

## North Yorkshire County Council

### Skipton and Ripon Area Constituency Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the Skipton and Ripon Area Constituency Committee held on 13 December 2018, commencing at 10.00 am, at Bishopside and Beweley Memorial Hall, Park Road, Pateley Bridge.

#### Present:-

County Councillors Margaret Atkinson, Mike Chambers MBE, Robert Heseltine, David Ireton, Stanley Lumley, Stuart Martin MBE, Patrick Mulligan, Gill Quinn, Andy Solloway and Richard Welch (Chairman).

County Council Officers: Daniel Harry (Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager), Hannah Bowles, Business Support, Andrew Bainbridge, Team Leader, Transport Planning, Highways and Transport, Rebecca Gibson, Senior Transport Planning Officer (Projects), Highways and Transport, Andrew Dixon, Strategic Planning Manager, Education and Skills.

Other: Sue Pitkethly, Director Accountable Care Airedale, Airedale Wharfedale and Craven Clinical Commissioning Group (AWC CCG), Colin Renwick, Executive GP, AWC CCG, Mike Dyson, Principle Construction Manager, NHS Property Services, Stacey Hunter, Chief Operating Officer, Airedale NHS Foundation Trust.

In attendance: County Councillors Carl Les, David Chance and Don Mackenzie.

There were approximately ten members of the public present.

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors Philip Barrett, Michael Harrison and Robert Windass.

---

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

---

#### **21. Introduction by the Chairman**

The Chairman, Cllr Richard Welch, welcomed members to the third meeting of the committee. He reminded all present that this was a county council committee meeting that was held in public and not a public meeting.

Cllr Richard Welch informed the committee that he would follow up with Highways on the petition that the former Craven Area Committee had received regarding the concerns about road safety at the junction off the Skipton by pass.

#### **22. Minutes of the Skipton and Ripon Area Constituency Committee Meeting held on 31 August 2018**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 31 August 2018 be taken as read and be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

Daniel Harry said that there had been one outstanding action from the last committee meeting, which was not being picked up on the agenda for today's meeting. Cllr

Stanley Lumley has advised that the candidate for the vacant seat on the Gouthwaite Reservoir Board of Management is Cllr. Ian Skaife, of Pateley Bridge Town Council.

### **23. Any Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Andy Solloway advised that, regarding item 6, he worked as a private tutor.

### **24. Public Questions or Statements**

There were the following public questions:

#### PQ1 - Malcolm Margolis, Harrogate District Friends of the Earth

This question was asked by Anne Proctor, on behalf of Malcolm Margolis, who was unable to attend the meeting.

Councillors, Ladies and Gentlemen

'The so-called relief road should be dropped – and dropped right now'. This is the message my colleagues and I have been giving for the last two years but in fact they are not our words but those of Andrew Jones, MP for Harrogate and Knaresborough, in his column in the Harrogate Advertiser on November 22nd, 3 weeks ago.

Why does our MP believe the road should not be included in a consultation? First he says the environmental damage would be unacceptable. To quote: 'The Nidd Gorge and the land surrounding it is a part of what makes our area special. It isn't an added extra that we can do without. It has high environmental value in itself and welcomes thousands of walkers, horse-riders and cyclists. How can a road which means crossing Forest Moor in Knaresborough even though it has many homes on it, bisecting Harrogate Golf Club, crossing somehow the Nidderdale Greenway and potentially the River Nidd outweigh the environmental value of that land?'

I believe unless you have experienced the wildlife and wonderful tranquillity of the Nidd Gorge and the Nidderdale Greenway you cannot appreciate why Andrew Jones is so strongly opposed to the road.

But he also doubts its effect on congestion. Quoting WSP's figures, he continues: 'Through traffic is seven per cent of all traffic. Would the effect of a relief road in that location really have such a dramatic effect on congestion as to be worth the environmental damage it would cause.?'

And he concludes: 'With the competing priorities for road funding across the United Kingdom would such a road really attract the national funding it would require in order to be built? The answer to all those questions is no. That is why I think the idea should be dropped – and dropped right now.'

Mr. Jones, who is a transport minister, is ideally placed to reach that conclusion. All but 2 of the local county councillors who have been involved in the congestion study since it was announced in 2016 oppose the road and agree with our MP who states: 'a package of measures under a sustainable transport heading is where progress lies.'

