virement, which we did approve.

Treasury Management – Quarterly Update Q1 2022/23

As reported in the Q1 financial results with rising interest rates and buoyant cash balances, treasury returns performed relatively well in the 1st quarter of the year.

On average the Council's investments totalled £83.5m over the quarter at an average rate of 0.78% and earned interest of £161.7k (£116.6k allocated to the General Fund; £45.0k allocated to the HRA), which is £123.5k above the year-to-date budget.

Allowing for anticipated interest rate rises, forecast returns for the year could be in the region of £871.8k (£628.9k GF, £243.0k HRA) a total budget surplus of £719.4k.

It is worth noting that for the General Fund, any interest earned above a £350k threshold is to be transferred to the Contingency Reserve. This figure was forecast to be £278.9k.

The council also had £5.63m invested in property funds on 30 June 2022. The funds achieved a 2.93% revenue return and 3.13% capital gain over the course of the quarter. This resulted in revenue income of £40.5k to the end of Q1 and an 'unrealised' capital gain of £170.8k. However, these funds are long term investments and under current accounting rules, changes in capital values are only realised when the units in the funds are sold.

Long-term borrowing totalled £52.833m on 30 June 2022, (£1.6m relating to the General Fund; £51.233m relating to the HRA), Interest payments of £1.917m were forecast to be paid in 2022/23, a saving of £59k against budget.

The Council has no plans for any short-term borrowing for the year;
I can confirm that the Council's affordable limits for borrowing were not breached during this period.

Closedown of the 21/22 Accounts

The draft Statement of Accounts was published by the end of July in line with statutory deadlines and is available on the Council website. The audit which is carried out by Mazars is currently underway and is expected to conclude before the statutory audit deadline of the end of November.

ICT & Digital

The primary focus of ICT is to ensure that our teams can continue to work effectively up to and beyond vesting day. Bringing together seven or eight council systems post LGR, for example to create one Planning system or one Revenue & Benefits system will take time, so it is important that our current systems continue to be fit for purpose. In recent months we have applied software upgrades to Public Access (allows customers to view/comment on Planning information), Uniform (Planning case management) and Information@Work (document management), and we are currently upgrading our Windows Servers to ensure they continue to be supported.

The microphones in the Council Chamber have now been replaced – which has brought a significant improvement to the way we operate in meetings – and we have recently renewed our Microsoft licences.

The Housing team continue to benefit from the new housing management system; the “go live” for the second and final phase focusing on the repairs/property side is expected in the autumn.

Payment of Council Tax Energy Rebate

As at the end of August, 31,121 households (out of 31,315 eligible) had been paid their Core Council Tax Rebate (99.4%).

In total, £4,668,150 has been paid out in Core Council Tax Rebate.

In addition, 2,385 households have been paid out of the Discretionary Fund. The total amount paid via the Discretionary Fund was £130,750.

I am grateful to the teams for progressing these payments so efficiently.

Councillor Cliff Lunn, Executive Member for Finance and Resources

This page is intentionally left blank



**Councillor David Buckle, Executive Member for Communities and
Economic Development**
Report to Council on 27 September 2022

Economic Development

Business Support

Continuing with the ongoing strategy of engagement with larger businesses across the district, Economic Development officers have continued to visit and meet with the district's large businesses, recent discussions have been held with: Campeys, Bowker, Greencore, Seven Video, John King Chains, VPK & For Farmers amongst others. Work continues to build a stronger relationship and to work together to overcome challenges, support growth and highlight good practice.

Despite the highly publicised challenges of high energy prices and inflation in general, recruitment continues to be the biggest challenge facing employers in the district. Officers have sought to help to address this by continuing to plan and deliver a series of Employment & Skills forums looking at practical ways to help resolve this pressing issue. The series has proven to be extremely popular and will culminate in an Employment & Skills conference to be held at the Parsonage in Escrick on 29 September 2022.

To further help with issue, the council has commissioned a series of 6 videos highlighting the career opportunities available in some of the district's larger employers which are now live on the Selby District Means Growth website and released on social media in the run up to the conference. The videos feature: Cranswick Gourmet Bacon, Clipper Logistics, John King Chains, Triesse, Switch Mobility and Pecan de Luxe. To the same end, the council has launched a jobs portal hosted on the Selby District Means Growth website, allowing employers to post their own local recruitment opportunities.

Officers have recently launched a forum to support hospitality and retail businesses in Selby to address the specific issues facing that sector in a collaborative manner, the latest of which was held recently at the Flying Pig. It was extremely well received and was attended by over 30 people.

Small, medium and large businesses alike continue to be supported with advice, mentoring and signposting to support programmes across a range of topics including employment, skills, planning, expansion, business diversification and funding support. Selby district remains an active participant of several Enterprise programmes accessed via both Leeds City Region LEP and York & North Yorkshire LEP, officers have recently attended board meetings of the Digital Enterprise programme and the Ad:Venture start-up programme. Referrals have been made into these programmes as well working closely with York and North Yorkshire Growth Hub to enable local businesses to take advantage of the broader range of programmes and support available.

There are many headwinds facing businesses across the district, particularly Inflation and recruitment difficulties, however, the broad consensus is still positive about the local economy moving forward.

Inward Investment & Strategic Sites

Officers continue to work with the Department for International Trade & York and North Yorkshire LEP along with landowners and developers to facilitate inward investment into the district, enquiry levels continue to be high. Officers continue to develop proposals to further promote the opportunities and attractions of being based in Selby District, both for inward investment and expansion of local businesses, enhancing the success of our previous place-branding work as well as developing that work.

Close working has continued with strategic site developers across the district. In particular, planning permission was recently granted for the Sherburn 2 access road, and it is hoped that the full site will be developed soon. There is still a continued high level of enquiries for new investment in commercial space and this is encouraging developers to speculatively build large units to satisfy the growing demand, although rising and unpredictable construction costs are making development more challenging. Sites are therefore being progressed quickly to satisfy current requirements. This demand closely reflects the Council's emphasis on prioritising highly paid, highly skilled jobs into the district.

Regeneration

Town Centres Revitalisation Programme

The business cases for upgrading of the bus station in Tadcaster, and for Phase Two of the Low Street improvements scheme in Sherburn have been completed and are currently being assessed by SDC Finance Team. This financial assessment work is nearing completion. Once approved, initial feasibility work can be undertaken for Tadcaster Bus Station. At Low Street, further engagement with businesses and wider community can begin. This will help shape the final, detailed technical design work.

Town Centres Revitalisation Programme Grant Award

The work relating to first two applications for the Town Centres Revitalisation Programme Grant Award scheme from Sherburn-in-Elmet Community Trust is nearing completion. A further application has been received relating to improvements to the entrance at Eversley Park. This application is currently being progressed through the assessment process.

Selby Station Gateway Transforming Cities Fund (TCF)

NYCC's appointed contractor, Galliford Try, have completed the archaeological survey works required to support the Planning Application. The Planning Application was presented to the 7 September Planning Committee, where it was resolved that the Head of Planning be delegated authority to grant permission with appropriate conditions pending expiration of the consultation period (subject to no

new material planning issues being raised within the continued consultation). Land negotiations continue to progress well and look to be finalised by end September 2022.

Changing Places Toilets Grant Fund

The funding award will enable the construction of accessible Changing Places Toilets as part of the Tadcaster Bus Station building improvements and Selby Train Station improvements. Officers are currently working with consultants, and Changing Places Toilet specialists, in defining the final specification for the work and determining final construction costs.

Member Community Funding

In the first quarter of the Member Community Fund being open, there has been fifteen member recommendations submitted, and fourteen have been approved. This money will have a direct impact on our communities by supporting local activities that bring people together, maintain green spaces and develop community facilities.

Members are encouraged to submit their recommendations for support to local projects and are reminded that the deadline for final applications to the scheme is 31 January 2023.

Community Safety and Prevent

In support of the work to raise awareness of Prevent, officers are hosting face to face sessions for members throughout September and October. I would encourage members to attend these sessions in order to develop your understanding of the subject, and how you can work to support the prevention of vulnerable people in our communities being drawn into extremist activity. The next session is scheduled for Wednesday 19 October 2022.

Councillor David Buckle, Executive Member for Communities and Economic Development

This page is intentionally left blank



Councillor Tim Grogan, Executive Member for Health & Culture

Report to Council on 27 September 2022

Environmental Services

The Executive approved not to re-tender the Environmental Services Contract and transfer to in house upon contract expiry as part of the transition to a single service for NYC.

The capital investment to improve play facilities in the Selby District has resulted in the award of a contract to improve 4 play areas: Petre Avenue and Volta Street, Selby; Parkland Drive and Woodlands, Tadcaster. It is hoped that the work will be completed before the end of the financial year.

Visitor Economy

Work on the Food & Drink improvement plan is ongoing and engagement via the Heart of Yorkshire website and social media channels continues to grow. Blogs on autumn activity and Halloween will be added in September.

Cultural Development Framework

The Heritage Interpretation Masterplan and Public Art Plan are nearing completion. The Barlby Road artist research project is complete and concept designs have been presented. The artists used a variety of consultation methods to hear the stories of people who had worked at BOCM, culminating in "The Last Dance" in Selby Park, which was a recreation of BOCM's last dance in the 1950s. The event included 40 children from the Theatre & Dance Academy, a swing band and an old-time dance group, with beer provided by the Jolly Sailor. More than 275 people attended at Selby Abbey.

Artist Katayoun Dowlatshahi is working with the landscape architects to develop the final designs for Selby Station plaza and the entrance to Selby Park.

Artist Chris Tipping has begun work on designs for public artwork at Tadcaster bus station, emphasising Tadcaster's rich heritage.

Selby Stories, the High Street Heritage Action Zone Cultural Programme, has had artists engaging the community with their heritage stories:

- Serena Partridge has added works to her installation in the Abbey and delivered a workshop
- Writer Sarah Butler has held a stall at the Market where she has collected 83 stories as well as delivering a number of creative writing workshops. These

will be shared through physical installations in the town and an interactive map.

- Wizard Keen's new Block Party (Minecraft) featured on Look North and over 90 children attended his drop-in at the Abbey.
- Ed Kluz has developed designs for a project putting his work on scaffolding shrouds.

Regulatory Services

Licensing

Licensing Security and Vulnerability Initiative (SAVI) has enabled two licensing premises to achieve accreditation for the pilot Licensing scheme run with North Yorkshire Police.

Hackney Carriage Fare increase: the Executive have agreed to a formal consultation in terms of Hackney Carriage fares. This will run from the 8 September to 22 September 2022. If there are no objections the new fare will commence on the 1 October 2022. If objections are received the Executive will need to agree a way forward.

Environmental Health

Environmental Health undertook routine interventions, conducting 161 food hygiene inspections. This included 46 newly registered businesses, each receiving valuable advice.

In June the Council provided its yearly report to the Department for Environmental Food & Rural Affairs addressing requirements under the Environment Act 1995. It received a positive response recognising work completed in respect of Air Quality Management undertaken in the district and concluded that processes were well structured and detailed, providing information specified in the guidance. Amongst other detail it stated:

"...the Council has provided a detailed and extensive summary of progress against the Air Quality Action Plan measures. This demonstrates the Council's dedication to improving air quality."

Enforcement

General enforcement work undertaken is as follows:

52	FPN's issued since 01/04/21 (1 issued since the last report)
25	Littering
18	Fly Tipping
7	Household disposal
2	Commercial Waste

Enforcement currently has 3 fly tipping cases pending court action and continues to work with partner agencies targeting littering and fly tipping. Urbaser and the SDC

Contracts team are also encouraging residents to appropriately dispose of their rubbish and unwanted items. This work has included leaflet drops and face to face meetings within Selby town.

Advice has also been given to private landowners and Parish Councils on how they might try to secure their land to discourage illegal encampments and fly tipping.

8 encampments were reported in the district since the last report in June.

Councillor Tim Grogan, Executive Member for Health and Culture

This page is intentionally left blank

Councillor Chris Pearson, Chair of the Policy Review Committee
Update to Council on 27 September 2022

The Policy Review Committee has met once since the last update to Council on 19 April 2022. The meeting took place on 12 July 2022.

Policy Review Committee Meeting – 12 July 2022

Members considered the following matters:

Update on the Low Carbon Working Group (LCWG)

The Committee received an update on the low carbon work since the last Committee meeting. The Committee were advised that a number of officers who had worked with the LCWG had either resigned or moved to other authorities, and that due to the uncertainty caused by the Local Government Reorganisation (LGR), a decision had been taken not to recruit officer replacements. Members were assured that officers would continue to deliver what they could of the Low Carbon Action Plan and were currently working with colleagues at North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) to establish where shared agendas overlapped, and where NYCC could help to support delivery.

The Committee heard that officers had liaised with potential delivery partners to secure the planting of some trees in the autumn and continued to engage with the LGR climate change working group. It was noted that baseline emissions data had been provided to support a North Yorkshire wide baseline and this would contribute to the development of a Climate Change Strategy for the new Council.

Members stated their disappointment on the contribution made by Selby District Council in relation to low carbon, however it was highlighted that the Members who were both Selby District Council Councillors and NYCC Councillors would support any initiatives through the Local Government Review process.

Industrial Units Information Report

The Committee received a comprehensive update from the Strategic Asset Management and Property Services Manager on the current position in respect of the Council's commercial and industrial property portfolio and the suggested proposals for their improvement and future management.

