

## North Yorkshire County Council

### Selby Area Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the Selby Area Committee held at Selby Civic Centre on 12 June 2017 at 6.00 pm.

**Present:-**

**Members:-**

County Councillors Karl Arthur, Stephanie Duckett, Mel Hobson, Mike Jordan, Andrew Lee, John McCartney, Don Mackay, Richard Musgrave and Chris Pearson.

Apologies for absence were submitted by County Councillor Cliff Lunn.

**In attendance:-**

Jackie Dawson (Legal and Democratic Services), Ian Fielding (Assistant Director, Transport, Waste and Countryside Services), David Dryburgh (North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service), Marie-Ann Jackson (Head of Stronger Communities), Tom Jenkinson (Stronger Communities Delivery Manager - Selby), Steve Loach (Democratic Services), Catherine Maudsley (Democratic Services), Nigel Smith (Area Highways Manager) and Janet Waggott (Chief Executive – Selby District Council/Assistant Chief Executive – North Yorkshire County Council).

There were ten members of the public in attendance.

**1. Appointment of Chairman**

**Resolved -**

That County Councillor Richard Musgrave be appointed Chairman of the Selby Area Committee until the meeting following the Annual Meeting of the County Council scheduled for May 2018.

---

**County Councillor Richard Musgrave in the Chair**

---

**2. Minutes**

**Resolved -**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2017, having been previously circulated, be taken as read and confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

---

**Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book**

---

### **3. Appointment of Vice-Chairman**

#### **Resolved -**

That County Councillor Karl Arthur be appointed Vice-Chairman of Selby Area Committee until the meeting following the Annual Meeting of the County Council scheduled for May 2018.

### **4. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made at this stage of the meeting.

### **5. Public Questions or Statements**

Rita Stephenson attended the meeting, further to her previous attendances on this matter, to reiterate her concerns in respect of the bus services for Fairburn and Byram. She considered that the situation had worsened and outlined an incident that had occurred in Pontefract Bus Station which had resulted in an altercation between the bus operator's owner, security personnel and an old gentleman from that area, resulting in the old gentleman being banned from using the bus services in future. She stated that the bus company owner had been abusive towards the older gentleman and had used threatening language. She also considered that the bus services were not operating in accordance with the timetable, that the service to Fairburn and Byram had got worse and that older people without their own transport in those areas were unable to access services due to the situation. She asked whether anything could be done by the Area Committee to rectify the situation.

County Councillor Chris Pearson, who had been attempting to mediate on this issue, noted that he had been given an alternative version of the events, outlined by the public questioner, from the bus operator's owner and had been informed that the old gentleman in question had been highly abusive during the incident. He had also been told that the bus service that operated every two hours to Fairburn was operating according to the timetable and, due to that, no additional services could be offered through NYCC grant subsidy, as an appropriate commercial service was in place. The public questioner emphasised that the timetable was correct however the bus service was not always operating in accordance with that.

A Member noted that, at the previous meeting, the bus operator's owner had agreed to hold a meeting with local residents and community representatives with a view to finding a suitable solution to the concerns raised and he asked whether that meeting had taken place. In response the local Member stated that, having spoken to the company owner, he had been informed that there was no point in holding the meeting as there was nothing that the company could do in terms of providing additional bus services as these already operated to the timetable that was in place.

In relation to this Members raised concerns that assurances had been given that the meeting outlined would take place, with a view to determining whether a solution could be provided, and considered it disingenuous that the operator's owner was now saying that he would not take part in this. It was asked, therefore, that the operator's owner be contacted with a view to the meeting, as arranged through the Area Committee at its meeting on 13 March 2017, taking place, as detailed, as soon as possible.

Members agreed that the course of action outlined should be undertaken to address the situation.

## 6. Introductory Information for Members

Considered -

The report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) that provided advice on how the Committee had previously decided to operate and gave details on the working practices of the Area Committee.