Cllrs Don Mackenzie and Michael Harrison have made their support for a road clear throughout the process. Andrew Jones' article may not have changed their view. Even so, surely it's time they accepted the inevitable. The road is not going to happen. WSP's report short-lists 26 sustainable measures such as park and ride, various public transport improvements, and promotion of walking and cycling. These are the issues on which the congestion review and any consultation now need to focus.

Cllr Richard Welch asked that Andrew Bainbridge respond once both of the questions that related to the Harrogate Congestion Study had been given.

Cllr Richard Welch also made a point of clarification relating to the first Public Question. He had received an email from Cllr Michael Harrison, who had given apologies for not being able to attend the meeting, which stated that he supported a public consultation on all of the options and not just a Harrogate relief road and bypass for Killinghall, as had been stated by Mr Margolis in his public question.

#### PQ2 – Rod Beardshall

I am here to present the view of Zero Carbon Harrogate, on the addendum to the Harrogate Congestion Review Options Assessment Report. It is important to consider this in the context of October's report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) which makes clear that we must all engage with cutting our carbon emissions at every decision making level. It is especially relevant to the congestion relief review, given that transport is one of the few sectors where carbon emissions are still increasing and the problem is especially acute in rural counties such as North Yorkshire. We need to limit global average temperature rise to 1.5C and to do this we need "rapid, far reaching and unprecedented changes in all aspects of society": a 45% reduction in carbon emissions by 2035 and zero by 2050. These dates are all within the timeframe of the transport choices being considered today. These targets represent our best chance of preventing unthinkable human suffering and the opportunity to create a viable climate resilient future for our children and grandchildren.

We are very pleased that the report focuses largely on sustainable methods of congestion relief that reduce our environmental impact, including our carbon footprint. These methods rely on making active travel (walking and cycling) safer and more inviting, and rebalancing the equation regarding cost and convenience to increase the attractiveness of public transport relative to private transport. Modest reductions in traffic volumes significantly reduce congestion so we can think of this as a process of evolution rather than revolution. The report recommends consulting the public on numerous possible sustainable solutions and we would wholeheartedly endorse this as an important step toward devising the most practical and cost effective package of measures.

The report also considers the possibility of a major new road as part of a package of measures. This would be by far the most costly and environmentally damaging of all the proposals. If it were to provide an effective solution, some may consider this acceptable, though possibly a minority. However, the proposal is doubly frustrating because it would be ineffective in its stated aim of congestion relief. The modestly positive, though far from compelling, Benefit Cost Ratios (BCRs) attributed to the road need to be put into context in order to expand on this opinion. In line with national guidelines many aspects of the environmental and social costs and benefits will not be considered until a later stage of the decision making process. It would seem inevitable that when loss of amenity and loss of environment is considered in due course, the true BCR is going to reduce. Even more significant but not even touched on by the report is the established phenomenon of induced traffic, whereby increased road capacity leads to increased overall traffic volumes. It won't take much additional traffic to render obsolete the calculated improvements in local journey times which are behind the overwhelmingly major part of the benefits applied to the BCR calculation.

Zero Carbon Harrogate is opposed to consulting on the option of a new road, largely because to do so would inevitably polarise opinion between those for and those against a road rather than help to encourage a mature debate about real, sustainable, solutions. We hope you take a similar view.

You will no doubt be aware of the strong opposition to a new road of those elected to represent the areas most affected by it, i.e. Andrew Jones MP and the Harrogate and

Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee. We ask that you support their position. We also ask you to ensure that should the option of a road be taken forward for public consultation, these views are clearly reflected by NYCC in any consultation material.

Andrew Bainbridge gave the following response to the two public questions that related to Harrogate Congestion Study:

#### Answer to public question 1

Thank you Mr Margolis for your comments. We are aware of the comments of Andrew Jones MP, from the article in the Harrogate Advertiser. The process we are undertaking, in developing options to address congestion relief in Harrogate, is well established and the arguments for considering a wide variety of options, are well rehearsed.

As members are aware the problem we are looking to address is the ongoing issue of congestion in Harrogate, and initial modelling has shown the relief road to be an effective approach to so doing. We do understand that any relief road will have an environmental impact and that this needs to be balanced against the congestion relief benefits. What we wish to be able to ask the wider public in Harrogate and Knaresborough is their views on whether, firstly they think any action should be taken, and if so, what form that might take.