The officer explained that Selby District Council (SDC) owned a 50 percent stake in 40 industrial units across four sites within the Selby District; two situated in Sherburn in Elmet and two in Selby. All the sites were subject to a 50 percent claim of beneficial interest by North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC), and NYCC received 50 percent of the rental earned from the sites.

The Committee were informed that one of the key things to affect the industrial units was the legislation around energy performance and the minimum energy efficiency standards. The Energy Efficiency (Private Rented Property) (England and Wales)

Regulations 2015, colloquially referred to as the “MEES Regs” imposed legislative minimum energy efficiency requirements of an ‘E’ rating for all private rented sector domestic and private rented non-domestic properties.

Members heard that in March 2021, the government had launched a consultation seeking views on proposals to amend the MEES 2015 regulations to mandate even greater levels of energy efficiency in non-domestic rented property, with a proposed interim step of ‘C’ by 1 April 2027, and a minimum ‘B’ energy efficiency rating by 1 April 2030.

It was highlighted that these increases in mandated energy efficiency requirements presented significant challenges for the Council, particularly in relation to the two Selby sites at The Vivars Centre and The Prospect Centre. Following full independent energy audits of the two sites it had been confirmed that both sites could be made to achieve the minimum ‘E’ rating required under MEES 2015 but delivering a ‘C’ and subsequently a ‘B’ EPC rating may not be feasible even with substantial investment.

It was confirmed that officers were actively working on proposals to improve one of the two sites at the Prospect Centre to achieve at least MEES 2015 requirements before 31 March 2023 to ensure the Council was not required to serve notice on its current tenants. In parallel, discussions with tenants in the Vivars Centre were underway to facilitate a transfer of their businesses to the newly upgraded Prospect Centre once completed.

Members debated the report and asked the officer several questions in relation to whether NYCC would be making a contribution to the cost of the works required, alternative site options for businesses, and what improvements could be implemented at the Prospect Centre to achieve a minimum ‘C’ EPC rating.

The Committee were in agreement that this approach was correct for the future improvement and management of the industrial unit and supported the suggested Improvement Plans. Officers were requested to forward the plans and recommendations to Councillor David Buckle as Lead Member for Communities and Economic Development; and also strongly advocated that a level “C” EPC rating was achieved by March 2023.

Annual Report of the Policy Review Committee 2021-22

Members approved the Policy Review Committee Annual Report for 2021-22, the report provided an update on the topics considered and the subsequent findings of the Policy Review Committee over the last municipal year.

Work Programme

Members suggested that the Selby Local Plan be added to the work programme, to be presented at Committee once the public consultation had ended on the 7 October 2022, they also felt strongly that they should continue to have sight of work at a District level such as Low Carbon and Universal Credit. The Committee noted the Policy Review Work Programme.

The Policy Review Committee will be meeting next in October 2022.

Councillor Chris Pearson, Chair of the Policy Review Committee



Councillor Steve Shaw-Wright – Chair of Scrutiny Committee

The Scrutiny Committee has met once since the update given at the last meeting of the Council in April 2022; the meeting took place on 30 June 2022.

The following items were on the agenda for the June meeting.

North Yorkshire Police and Fire Commissioner – Zoe Metcalfe

Zoe Metcalfe was welcomed to the meeting. The Committee discussed numerous issues with the PFCC, who gave updates on her recent work such as the development of the strategic Police and Crime Plan and Fire Plans and her focus on tackling the root causes of crime, precept consultations, a new victims centre in York, road safety, violence against women and girls and child protection.

Members asked the PFCC questions about the provision of fire services in Selby, dealing with gypsies and travellers, neighbourhood policing, speed limits throughout the district, cross border drug dealing 'county lines', the provision of night marshalls in Selby town and the waiting times and efficiency of both the 999 and 101 phone services.

The PFCC made a note of the issues raised by the Committee and thanked them for inviting her to the meeting.

Update on Leisure Services Provision (Verbal Update)

Following a verbal update from Officers, Members asked questions on several issues, including health and fitness memberships, the use of the leisure centre, fitness class attendance, fee levels and income, the effect of inflation and increased energy prices, staff pay and training for safety roles such as lifeguards.

Officers provided information on the use of the leisure centres and memberships, improvements in income levels, repayment of the subsidy given due to the pandemic, footfall, the effects of inflation and increases in energy costs, issues with recruitment of staff and lastly public confidence in leisure services.

Financial Results and Budget Exceptions Quarter 4 – 2021-22

Alongside Officers also in attendance at the meeting was the Executive Member for Finance and Resources.

Officers presented the report to the Committee who queried the budget carry forward amounts and the reasons for them, including why such sums were not being spent, particularly on Council projects that had not yet been delivered or were delayed.

Officers explained the need for contingency planning and carry forwards when it came to budgets, particularly with the ongoing issue of the pandemic which had not gone away.

Members were very keen for numerous projects, such as the Transforming Cities Fund works in Selby, to be delivered before the end of March 2023 when the Council would no longer exist due to local government reorganisation and the district's amalgamation into the new North Yorkshire Council.

Officers noted and acknowledged Members' concerns and reassured the committee that every effort was being made to deliver the projects identified.

Treasury Management Quarterly Update Q4 – 2021-22

Again, alongside Officers, in attendance was the Executive Member for Finance and Resources.

Members commented on the changes to the Council's finances relating to property investment and were pleased that results of the Council's treasury management were encouraging.

Officers explained that further investment in property was not being considered at that time, and that such decisions would be for the new North Yorkshire Council to make.

Annual Report 2021-22

Members considered the annual report which covered the business the Committee had undertaken during the 2021-22 municipal year.

The Committee had met on 7 occasions and looked at a range of issues throughout the year.

These included housing repairs, quarterly finance, treasury management and corporate performance reports, Executive Member portfolio reviews, North Yorkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Reports 2019/2020 and Safeguarding Children Partnerships Independent Scrutineer's Annual Reports 2019/2020, Director of Public Health Annual Report 2021, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust Barlow Common Annual Report 2020-2021 and the Wildlife Habitat Protection Trust Hambleton Hough Annual Report 2020-2021, Update on the Contact Centre Move, Housing Revenue Account and Business Plan 2020-2025 (2021/22 Review) and Blue Light Services (Police and Fire Services and Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS)).

There was also a Call-In meeting on an update on Leisure Services Provision, specifically Executive Report E/21/45.

Work Programme 2022-23

Members suggested that the impact Covid-19 in the district should be added to the work programme, as well as the issue of housing voids.

Future Meetings: The next meeting of the Committee will be on 29 September 2022.

Councillor Steve Shaw-Wright, Chair - Scrutiny Committee



Councillor Karl Arthur – Chair of Audit and Governance Committee- Update to Council on 27 September 2022

The Committee has met twice since the last update provided to the Council on 19 April 2022. The meetings took place on Wednesday 27 April and Wednesday 27 July 2022.

Audit and Governance Committee Meeting – 27 April 2022

This meeting had a slightly shorter agenda than usual. Amongst the items covered the committee considered the External Audit Strategy Memorandum presented by the Authority's external auditor Mazars who outlined the audit plan for the year ending 31 March 2022.

The Committee heard that an enhanced risk had been identified in relation to the Council National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR) appeals provision, however the report set out the work Mazars planned to undertake to address the risk. Members noted this report.

The Committee also received the quarterly Internal Audit, Counter Fraud and Information Governance Progress Report from internal auditor Veritau who provided members with an update on the delivery of the internal audit work plan for 2021-22. It was confirmed that there were no areas of concern.

Turning to Counter Fraud members were informed that the government had introduced a new Omicron Hospitality and Leisure Grant between January and March 2022 and extended the Additional Restrictions Grant scheme. Criminals had been quick to target the schemes. It was noted that Veritau had shared intelligence updates from their work with other local authorities and national contacts to alert officers to potential identities and bank accounts, which had been used to commit fraud.

A number of questions were asked in relation to the £150 council tax rebate payments announced by the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, that had been made to most households within council tax bands A to D. It was explained that Veritau had supported officers to prevent and detect potential fraud linked to those payments. The Committee noted that as part of the Councils Annual Billing process for Council Tax, a message to residents had been included to raise fraud awareness. In respect of the information asset register, Members noted that an updated version had been presented to the Corporate Information Governance Group (CIGG) in March 2022 and that the register was now complete and reflected the United Kingdom General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) compliance requirements.

It was noted that the CIGG had agreed to undertake a review of the information asset register in consultation with the other North Yorkshire Councils to consider alignment and consisting of information across the councils ahead of Local Government Re-organisation

Members resolved to note the progress on the delivery of internal audit, counter fraud and information governance work.

Veritau also presented the Internal Audit, Counter Fraud and Information Governance work programmes for 2022-23. It was explained that the proposed Work Programme had been drafted with senior officers of the Council and summarised the overall areas where audit work was expected to be undertaken.

It was highlighted that the final year of the Local Government Re-organisation (LGR) preparation would have a significant impact on the Councils risk areas, and therefore would be the focus of the internal audit work for the year. The Committee noted that a total of 80 days had been agreed for the information governance plan 2022-23 work. In response to queries raised by members the audit manager confirmed that although Veritau provided support to the LGR workstreams, the main priority and focus for the year 2022-23 would be to continue to support Selby District Council and members also queried how suspected fraud was reported to Veritau. It was confirmed that fraud was reported by a number of different sources. This ranged from Council Officers, members of the public, through to the National Fraud Initiative.

Following the discussion members agreed to approve the Internal Audit Work Programme for 2022-23 and to note the Counter Fraud and Information Governance Work Programme for 2022-23.

The committee received the Audit and Governance Committee Annual Report for 2021-22 and agreed to delegate authority to the Democratic Services Officer, in consultation with the chair, to update the final version of the annual report 2021-22 following the inclusion of details from the current meeting and approve the Annual Report for 2021-22.

Finally, the Committee considered and agreed the Audit and Governance Committee work programme for 2022-23.

Audit and Governance Committee Meeting – 27 July 2022

There were ten agenda items for this meeting. Amongst the items covered members considered the External Audit Progress Report which summarised the external audit work completed to date on the 2021-22 financial statements along with the progress made on the 2022-23 audit planning work. Members resolved to note this report.

The Committee also received the draft Annual Governance Statement, which was presented by the Chief Finance Officer, who explained that the report provided an assessment of the Councils Governance environment for 2021-22 and would be part of the Statement of Accounts which would be brought to the committee in October 2022.

A number of questions were asked in relation to Performance and Development Reviews (PDR's) in terms of the percentage of PDR's which had not been completed, the individual staff numbers involved, how this compared over previous years, and whether PDR's had not taken place within certain teams for a particular reason, The Chief Finance Officer was unable to provide an answer to the queries but stated that she would speak with the officers concerned and circulate the information to the committee. Members expressed concerns about PDRs not being undertaken in a

timely manner, as it was felt that PDRs were an important factor not only in the retention, morale, and professional development of staff, but also a mitigation action against the risk of non-delivery of the Councils priorities. Members were assured that performance was monitored in other ways, and that both the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive were aware and keeping a close watch on the situation and resolved to note the draft Annual Governance Statement.

Members received the Annual Report of the Head of Internal Audit for 2021-22 which provided a summary of the internal audit work undertaken in 2021-22, along with an opinion on the overall adequacy and effectiveness of the Councils framework of governance, risk management and internal control. The report also set out the counter fraud and information governance work carried out during the year 2021-22. The Audit Manager, Veritau advised that based on the results of the quality assurance process the Head of Internal Audit had concluded that the internal audit service provided by Veritau generally conformed to the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards (PSIAS). Members also noted that at the beginning of 2021-22 that the Council had been recovering from the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on its working practices and that since then significant and increase resources had been redirected to the preparations for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). Members resolved to note the report.

Members received the Risk Management Annual Report 2021-22 which summarised the risk management activity during the municipal year 2021-22, whilst also showing the proposed actions to be taken to embed sound risk management processes within the Council for the current 2022-23 municipal year and resolved to note the report.

The Committee received the Corporate Risk Register for 2022-23 which the Audit Manager, Veritau explained contained a twice-yearly update on movements within the register and was last reported in January 2022. Members were informed that there were a total of 12 risks on the Councils Corporate Risk Register, with no new risks being added. Members noted that the risks “Failure to deliver Corporate Priorities” and “Organisational Capacity” had both increased and it was explained this was due to the significant capacity challenges being faced by the Council, with key staff leaving and difficulties experienced when recruiting largely as a result of LGR. Finally, the risk “Economic Environment” had also increased its score which was a reflection of the recent steep inflationary increases that it was felt threatened consumer confidence and of the continued challenges in the labour supply. Members resolved to note the status of the Corporate Risk Register and also asked for officers to circulate the two strategies which underpinned the risks “Failure to deliver Corporate Priorities” and “Organisational Capacity” to committee members.

Finally, with the Statement of Accounts unlikely to be ready in time for the next proposed meeting due to take place on 28th September 2022 it was agreed by members that an extra meeting be held on Wednesday 26th October 2022 to discuss the Statement of Accounts. Members were also of the opinion that the meetings should be combined and asked the Democratic Services Officer to explore the possibility of combining the two meetings into just one date this being Wednesday 26th October 2022.

Next Meeting of the Committee

The next meeting of the Audit and Governance Committee will be taking place on Wednesday 26 October 2022 commencing at 5.00pm.

