

CLOUGHTON PARISH COUNCIL

Mrs J. Marley, Clerk to the Parish Council,
Annan, 41 Scalby Road, Burniston, Scarborough, YO13 0HN
Tel. 01723-870299
Email: clerk@cloughton-pc.gov.uk

PARISH COUNCIL MEETING St. Mary's Church Hall Monday 6th October 2025 at 7.30pm Parishioners welcome to attend

AGENDA

All declarations of interest in agenda items to be made by the member, in writing, on the form provided. If unsure - DO NOT WAIT TILL THE MEETING - please contact the Clerk on receipt of the agenda.

1. To receive apologies for absence given in advance of the meeting.
2. To consider the approval of reasons given for absence.
3. To receive member's declarations of interest in items of business on this agenda.
4. Minutes of Council meeting of 1st September 2025 [*enclosed*] to approve and sign.
5. Public Open Forum.
6. To consider & agree action as appropriate on matters raised in the Public Open Forum.
7. Reports/updates to receive (as available) & agree action as appropriate – Police, Unitary, Parish, Clerk - not to exceed 30 minutes in total.
8. EA consultation on environmental permit for fracking [*Minute 57/25c*] refers] – to receive Cllr. Fanthorpe's report (enclosed) and agree action as appropriate.
9. Increasing Council's public profile [*Minute 58 /25c*] refers] – to consider and agree action as appropriate. (DEFERRED FROM SEPT. MEETING)
10. Standing Orders and Financial Regulations – to note these are in need of updating (last updated by council in 2021 and the Model Templates issued by NALC have been updated since then).
11. Updates on matters raised at previous meetings:-
 - a) Unoccupied property Station Lane [*Minute 55/25*] refers] – to receive update from Chairman and agree action as appropriate;
 - b) Increases in precept [*Minute 55/25*] refers] – to receive & note emails between Clerk & parishioner (emailed to councillors 1/9/25) and agree action as appropriate;
 - c) Overnight camping, Saltpans [*Minute 59/25a*] refers] – to receive update from Cllr. Couch and agree action as appropriate;
 - d) Speeding/Community Speedwatch [*Minute 59/25b*] refers] – to receive report from Cllr. Fanthorpe & agree action as appropriate.
12. Correspondence:-
 - a) Planning training at Helmsley 5.30-7.30 – to agree who is to attend;
 - b) Parish Member vacancy on NYMNP – to agree if this council wishes to nominate one of its councillors;
 - c) Parish Election Recharge Policy (enclosed) – to receive and note;
 - d) Request for donation from N. Yorkshire CAB – to agree action as appropriate;
 - e) Correspondence received after 29/9/25 requiring a response before next meeting.
13. Planning Matters:-
 - a) Applications Received- to agree comments on:- none at preparation of agenda.
 - b) Decisions received to note:- none at preparation of agenda.
 - c) To agree comments/note any planning matters/decisions received after 29/9/25.
14. Accounts to Certify:- N. Barnes (moles and paths) £58-75; T Harland (rural verge cutting) £900-00; M Eyres (Reading Rooms painting) £320-00.

J. Marley

J. Marley (Mrs)
Clerk to the Parish Council
30th September 2025

MINUTES OF ORDINARY MEETING OF CLOUGHTON PARISH COUNCIL HELD IN ST. MARY'S CHURCH HALL ON MONDAY 1st SEPTEMBER 2025 AT 7.30PM

Present: Councillors P Couch (Chairman), D Baker, P Bleasdale, K Fanthorpe, D Ford, S Staveley.
North Yorkshire Councillor D Bastiman (left 8.43). Eight members of public (left various times). Mrs J Marley (Clerk to Council).

Absent: None.

50/25 **APOLOGIES GIVEN IN ADVANCE OF MEETING:-** None.

51/25 **APPROVAL OF REASONS FOR ABSENCE:-** None.

52/25 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:** None.

53/25 **MINUTES**

Having been previously circulated, **resolved** the minutes of the meeting of 7th July 2025 be **approved** as an accurate record & authorised for signature by the Chairman of the meeting.