#### Answer to public question 2

Thank you Mr Beardshall for your comments on behalf of Zero Carbon Harrogate, and more specifically on the measures suggested through the OAR addendum.

To clarify for Members the BCR's set out in the OAR are for the relief road in combination with sustainable transport measures and not for the relief road as a standalone measure. Without wishing to go into too much detail the BCR is just one element of the assessment of transport schemes and most of the social and environmental impacts are not included in the assessment of a BCR but are assessed separately. As such they are unlikely to have any impact on the BCR.

To clarify the situation with the Harrogate ACC. There was not a Member vote on the matter, they considered essentially the same report as you. The views of the Members are a matter of record and can be seen in the draft minutes but many Members, although having concerns about the relief road, supported the need to consult the public on the option.

I can also assure members that any consultation materials will clearly set out the wider benefits and costs of all the options within the packages and will be carefully developed to ensure a balanced approach.

#### PQ3 – Andrew Murday

North Yorkshire County Council is currently proposing drastic reductions to funding of educational provision for children who are excluded from mainstream schools.

These changes are driven by an ideology which puts budget before benefit and is symptomatic of conservative elected representatives both in local government and parliament.

There are seven Pupil Referral Units (PRU) in North Yorkshire. They are all recognised as either good or outstanding by OFSTED. These institutions provide life chances to children who would otherwise be left by the wayside. The PRU in Harrogate, The Grove Academy, takes children excluded from 11 secondary schools in North Yorkshire and is threatened with closure within the next few months, as is the Craven Pupil Referral Service in Skipton. It will be impossible for them to function with the

proposed cut in funding of at least 50% and probably as much as 66%. The alternative provision, such as virtual schooling, proposed by NYCC is clearly far inferior.

May I ask the council today if they will consider delaying this decision to allow for a fuller and proper public consultation and to allow the PRU's time to manage the drastic change to their financial circumstances?

In response to the third public question, Daniel Harry apologised to Mr Andrew Murday for not having a reply to his question at the meeting itself. He said that a reply would be sent by email as soon as possible after the meeting.

The response was received from Jane Le Sage, Assistant Director for Inclusion, Children and Young People's Services later on the day of the meeting. The response is as below:

#### Answer to public question 3

NYCC currently provides £2.7m of non-statutory High Needs Block funding to PRS and AP to work proactively with local schools to reduce exclusion, this is in addition to £1.9m of statutory funding. Despite this investment, exclusions are increasing rapidly and schools report regularly being unable to access support from the current PRS model early enough to prevent exclusion.

We recognise the Ofsted judgements of all PRS in North Yorkshire and have not sought to question the quality of provision. However we must recognise and respond to the challenge of increasing exclusions and stretched budgets by ensuring that young people can access support before, and not after, they are excluded from school and ensure that funding arrangements from the High Needs Block (HNB) are fair and equitable across a vast range of SEND provision.

Currently the national average cost for alternative provision is £18,000 per place. North Yorkshire's present funding arrangements are disproportionately higher than this national average. A full time place at The Grove Academy currently stands at around £48,000 per place. For the purposes of context, and to illustrate the disproportionate levels of funding, maintained SEMH special school provision funded from the HNB costs, on average, £19,769 per place.

The HNB is currently running at a projected deficit of £5.7m for this financial year. This level of deficit is unsustainable into the future. The proposed reduction in spend in relation to alternative provision for those who have been, or at risk of being, excluded is 29% and the proposals will give school leaders more scope to shape a system of support that can be accessed before exclusion.

Irrespective of the pressure on the HNB budget we would still be bringing forward these proposals to address the effectiveness of early intervention, the disparity of funding between PRS and other HNB funded provision and the role of local education leaders in shaping the AP offer in each locality.

The Council has undertaken extensive consultation in respect of the High Needs Budget proposals and has carried out a legal consultation. The LA is not of the view that there is a need for a second consultation on these principles.

Officers are currently fully considering those consultation responses prior to developing recommendations to propose to the Executive in January 2019.

All consultation feedback is under analysis.

## 25. Harrogate Congestion Study

Considered -

The report of Dave Bowe, Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services, North Yorkshire County Council on the Harrogate Congestion Study.

Daniel Harry stated that the intention was for the committee to comment on the draft Executive report. He said that members were not expected to come to a consensus or to pass a resolution as a committee. Instead, individual comments were sought, which would then be included in the report to Executive.