I commend my statement to the Council.

Councillor Karl Arthur Chair, Audit and Governance Committee

Agenda Item 12



Report Reference Number: C/22/4

To:	Council
Date:	27 September 2022
Status:	Key Decision
Ward(s) Affected:	Selby Town, Tadcaster, Appleton Roebuck, Brayton, Cawood, Hemingbrough, Monk Fryston and Riccall
Author:	Caroline Skelly, Planning Policy Manager and William Smith, Planning Policy Officer
Lead Executive Member:	Councillor Richard Musgrave, Lead Councillor for Place Shaping
Lead Officer:	Martin Grainger, Head of Planning and Interim Head of Regulatory Services

Title: Adoption of Conservation Area Appraisals for Selby Town, Tadcaster, Appleton Roebuck, Brayton, Cawood, Hemingbrough, Monk Fryston and Riccall

Summary:

Conservation Areas are areas created by local planning authorities due to their special architectural or historic interest and thereby deserve careful management to protect that character. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1980 requires local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation of Conservation Areas and consult the public in the area in questions, taking account of the views expressed.

It is a statutory requirement for local planning authorities from time to time to review their Conservation Areas. To fulfil this requirement and help to inform the preparation of the Selby District Local Plan Conservation Area Appraisals have been undertaken in Selby Town, Tadcaster, Appleton Roebuck, Brayton, Cawood, Hemingbrough, Monk Fryston and Riccall.

Recommendations:

That Council adopt the Conservation Area Appraisals attached at Appendix 1.

Reasons for recommendation

To fulfil the statutory requirements set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1980 and provide a sound basis for planning decisions which may impact Conservation Areas.

1. Introduction and background

- 1.1 Conservation Area Appraisals help Selby District Council and local communities to preserve the special character of Conservation Areas. They do this by providing homeowners, developers, Council officers and other interested parties with a framework against which future development proposals in the conservation area can be assessed and determined.
- 1.2 A Conservation Area Appraisal outlines the history of an area and explains what makes it special. It identifies the elements that make up the character and special interest of the area, and those that detract from it, and provides recommendations for the area's management. This may include changes to its boundaries, where appropriate. In doing so, appraisals support the District Council's legal duty (under section 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990) to prepare proposals for the preservation and enhancement of Conservation Areas and to consult the public about those proposals.

2. Conservation Area Appraisals

- 2.1 The Selby District has 23 Conservation Areas designated between 1969 and 2000. The town of Selby consists of 4 Conservation Areas of Selby Town; Armoury Road and Brook Street; Leeds Road and Millgate.
- 2.2 Section 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on Local Authorities to publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of each of their Conservation Areas, and at present, none in the Selby District have up-to-date appraisals. Those areas that do have an appraisal were reviewed in 1995. Boundary reviews were undertaken between 1997 and 2004 but there has been no further review of the Conservation Areas since this time.
- 2.3 In June 2020 Alan Baxter Associates were commissioned by the Council to undertake Conservation Area Appraisals for Selby Town, Tadcaster, Appleton Roebuck, Brayton, Cawood, Escrick, Hemingbrough, Monk Fryston and Riccall. These Conservation Areas were prioritised as they were under the greatest pressure from future development.
- 2.4 Draft Conservation Areas Appraisals have been drafted and public consultation taken place as set out in the table below.

Conservation Area Appraisal	Consultation Dates
Selby Town Conservation Area Appraisal	3 December 2020 to 28 January 2021
Armoury Road and Brook Street Conservation Area Appraisal	
Leeds Road Conservation Area Appraisal	
Millgate Conservation Area Appraisal	

Tadcaster	5 March 2021 to 16 April 2021
Appleton Roebuck	18 June to 30 July
Brayton	
Cawood	
Escrick	
Hemingbrough	
Monk Fryston	
Riccall	

2.5 The comments received to the consultations on the Draft Conservation Area Appraisals can be seen at Appendix 2. Further work is being undertaken on the Escrick Conservation Area Appraisal to address comments received and will be presented to Council at a later date.

2.6 The final versions of the Conservation Area Appraisals which have been amended to reflect consultation comments where appropriate are attached at appendix 1.

3. Alternative Options Considered

The reviews are considered necessary as Local planning authorities have a statutory responsibility to review designated Conservation Areas.

4. Implications

4.1 Legal Implications

The Conservation Area Appraisals have been prepared and subject to public consultation in line with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1980 and guidance from Historic England.

4.2 Financial Implications

The Conservation Area Appraisals have been undertaken within approved Local Plan budget resources.

4.3 Policy and Risk Implications

None

4.4 Corporate Plan Implications

The Conservation Area Appraisals provide a sound evidence base to help inform future the emerging Local Plan or planning applications and will help the Council to

deliver its Corporate Plan objectives to make Selby a great place to do business and to enjoy life.

4.5 Resource Implications

The Conservation Area Appraisals have been undertaken within Local Plan resources.

4.6 Other Implications

None

4.7 Equalities Impact Assessment

None

5. Conclusion

- 5.1** That Council adopt the Conservation Area Appraisals attached at Appendix 1 so that they can provide evidence to support future planning decisions.

6. Background Documents

Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management Historic England Advice Note 1 (Second Edition)

7. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Conservation Area Appraisals (Not included in agenda pack due to document size but available to view online [here](#))

Appendix 2 – Schedule of Comments (Included in agenda pack)

Contact Officer:

Caroline Skelly, Planning Policy Manager
cskelly@Selby.gov.uk
01757 294217

Rep.No	Date Received	Name	Organisation	Email	Con Area	Comment
1.	18.12.2020	Tom Beharrell	Selby Civic Society	tom@beharrell.com	Millgate	<p>Millgate CA Draft Feedback</p> <p>Flaxley Road mistyped as Flaxby Road on page 5, 6 [x2] and 15, and the key on the interactive map.</p> <p>B1223 mistyped as B12234 page 6.</p> <p>Left hand photo on page 6 shows new houses completed in 2019 on the site of the Friendship pub, not the adjacent 1979-approved Friendship Court development.</p> <p>Interactive map historic development analysis mid-20th century should be late 20th century. Friendship Court is late 20c rather than 21st.</p> <p>86-90 Millgate are a terrace of three, not four houses, page 10.</p> <p>On page 10 Dobson's Row is stated to have all replacement doors and windows, with the photo caption stating uPVC replacements. The terrace doesn't have uPVC windows; all windows are timber casements and doors are wooden. Most of the row are single glazed timber windows, number 2 and 7 had their windows replaced with new timber double glazing in the same style in 2016. At the time, the heritage statement noted that front and back of number 7 has 19th century three and four plank doors.</p> <p>Page 11 states that redevelopment of former public house and Friendship Court are still ongoing – for clarification, Friendship Court was approved in 1979 on 66 Millgate's land. Next door the Friendship pub development phase I was completed in 2019. There is ongoing phase II development next door at 54 Millgate.</p>

Page 38						<p>The second paragraph for Negative on page 11 refers to Millgate Mews being replacement terraces on Millgate not incorporating chimneys, I believe this is Firth Mews, as pictured bottom left on page 12, built 1993-94.</p> <p>Top photo on page 12 shows Friendship Court and the projecting bay on Millgate, which went through planning in 1979 rather than being early 21st century. The photo below of 21 Millgate is the terrace previously mentioned as part of Firth Mews, not Friendship Court, on the opposite side of Millgate and dates from 1993-94.</p> <p>Page 16 refers to the Millennium Green in view 4, I think this is the Spagnum. View 14 of the Maltings should be 34.</p> <p>Page 17 has Spagnum mistyped, I'm also missing views 8, 29 and 34 in the document.</p> <p>Page 18 refers to the recent Friendship Court development, should be Friendship pub (both under 6.1 and 6.2.)</p>
2	21.12.2020	John Wetherell	Resident	jmgwetherell@gmail.com	Leeds Road	<p>The report is somewhat superficial, inconsistent in at least one respect. ie page 5 says 'The Croft' is late 19th century but on page 8 it is an example of 1920/30's building!</p> <p>Otherwise, as probably the longest resident on the road I support the proposals.</p> <p>In view of the importance of 'streetscape' it is a pity the council did not use the powers when, several years ago, they allowed a hedge to be ripped up and replaced by a very much out of character wall.</p> <p>The whole thing is pointless if not followed up!</p>

3	14.01.2020	Tania Weston	SDC Economic Regeneration	Tweston@selby.gov.uk	<p>General</p> <p>This is a good appraisal document that highlights the key heritage issues of Selby Town centre, as well as the challenges and opportunities. It is good to see that there is clear alignment with the Economic Development & Regeneration team's pipeline of projects to improve the town centre in line with the Council Plan. The recognition of 'a sense of place' is welcomed, and we support the focus on a more people-centred approach to traffic management and infrastructure. It is good to see recognition of opportunities for regeneration and development, such as infill, renovation of run-down buildings and replacement of inappropriate buildings. However, there could be more, and more positive, reference to the Council's previous and current work, and strategic ambitions for Selby Town. There have been positive changes, such as the Water Lane and Town Hall public realm enhancements, previous CARS/HERS scheme improvements on New Street, new residential development on Park Row and Audus Street/Douglas Street. The HAZ, town centres work and Transforming Cities Fund projects should have positive impacts in the near future (2024 at the latest), while longer-term strategic projects (the Places and Movement Strategy and station quarter masterplan) will also help deliver people-centred improvements. These projects will address some of the negatives identified in the draft CAA, such as car dominance, the poor setting of the listed current and former railway stations, the entrance into Selby Park and opportunities for tree management in the park.</p> <p>The ED&R team generally agree with the risks, opportunities and recommendations set out in section 6. However, we have a concern that there is the potential for a difference in corporate priorities relating to the old Maltings (6.2.1). We would argue that while it has the potential to make a positive contribution to the</p>
---	------------	--------------	---------------------------------	--	--

conservation area, the CAA needs to recognise that it is in incredibly poor condition which has considerably worsened since its de-listing 16 years ago. Conversion of the building would require substantial investment given the conservation deficit. This makes it unviable for private development, even enabling development, and also unviable for public funding; as an unlisted asset there will be other buildings considered much higher priorities for investment (such as Abbot's Staith). The ED&R team is currently developing a proposal for quality new development including the demolition of this building that would enhance the conservation area, and which has Executive member support. This raises the prospect of a Council policy document in conflict with a Council proposal for improvement of the area.

Specific comments

- Agree with the suggestions about de-designation and re-drawing of the boundary; all seem sensible. The CAA will therefore need to be slightly re-written to reflect this change.
- We agree about the opportunity for redevelopment of the WH Smith and 9 Day Lewis Pharmacy sites. However, we suggest that good quality, sensitively designed contemporary design might be more appropriate. Unless there is evidence of the former buildings, any frontage 'restoration' would be conjectural. Should the former Bargain World also be included as a potential development opportunity? Any view of the merits or otherwise of the carpet shop building on the Scott Rd/Leeds Rd junction?
- We do not necessarily agree that the Park Row/Thornden Buildings development constitute an exception to defined character.
- Should there be more mention of the need to improve the setting of the listed buildings and park along Station Road (i.e., the impact of the current station car parking and Selby Business Centre on the conservation area)?

- | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Could there be more said about Selby Park, and potential opportunities for improvement, such as better links with the Abbey, better visibility and lighting, removing car parking, improving direct access and enhancing feelings of safety?• There is good alignment with the Places and Movement strategy relating to the environments at New St / Park St junction, The Crescent and Water Lane.• The suggested improvements to cycle infrastructure for Micklegate and Gowthorpe are welcomed. Any proposals should link with other infrastructure developments, especially those relating to the station (TCF) and LCWIP proposals.• It is good to see acknowledgement of the town's industrial significance.• Can you introduce an Article 4 Direction outside a conservation area? It's suggested for Armoury Road and Brook Street, but these are also proposed for de-designation. A blanket Article 4 Direction would need considerable consultation – it has potentially significant implications for homeowners and businesses. We suggest should be specific engagement with businesses to build engagement and support for any changes..• Welcome suggestion of working with identified groups, but local groups should also be included (e.g. Selby College, Town Council, Civic Trust, other local groups)• Is there alignment between the CAA's proposals for car parking with the Council's car parking strategy, that of the County Council? The district's poor provision of EV charging points is readily acknowledged, however, it would be unfortunate if traffic volumes increased from local residents driving across town to charge their cars (e.g. Back Micklegate).• The reference to refreshing design guidance is welcomed. This fits well with the proposed HAZ design guide for Selby. Perhaps reference to other design guides in development (Delton's residential design guide). |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sure 115-121 Millgate (1167502) and 123 & 125 Millgate (1132553) still exist?? • Format • Leeds Rd: typo p.6 • Selby Town: p.24 pictures need switching around. Section from p.27-30 text doesn't correspond with images. • 6.2.10 Milton Place car park is actually called Audus Street car park (link to prominent historic family/architect)
4	18.01.2021	Tom Beharrell obo Selby Civic Society	Selby Civic Society		<p>Selby Conservation Areas Appraisal feedback</p> <p>Selby Civic Society's response to the request for comments on the Conservation Area Appraisal is as follows. Selby Civic Society supports the recommendations outlined in the appraisal documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resolve the lack of full-time conservation adviser. • Ensure that planning proposals always take account of the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation areas. • Create a more people-centred approach to traffic management and infrastructure. We agree street signage and other clutter tends to be poorly positioned within the conservation areas. • Support an appropriate conservation-related evidence-base to inform development management decision making. • Prioritise the preparation and adoption of guidance for householders and businesses regarding conservation issues, including issuing up-to-date shopfront and window & door replacement design guides. We agree that shopfronts are often heavily branded and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the conservation areas, and that uPVC replacements of doors and windows common throughout the conservation areas do not respect the character and appearance of traditional timber sashes.