54/25 **PUBLIC OPEN FORUM** Matters raised included 1] problems being caused to properties in Linton Close by an unoccupied property in Station Lane and 2] question on why recent precepts had increased.

55/25 **MATTERS RAISED IN PUBLIC OPEN FORUM** 1] Chairman would meet with the affected residents of Linton Close and report to next meeting; 2] this had been explained to parishioner by Clerk in an email in July, email would be forwarded to councillors and item be placed on next agenda.

56/25 **REPORTS**

a) **Police:** the report for July incidents (emailed to councillors 4/8/25) was **received & noted**.

b) **Unitary:** Cllr. Bastiman reported on matters regarding the recent moor fire and the impact the closure of the A171 has had (such as no bus service) and explained he understood the fracking application may be considered by North Yorkshire Council at a strategic planning committee meeting in October. He also gave details of possible ways in which the matter of overnight parking at Saltpans could be addressed.

c) **Parish:** Cllr. Baker reported on a very large dormer which had been added to a property on Quarry Bank and it was noted the matter had been referred by the Clerk to planning for investigation. Cllr. Staveley reported the playground fence adjacent the beck had been replaced by the Duchy. Cllr. Couch reported 1] the Environment Agency had cut the weed in Cloughton Beck from West Lane to the bridge at Tause's Lane; 2] Cober would do what they could to the duckpond when they had staff availability. All councillors were in agreement that a letter of thanks be sent to the Fire Service for their sterling work with the recent moor fire.

d) **Clerk:** no matters to report.

57/25 **EA consultation on environmental permit for fracking** [Minute 45/25c) refers] – Cllr. Fanthorpe's written report was received. The EA was holding a "drop in" session later in the week and it was agreed to hold an Extraordinary Council Meeting 7pm 15/9/25 in the church rooms to give feedback by the Joint working group following on from the drop-in.

58/25 **Increasing Council's public profile** [Minute 45/25c) refers] – deferred to October meeting.

59/25 **UPDATES ON MATTERS RAISED AT PREVIOUS MEETINGS:-**

a) Overnight camping, Saltpans [Minute 24/25a) refers] – Cllr. Bastiman's suggestions had been noted. Cllr. Couch to speak to Chairman of Burniston PC re a joint request for a ban with a view to referring on to Highways.

b) Speeding/Community Speedwatch [Minute 46/25b) refers] – **noted** report by Cllr. Fanthorpe received & **resolved** that four traffic speed sensor surveys be carried out at a cost each of £110. Cllr. Fanthorpe to liaise with NYC Highways as to placement etc. A decision on seeking a formal quote for a VAS sign was deferred pending the speed survey results.

60/25 CORRESPONDENCE

- a) War memorial – **noted** a parishioner had tidied around the area & Clerk had sent thanks;
- b) Correspondence received after 25/8/25 & requiring a response before next meeting – none.

61/25 PLANNING MATTERS

a) Applications Received & Appeals Notified:-

- 1) NYM/2025/0447 Construct enlarged replacement dormer, Shearwater, Hood Lane. **Resolved** no objections;
- 2) ZF25/00753/HS Retrospective application for raised timber patio and kettle deluxe pansol positioned on patio, 12 Littlemoor Close. **Resolved** object, unacceptable and intrusive impact on neighbouring properties due to height, scale and massing;

b) Decisions received: –

- 1) NYM/2025/0377 – vary condition 4 and remove condition 5 of NYM/2016/0765 to remove reference to holiday letting, amend local occupancy wording in line with 2020 Local Plan, sever tie between Calthwaite Farmhouse and the two dwellinghouses at Calthwaite Farmhouse. Granted with conditions.

c) Planning matters received after 25/8/25:- None.

62/25 ACCOUNTS TO CERTIFY – The following was approved for payment via online banking (Cllrs. Baker & Staveley to do the online authorisation within 24 hours):-

Duchy of Lancaster Playground rent 29/9/25-28/9/26 £60.00

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 9.33pm.