Information within the report included:-

- ◆ The role of the Area Committee.
- ◆ Executive decisions.
- ◆ Public questions and/or statements.
- ◆ Reports on service updates.
- ◆ Requesting agenda items for Members.
- ◆ Proceedings.
- ◆ Time management of the meeting.
- ◆ Declarations of interest.
- ◆ Publicity.

The Clerk highlighted, in particular, how Members were able to place items on the agenda for future meetings, allowing information to be provided in relation to those issues. He also noted that the previous Area Committee had adopted a refreshed style of meetings which allowed significant local issues to be considered, in depth, with the Area Committee undertaking an investigative style of questioning with invited representatives culminating in recommendations for a way forward on these matters being developed for the Selby area.

A Member of the public, and former County Councillor, commented on the way forward for the Area Committee, noting the changed style that had been introduced by the previous Committee and suggesting that there may be an opportunity to reconsider how the Committee approached issues, taking account of, in particular, the “Better Together” initiative. He considered that there was a need to have a full and frank discussion with the local communities to determine their perception of their relationship with the Area Committee and how that could move forward. He considered that the beginning of the new County Council provided an opportunity to have those discussions and determine how the Area Committee could be developed from there. He considered that the time was appropriate to review the constraints of the Area Committee, look how decisions could be devolved to the body and determine how it operated alongside the “Better Together” initiative with a closer involvement of the District Council. As an example he noted that, currently, County Councillors could be included in the decision-making process on the District Council’s Community Engagement Forums, however, representatives other than the County Councillors were unable to take part in any vote on issues at the Area Committee.

A Member considered that the new arrangements, put in place by the previous Committee, were appropriate and would not like any further changes to be made at this stage. He suggested that details of what should be considered, using that operating style, could be debated during the work programme item later in the meeting, with a view to prioritising issues for consideration by the Committee.

Another Member, who had formerly been a Co-opted Member of the Committee, stated that she accepted at the time that she had no vote, was satisfied with her role and considered that she was fully involved with the Committee. She also considered that the arrangements worked well and would not want to change those again at this stage.

The Chairman acknowledged the issues raised, noting the challenges ahead for the Area Committee and the relationships being developed through the “Better Together” initiative. He considered that the role of the Area Committee provided it with the scope to take a lead role in that initiative.

**Resolved -**

That the report be noted.

**7. Appointments to Outside Bodies**

Considered -

The report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) requesting Members to identify the appointment to outside bodies to be made by this Area Committee under the County Council’s Constitution and providing an opportunity for those appointments to be made.

A Member suggested that it was appropriate that the Area Committee was provided with updates, and occasional reports, on the work of the outside bodies to which appointments were made. Members agreed to do this on an annual basis, and some information was provided, by Members, as to the history and work undertaken by the outside bodies listed.

**Resolved -**

- (i) That the following appointments be made to Category 2 outside bodies, each to serve until the date of the County Council elections in 2021:-

National Coal Mining Museum for England Liaison Committee - County Councillor Mel Hobson

Safer Selby Local Delivery Team - County Councillor Stephanie Duckett

Selby District Association for Voluntary Services - County Councillor Karl Arthur

- (ii) That the following appointments be made to Category 3 outside bodies, each to serve until the date of the County Council elections in 2021:-

Edward Atkinson Charity (Camblesforth) - County Councillor Mike Jordan

Mary Waud Foundation (Cliffe School Charity) - County Councillor Mike Jordan

Oglethorpe and Dawson Educational Foundation - Mrs J Marshall, County Councillor Don Mackay and a further nomination to be submitted to a subsequent meeting of the Committee

St John’s Catholic School for the Deaf, Boston Spa - County Councillor Mel Hobson

Wistow Church of England School Charity - County Councillor Andrew Lee

Cridling Stubbs Educational Charity - County Councillor John McCartney

## **8. Membership of the Area Committee - Appointment of Co-opted Members**

Considered -

The report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) inviting the Area Committee to identify organisations from whom it wished to seek nominations for appointment as Co-opted Members.

Details of the previous Co-opted Membership and the nominations and appointment processes were provided.