Changes to the conservation area boundaries

We agree the Selby Town Conservation Area boundary should be extended to take account of “View 2” on the Barlby riverbank and to be extended south-east to incorporate more of the River Ouse south bank and Grade II listed 121-122 Ousegate. We further believe it should be extended to the end of this block to incorporate the Grade II listed Nelson public house. This creates a natural boundary to the Selby Town Conservation Area at the end of Ousegate.

We agree with de-designating “Upper Millgate”. The condition of the buildings is poor with a couple of exceptions – 129 and 131 Millgate have original windows and are in great condition though are non-designated; Dobson’s Row is also in good condition and contain lots of original character and is Grade II listed. Other listed buildings at 115 to 125 Millgate appear to have been demolished probably for Ebor Court. If conservation area status is lost, we would like to see alternative provision to ensure more sympathetic alterations in the future.

We disagree that the impact of changes on the character of Armoury Road and Brook Street are enough to de-designate this conservation area. There are just six front walls that have been taken down to ground level on Armoury Road to provide car parking. Boundary loss to the rear of Brook Street properties is visible on Armoury Road and is limited to the terrace of 3-storey houses numbers 64-82 (pictured on page 9 photo 2.)

There need to be protections and/or enforcements to reinstate and prevent further similar works. Most styles of house have at least one example with original windows and doors still present, and several houses on

Armoury Road including the terrace 47-51 have original windows, doors and tiles, and contribute very positively to the area. There are similar well-preserved houses on Brook Street around and including Beech Grove and others.

The impact of the negative new developments on the corner of Gowthorpe and Brook Street are limited to the edge of the conservation area. The loss of original doors & windows and insensitive development is arguably less damaging than that within Millgate Conservation Area and to a large extent Selby Town Conservation Area.

Selby Town Conservation Area

We would like to add to the summary of special interest the extensive number of “Yards” throughout Selby Town and Millgate within the medieval burghage plots. There are numerous examples of surviving Yards that consist of doorways or carriage entrances from a street-front property through to terraces of cottages or workshops built behind: Hope Yard, Conway’s Yard, Preston’s Yard, Simpson’s Yard, Pitt’s Yard and Dobson’s Yard. Over 50 Yards were listed in the Rimmington’s Directory of 1931. Robert Street is a great example of how new, sensitive development can be married in with these original terraces to enhance and increase housing stock within the town.

- We agree the Ousegate Maltings requires urgent conservation.
- We support the upgrading of the listing for the Old Railway Station and enhanced status within the town due to the significance of the building; to ensure its conservation and re-use such as being a publicly accessible part of the new Station Quarter development.
- Prioritise saving the Abbot’s Staith, currently in a

					<p>perilous state and in danger of being lost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enhance the pedestrian and cycling accessibility of Water Lane and improve the appearance of the pumping station and railings.• Support the pedestrianisation of Finkle Street and Micklegate, to design out cars.• We agree the park and Stagnum are poorly managed and would like to see an increase in the level of tree cover throughout the conservation areas, especially in Micklegate, The Stagnum, Selby Park and riverbank in response to the climate emergency. These should enhance and not obstruct key views.• Re-design Back Micklegate car park on a smaller footprint, allowing for new housing to extend along the existing burgage plots along the lines of the Robert Street development.• Redevelopment of the Royal Mail site on Micklegate would be encouraged with a scheme that would contribute to the character of the area if Royal Mail would relocate. <p>Millgate Conservation Area</p> <p>We agree that “Lower Millgate” has been significantly compromised by the loss of most timber windows and doors (in both listed and non-listed buildings) and is further impacted by over 30 satellite dishes which detract from its character. One listed building at 38 Millgate appears to have been lost probably to create the road to New Millgate, which looks out of character being so wide.</p> <p>We agree that specific design guidance should be prepared for Millgate to try and bring doors, windows, roofs and rainwater goods back to appropriate conservation area standards during future refurbishments, and to engage with owners/landlords as we suspect most residents do not know they live in a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>conservation area. We also suspect that many listed building owners do not know what is or is not permitted.</p> <p>We strongly agree that Article 4 Directions need to be strengthened and enforced by Selby District Council.</p> <p>Leeds Road Conservation Area</p> <p>We agree with other recommendations to allow greater control over property boundaries and infilling of existing plots, to increase the spread of TPOs to all trees and to ensure the careful management of surviving grass verges.</p> <p>Armoury Road and Brook Street Conservation Area We agree that future loss of front gardens and windows & doors must be avoided by tighter restrictions and/or enforcement by Selby District Council, including the use of Article 4 Directions.</p> <p>With stronger conservation area protections and an invigorated planning department, in the future we think there is a case for extending the conservation area down the east side of Doncaster Road, to contain 1 to 105 Doncaster Road and incorporating the Victorian Cemetery and other side streets where appropriate. Selby Civic Society are happy to work in conjunction with the council on the initiatives, and we strongly recommend the measures are adopted and enforced as necessary.</p>
5	18.01.2021	Tom Beherrel	Selby Civic Society	tom@beharrell.com	<p>Leeds Road</p> <p>Page 8 photograph 3 is of The Croft but description doesn't match. Page 11 photograph described as being a mid-20th century terrace, looks Edwardian and is present in 1930s photographs. Page 12 Flaxby Road -> Flaxley Road typo (x2 plus photo.)</p>

Page 15 map doesn't show boundary of Leeds Road CA with Selby Town CA.

Armoury Road and Brook Street

Page 8 says there's controlled on-street parking on the west side of Brook Street, however parking is on the east side of Brook Street.

Page 9 photo 1 labelled as 160-162 Brook Street, should be 60-62.

Page 14 says front boundary walls and gardens have been removed on both Armoury Road and Brook Street for parking. There are six houses on Armoury Road that have lost their front wall and garden, but none on Brook Street.

Selby Town

Page 1 dates the A19 swing bridge as early 20th century; it dates from late 18th century but was renewed in the mid-20th.

Page 1 & 6, 30 & 31, 36 Ousegate Road is just Ousegate.

Page 8 Broad Street should be Brook Street.

Page 9 photo three shows Church Hill.

Page 10 photo one shows a late 19th Century terrace rather than 20th (built 1895/96.)

Page 14 Market Place photograph mislabelled, not a view towards St Mary's Church.

Page 14, 15 & 17 Selby Dyke is Selby Dam.

Page 16 Abbey Staithe is the Abbot's Staith.

Page 18 Cholera burial ground is mid-19C.

Page 19 first bullet point has New Road which should be New Street. Last bullet point: Part Street should be Park Street.

Page 20 dates the first railway station as 1835, it was built between 1830 and 1834 opening on 22/09/1834.

Page 30 Flaxby Road -> Flaxley Road (x2.) Page 31 Trees along Station Road should be Portholme Road.

						<p>4.2.2 "Strong Contribution" duplicated in title.</p> <p>Page 33 view 28 photo has a description referring to further along the river.</p> <p>Page 45 describes the junction of Park Street and The Crescent.</p>
6	22.01.2021	James Langer	Historic England	<p>Langer, James <James.Langer@HistoricEngland.org.uk></p>		<p>Lower Millgate Conservation Area – no objection to the proposed boundary revision.</p> <p>Selby Town Conservation Area – no objection to the proposed boundary revision along the banks of the River Ouse.</p> <p>Armoury Road and Brook Street Conservation Area – whilst regrettable, we would not object to this decision provided that suitable safeguards are put in place to conserve remaining heritage assets/character elements.</p> <p>Proposal to amalgamate the Leeds Road and Lower Millgate Conservation Areas into the Selby Town CA, whilst it would be preferable to keep distinct areas separate, we would not object to this proposal provided that the Conservation Area Appraisal for the amalgamated Conservation Area includes distinct and clearly identifiable character areas with separate management recommendations.</p>

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

Rep.No	Date Received	Name	Organisation	Email	Con Area	Comment
1	15/03/21	CR Burton	resident	crburt@btinternet.com	Tadcaster	The only comment I would make is that the whole plan seems to be aimed at reducing car parking in the town centre which in my view would be counterproductive in the development and wellbeing of the town. Over the last few years, the council have been trying to encourage people to come to the town for the beach, walks etc so without central car parking this will have been in vain. Also where will visitors park to access eating establishments, functions at the Riley Smith Hall, Church School rooms, church services and funerals, meetings at Council Offices.
2	21/03/21	Caroline Wyatt	resident	carolinewyatt69@hotmail.com	Tadcaster	<p>I welcome much of what is said in this Appraisal. Tadcaster has for too long been left to decline. The amount of empty/derelict buildings of historic importance is a disgrace. I just hope that you have the influence to make these changes.</p> <p>My property backs on to Robin Hoods Yard, our only access is across this Yard. As you can see posts were put up to prevent any parking in this area.</p> <p>We had a long, very expensive legal battle to guarantee an access route as SSOB stated they owned RHY. We eventually signed an agreement with clauses such as - not objecting to any planning application made for the land, not running a business from our</p>

Page 50						<p>homes, following the route down Pegg Lane and round the posts, (although they couldn't determine the ownership of Pegg Lane). Our Historic access from Kirkgate (identified on various conveyances) is down the cobbled route by No 24, this has been altered to make it impossible for vehicular access.</p> <p>The Maintenance of RHY is a constant irritant and numerous requests by residents have fallen on deaf ears!</p> <p>We welcome the proposed change to RHY but need assurance that parking for residents and visitors and access for all vehicles can be maintained.</p>
3	21/03/21	Gary Lee Wigley	resident	wigleygary@yahoo.co.uk	Tadcaster	<p>I have lived in Tadcaster for 9 years, having lived and being brought up in Leeds. The people are friendly, and many are proud of Tadcaster. However, the way that Humphrey Smith has been allowed to control Tadcaster is unbelievable. If he does not like anything it does not happen, the farce with the footbridge is one example, he has values that come from the early 1900's.</p> <p>The amount of derelict buildings that are owned by him is many. When you look at historic places like Otley and Ilkley, that attracts thousands of visitors each year, then you look at Tadcaster that reminds me of estates in Leeds like Halton Moor with its many</p>

Page 51						<p>empty homes. I strongly welcome any work in Tadcaster that improves it and keeps the history of Tadcaster, but while ever you allow Humphrey Smith to control what happens in Tadcaster it will be a waste of money. He even controls what business can operate in Tadcaster. I have friends that ask me 'why are the Council not repairing all these empty properties when we have so many homeless'. We have a democratically council in place to ensure the will of the people is followed, but we have an individual that has the final say on anything Tadcaster. It reminds me of an American movie where the whole small town is controlled by one rich person.</p> <p>Tadcaster is a lovely place to live, because of its people, it could be a fantastic place to visit if someone had the courage to stand against Humphrey.</p>
4	21/03/21	Holly Hemsworth	resident	holly545@hotmail.co.uk	Tadcaster	<p>I disagree strongly with the plans to build on the central car park. There will not be adequate parking for residents or visitors without this. The proposed new area for car park development is much smaller and liable to flooding making it not fit for a replacement car park. The argument that this was once a site for housing is irrelevant given there was not the need for substantial car parking at that time. The focus should be on developing the derelict and dilapidated buildings all around that area. This would not only provide extra housing but also improve the street scene.</p>

Tadcaster CAA Comments Database

5	08/04/21	Craig Broadwith	Historic England	Craig.Broadwith@HistoricEngland.org.uk	Tadcaster	See PDF
6	21/04/21	Julie Askham	resident	Julie.askham@gmail.com	Tadcaster	I grew up in Tadcaster and my parents still live in the town. The documents seem to be suggesting that the main car park in the centre of Tadcaster will be reduced/removed. I do NOT think that this is a good idea. Having a car park in the centre of town means that people are able to park to visit the local shops in the towable centre. Removing/reducing this facility will kill the town centre! The suggested replacement will not be large enough to accommodate the number of cars that use the car park now.
7	21/03/21	Julie Hornshaw	resident	julie.hornshaw@gmail.com	Tadcaster	<p>I think the derelict unused buildings in Tadcaster need to be renovated and used for housing rather than building more new housing in the town centre. The central car park needs to be retained but the surface needs to be improved and laid out with markings as usually seen in car parks.</p> <p>The former vicarage gardens should be turned into a park/gardens for the town which would be beneficial for the community and would improve the area for visitors.</p> <p>The traditional shop fronts need to be maintained and independent businesses given some sort of grant to encourage them to set up in the unused shops.</p>