Report to: Cloughton Parish Council
Report from: Cllr Karen Fanthorpe
Subject: Environment Agency Consultation re Europa Proposal
Date: 6th October, 2025

Section 1: Purpose of Report

Parish Councillors received a verbal report at the meeting on 1st September relating to the Environment Agency's consultation on the application from Europa Oil & Gas for a drilling facility to be established in Burniston.

Councillors were advised of the intention for Cloughton Parish Council to make a submission to the EA along with neighbouring councils from Burniston and Newby & Scalby. This submission would be the opportunity to ask a number of questions which are in accordance with the concerns raised previously from local residents. The questions arise from the many documents submitted by Europa to the EA about the technical aspects of their proposal.

Following discussion on the 1st September, Councillors agreed that an Extraordinary Meeting should be held in order to review, debate and agree the content of the proposed submission prior to it being sent – a date was set for 15th September which would have allowed for submission by the deadline date of 19th September. In light of an extension to the consultation to 7th October, the Extraordinary Meeting was no longer needed and this report is, therefore, being presented to Council as part of its routine business meeting.

Section 2: Introduction

Europa Oil & Gas (EOG) have to apply to the Environment Agency for environmental permits relating to different aspects of their proposal.

As part of the process of reviewing the permit applications, the EA has launched a consultation process to seek public comments on the proposal. The consultation was launched on 16th July, 2025 with a closing date of 13th August. This was subsequently extended to 19th September and has now been further extended to 7th October.

Much of the detail contained in the various documents is very specialist. The EA is the organisation which has access to the relevant expertise/technical knowledge to be able to determine whether the application is reasonable in terms of its impact on the local communities – our approach is, therefore, to ask questions about the issues that are of concern to our Councillors and residents.

The EA is very strict about its remit and what it has authority to consider. It is also clear that, in the event that all legal requirements are met, the Agency is obliged to issue permits to the company.

The EA has confirmed that it will respond to the questions raised. We hope, therefore, that this will give us the opportunity at a later date to share information with our local residents about the issues we know are of concern to them, regardless of the EA's final decision.

Our questions relate, in the main, to the EA's authority in terms of the criteria "the shape and use of the land around the site in terms of its potential impact, whether that impact is acceptable and what pollution control or abatement may be required".

We have, however, also identified some information which we think the EA may not be aware of via the application.

The EA held a public open meeting for residents to attend on 3rd September. There was a good attendance from local councillors and residents and the EA fielded national experts as part of their team. It was acknowledged that there is a high level of public interest in this proposal. The EA billed this as an opportunity to ask questions and raise issues directly with their representatives. The EA has confirmed that more than 60 people attended the event.

One of the key outcomes from the open event was that the EA had issued a Schedule 5 document to EOG which required them to provide considerable extra information on a range of issues. These issues are land drainage, cellar construction, chemical inventory, proppant squeeze (sub divided into 4 sections) and air quality impact assessment (sub divided into 5 sections) - a total of 12 detailed questions.

The EA set a response date of 15th September for this information. As the consultation period was to close on 19th September it was very unlikely that the additional information could be reviewed in time. Furthermore, the open event highlighted the absence of some key documents that were not on the EA website. As a result, the three councils requested an extension to the consultation. This request resulted in a further extension to 7th October.

EOG supplied information relating to the 12 questions and all the documents have been published on the EA's consultation site. From a "layman's" assessment, some of their responses appear to be hypothetical rather than actual and others refer to actions which will be taken at a future date. Whether they provide the reassurance which the EA requires is for the EA to determine. Other documents contain data lists or specialist references which only the EA will be able to assess. Nevertheless, it appears that the EA has pushed EOG to provide further assurance which can only be helpful in terms of assessing the environmental impact and holding the company to account.