Noting the potential of future developments for the Committee, as discussed earlier, a Member suggested that the appointment of Co-opted Members be deferred to ensure that the appointed Co-opted Members correlated with the Committee's vision. Another Member suggested that the previous structure for Co-opted Members had worked well for the Committee and that there was no reason to make alterations to that.

There were a number of suggestions made as to the structure for Co-opted Members, including retaining the current structure, altering the numbers within that structure and reducing the number of Co-opted Members that could serve on the Committee. In view of the mixed views on the structure for Co-opted Members representation it was suggested that this be put in place for one year, initially, to determine how the Area Committee was moving forward, enabling the structure of Co-opted Member representation to be altered in line with that, if necessary.

**Resolved -**

- (i) That the following recommendations are forwarded for approval at the meeting of the full County Council on 19 July 2017.
- (ii) That the following seats be created for Co-opted Members on Selby Area Committee, initially for one year, until the meeting following the Annual Meeting of the County Council scheduled for May 2018, subject to each Co-opted Member continuing to be eligible to represent their nominating body:
  - (a) Four elected Members nominated by Selby District Council.
  - (b) Two Parish Council representatives representing the north and south of the District, as outlined in the report, with any related ballots organised by Legal and Democratic Services.
  - (c) One representative nominated by the Voluntary Sector.

## **9. North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service - Community Safety Update**

Considered -

The report of Group Manager David Dryburgh, North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service, informing the Committee of the community safety initiatives undertaken by North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service since his previous report.

For the benefit of new Members and as an update for returning Members, the Group Manager provided an overview of North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service and how the Selby area related to that.

He provided details of area cover and District cover, together with the number of incidents across the area and within the District.

The Group Manager outlined the details within the report highlighting the community safety activity that had been undertaken in the Selby District and highlighting the following:-

- ◆ Efforts being made to identify and protect the most vulnerable in local communities.
- ◆ The focus for 2017/18 on water safety in York and Selby through the Water Safety Forum.
- ◆ The use of temporary sprinkler systems for the most vulnerable, to ensure that they were protected, and details of how those requiring that system were identified.
- ◆ An update on the introduction of the Technical Response Vehicle (TRV) at Tadcaster was provided. It was noted that, at present, there had been 276 deployments of the vehicle, which was crewed by three firefighters presently, with consideration being given to moving this to two firefighters. It was stated that there had been no significant issues reported in terms of a detrimental impact on public safety from its introduction. It was also noted that there had been an impact on training in relation to the deployment of this vehicle due to an ongoing dispute between the FBU and management.
- ◆ An ongoing issue for the area was in relation to the recruitment and retention of firefighters, and although the fire station had a full complement of retained staff currently, there were particular problems at Tadcaster.

Following the initial report a number of issues and points were raised as follows:-

- ◆ The issues around the difficulty in recruiting and retaining firefighters were discussed and it was noted that appointments were being made to try and address this situation. The main issue in relation to this was availability, with many people working outside local communities and people being less willing to commit to being a firefighter.
- ◆ A Member referred to the water safety issue and noted that a recent submission to a local Town Council had indicated that lifebelts/buoyancy aids were being removed from appropriate places and then not replaced. She asked whether, as part of the water safety initiative, there would be visits to schools and youth groups with a view to preventing these life-saving resources from being removed and/or vandalised. In response the Group Manager stated that a review was being developed in July 2017 and he would ensure that reference to this matter was included within that. He noted that these difficulties had arisen in other areas and that some of those areas had initiated locked cabinets for the lifebelts, with instructions providing a telephone number to contact, whereby a security code could be obtained to gain access to the lifebelt. He considered that there were other issues to be addressed in relation to the response to this issue.
- ◆ A Member noted the issues raised by the Group Manager in relation to the implementation of the TRV, and noting that there had been no impact to public safety, asked whether the changes had brought about savings for the Fire Authority. In response the Group Manager stated that the efficiencies created related to less personnel being situated on the TRV than on a full sized appliance. He noted that the TRV was able to bring enhanced equipment to incidents and gain access much more easily. He emphasised that reducing risk was the most significant factor to introducing the TRV rather than saving money. In relation to this response a Member considered that although there had been no impact on public safety, through the introduction of the TRV, there had been an impact on staff, with reduced numbers required because of less personnel being needed to serve on the TRV. He also noted that the FBU were concerned regarding the safety of firefighters because of less staff attending incidents. He emphasised the need to not reduce the number further, through