Andrew Bainbridge introduced the report and said that the report had also been considered by the Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Constituency Committee at their meeting on 8 November 2018. He went through the detail of the report explaining to committee members key aspects of the development of the options that were being considered. This included information about two packages which were emerging as the strongest:

- Package B – Demand management and behaviour change
- Package E(iii) – Highway operational improvement and sustainable transport, with urban realm improvements plus inner south relief road alignment without a link to Bilton Lane.

Andrew Bainbridge said that Executive will consider the report at their meeting on 15 January 2019. They will look at what options could be consulted upon and not what to adopt.

The Chairman then invited committee members to comment.

Cllr Mike Chambers MBE said that he had been chairman of the County Area Committee for the Harrogate District when the Congestion Study was being developed. He said that he supported measures that promoted sustainable transport but did not want to rule anything out at this stage as the issue was complex. Cllr Mike Chambers MBE said that he supported a full public debate and consultation that took into account all options so that an effective solution could be found.

Cllr David Ireton said that there needed to be a consultation on a range of issues for it to be meaningful.

Cllr Andy Solloway said that a key issue for people living in the Skipton and Ripon constituency was east-west connectivity as this was important for economic development and prosperity. What people in this area want may impact upon the people of Harrogate.

Cllr Stuart Martin MBE said that there should be a full consultation on options and that ruling out a consultation at this stage would not be democratic.

Cllr Margaret Atkinson said that any consultation would need to cover a large geographic area as changes to the flow of traffic in Harrogate would impact upon a much wider and largely rural area.

Cllr Patrick Mulligan said that there was a need to look at all options and to let the public have their say.

Cllr Stanley Lumley said that he agreed with the comments of his fellow committee members and that it would be wrong to discount anything at this stage.

Cllr Richard Welch queried whether the various road haulage professional bodies and associations would be consulted with.

In respond, Andrew Bainbridge confirmed that they would. Also, that the impact of any proposals upon local businesses would be considered.

**Resolved -**

- 1) That the comments made by committee members be included in the report to the County Council's Executive
- 2) If there is a public consultation on options, then the committee has an opportunity to submit a response.

**26. A59 Kex Gill Diversion and Coniston Aire Causeway – Progress Updates**

Considered – the report of Dave Bowe, Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services, North Yorkshire County Council on the Harrogate Congestion Study.

Rebecca Gibson, Senior Transport Planning Officer (Projects), Highways and Transport, introduced the report and highlighted the following issues in relation to the A59 Kex Gill diversion:

- Work on permanent repairs is ongoing. It will take longer than expected because ground conditions are more difficult than the original investigations indicated. As such, traffic signals will remain in operation over the Christmas period
- Executive approved the preferred route on 24 July 2018 and work is now progressing on the detailed design of the scheme
- The submission of the planning application is programmed for October 2019
- A draft Outline Business Case has been submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT)
- Construction of the new road is expected to commence in spring 2020 and may take about 16 months. It is anticipated that the new road could open in the summer of 2021.

Cllr Stanley Lumley said that good progress has been made with the realignment work and that there is widespread support for the new road.

Rebecca Gibson then gave an update on the recent repairs to the Coniston Aire Causeway and the proposal for improvements to the crossing:

- A report was previously brought to the meeting of the Skipton and Ripon Area Constituency Committee on 31 May 2018. At that meeting, the committee stated its support for Option 5, which is the construction of a multi-span causeway with an estimated cost of £9.5 million
- Design work is underway and a business case is being developed for submission to DfT, when funding becomes available
- The design work will take about 12 months. Land purchase and procurement could be completed within 18 months of getting the necessary funding. Construction of the new multi-span crossing could take about 12 months.

Cllr Richard Welch said that the new crossing would be welcomed as there were continual problems with damage to the bridge and the subsequent disruption caused by repair work.

Cllr David Ireton said that it was good to see progress being made as any diversion put in place was usually substantial.

Cllr Gill Quinn stated that local Parish Councils were particularly concerned about this issue and so progress was welcomed.

Cllr Andy Solloway said that key east-west routes needed to be improved and the traffic kept flowing.

#### **Resolved -**

- 1) To note the contents of the report
- 2) To come back to a future meeting of the committee with updates on the A59 Kex Gill Diversion and Coniston Aire Causeway.