8	21/03/21	Katrina Tempest	resident	tina_lally@hormail.co.uk	Tadcaster	There is so many empty buildings in Tadcaster, and business premises that could bring money into Tadcaster and rejuvenate the area, also there is nothing for the younger children to do, there is only one park which is not fit for purpose and not any good for very young children, Tadcaster is a shell of what it could be and other villages have so much more to offer. Also, the riverbank could have picnic benches and a safe route down to the beach area.
9 Page 53	21/03/21	Lewis Buckle	resident	gsk0001@gmail.com	Tadcaster	I think the main focus must be the renovation of derelict buildings and the addition of new build housing developments as the housing situation in Tadcaster is horrendous compared to surrounding areas. If local landowners don't comply legal powers must be used for the future survival of Tadcaster.
10	21/03/21	Louise Parkinson	resident	lparkins7547@sky.com	Tadcaster	I was wondering if there are plans to improve the appearance of the walkway over the top of the viaduct? If this area was regenerated and planted with lots of beautiful flowers and plants, it could be a huge pull for walkers and tourists.
11	08/03/21	Paul Bissett	resident	pb15ett@gmail.com	Tadcaster	I very much agree with the proposals made in this document. In particular I feel that it is important to use quality materials - not pvc within the Conservation area. I feel particularly strongly that all derelict properties, whether shops residential must be renovated and put back into everyday use. The town

						has had a rundown atmosphere for far too long which results in reduced commerce and reduced tax revenue. We need a nice place to live.
12	14/04/21	Peter Rowe	NYCC	peter.rowe1@northyorks.gov.uk	Tadcaster	<p>I am just reading through the Tadcaster appraisal and enjoying the layout and interactive map. I'd better make some comments as I read through:-</p> <p>1.6 – Special mention of the chimneys being a particularly dominant landscape feature in distant views?</p> <p>2.0 – You could push the origins of Tadcaster back a bit if you wanted to reference the following which sounds like a prehistoric inhumation:-</p> <p>In around 1886, during extension to John Smith's Brewery, alongside Centre Lane, the skeleton of an adult male was unearthed, together with a blue stone axe, chisel-shaped stones and flint arrowhead(s) (1).</p> <p><1> Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1977 - 1980, Yorkshire Studies Card, SE44SE 2523 (Card Index). SNY2.</p> <p>in this section I might include a statement that the High Street with its long narrow properties on either side is likely to be the result of the Norman reorganisation of the town in the later 11th century.</p>

Page 55						<p>The less structured, curving, streets to the north, may represent earlier organic, and less formal growth of the settlement.</p> <p>The bit about the earthwork on the first edition map is very interesting and I have added this to the HER. It's perhaps a bit unfair to single out the MAP report here as there have been a number of other organisations who have worked in this part of the town.</p> <p>6.2.1& 6.2.5 – Good to see archaeological potential mentioned here and this will help greatly should the sites progress. Pleased to see community archaeology included.</p> <p>Recommendation 3 – You have my support here.</p> <p>Overall, I think it is very good and doesn't get bogged down in detail but makes recommendations for further work. I think the reason many local authorities get behind on their appraisals is that they are too detailed, so I think this is a good way forward.</p>
13	16/04/21	Kate Martyn	Donald Insall Associates obo SSOBT	kate.martyn@insall-architects.co.uk	Tadcaster	See PDF

14	16/04/21	Stephanie Dick	SDC	sdick@selby.gov.uk	Tadcaster	<p>• Why does the north-eastern boundary of the proposed conservation area cut in to hug the river? Surely anything that is proposed between the river and the road in this location will have a significant effect on the setting of a large swathe of the conservation area. Would it not be better to just include it, to ensure a consistent approach and safeguards for the historic river corridor? (Using the same rationale for inclusion that's been used for the John Smith's and the Riverside Public Car Parks later in the document). This is assuming the land is not protected by other means (e.g., environmental designation).</p> <p>• p9 – "Small alleyways survive between buildings leading to dwellings, outbuildings and yards within rear plots."</p> <p>Are these culturally/traditionally the same as the Snickleways of York? And is there a local word or reference for these which is worth recording here?</p> <p>• 3.2 [p10] – "Medieval burgage plot boundaries are difficult to read in the historic townscape possibly because many may date back to a pre-conquest (Late Saxon) land ownership."</p> <p>How does this follow? Does this statement make sense?</p>
----	----------	----------------	-----	--	-----------	--

Page 57					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• p14 – “Reconstructions and replacement shop fronts that reflect a traditional style should be avoided. Contemporary design may be appropriate where it results in enhancement.” <p>I categorically and fundamentally disagree with the first statement, and equally strongly support the second.</p> <p>Surely the critical reinstatement of a lost shopfront would also constitute an enhancement of the historic environment, so why should this be avoided? Design decisions should be responsive to context (cultural/historic/environmental/etc), based on variety of factors, and be allowed to draw upon the rich canon of existing and emerging design excellence, coupled with an informed understanding of place. (Article 9 notwithstanding, for reasons I’d be happy to discuss further.)</p> <p>By definition ‘contemporary’ includes anything built now, irrespective of stylistic influences.</p> <p>At the same time, this advice seems to run contrary to the spirit, intent, and purpose of Conservation Areas as spelt out on p35, which “exist to protect the features and the characteristics that make a historic place unique and distinctive.”</p>
---------	--	--	--	--	--

Page 58					<p>[p15] cites the damage done to Tadcaster by unsympathetic alterations such as ‘modern’ shopfronts, but which were presumably ‘contemporary’ when they were created.</p> <p>Pastiche and poor quality ‘faux’ traditional shop fronts should be avoided, but the sentence has other meaning. In comparison the Selby CAA recommends a shop front and window/door replacement design guide “to improve the quality of existing and proposed shop fronts” and recommends “the restoration of the original frontage” of some of the modern buildings on Gowthorpe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 6.2.5 Former Vicarage Garden ‘grassed area with no known use’ ... Shouldn’t we find out if it has a use, rather than put that in print?• p30 – Recommendation 2 – How much weight or importance are we giving to maintaining the backland character and appearance of Robin Hood’s Yard, given that it is inextricably linked to the successful delivery of a scheme on the Central Area Car Park, and some development might be useful to achieve that objective?• p34 – Architectural Periods/Styles – The definition of Vernacular should pertain to Tadcaster, not Selby.
---------	--	--	--	--	--

15	21/03/21	Sue Lawrie	resident	Susan.elcock@ hotmail.co.uk	Tadcaster	Please provide comments here on the Conservation Area Appraisal document: I am not disagreeing with the new proposal all I want to know is if houses are built on main carpark where do myself and husband park where we live on westgate it has a 2hr restriction of parking I am a caseworker around tad and Sherburn so in and out most of day we both need car parking spaces.
16 Page 59	23/03/21	Susan Tennant	resident	sue_tennant@hotmail.com	Tadcaster	The document certainly shows that there is a lot of scope for improvement in the Tadcaster Conservation Area!! As a resident of Tadcaster the improvements that would provide the most immediate benefit would be if the derelict and dilapidated buildings were brought up to an acceptable standard and if empty buildings, both residential and commercial, were occupied. The current impression is overwhelmingly of a run-downtown with few reasons to visit or linger very long. Post pandemic planning provides a unique opportunity to prioritise boosting the local economy by providing and enhancing existing local facilities at a time when people are more likely to be needing these as commuting becomes less prevalent. Any improvements that would encourage residents to shop, socialise and exercise locally and encourage visitors to the town are to be encouraged.

17	15/04/21	Delton Jackson	SDC	djackson@selby.gov.uk	Tadcaster	<p>Comments & Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why does the northeastern boundary of the proposed conservation area cut in to hug the river? Surely anything that is proposed between the river and the road in this location will have a significant effect on the setting of a large swathe of the conservation area... Would it not be better to just include it, to ensure a consistent approach and safeguards for the historic river corridor? (Using the same rationale for inclusion that's been used for the John Smith's and the Riverside Public Car Parks later in the same document...) • p9 – “Small alleyways survive between buildings leading to dwellings, outbuildings and yards within rear plots.” <p>Are these culturally/traditionally the same as the Snickleways of York? And is there a local word or reference for these which is worth recording?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2 [p10] – “Medieval burgage plot boundaries are difficult to read in the historic townscape possibly because many may date back to a pre-conquest (Late Saxon) land ownership.” <p>How does this follow? Does this statement make sense?</p>
----	----------	----------------	-----	--	-----------	--

Page 61					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• p14 – “Reconstructions and replacement shop fronts that reflect a traditional style should be avoided. Contemporary design may be appropriate where it results in enhancement.” <p>I categorically and fundamentally disagree with the first statement, and equally strongly support the second.</p> <p>Surely the critical reinstatement of a lost shopfront would also constitute an enhancement of the historic environment, so why should this be avoided? Design decisions should be responsive to context (cultural/historic/environmental/etc), based on variety of factors, and be allowed to draw upon the rich canon of existing and emerging design excellence, coupled with an informed understanding of place. (Article 9 notwithstanding, for reasons I’d be happy to discuss further.)</p> <p>To do otherwise is like telling a musician that they can only play one style of music, or an artist how to do ‘art’... Equally, by definition ‘contemporary’ includes anything built now, irrespective of stylistic influences.</p> <p>At the same time, this advice seems to run contrary to the spirit, intent, and purpose of Conservation Areas as spelt out on p35, which “exist to protect the features and the characteristics that make a historic place</p>
---------	--	--	--	--	---

Page 62						<p>unique and distinctive.”</p> <p>A final point: Literally, the very next page [p15] cites the damage done to Tadcaster by unsympathetic alterations such as ‘modern’ shopfronts, but which were presumably ‘contemporary’ when they were created. The old saying that “the only thing we learn from history is that we never learn anything from history” suddenly springs to mind...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 6.2.5 Former Vicarage Garden ‘grassed area with no known use’... Shouldn’t we find out if it has a use, rather than put that in print?• p30 – Recommendation 2 – How much weight or importance are we giving to maintaining the backland character and appearance of Robin Hood’s Yard, given that it is inextricably linked to the successful delivery of a scheme on the Central Area Car Park, and some development might be useful to achieve that objective?• p34 – Architectural Periods/Styles – The definition of Vernacular should pertain to Tadcaster, not Selby.
	18	07/04/21	Jane Crowther	Tadcaster Town Council	clerk@tadcastertowncouncil.gov.uk	Tadcaster

Village Document Consultation Responses

Name	Organisation	Email Address / Address	Conservation Area	Comment
Judith Bellamy		2 Turton Square, Brayton, Selby	Brayton	I have read through the Brayton document to the point where there are two recommendations. The first suggests that the conservation area is only in place to preserve a gap between Brayton and Selby which is no longer required. I disagree, the fact that there is a commitment to preserving the views of the church and trying to maintain Brayton as a village with fields still being actively farmed is essential to the character of the village as a whole. Downgrading the status is just one step closer to multiple houses being built in this area. The second recommendation relates to Hemingbrough which makes me wonder if anyone at the council has actually read the proposals, which is of greater concern.
David Hull		9 Northfield Lane Riccall YO19 6QF	Riccall	Which ill informed moron wrote this "appraisal"??? Most of what they have written is factually incorrect. The buildings that they mention being of historical importance are generally absolute eyesores that need restoring. The buildings they are moaning about generally fit very well in the village. You can clearly see their surroundings have been very well considered in the designing stage. I could go on and on but I feel I would be wasting my time.
Caroline Wandless		25 Skipwith Road, Escrick	Escrick	Escrick Church is St Helen's. Incorrectly refered to as St Mary's under one of the view photos. Please could it be amended. Thank you.

Village Document Consultation Responses

Glen Hopkinson		Glebe Cottage, Escrick YO19 6LN	Escrick	"Recommendation 7 In particular, the local bus company should be encouraged to use the Main Street as a pick up and drop off to avoid residents having to use the A19". I totally disagree with this recommendation. The buses should stay on the A19. The recent introduction of laybys for the bus stop has improved traffic flow. I really can't see how buses should be routing down essentially a side road not built for such traffic and the detour will necessitate the bus pulling out of a busy junction back onto the A19 which as busy times might hold the bus up. The old bus stop on main street regularly has school drop off cars along one side of the street and is less than 100 yards from the current A19 bus stop. I assume in the past the bus did detour off the A19 down Main Street and this proposal is a retrograde step.
Sarah Force		7 Bedfords Fold, Hillam LS25 5HZ	Monk Fryston	20 mph or crossing needs to be implemented. As an adult it is hard to cross that road, I wouldn't allow a child to do so. Also if a reduced speed was considered it would make the turning into Water Lane safer.
Robert Jackson		2 West view, Bettarashill Road, Hillam	Monk Fryston	Traffic through monk Fryston and Hillam is extremely heavy and we have noticed an increase in traffic coming through hillam as a cut through from
				the A162 down betterashill road. The group of houses at the end of
				betterashillroad are just within the 30 zone coming in to hillam and monk frystone and the signs that indicate this coming from the national speed limit are not adequate. Speed bumps would be sufficient.
Henry James Mellard		22 Chapel Walk, Riccall	Riccall	As such I have little comment on your document.
				Riccall is my home i oppose any more building because the population density is already obscene for a village.
				The fields of riccall make no home for birds and hedgehogs forced into the village there is precious little habitat as it is. The tamwood site is critical to various ecological systems and must NOT be destroyed. People above money, peace .