the exercise taking place in relation to numbers on the TRV and suggested that this issue could be directly related to the problems in recruiting firefighters. In response the Group Manager again emphasised that Tadcaster had a full complement of retained firefighters and did not believe that the issues around the TRV were affecting recruitment. It was noted that incidents were responded to by the same appliances used previously, with the TRV in addition to those and that a full sized appliance would always attend an incident. A Member suggested that the TRV was designed to arrive eight minutes before other appliances at the scene of incidents and considered that this could be contributing to the recruitment issues. In response the Group Manager emphasised that the TRV was designed to arrive as first response to incidents, but would not be eight minutes in advance of other response vehicles. He emphasised that the recruitment issues would be addressed through initiatives being undertaken. He also noted that, currently, the TRV was not arriving at incidents first due to the dispute between the FBU and the Fire and Rescue Service.

#### **Resolved -**

That the activities that had taken place, outlined within the report, and the updates provided, be noted.

#### **10. Stronger Communities Progress Report**

Considered -

The report of the Stronger Communities Delivery Manager (Selby), together with the Manager of the Stronger Communities Programme, who provided a brief overview of the full programme and an update on progress made within the Stronger Communities Programme in the Selby district.

Tom Jenkinson (Stronger Communities Delivery Manager Selby) and Marie-Ann Jackson (Manager Stronger Communities Programme) presented the reports to Members.

The Manager of the Programme provided an overview of how this operated, for the benefit of new Members, and as a reminder to returning Members. She noted that the Stronger Communities Programme had been introduced around 2½ years ago as part of the County Council's 2020 Programme and regular progress reports were submitted to the Area Committee. The aim of the Programme was to support communities in playing a greater role in delivering services in the county. The team worked with local residents, community groups and other partners from the public and private sector, across North Yorkshire, identifying opportunities to co-produce a range of local support and services within local communities.

The four initial priorities for the programme were:

- ◆ Libraries.
- ◆ Universal services for children and young people.
- ◆ Community transport.
- ◆ Some services for older people and adults.

A number of projects that had been developed, through the Programme, on a countywide strategic basis, were outlined in section 6 of the report it was noted that these would benefit local communities in the Selby district.

Details of the new Investment Strategy, the Stronger Communities Investment Prospectus, were detailed, with three new approaches to stronger communities' support which would assist local communities to inspire, achieve and innovate.

The local Delivery Manager provided an update on the development of local projects.

He noted that, initially, the Selby Stronger Communities Programme had developed slower than some of the other districts, however, many more groups had come forward for assistance, leading to a substantial increase in the amount of funding coming into the area.

Specifically he outlined the following:-

- ◆ A volunteer development programme for Tadcaster Library.
- ◆ A grant of £10k to the Kirk and Little Smeaton Development Group for the development of their Parish Hall facilities, through an approach to Awards for All and Lottery funding. It was noted that the Stronger Communities Programme had enabled them to access these grant funding regimes and further opportunities, for other groups, would be developed to attract funding to the area, in future.

#### **Resolved -**

That the overview, the contents of the report and updates be noted.

#### **11. Public Rights of Way - A New Approach to categorising the Public Rights of Way Network**

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services highlighting the following:-

- (i) presenting a set of draft proposals relating to the categorisation of the Public Rights of Way (PROW) Network;
- (ii) reporting the results of a public consultation carried out on the draft proposals and discussing key issues raised by the consultation respondents; and
- (iii) requesting the Area Committee to note the consultation responses and to comment on the services suggested responses to the consultation.