In spite of this additional information being forthcoming, there is still an absence of detail about the seismic hazards arising from this proposal. The national scheme of responsibilities indicates that the North Sea Transition Authority (NSTA) assesses the Hydraulic Fracturing Plan. Having been in contact with them to ask how they communicate their findings, the NSTA has confirmed that they notify the Local Authority once they have reached their decision. The Joint Plan which covers our area explicitly states that detailed geological assessment should be performed which implies that it will be considered in the local planning process. As it remains unclear as to whether it is to be considered by NYC as part of the planning process or by the NSTA, the seismic hazard has been included in our submission to the EA in the hope that this might encourage them to include it as part of their process.

The following section of this document (which is shown in italics), is the proposed wording for the submission from Cloughton Parish Council.

Section 3: Proposed Submission

Cloughton Parish Council is submitting this document as part of the Environment Agency's consultation on the application EPR/YP3623LC/A001.

Members of the Council are not experts in the scientific specialties of geology, chemistry and engineering and are, therefore, looking to the EA as the organisation which has access to the relevant knowledge and expertise to consider the technical aspects of this proposal.

We are, however, knowledgeable about the concerns raised by our local residents and we are very aware of the local environmental concerns which arise from this proposal.

Much of the mitigation provided as part of the planning application process has relied upon the temporary & reversible nature of the risks involved in this project. Councillors refute this vehemently. The potential for the project to last up to 3 years (and up to 2 decades if they move to full operation) is not a temporary situation for our residents. Damage done to our environment may not be reversible. We have a duty to protect the area in which we live.

We hope our questions and contribution will assist the EA in undertaking a rigorous assessment of the permit application. We understand that, in the event that all legal requirements are met, that you are obliged to issue permits. If this is the case, it will be very helpful to receive the answers to our questions so that we can communicate this information to the residents we serve.

Our questions have been organised into three sections – local environmental concerns, risk of seismic damage and the mining waste facility. In preparing our response, Councillors are mindful of the types of concerns which you are able take account of (and those that you are not). We consider that the concerns we are raising are relevant to your assessment in terms of your criteria “The shape and use of the land around the site in terms of its potential impact, whether that impact is acceptable and what pollution controls/abatement may be required”.

It is worth reiterating that we do not consider Burniston to be a suitable location for this proposal because of its rurality, the importance of protecting its beauty & tranquillity and its close proximity to a residential area. All these features were strongly reflected in our submission to the planning application process still to be considered by North Yorkshire Council.

Our submission also brings to your attention information which you have not been made aware of in the application. In particular, we are raising the absence of any detail about the risks of seismic damage in Europa’s application and we are highlighting a list of receptors which are vulnerable to impact.

We are grateful for the opportunity to bring these questions to your attention and hope that our contribution is helpful. We have structured our response to set out the underlying concerns (referred to as “context”) that then lead to the resulting questions.

Issue 1: Local Environmental Issues of Concern

Context 1: *The EA submitted an objection to North Yorkshire County Council in respect of the construction of this well site (14th May, 2025). The recommendation to refuse the planning application was based on “an unacceptable risk to groundwater”. The EA considered that there was an “unacceptable risk of causing a detrimental impact to groundwater quality because there is the potential for vertical migration of pollutants to ground water in the overlying aquifer”.*

Councillors understand that this objection has subsequently been withdrawn in response to additional information from EOG, presumably linked to the requirement to provide a detailed construction method statement.

Context 2: *the Surface Water Management Plan has been reviewed but it contains little detail on whether the perimeter ditch and the secondary containment system have sufficient storage capacity. If not, overspill and contamination of groundwater is presumably a risk?*

Context 3: *One of the documents submitted by EOG is their Environmental Impact Assessment. This lists 3 risks which are described as having a high impact (defined as a major environmental incident).*

One of these risks ("Indirect input to groundwater from well") is also listed a risk which has a high probability of occurring ("emissions to groundwater").

The very real possibility of a major environmental incident occurring in relation to our groundwater is of major concern to residents.

Context 4: *the location of this site, with its range of risks, must be considered in terms of the population which could be affected.*

Burniston Parish Council has provided the following details about the sensitive receptors which would be affected – this confirms a much greater number of people living locally than previous documents have detailed.