Village Document Consultation Responses

Joanna Comerford		7 Station Rise, Riccall	Riccall	I believe that the conservation area within Riccall should extend within the centre of Riccall village, along Station Road and include the 'orchard'
				area behind Tamwood, which houses a large number of wildlife and plant species. We believe that this includes bats as we see them flying into the garden from our neighbouring property.
				Station Road houses historical buildings including station house and the old railway line, and I believe that this should be protected.
				Riccall is already becoming a densely Pilates area and we believe that extensive additional dwellings within the village centre should be avoided at all costs.
Benjamin Comerford		7 Station Rise, Riccall	Riccall	It is my opinion that the conservation area within Riccall should extend within the centre of Riccall village, along Station Road and include the 'orchard' area behind Tamwood, which houses a large number of wildlife and plant species. We believe that this includes bats as we see them flying into the garden from our neighbouring property.
				Station Road houses historical buildings including station house and the old railway line, and I believe that this should be protected.
				Riccall is already becoming a densely populated area and we believe that extensive additional dwellings within the village centre should be avoided at all costs.
David Kendrew		Hawthorn Farm, Kelfield Road, Riccall, York, YO19 6PQ	Riccall	
Amanda Kendrew		Hawthorn Farm, Kelfield Road, Riccall, York, YO19 6PQ	Riccall	

Village Document Consultation Responses

Mrs Barbara Jean Bennett		5 Ash Grove, Riccall, York, YO19 6NW	Riccall	I am commenting about the property known as Tamwood in Station Road Riccall and would urge the council to reconsider their decision regarding demolition of this property. I was horrified when I learned of this decision. I had known Mr Clark all my life (I am 70) Mr Clark was a family friend and Tamwood was built on behalf of his parents. It is part of the history of Riccall, in keeping with the other properties of Station Road and should be left so. I know that a lot of Riccall residents have the same opinion as me and would hope that our combined opinions would help to save the property to be enjoyed by future generations.
Mark Glover		9 The Meadows, Riccall, York, YO19 6RR	Riccall	We love our village and want to keep it as it is, so NO MORE HOUSES BUILT please
Richard Rowson		1 Carrs Meadow, Escrick, YO19 6JZ	Escrick	<u>Context:</u>
Page 66				I am responding to this consultation in a personal capacity, albeit no doubt my views have been shaped through 6 years as a Parish Councillor, and contributor to Escrick's Neighbourhood Plan project.
				I have tried to approach this consultation positively, and in a constructive manner. However, this is set against the context that the quality of this review is disappointing, and not to the standard that we are used to seeing from SDC.
				The review also contains numerous factual errors, and basic errors such as mis-spelling street names and getting the name of the church wrong. None of which helps its credibility, nor implies attention to detail.
				It is further disappointing that it appears to be being rushed through at a time when SDC are well aware that Escrick is developing a neighbourhood plan and design code, which, unlike this document, have been based on over 2 years of extensive community engagement.
				<u>Headline views:</u>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				The review appears to take a very narrow view on what is 'good' and 'bad'. It seems to be based purely on the opinions of the author, without taking into account views of local residents.
				The review seems to take the stance that anything from the Victorian/Edwardian era is good; anything that emulates it is ok; and anything else is a problem.
				The overall tone comes across as rather derogatory and of aloof. Whilst the village may not be to the personal tastes of the individual conducting the review, this seems to have clouded objective opinion, and as a result the review does not appear to be balanced nor objective.
Page 67				An alternative view could be that Escrick provides a varied collection of styles representative of the times at which they were built, intertwined with the socio-economic history of the time, the variety of which very much define the character of the village.
				Variety that includes:
				the historic manor house, with its stables, gardens and outbuildings;
				the Victorian/Edwardian era of workers cottages, social housing of the Alms Houses, alongside grand buildings such as the rectory, Dower house and church;
				the absence of significant development in the early 20 th century as residents moved away to industrial towns;
				the rapid growth of the 1960s/1970s (as private car ownership established commuting), bringing whole new roads of bungalows and houses with their driveways and garages;
				1980s 'executive home' cul-de-sacs – some with a nod to the architecture of the Dower House they sit alongside;
				1990s developments incorporating affordable housing and shared ownership;
				21 st century infill.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				Had the Victorian's taken the view that all buildings should resemble the styles of 150 years previously, we'd have had none of the architecture that the author now appears to value so much.
				Whilst some styles will inevitably be more popular than others, I do not share the author's view that architecture of certain eras is automatically better or worse than others. A 1960s bungalow may not be the current flavour of the month, but it is nonetheless part of our architectural and socio-economic heritage, and its role therein should be respected.
Page 68				Personally I feel that the review is so narrowminded, and so misses the very ethos of Escrick, that it should be withdrawn and redone with a fresh pair of eyes that are more receptive to a wider range of styles and views. Nonetheless as I suspect this is unlikely, I have set out some specific thoughts below for consideration.
				<u>Specific objections:</u>
				Page 32 / Recommendation 3: “Article 4 Directions or similar mechanisms are adopted to remove current permitted development rights for the control of boundaries, windows and doors, rear yards and shop fronts within the conservation area.” I can see this may be appropriate for some prominent aspects of the conservation area or buildings of specific historic importance. However, many of the buildings within the conservation area, such as Carrs Meadow or Escrick Park Gardens are modern developments which SDC themselves describe as ‘exceptions to defined character’ and ‘neutral areas that do not add to the character of the conservation area’. It would seem ironic on one hand to be quite dismissive about the value of these developments, and on the other hand burden residents with article 4 directions to preserve features that the report states are of no value.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<p>Page 33 / Recommendation 5: <i>“Recommendation 5: Development Management Any future development of the slaughterhouse site off the Main Street will need to ensure that every effort is made to incorporate the historic farm out-buildings into development and that views from the Main Street are maintained and enhanced including around Carr Meadows.”</i> I strongly object to this recommendation. This is a working abattoir site, with all the blood, gore, and odour that goes with it. Residents of Carrs Meadow fought to get the screening put in place to shield Carrs Meadow from the sights and sounds of the abattoir and I would strongly object to having these reinstated, as I believe would be widely the case of other residents.</p>
Page 69				
				<p><u>Detailed feedback:</u></p>
				<p><i>General</i></p>
				<p>I recognise that this is specifically a review of the conservation area, rather than the village has a whole, and therefore legitimately omits the north and east of the village. However, the review seems to give very little consideration to the conservation area within the boundary of Queen Margaret’s school. This has a number of significant buildings, gardens, and settings. Whilst recognising this is largely private property, as the historic heart of the settlement, it should nonetheless form part of the review.</p>
				<p><i>Map – Historic Development Analysis:</i></p>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				I think the key may have ‘mid 20 th century’ and ‘late 20 th century’ transposed, or some areas may simply be miscategorised? For example Carrs Meadow is shown as ‘mid 20 th ’ (but dates from 1996), Farriers Close is early 21 st century, but shown as mid 19 th ; Dower Park and Escrick Park Gardens are both 1980s, but shown as mid-20 th (shouldn’t that be late 20 th ?)
				Map – Archaeology:
				1. The site of the medieval village is generally regarded to have been south of the hall, not to the north as shown
				2. The map refers to ‘St Mary’s Church’ – I think this should be ‘St Helen’s and the location was further south than shown
				3. I’ve always been led to believe that the current hall sits on the same site as the medieval hall that stood before it (you’ve shown the medieval hall as further north)
				Map – Historic routes:
				I’ve always been led to believe that the historic east-west route followed roughly the ridge of high land along what is now Cawood Road, then south of the Manor House, and then along what is now the driveway and Wheldrake Lane. This is substantiated by historic records referring to the road following the high ground.
				Section 1.2: Escrick is a largely ‘no through’ village off the A19

Village Document Consultation Responses

				What does this mean? A key issue for local residents is the very opposite of this – i.e. that the busy A19 and Skipwith Road both slice through the village, significantly influencing the built form, and the flow/movement around the village. The village history is from being at the junction of the Riccall – Stamford Bridge and Selby – York ‘roads’.
				Section 1.4:
				No mention is made of the 2003 review, nor do its findings/conclusions appear to have been considered in this review.
				Page 5 / Section 2.0: Historical Development
Page 71				There are numerous bits of this narrative that are different to my understanding through Parish Council records, Estate records, and Escrick Heritage project. It may be that the author is correct, and others are wrong, but for example:
				<i>“...the home of the private Queen Margaret School since 1949. Previously the school was housed in the Grade II listed Parsonage.”</i> Incorrect – previously the school was in Scarborough, then briefly Castle Howard during the war, prior to moving into Escrick in 1949. The school subsequently occupied many buildings in the village, including the now Parsonage and Dower House (but not prior to 1949).
				St <u>Mary’s</u> Church – incorrect, it is St Helen’s
				<i>“The present church, the Grade II* listed St Helen’s, dates to 1857 implying that the original church or a replacement ‘chapel of ease’ survived at the Hall until then.”</i> This is different to local records, which record that the church was consecrated in the current location in 1783. It was rebuilt at the same location in 1856-7, and then restored following a devastating fire in 1923.
				My understanding is that the medieval village lined the west-east route from Riccall to Stamford Bridge.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<p><i>“to re-route the main road from Selby to York to the west, <u>the modern A19</u>”</i> - The act of parliament in 1781 diverted the north-south road slightly west of the village (following the course of ‘Old Road Plantation’ and the historic wall currently forming the boundary of the primary school grounds) but it wasn’t until the 1820s that it was diverted yet further west to the current course of the A19.</p>
				<p><i>“Earlier developments such as the 1970s development of the ‘Villa’ grounds (the Dower House) off Skipwith Road have very little in common with the estate village theme and reflect suburban style designs.”</i> Dower Park actually dates from the 1980s, and the style of the properties are intended to reflect the architecture of the neighbouring Dower House. So whilst true they don’t reflect the Estate Village, it is not a generic suburban style either.</p>
Page 72				<p><i>“The earlier medieval village lay to the south of Carr Lane and comprised Main Street and the immediate grounds of the present hall.”</i> – local records suggest the medieval village was south of the hall, and not the area now known as Main st.</p>
				<p>Page 6 - <i>“Black Bull Public House and the village hall continue to provide a community focal point”</i> – This is not the case. In reality the main community focal points are the Escrick & Deighton Club, Church, Village Hall and Village Green. The Black Bull has been a chain pub since 2006, with notable periods of closure, or focus on tourist markets from outside the village.</p>
				<p>Page 9 – <i>“Negative : There is a significant amount of late twentieth-century and early twenty-first-century development around the peripheries of the conservation area”</i>. Why is this negative? This appears to be purely a prejudice on the part of the author against certain design styles vs others. Whilst some of the development is negative, it is not all the case, and the fact it is late 20th century doesn’t automatically make it a negative.</p>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				The author appears to have chosen unrepresentative negative pictures to illustrate 20 th Century development. Selecting a picture of a building site with a skip can surely not be regarded as objective and balanced, but comes across as a deliberate attempt by the author to present certain areas negatively.
				Page 9 – <i>“Although later twentieth-century developments such as Carr Meadow pay some regard to local character in some architectural detailing, the design and layout reflects late twentieth-century suburban forms and site designs.”</i> – It surprising to see a development such as Carrs Meadow, where a mixed development of housing, including affordable homes and shared ownership, set as a cul-de-sac around a village green is highlighted as a ‘negative’ feature of the village.
Page 73				Page 11 – <i>“Negative: Gates to the main house are a barrier to movement but have been there since the early twentieth century.”</i> – I’m surprised to see the historic gates called out as a negative feature (Indeed I thought they were listed?). Given their tenure and historic significant I would have thought that from a heritage/architectural perspective we’d want them preserved. Calling them out as a negative almost implies we’d be happy if the scrap metal man came and took them away.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				<p>Page 11 – “<i>The low concrete posts apparently removed in 2015 better reflected the character and appearance, particularly in terms of scale.</i>” I’m surprised to see that 1980s concrete street lamps are called out as a positive feature of the conservation area. In my personal opinion the low concrete posts, with significant ‘arm’ overhang were quite imposing on the streetscape, cutting into the views down the streets, and gave out a lot of light pollution. Whereas the simple dark steel posts with no arm overhang are far less imposing on the streetscape and don’t cut into the views down the streets. The LED lights give far less backscatter and associated light pollution. I guess this serves to illustrate that there can be a variety of opinions on such topics. NB: I’d agree that urban lighting density in the modern developments is excessive for the rural context.</p>
Page 74				<p>Page 13 – “<i>Note use of block paving and entrance splay, both of which introduce negative designs into the conservation area.</i>” – I’m a little bit baffled as to what is negative about block paving, but no reference made to tarmac and concrete drives elsewhere in the village being negative, so presumably tarmac now our preferred driveway material of choice? I thought generally that tarmac and concrete driveways were frowned upon because of their permeability and that block paving had better ‘soak away’ characteristics.</p>
				<p>Page 20 – “<i>Incorporates a number of nineteenth-century park features including a fish pond</i>” – Incorrect - The fish pond is long since gone, now just the historic Duck Decoy (which has been split by Skipwith Road being built over it)</p>
				<p>Page 23 –the Village Hall and the Escrick and Deighton Club are two separate buildings/facilities, so would be best to make the title ‘4.2.7 – Village Hall, Escrick & Deighton Club, Alms Houses and bowling green’</p>