Ian Fielding, Assistant Director, Transport, Waste and Countryside Services, provided details of the review noting that this was a consequence of making the service more efficient due to reduced funding levels. Details of the scope for the review were set out in the report and it was noted that each of the key areas were progressed separately.

The draft proposals for the service had been discussed within the County Council and had also been subject to discussion at the Local Access Forum.

Some work had been carried out, in relation to the re-development of the service, with local stakeholders, prior to the public consultation.

The public consultation sought a wide range of views to determine how to move forward on the proposals. These included categorising routes and rights of way. A number of documents, including maps, were prepared to assist with the consultation.



There had been 307 on-line responses and 31 written responses as a result of the consultation process. The outcomes of that process were provided in detail within the report. Mr Fielding noted that, in general, the proposals for the development of the service were supported, with a number of issues and exceptions to that outlined in full in the report. He highlighted the following:-

- ◆ Individual comments were collated and provided within the report and it was noted that there were some issues of principle and suggested amendments contained within those.
- ◆ Details on engagement with parishes, or user groups, to measure community value, were included.
- ◆ An issue to consider for the Area Committee was whether higher use routes should be given a higher priority in terms of the resources focused on these.
- ◆ A principle relating to the designation of routes, similar to the classification of highway routes, had been consulted upon and there had been significant objection from some user groups. Details of all responses were provided.
- ◆ It was noted that amendments had been made to the proposals based on the views submitted through the consultation exercise.
- ◆ Further work was to be carried out in relation to the community value and how to implement work alongside Parish Councils.
- ◆ He acknowledged that the report was complex and comprehensive but emphasised the importance of this in terms of it setting out the principle of future service delivery and the mechanism of how that was carried out.
- ◆ The report, together with comments from the various Area Committees, would be submitted to Executive Members with a view to implementing the new service delivery mechanism as soon as possible.

Following the initial presentation a number of issues and points were raised as follows:-

- ◆ A Member noted that some of the local parish councils were frustrated with the approach to Public Rights of Way. He provided an example of a road which had become a track, in his area, but attempts to provide maintenance to that, following it having become rutted, had resulted in the Parish Council being informed that they could not carry out those improvements, but neither would NYCC. Mr Fielding stated that if the Member would like to make him aware of the exact details in relation to this issue he would advise as to whether this was the responsibility of Highways or Public Rights of Way, to undertake the maintenance.
- ◆ A Member enquired as to the responsibility for the maintenance of Public Rights of Way, particularly in the more urban areas, when building had taken place alongside the route. Mr Fielding stated that it was dependent upon what type of right of way this was and whether a maintenance agreement was in place. If the developer had a maintenance agreement then it would be for them to carry out maintenance, otherwise it was likely to be the responsibility of NYCC.
- ◆ A Member referred to an issue in his own area where a Public Right of Way had been blocked by a gravestone and he had raised the question as to what could be done about this. He noted that, during his investigation into this matter he considered the categorisation of the right of way to be somewhat strange

and welcomed the consideration being given to the re-categorisation process. He suggested that the possibility of Parish Councils and Stronger Communities working together to maintain and develop Public Rights of Way should be investigated and, in general, welcomed the report as it highlighted the structure for rights of way and the need to maintain those and keep them open. In response Mr Fielding welcomed the Member's comments and the suggestion of developing a parish and user group in response to the development of Public Rights of Way, through Stronger Communities believing that this would be beneficial to the co-ordination of that.

- ◆ A Member referred to a Public Right of Way being interrupted by a farmer ploughing across it and then it not being reinstated. He asked whether there was a time limit for the reinstatement to take place. In response Mr Fielding stated that ploughing and cropping issues were considered as part of the review and the service was looking to create an improved response in relation to these matters through the review process. He emphasised that efforts were made to ensure that a right of way was reinstated as quickly as possible in such circumstances and noted that when this related to a higher category right of way then enforcement action could be instigated to ensure this was done more quickly.