### **27. Schools and educational achievement**

Considered – the report of Stuart Carlton, Corporate Director – Children and Young People’s Service on some of the factors affecting the short, medium and long term sustainability of schools in the Skipton and Ripon Area Constituency Committee area.

Andrew Dixon, Strategic Planning Manager, Education and Skills introduced the report and summarised the key aspects as follows:

- In the Skipton and Ripon area, there have been fewer primary school Academy conversions than the rest of the county (7% compared to 22%). The secondary school conversions are in line with the rest of the county
- In the area, 86.2% of primary schools are judged good or outstanding by Ofsted, which is above the region, but below the North Yorkshire and national benchmarks. 88.9% of secondary schools are judged good or outstanding, which is above all benchmarks
- Both primary and secondary attainment in the area is above all benchmarks
- Nearly 20% of LA maintained schools in the county are in deficit. That is projected to rise to nearly half by 2019/20 and two out of every three by March 2021
- On average, a secondary school in North Yorkshire received £4,897 per pupil in 2018-19 compared to £7,840 per pupil in Hackney
- There are 62 primary schools, 5 secondary schools, 2 special schools in the committee area
- By March 2019, it is projected that 13 schools will be in deficit (19% all schools in the area)
- Three key issues that affect the long term sustainability of school: falling pupil rolls; school standards; and financial difficulty.

Cllr Margaret Atkinson queried whether the closure of small rural schools and the subsequent transport of children to schools further afield led to an increase in costs that was similar to the savings made by closing the school. If that was the case, then there was a strong argument for keeping the schools open.

In response, Andrew Dixon said that there were significant transport costs but that these were relatively low compared to the ongoing costs of running a school.

Cllr Andy Solloway said that parental choice had distorted things. Also, that often children were placed at schools that suited parental access to work and child care, as opposed to the performance of quality of the schools themselves.

Cllr Richard Welch noted that there were only a limited number of companies that were willing to provide home to school transport in the area.

Cllr Robert Heseltine raised his concerns that the national funding formula for schools had not been reviewed by the government. Rural areas continued to lose out and as a result there was a managed decline of school funding in the area.

Cllr Robert Heseltine asked whether more work needed to be done with the district councils regarding planning school capacity increases in line with increases in housing stock.

In response, Andrew Dixon said that the County Council worked closely with the district councils to plan school places. He said that an increase in housing stock did not always mean that there was going to be a significant increase in the number of children in the area.

Cllr Stanley Lumley noted that federation of small rural schools can help to manage the impact of falling roll numbers. Also, that where pupils with complex needs or challenging behaviour are not adequately supported, then they can impact upon the performance of the school and so impact upon the number of children being admitted to that school.

Cllr David Ireton queried why the projected deficits, in section 4.4 of the report, for secondary schools were unchanged 2018/19 over the period 2020/21 whilst over the same period the deficits for primary schools increased threefold.

Andrew Dixon said that he would check the data and contact Cllr David Ireton outside of the meeting.

Cllr Stuart Martin said that a maintained school that has a deficit and which becomes an academy leaves the deficit with the local authority. He said that this was unfair and should be challenged.

Cllr Patrick Mulligan said that it was important to note that although there were challenges associated with managing schools in rural areas, the standard of education was high with large numbers of OFSTED judged good or outstanding schools. He said that he was concerned that there were times when a failing school was forced to become an academy but could not find a sponsor. In such circumstances, the school often closed and the County Council was unable to intervene.

Cllr David Ireton asked whether more could be done to maximise the contributions to school infrastructure made by housing developers.

Andrew Dixon replied that a lot of work was done with housing developers to look at what infrastructure was needed in the local area and what could be done to support school growth and development. He noted that in cases where Community Infrastructure Levy arrangements were in place, it could be more difficult to channel funding into specific uses.

#### **Resolved -**

- 1) To note the contents of the report.
- 2) To provide an update on the factors affecting the long term sustainability of schools in the area in the next 6 to 9 months.

#### **28. Castleberg Community Hospital, Giggleswick**

Considered – the report of Sue Pitkethly, Director Accountable Care Airedale, Airedale Wharfedale and Craven Clinical Commissioning Group providing a summary of the current position with regard to the development of the Castleberg Community Hospital.