- *37 homes within 500m – the nearest one being on the perimeter of the site*
- *920 people living inside 1km*
- *2785 people within 2km*
- *9784 people within 3km*

As a result, we consider that the site should be covered by some sort of designation that would bring with it the need for Major Incident Planning and exercising to address the significant risks associated with the operation of this site.

Context 5: *the incineration of natural gas will include venting straight into the atmosphere via the shrouded flare stack. Our understanding is that natural gas contains an array of toxic hydrocarbon gasses and organic sulphurs which will be highly inflammable, odorous and reactive. The consequences of human error, equipment failure or accidents resulting in an explosion or fire is of major concern. It should be noted that this community has very recent experience of the consequences of uncontrolled fires nearby on the moors. This is something we must seek to avoid whilst also being prepared to respond.*

EOG has stated in its Environmental Risk Assessment that a fire risk is "not significant". Given the location of this site alongside a residential area, open fields and woodland we are asking the EA to address this risk in more detail.

Context 6: *in the Odour Management Plan, EOG state that "due to the nature of the fluids and the fluids having been exposed to the conditions of the wellbore and formation, there is the potential for odours to be present within the fluids when stored at surface withing the stock tanks". There is a suggestion that odours will only be investigated if there is a complaint from the public.*

Context 7: *EOG has stated in its application that no baseline monitoring of air quality has taken place. It also states that only two ambient air quality monitoring locations will be used. We are pleased to see that the EA has requested additional information on the Air Quality Impact Assessment as part of the Notice Of Request for More Information (Schedule 5).*

Question 1 – is the EA satisfied that the risk of causing contamination to the groundwater has been fully addressed? If so, on what basis has this revised position been reached?

Question 2 – will the EA set a realistic cut off point (ie maximum volume) for the flaring of gas on a daily basis and how would this be monitored and reported?

Question 3 – will the EA address the potential risk of fire/explosion on the site from the flaring operation by requiring EOG to be much more specific in terms of mitigation to reduce the potential of occurrence and severity of risk?

An emergency response plan which involves local residents and emergency services would seem to be essential.

Question 4: will the EA require EOG to be much more precise in their assessment of the process leading to odours being produced and will it be a condition of any permit that they are required to report to an external agency when routine monitoring of odours exceeds a permissible level?

Question 5: will the EA consider setting a condition that regular but random monitoring air quality data be collected over a wider area and for a period of months prior to the construction starting and that this monitoring is undertaken by an agency that is independent of the EOG company?

Issue 2: Risk of seismic damage

Context 1: The submissions from EOG do not include a detailed deep structure analysis. Despite repeated requests, Europa continues to maintain that consideration of geological matters is not part of the local planning approval process but, instead, occurs later and through other authorities.

This seems to be in direct contravention of the published local plan in which an understanding of the geological context is clearly required. We would expect there to be a legal (or at least civic) obligation to know and present detailed subsurface information as part of the proposal.

It seems inconceivable that Europa has not carried out a survey of the deep geological structures in order to decide the site from which to drill and the direction(s) in which to pursue extraction.

We are pleased to see that in your "Notice of Request for More Information" (Schedule 5) you have asked for more detailed information about the "distances to geological faults relative to the wellbore and the proposed mining waste facility" but this seems to relate to the role of faults as conduits for groundwater flow rather than as weak points in the geological sub structure which may cause seismic damage.

We have sought clarification from the North Sea Transition Authority about the process they will follow to make their decision based on the Hydraulic Fracture Plan submitted by the company. From their response, it seems that input from, or communication with, local residents is not part of the process.

Context 2: The Waste Management Plan document submitted by Europa to the EA describes the Proppant Squeeze process as 4 treatments of 300 – 500 cubic meter pretreatment at 9000psi, resulting in the total volume of proppant squeeze and diluent of $\leq 2000l$ of contaminated fluid".