#### **Resolved -**

- (i) That the views and the comments of those who responded to the consultation be noted.
- (ii) That the service's response to the themes from supplementary comments as set out in the tables within the report be noted.
- (iii) That the service's suggested response to the consultation, as set out in the report, be agreed and the comments of the Area Committee, as detailed above, be taken account of in that response.

## **12. Highways Update**

The Area Highways Manager, Nigel Smith, provided an oral update, highlighting the following:-

- ◆ The programme of work for the 2017/18 financial year was now in place and was being implemented.
- ◆ The surface dressing programme had been completed.
- ◆ The usual highway maintenance was underway based on the Highway Safety Inspection Manual.
- ◆ There had been a successful collaboration between NYCC and Selby District Council in respect of the Tour de Yorkshire cycle race which started on Tadcaster Bridge and travelled through the Selby district.
- ◆ There had been a number of issues arising from the temporary lights in place in relation to the strengthening of Cawood Bridge. A number of people were jumping the red lights which was creating significant disruption, as this reset the timing of the lights, therefore, leafleting and signage had been put in place to raise awareness on this matter. It was noted that every effort was being made to complete the works on the bridge by 3 September 2017 in line with an event that was taking place.

- ◆ The final phase of the Selby Bypass repairs was currently out to tender, and it was hoped that this would commence around 4 August for a 12 week period, dependent upon the weather. It was acknowledged that there would be an overlap with the closure of Cawood Bridge and the Area Highways Manager emphasised that there had been extensive discussions in relation to this. He noted, however, that it had been concluded that the repairs could not be deferred any further as the surface had deteriorated to such an extent that it could become problematic in the winter should the repairs not be delivered. He emphasised that the aim was to ensure that the entire length of the bypass was at a good level of repair.
- ◆ The service had been reviewing winter maintenance provision and it was noted that the aim was to complete Priority 1 routes as quickly as possible, the intention being by 7 am, and then concentrate on Priority 2 routes with a view to ensuring that road users could get to work as safely as possible.
- ◆ Highways continued to work with Selby District Council on the Better Together initiative, with regular meetings taking place, with a view to developing and strengthening relationships. It was noted that Building Services officers from the District Council were co-located with Area Highways Officers in the Area Office, which was of great assistance in sharing knowledge and information.
- ◆ He emphasised that for local issues of concern it was more advantageous for Members to raise these with the Area Office, between meetings, rather than wait to raise these at Area Committee meetings. This would assist in either addressing the issue directly or in allowing a detailed report to be submitted to the next Area Committee meeting.
- ◆ In relation to the formal meetings held between Members and officers in the Area Highways Office, it was asked whether Members would prefer group sessions, with all Members, or to undertake these on a 1-1 basis. It was emphasised that this related to the formal meetings only and the informal drop-ins could continue as at present.

Following the presentation a number of issues and points were raised as follows:-

- ◆ In response to the issue raised by the Area Highways Manager regarding formal meetings between Area Highways Officers and Members, a number of suggestions were provided and the Area Highways Manager stated that he was happy to accommodate the specific wishes of Members in relation to those.
- ◆ Issues relating to the overlap of the closure of the Selby Bypass and Cawood Bridge were discussed and Members emphasised that careful planning would be required to minimise the disruption caused and to avoid large amounts of queuing traffic throughout the district. The Area Highways Manager stated that there was no intention to carry out other repairs during that time in an attempt to minimise disruption and waiting times. A Member stated that other services, such as utilities, could cause highways disruption during that time and emphasised the need to try and avoid that where possible. It was clarified that the work on the Selby Bypass was expected to commence on 4 August for 12 weeks, with the work on Cawood Bridge due to finish by 2 September. The Area Highways Manager stated that he would work alongside the utility companies to try and ensure that as little disruption as possible took place, during that time.