Village Document Consultation Responses

				Page 24 – 4.2.8 should refer to the grounds of Escrick and Deighton Club (the village hall doesn't have any grounds, it sits in the grounds of Escrick and Deighton club)
				<u>Areas not covered but worth considering:</u>
				The report does not look forward at some of the emerging challenges and considerations, for example:
				Solar panels – are these to be supported within the conservation area? – the balance between ecological conservation, and architectural conservation.
				Heat pump equipment – is guidance needed on the siting of heat pump equipment? – a number of units have been installed on prominent front wall locations within the conservation area
Page 75				Similarly, we're likely to need a plethora of electric vehicle charging infrastructure over the next decade. Is there any guidance how best to incorporate this into the conservation area? (particularly those areas that rely upon on-street parking)
Chris Shepherd		no addresss	Cawood	I fully support that the school playing fields, Kensbury and the former ferry landing area should be included in the conservation area as per the recommendation within the appraisal.
Mrs Pauline Cogan		11 Northfield Lane, Riccall, YO19 6QF	Riccall	My comment is in relation to item 4.0 Landscape character in the Riccall Conservation Area Appraisal.
				I would suggest that in terms of open space outside of the conservation area, the farmland and allotments to the north west of the said area, adjacent to the school playing fields and accessible from the end of Northfield Lane (marked as a historic route), should also be considered as making some contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Village Document Consultation Responses

Eric Hardy		27 Carrs Meadow, Escrick, YO19 6JZ	Escrick	From this open space, views are afforded of the historic manor house and its location to the settlement as a whole, which, although it is not in the marked conservation area, is a significant part of the village's heritage.
				Also, when villagers return from visiting the allotments or enjoying a countryside walk (as many do!) and head back down Northfield Lane towards the junction with the Main Street/York Road (site of the historic pinfold) they directly pass and view historic farm workers cottages (7 and 9 Northfield
				Lane) which serve to remind villagers of the strong past and present agricultural heritage, whilst reinforcing the relationship of the historic settlement to the surrounding fields and countryside.
Antoni Janik		100 Main Street, Monk Fryston, LS25 5DU	Monk Fryston	If this greenbelt land was to be developed for more residential housing under proposals that have been made and rejected by SDC, I sincerely believe this would further undermine and negatively impact how we preserve Riccall's conservation area and it's special connections with the landscape from which it originated.
				You comment that there are "no traffic calming measures" along the A63. I find this an interesting comment as many years ago (probably 10 +) a consultation took place regarding traffic calming in Monk Fryston. After several years it was decided that the double white lines which ran down the centre of the road through the village would be erased. We were told at the time that this was a "traffic calming measure". I am happy to see that this ridiculous suggestion has now been discredited.
				The biggest contribution to traffic calming and slowing traffic through the village would be to re introduce the double white lines as this gives a visible indicator to drivers that caution is needed and would prevent drivers overtaking and straight lining the double bend near the junction near the Post Office.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				I did contact the highways department at the time of the white line removal to comment on the potential danger of their actions but was told that there was no intention to replace them.
				I would be grateful if this could at least be considered.
Thomas Morris		Prospect House, Main Steet, Hillam, North Yorks, LS25 5HG	Monk Fryston	In relation to recommendation 7: imposing a 20mph speed limit on Monk Fryston Main Street - I would strongly support this. However, I would ask that the limit be extended through Lumby Hill and the main road through Hillam. It would seem bizarre not to have this continuity, effectively encouraging drivers to 'speed up' as they leave the A63 and pass Monk Fryston Primary School on Lumby Hill and into the narrow corners and blind summits of Hillam Main Street, which would have higher speed limits. The two communities effectively act as one and a single safe speed limit would benefit both. This would also deter any drivers who get frustrated with 20mph zones from seeking to circumvent the situation by detouring through Hillam.
Matthew Blackburn		56 Main Street, Riccall, YO19 6QD	Riccall	I'm writing to put forward my opposition to any extensive further development in Riccall, at least without significant investment in local infrastructure and education in the village.
				Infrastructure specifically includes faster broadband to keep pace with work pattern changes as we move out of the covid pandemic and to facilitate local business innovation. Additionally, I don't believe the current electricity infrastructure is sufficient for the village as it currently is; adding more demand to the system will only exacerbate the regular power cuts we experience.

Village Document Consultation Responses

				I'm aware of plans to demolish Tamwood house on Station Rd and build several new houses on the site. In addition to the concerns outlined above; there are already several recent property developments on Station Rd that, in my opinion, do not meet the aesthetic character of the village. Tamworth is an historic building with, I am told, a large picturesque garden that provides a pleasant view for many residents of the area. It is an enviable family property that should be put to use in its current state.
				I hope my comments contribute to the discussion of the Riccall conservation area, and that the council support the people and history of Riccall.
Janis Keys		5 The Hollies, Riccall	Riccall	We have been advised that there has been a proposal for planning permission for a proposed housing development by Barrett/David Wilson homes for 80 properties at end of York Road junction of A19. How can this be approved
Page 78				when: 1. The water tower is almost at capacity in provision as it stands at the present 2. Access on to York Road/junction A19 the proposal is almost on top of the junction to the A19 where this would lead to road issues on accessing and negotiating at such a busy and dangerous junction. Already accidents at this point are a regular occurrence 3. Amenities such as electricity where we already have regular power cuts, what will happen with further properties being built and impacting on what is already a burden on provision 4. Lastly we were advised that no further housing developments would take place due to the above issues and the heavy load this would place on what was already over loaded utilities provision and road capacity within the village. Lastly your aim was to ensure the conservation of what is a beautiful village why destroy the aspect of what you are trying to protect.

Village Document Consultation Responses

Jan Reczkowski		2 Kelfield Close, Riccall, YO19 6PY	Riccall	Tamwood is a building which was left to charity by its's last owners and I believe the last thing they would have imagined would be that the charity would sell it for it to be knocked down and other properties developed. It needs to stay ! We need to conserve more historical things as we have too many houses and cars in an already saturated village. The A19 already struggles with traffic flow at peak times so more housing development is a bad idea! Keep villages small !
David Turner		40 Main Street, Riccall, York, YO19 6QA	Riccall	looking at the plans for riccall, i would like to comment on this page, living in the village for nearly 40 years and in the conservation area, i feel that even this part of the village has not been dealt with sympathetically to keep what is supposed to be the old part of riccall, areas that need adding are station road and to be honest, the larger the village gets the more it effects this conservation area in the village, 400 year old buildings take the brunt of modern day pollution and you can see this in the houses themselves, i would like to propose that the whole of riccall be given conservation status to protect the area of conservation and the rest of the village so that riccall does not become overwhelmed with housing that the village cannot sustain and also to protect surrounding areas of flood wash and greenbelt land, like most people who buy homes in villages it is for that reason we do, i do not want the village to become one huge estate that will effect house prices here and also the areas we love, there are plenty of brown field areas that are available that would clear many eye sore ares and make them habital with new homes schools and shops to accomodate. i feel like the heart is being ripped out of many villages around us and a full village conservation area would protect us from becoming just another huge village with no heart. conservation is also about protecting village life as well as its designated buildings something that modern day planners often forget as all they want is huge profits and walk away thank you for allowing us to make our suggestions to you and i sincerely hope that they are listened to and this is not just another pr stunt. if you want to see how much the

Page 80				conservation area has been diminished then put a todays map and one from 50 years ago you will see the demise of this area even today houses like tamwood are homes that want to be arazed from menory riccall needs to be a full conservation area to protect it as a village
---------	--	--	--	--

Agenda Item 13



Report Reference Number: C/22/5

To: Council
Date: 27 September 2022
Status: Key Decision
Ward(s) Affected: All Districts
Author: Caroline Skelly, Planning Policy Manager
Lead Executive Member: Cllr Mark Crane, Lead Councillor for Place Shaping
Lead Officer: Martin Grainger, Head of Planning and Interim Head of Regulatory Service

Title: Revised Local Development Scheme and drawdown of £186k of funding from the contingency reserve to support the completion of the Local Plan

Summary:

The Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out a timetable for the preparation of a Local Plan and its relevant documents. It represents a public statement as to what Local Plan documents will be prepared over a three-year period, identifying key milestones and preparation arrangements. The purpose of this report is to consider a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) for 2022 to 2024 and seek additional funding from the contingency reserve to complete the Local Plan.

Recommendations:

1. That Council recommends that the revised Local Development Scheme which sets out the timescales for the preparation of a new Local Plan at Appendix 1 is brought into effect and published.
2. To approve a drawdown of a further £186k from the contingency reserve to complete work on the Local Plan as set out in paragraph 4.2.7.

Reasons for recommendation

It is important that there is clarity about what work is being undertaken to progress the Local Plan for Selby District and what documents will be produced. Local Plan documents have key implications for places across the district and for communities, businesses, and organisations across and beyond the district. There is a legal requirement to produce a Local Development Scheme, which must be made publicly available and kept up-to-date.

1. Introduction and background

- 1.1 The proposed new Local Development Scheme for Selby District Council covers the period 2022 to 2024.
- 1.2 Members approved a decision to begin work on the preparation of a new Local Plan in September 2019 and good progress has been made in accordance with the current Local development Scheme.

2. Progress of the Local Plan

- 2.1 In line with the current Local Development Scheme consultation took place on the Issues and Options for the Local Plan in early 2020. The responses to this consultation helped to shape the preparation of the Preferred Options consultation which took place between 29 January and 6 March 2021. Through the consultation exercise a further 44 additional or amended sites were also submitted to the Council for further consideration. Consultation on the 44 additional sites took place between 2 August and 13 September 2021.
- 2.3 Between 3 September and 15 October 2021 consultation took place on a number of technical evidence documents which will help to shape the Publication version of the Local Plan. Consultation took place on the Green Belt review, Greenspace Audit, Local Plan and CIL Viability report and the Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities Assessment.
- 2.4 In August 2022 the Council's Executive approved consultation on the Publication Local Plan to fulfil Regulation 19 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended. Consultation began on the 26 April, however due to the death of Queen Elizabeth II and the postponement of some consultation events this will now end on 28 October.
- 2.5 As part of the report on the Publication Local Plan presented to Executive a revised Local Development Scheme was also recommended to be put forward to Full Council for consideration. The key milestones are set out in the draft revised Local Development Scheme document attached at Appendix 1.

3. Alternative Options Considered

- 3.1 None as keeping the Local Development Scheme up to date is a statutory requirement.

4. Implications

4.1 Legal Implications

- 4.1.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires Local Planning Authorities to prepare and maintain a Local Development Scheme. This Legislation requires that the scheme should specify the Local Plan documents that are to be produced; the subject matter and geographical area to which each document relates; and the timetable for the preparation and revision of these documents. The Local Development Scheme must be made publicly available and kept up-to-date, as it is important that local communities and interested parties can keep track of progress.

4.2 Financial Implications

- 4.2.1 The Council has a specific budget for the preparation of the Local Plan and associated development plan documents. To date the work required to support the preparation of a new Local Plan has been delivered within the budgets established for this purpose when work commenced in 2019. However, as work has progressed a number of additional technical evidence has proved necessary to address concerns raised by Specific Consultees, this includes additional work on highways modelling, viability and the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment.
- 4.2.2 In order to complete the Publication Local Plan consultation and progress it through to Submission and Examination additional resources will be required as set out below:

Based on Budget allocation (reserve funded budget, not base budget)			
	Budget	F'cast spend	variance
21/22 c/f	£291,852		
22/23 Budget	£122,000		
22/23 revised budget	£413,852	£609,977	-£196,125
23/24 Budget	£60,000	£90,314	-£30,314
24/25 Budget	£0	£86,000	-£86,000
	£473,852	£786,291	-£312,439
Minus £127 approved via Urgency Decision	£473,852	£786,291	-£185,439

- 4.2.3 A significant cost of preparing the Local Plan has been in relation to Highways Modelling estimated to cost £495k. Discussions are taking place with NYCC Highways to seek contributions towards the costs for the development of the Strategic Highways model (estimated to be approximately £64k) and therefore the final sum could be reduced to -£250k.
- 4.2.4 The National Planning Practice Guidance say that Plans that are being prepared, but not yet adopted, can also carry over and continue through to adoption in the new authority. However, the regulations state that new plans covering the whole of the new area must be adopted within 5 years of the reorganisation. Continuation of the work will have significant benefits for the new authority as a large amount of work and financial investment has already been undertaken to support the preparation of the plan to this stage and this is underpinned by robust evidence. The Local Plan aims to provide for the long-term growth of Selby District beyond the plan period of 2040 and therefore will provide the new authority with a strong supply of new housing and economic growth for the medium to long term and help to contribute to meeting 5-year housing supply.
- 4.2.5 The completion of the Selby District Local Plan will clearly need to be supported by the new North Yorkshire Council beyond 1st April 2023. At this stage consideration

is being given by the LGR Planning workstream on whether Local Plans which are in this very late of preparation should go forward. As set out in Local Government (Structural Changes) (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2018, existing adopted plans will remain in place for the areas set out in the plan.

- 4.2.6 In order to continue to progress the Local Plan through the consultation on the Publication version and on to adoption Members are asked to drawdown further funds from the contingency reserve in order to complete the Local Plan. The balance on the contingency reserve is currently £1.1m. It should also be noted that as these costs exceeds £100k for revenue that it is captured by the Section 24 notice, so would also need that additional approval to proceed.
- 4.2.7 In order to ensure that the Local Plan can be progressed in line with agreed timeframes and submission before vesting day an Urgent Decision was made to drawdown £127k from the contingency reserve fund on 1st September under 3.8.3(k)(i) Part 3 of the Constitution to support additional technical highway work required for Local Plan. Council are therefore asked to support the drawdown of the balance of £186k from the contingency reserve.