Sue Pitkethly introduced the report and provided an update, as summarised below:

- A 'mobalisation group' has been established to oversee the development of the hospital. The group meets bi-weekly and includes representatives of the providers of the service, NHS Property Services, Morecambe Bay CCG and Airedale, Wharfedale and Craven CCG
- Architects' plans have been drawn up and the ground floor will see: private ensuite facilities for people nearing the end of life and those needing palliative care; a separate family room and treatment room; and improved access to the ground floor for people with disabilities
- The intention is to make the first floor available for use by community groups. This could also be developed as a hub for the delivery of a range of health and social care services
- The use of the first floor is potentially limited due to the access only being by stairs. It is estimated that an external lift may cost in the region of £80,000 and would be subject to planning permission. The NHS locally cannot fund the installation of a lift
- It is anticipated that the refurbished hospital will open in May 2019. The second survey that had been undertaken revealed a number of issues associated with the site being vacant for 12 months.

Cllr Richard Welch asked a number of questions that had been suggested to him by the Chair of North Craven Health and Wellbeing Group (formerly Castleberg Steering Group):

- 1) The statement made by the CCG after the initial consultation was to avoid replacing like with like, and instead develop an exciting 'Castleberg Plus' in partnership with the community. The expectation seems to be that it is up to the community to make 'Castleberg Plus' a reality. Why is practical and financial support being withheld by the CCG?
- 2) What steps are being taken by the CCG to fully involve the local community in decision making in relation to the future use of Castleberg Hospital?
- 3) What is the position of NYCC Social Services in relation to the use of space at the Castleberg Hospital?

In response, Sue Pitkethly gave the following replies:

- 1) The Craven Community First Group is inclusive and enables the community to engage in the planning and development of the new hospital. All ideas and suggestions are welcomed and investigated but we have to keep within the financial envelope.
- 2) The Craven Community First Group is heavily involved, as previously stated, and the CCG is happy to talk to anyone who has an interest in the development of the hospital.
- 3) There has been a meeting between the CCG, Airedale NHS FT and NYCC Health and Adult Services to explore what opportunities there are to run a joint service from the hospital.

Cllr David Ireton queried whether the May 2019 date for opening the hospital was reasonable and achievable, as he did not want to see people's hopes raised falsely.

Sue Pitkethly said that the work was on track at present and so May 2019 was achievable.

Cllr Richard Welch noted that there had been hopes in the community that the vacant Settle Middle School site could be developed for the provision of a number of other services. He had learned, however, that there was not sufficient capital funding

available to support any significant development, such as a health and wellbeing hub or a new GP surgery as had previously been suggested.

Cllr Richard Welch asked Daniel Harry to circulate to committee members a copy of the briefing note that had been provided by Jon Holden, Head of Property Service, North Yorkshire County Council.

Daniel Harry asked whether there were any lessons that had been learned from the management of the Castleberg Hospital and its redevelopment that could be shared with other commissioners and providers. He noted that there were a number of small, community hospitals in North Yorkshire that may experience difficulties in the future.

Stacey Hunter, Chief Operating Officer, Airedale NHS Foundation Trust said that the Rt Hon Julian Smith MP had been interested in what was happening with the Castleberg Hospital.

**Resolved -**

- 1) To note the contents of the report.
- 2) To provide updates on the progress and to attend the meeting of the committee at 10am on 30 May 2019.

**29. Skipton and Ripon Area Constituency Committee Work Programme**

Considered - the report of Daniel Harry, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager on the committee work programme.

Daniel Harry introduced the report outlining those items for scrutiny that had been scheduled for the next two committee meetings. He invited members to comment on the work programme and make suggestions for additional items to be included.

A number of areas were identified that could be researched further before inclusion in the work programme:

- What is the impact of public sector recruitment problems upon the sustainability of services and quality of life in the local area? Of specific concern were NHS and teaching recruitment shortages.
- What is being done to develop the digital economy in rural areas?

There was a discussion about the venue for the next meeting of the committee. It was decided to hold the meeting in Ripon. Subsequent meetings to be held in Settle and Skipton.

**Resolved -**

- 1) Daniel Harry to update the committee work programme and develop the lines of inquiry that had been identified by members
- 2) Daniel Harry to review the agenda for the committee meeting 14 March 2019.

**30. Other business which the Chairman agrees should be considered as a matter of urgency because of special circumstances**

There were no items of other business.

The meeting concluded at 11.55am

DH