- ◆ A Member raised concerns regarding the increase in traffic around the Sherburn Industrial Estate noting that traffic movement was getting more difficult and asked what was being considered to alleviate that. A Member noted that he was aware that a scheme had been agreed for re-routing, to be developed through planning contribution, but it was noted that this had not yet taken place. In response to the issue, the Area Highways Manager stated that he did not have the information in relation to this matter available at the meeting, but would provide an update in a post meeting note.
- ◆ A Member noted that previously a build out had been recommended for Wistow Moor, but this was yet to take place. The Area Highways Manager stated that he would follow this issue up and provide details to the Member as to what progress was being made on this.
- ◆ The Chairman asked why the Area Highways Manager submitted a verbal update to the Committee. The Area Highways Manager explained that this allowed for the most up-to-date information to be provided to Members and also saved on officer time in relation to the production of a written report. The Chairman emphasised the need for Members to raise specific highways issues with the Area Highways Officers outside of the Area Committee meeting to ensure that these matters could be addressed in a timely manner.
- ◆ A Member raised concerns regarding the lack of removal of loose chippings when the top dressing of roads had taken place, noting that he had received a lot of complaints in relation to this. In response the Area Highways Manager emphasised that an extensive information programme was in place in respect of road users encountering loose chippings, following road surface dressing, both through leaflets and signage and considered this to be appropriate, giving information as to what the road users would encounter where this had taken place. He stated that, where possible, efforts were made to prevent loose chippings from occurring.
- ◆ A member of the public raised concerns regarding recent surface dressing works at Brayton Crossroads, noting that the chippings had nearly all disappeared, leaving exposed tarmac which was being rutted up by heavy vehicles gaining access to the nearby building sites. The Area Highways Manager stated that he would investigate this matter.

#### **Resolved -**

That the update and issues raised be noted, with any action outlined undertaken accordingly.

### **13. Work Programme**

Considered -

The report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) presenting details of a potential future work programme and inviting Members to comment, amend and/or suggest additional items to be included.

Members raised the following issues and points:-

- ◆ It was noted that there were major housing and employment developments taking place within the Selby district, more than any other area in North Yorkshire, however, there were no plans for additional road building and it was suggested that there was a need to address this matter. It was considered

important that road infrastructure was approached in a co-ordinated manner and that the Area Committee received reports as to how this was being addressed.

- ◆ A Member noted that the Fire and Rescue Service provided regular updates to the Area Committee and it was asked whether the Police provided the same. In response it was noted that the Chief Superintendent and the Police and Crime Commissioner had attended recent meetings of the Area Committee and were happy to return to provide an annual update. Should specific issues arise that required discussion at the Area Committee then representatives of North Yorkshire Police would be invited to attend.
- ◆ A Member of the public, and former County Councillor, suggested that the Economic Development Strategies for both Selby District Council and North Yorkshire County Council, linked by the Better Together initiative and how they impinged on improved infrastructure in the area, were issues that should be discussed by the Area Committee as part of its work programme. Issues around traffic, the development of appropriate skills for emerging employment opportunities, engagement with the LEPs, the provision of Superfast Broadband and other related matters were all issues that could be considered under this heading, through the Area Committee.
- ◆ Members noted that, at the recent County Council meeting, the Leader of the Council had referred to a proposed development of Area Committees and consideration being given to the provision of additional Executive powers. It was considered appropriate that further consideration of the work programme be undertaken once that position had been clarified and evaluated.
- ◆ The Chairman stated that he would like the Area Committee to deal with some of the major strategic issues in the Selby area and would look to develop a work programme based on that, going forward.
- ◆ A Member agreed that the issues around economic development, infrastructure projects and the involvement of the LEPs were priority matters for the Area Committee, from the list provided. He also noted the potential for bringing together the District Councils CEFs and the Area Committee and suggested that consideration should be given to that in terms of savings that could be made by avoiding duplication.

**Resolved -**

- (i) That the report be noted.
- (ii) That the priorities identified be developed into the future work programme.
- (iii) That further work be undertaken in developing an appropriate work programme for the Area Committee, taking account of the review to be undertaken by the County Council in relation to the powers afforded to Area Committees.

The meeting concluded at 8 pm.

SL/JR