4.3 Policy and Risk Implications

The timescales for the preparation of a new Local Plan are dependent on the maintenance of existing staff resources and the implications resulting from any future changes to national planning guidance.

4.4 Corporate Plan Implications

The preparation of a new Local Plan will help the Council to deliver its Corporate Plan objectives to make Selby a great place to do business and to enjoy life. More specifically it will contribute to the objective to have a local plan in place which will deliver more houses in the District, business opportunities, promote health and well-being and protect and enhance the local environment.

4.5 Resource Implications

None

4.6 Other Implications

None

4.7 Equalities Impact Assessment

The Local Development Scheme is a project plan. An equalities impact assessment will be prepared to support the emerging Local Plan.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 The updated Local Development Scheme provides a public statement setting out which Local Plan documents will be prepared by Selby District Council. It sets out key milestones for these documents. Additional finances are required to complete the Local Plan work.

6. Background Documents

None

7. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Local Development Scheme 2022 to 2024

Contact Officers:

Caroline Skelly
Planning Policy Manager
cskelly@Selby.gov.uk
01757 292137

This page is intentionally left blank



Selby District Council

Local Development Scheme
2022 – 2024

1. What does an LDS include?

- 1.1 The Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out the key planning policy documents we will be producing over the next three years. This document is the third Local Development Scheme to be prepared in relation to the new Local Plan which began in September 2019. In terms of content there are particular requirements set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Section 15(2) as amended. This specifies that the LDS should include:
- the local development documents which are to be development plan documents;
 - the subject matter and geographical area to which each development plan document is to relate;
 - which development plan documents (if any) are to be prepared jointly with one or more other local planning authorities;
 - any matter or area in respect of which the authority have agreed (or propose to agree) to the constitution of a joint committee under section 29;
 - the timetable for the preparation and revision of the development plan documents;
 - such other matters as are prescribed.
- 1.2 This LDS was brought into effect from **# September 2022** by resolution of the Council.
- 1.3 Copies of the Local Development Scheme are available for inspection at the Civic Centre, Selby or may be downloaded from the Council's website www.selby.gov.uk.

2 What are the current Local Plan documents?

2.1 The Local Plan currently consists of the following documents:

- a) The Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 – this sets out a long-term vision and strategic policies to guide development and shape the growth of the District
- b) Some ‘saved’ detailed policies from the previous 2005 Local Plan - which remain part of the Council’s planning policies until replaced (those that were not replaced by policies in the Core Strategy)
- c) Policies in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan 2015 to 2030 adopted on 16 February 2022.

2.2 The Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 provides a strategic context with which subsequent Local Plan documents must conform. The Core Strategy covers the period from 2011 to 2027.

2.3 The Selby District Local Plan was adopted in February 2005. Transitional arrangements enabled policies and proposals in adopted development plans to be ‘saved’, initially for up to three years from commencement of the new legislation or until replaced by individual DPD policies. In the case of Selby District Local Plan the three year ‘saved’ period ran until February 2008 but those policies which remained consistent with national and regional policy at that time were further extended indefinitely (or until replaced), by Direction of the Secretary of State’s approval. The ‘saved’ policies can be viewed on the Council website.

2.4 Neighbourhood Plans are prepared for a particular neighbourhood area. The Localism Act 2011 introduced statutory neighbourhood planning in England, enabling communities to draw up their own plans and have more say in the planning of their area. The usual lead in this is the Parish Council who submits the proposed boundary (Neighbourhood Area) and supporting statement to Selby District Council. Once this is approved, the plan is drawn up by local people. The plan can be used to influence the type, design, location and mix of new sustainable development - it must generally be in line with the Local Plan, national and local planning policies and other laws. The plan is then checked by an independent examiner to ensure that it meets the standards for a Neighbourhood Plan. The final plan is then subject to a local referendum and is brought into force by Selby District Council if more than 50% voters support it.

2.5 At the time the LDS was adopted Appleton Roebuck and Acaster Selby and Church Fenton Neighbourhood Plans had been adopted. The progress of the Neighbourhood Plans are monitored and set out in the latest Authority Monitoring Report.

3. What Plans Are We Producing?

- 3.1 We are required to provide details of all our Local Development Documents within this Local Development Scheme.
- 3.2 We are now producing a new Local Plan which will provide a long-term strategy for the whole District. The Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy Document which was adopted in 2013 and the 'saved' policies from the 2005 Local Plan. Together with any adopted Neighbourhood Plans and emerging Joint Minerals and Waste Plan the new Local Plan will make up the development plan for the District. It will be supported by a Policies Maps which will identify allocations of land and constraints to development.

The Statement of Community Involvement.

- 3.3 The current document was adopted in December 2020 and sets out how the Council will involve people in plan making. The Statement of Community Involvement sets out how and when we will consult interested parties in developing our planning policies.

The Annual Monitoring Report.

- 3.4 Local Authorities must prepare and publish an annual monitoring report to cover a period of a minimum of 12 months. The Annual Monitoring Report demonstrates how effectively the Council's planning policies are working.

4. Preparation of Local Plan

- 4.1 The preparation of a Local Plan will provide a comprehensive Development Plan Document for the whole of Selby District. It will set out the overall spatial approach for new development, allocate specific sites and set out the policy framework for decision making up to 2040. A detailed timetable for the preparation of the plan is set out at Appendix 1.

Key Stage of Local Plan Preparation	
Year	Key Stages
2019	Initial Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement Preparation of Issues and Options Consultation Document (Regulation 18)
2021	Preparation of Preferred Options Local Plan (Regulation 18)
2022	Preparation of Publication Version of Local Plan (Regulation 19)
2023	Formal Submission to Secretary of State (Regulation 22)
2024	Adoption of new Local Plan (Regulation 26)

Local Plan	
Document Details	
Role and Subject	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will set out the volume and spatial approach for new development across the District. • Will identify site specific allocations for housing (including gypsy and traveller sites), retail/town centre uses, employment and other purposes and related policies and requirements. • Where necessary, will set out local standards and criteria against which planning applications for the development and use of land and buildings will be assessed and • Will provide more detailed policies to manage land and development. • Site specific allocations, designations and the areas to which policies apply will be identified on the Policies Map.
Coverage	District – wide
Status	Local Development Plan
Chain of Conformity	Consistent with national guidance
Arrangements for Production	
Lead Section	Planning Policy Team
Joint preparation	No
Resource Requirements	<p>Planning Policy Manager, Policy Officers, Development Management, Legal, Economic Development and Regeneration, Environmental Health, Housing and Business Support roles.</p> <p>External support provided by North Yorkshire County Council, and other key stakeholders (including public health).</p> <p>Evidence base studies undertaken by consultants.</p>
Approach to involving Stakeholders and the Community	In accordance with the Regulations and the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

5. Joint Working

- 5.1 It is not currently proposed to prepare any joint Local Plan documents with neighbouring local authorities. However, the Council is working in partnership with other local authorities to ensure that cross boundary issues are fully addressed under its duty to cooperate (Localism Act 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2018).
- 5.2 North Yorkshire County Council will contribute to the Council's plan making, particularly with regard to transport and education matters, and advice on strategic planning, monitoring and intelligence, biodiversity, landscape, archaeology and sustainability aspects, but are not specifically jointly preparing any Local Plan documents. It is important to note that on 1st April 2023 through Local Government Review, Selby District Council and North Yorkshire County Council will become a new North Yorkshire Council.
- 5.3 The Council will also work with other public bodies such as the Environment Agency and Highways England, as well as key stakeholders in preparing the Local Plan.

6. Monitoring and Review

- 6.1 The Local Development Scheme will be monitored on an annual basis through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). As a result of monitoring, the Council will consider what changes, if any, need to be made to its Local Plan, and will bring these forward through reviews of this LDS.
- 6.2 The Council will continue to monitor annually how effective it's planning policies and proposals are in meeting stated objectives. This includes publishing its AMR each year covering the period 1 April to 31 March. Depending on the stage reached in the process, the AMR will assess:
- Whether the Council is meeting the timescales and milestones in the LDS and, if not the reasons why;
 - The extent to which policy objectives are being achieved;
 - Whether any policies need to be replaced to meet sustainable development objectives; and
 - What action needs to be taken if policies need to be replaced.

Appendix 1

Timetable for the Preparation of a New Local Plan

	2021												2022												2023												2024											
	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
New Local Plan																																																

Agenda Item 14



Report Reference Number: C/22/6

To:	Council
Date:	27 September 2022
Status:	Reserved to Council
Ward(s) Affected:	All
Author:	Alison Hartley, Monitoring Officer
Lead Executive Member:	N/A
Lead Officer:	Alison Hartley, Monitoring Officer

Title: Independent Person Appointments to 31 March 2023 pursuant to the Localism Act 2011

Summary:

The Localism Act 2011 requires the appointment of at least one Independent Person under the Localism Act 2011. In 2017 the Council continued the appointment of Hilary Putman and Wanda Stables and appointed Philip Eastaugh.

The appointments of Wanda Stables and Philip Eastaugh were made for three years and Hilary Putman for five years. All three Independent Persons were content to continue to be consulted by the Monitoring Officer throughout the pandemic to deal with complaints and provide support to complainants where appropriate. No matters have required formal action on the part of the Independent Persons to consider investigation outcomes under the standards regime or to attend the Advisory Panel on Disciplinary Matters relating to Statutory Officers during the period since the formal appointment terms ended.

Having reviewed the situation in 2022, the Monitoring Officer is of the opinion to recommend that the engagement of all three Independent Persons be made until the abolition of Selby District Council on 31st March 2023. This report seeks formal confirmation from Council as required pursuant to Section 28 of the Localism Act 2011 that the three appointments be made until 31 March 2023.

Recommendations:

That, for the purposes of section 28 of the Localism Act 2011, the Council agree to the appointment of Hilary Putman, Wanda Stables and Philip Eastaugh as its

Independent Persons with immediate effect until the abolition of the Council on 31 March 2023.

Reasons for recommendation:

To meet the statutory requirements of the Localism Act 2011 to appoint at least one Independent Person.

1. Introduction and background

- 1.1** The Localism Act 2011 (the “Act”) changed the arrangements for dealing with governance issues regarding the conduct of Members. It abolished the national Standards Board and required that local authorities establish their own Code of Conduct and establish a process for dealing with allegations that members of the authority may have breached the Code of Conduct.
- 1.2** To add external input, section 28(7) of the Act required the Council to appoint at least one “independent person”, who must be consulted, and their views taken into account on all complaints investigated and before a decision on any such complaint is made. The Council may consult with the independent person on other matters relating to an allegation and the Member complained about can also seek the independent person’s views.
- 1.3** To ensure “independence”, the Independent Person is not to have links to the Council, councillors or officers.
- 1.4** The role of the independent person has since been widened under the Local Authority’s (Standing Orders) England (Amendment) Regulations 2015, which came into force on 11 May 2015. These regulations changed the localised disciplinary process in relation to the Council’s Head of Paid Service, the Chief Finance Officer and the Monitoring Officer statutory positions. In the case of any proposed disciplinary action against such a statutory officer, the Council is required to appoint the independent persons who have been appointed for the purposes of the Members Code of Conduct regime to the Advisory Panel on Disciplinary Matters relating to Statutory Officers (Part 3 Para 3.4.5 Constitution) that advises the Employment Committee, which makes recommendations to Full Council regarding any decision to dismiss a statutory officer.

2. Review

- 2.1** The period of tenure of the remaining Independent Person ended in July 2022. As the process of recruitment is complex, time consuming and expensive, it is considered the best use of resources in light of the imminent abolition of Selby District Council to continue the engagement with all three existing Independent Persons until 31 March 2023. All three have agreed to do so in the event that Council approves this.

3. Alternative Options Considered

- 3.1** The Council has a statutory duty to appoint at least one Independent Person and therefore could choose only to continue with one appointment.

Alternatively, the Council could seek arrangements with another Council to share its Independent Person. However, all three existing Independent Persons are willing to continue their appointments at Selby District Council and have also expressed an interest to get involved in the new North Yorkshire Council arrangements for dealing with standards if requested. All three have valuable experience and knowledge in standards matters, including parish councils and it is therefore in the best interests of the Council to retain these skills by formally appointing all three with immediate effect.

4. Implications

4.1 Legal Implications

The statutory requirements are set out in the report and have been met. Under Section 28(8)(c)(iii) of the Localism Act 2011, this decision must be agreed by a majority of the whole number of councillors.

4.2 Financial Implications

None

4.3 Policy and Risk Implications

None

4.4 Corporate Plan Implications

None

4.5 Resource Implications

None

4.6 Other Implications

None

4.7 Equalities Impact Assessment

The previous appointments followed an open recruitment process ensuring that the recommended candidates were selected on merit.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1** For the reasons outlined above it is proposed that the Council agrees the engagement of the Independent persons to continue until 31st March 2023.

6. Background Documents

Agenda for Council 18 July 2017 – Item 12

<https://democracy.selby.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?Committeeld=254&MeetingId=625&DF=18%2f07%2f2017&Ver=2>

The original recruitment documents relating to each of the Independent Persons contain personal information and as such are exempt under paragraph 1 of Schedule 12 A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended and it is not in the public interest to disclose those documents.

7. Appendices

None.

Contact Officer:

Alison Hartley, Monitoring Officer
ahartley@selby.gov.uk