At the Cuadrilla site at Preston New Road, Lancashire, there was induced seismic activity using one treatment of almost half the amount EOG are proposing.

Context 3: the proposal that there will be 4 treatments at this site is, we believe, new information which was not specified in the planning application to NYC. It will, surely, quadruple the risk of seismic damage occurring in our community?

Context 4: EA Research – the EA has produced a research report that specifically investigates various types of methods used in the Oil & Gas industry. The report "Potential Environmental Impacts from Techniques to Enhance Rock Permeability" considers different volumes of fracking and the use of Carbon Dioxide (which EOG has put forward as an alternative method for the Burniston site). The conclusion of the research is that there is insufficient data although it is known that using Co2 produced larger fractures with more secondary fractures than is achieved with high volume fracking.

Question 6: what is the EA's expert opinion on the complexity of geological structures which exist beneath the ground at the wellbore and what is the EA's assessment of the potential for seismic damage as a result of the Europa proposal?

Question 7: will the EA make any recommendations relating to the absence of detailed assessments of the deep geology and seismic risk?

Question 8: is the EA fully satisfied that EOG can prove the safety of using a Proppant Squeeze technique (or CO2) if the EA as a body has published research which concludes there is insufficient data to prove either way?

Issue 3: Mining Waste Facility

Context 1: The EA documents refer to an underground waste facility off Barmoor Lane, Scalby, **hitherto unknown**. This development would be of a significant size and scale. This facility will hold 50- 70% of the proppant squeeze and thus ≤ 1400 litres contaminated fluid "within the rock formation for an indefinite period. This brings this aspect into the "after closure" phase and is part of the entire life cycle of the drilling proposal.

It has been stated that there will be a gradual deterioration of the fluid over time.

This facility was NOT included in the original application being considered by North Yorkshire Council and this fact is being brought to the attention of the EA.

Barmoor Lane is completely separate from the drill head site being at a distance of 1.6 miles. On the basis that that this consultation process relates to "the shape and use of the land **around the site**", we would suggest that the Mining Waste Facility cannot be considered simply as part of the bid to the EA for permits.

We would argue that it is an entirely separate site which should be subject to a separate planning application. A full planning application process would give the proper opportunity for scrutiny from local residents and the relevant authorities.

Context 2: In their application, EOG has firmly argued that this facility should not be classed as a Category A Mineral & Waste Facility which may well be the case. It is also doubtful that it would meet the criteria for a COMAH site.

Nevertheless, councillors believe there is a compelling argument that this whole proposal (ie the wellhead and the mining facility) should be covered by a designated status that brings with it responsibilities for off site safety.

Question 9: Will the EA consider the requirement for off site safety requiring a multi-agency planning and response arrangement and, if so, what recommendation will it put forward?

Question 10: Should the development of an underground waste facility be subject to a full planning application so that the impact of this proposal can be properly considered by the relevant authorities with input from local residents?

Question 11: what is the EA's assessment of proppant squeeze fluid being left underground indefinitely? Is there knowledge about any damage to the rock formation which may occur as the fluid deteriorates?

Summary

The Parish Councillors who have reviewed all the supporting documents are not experts in the scientific specialties of geology, chemistry and engineering. Nevertheless, we have spent considerable time and effort in producing questions which we believe reflect the local environmental factors of concern to our residents.

Section 4: Recommendations for Councillors

1. Councillors are asked to review and debate the content of the proposed submission and offer suggested amendments as a result.
2. Councillors are asked to confirm, or not, whether the response (including any amendments agreed during the meeting) should be submitted by tomorrow as part of the EA's consultation.

Cllr Karen Fanthorpe

29th September, 2025

Parish Election Recharges Policy

September 2025

Contents

Why do we recharge?	2
When will recharges apply?	2
What is recharged?.....	3
How much will be recharged?.....	5
Paying the recharges.....	5
Schedule 1 - Cost Elements for a Parish Election	6
Schedule 2 - Election staff rates of pay	7
Schedule 3 – External Print and Postage Costs	8
Schedule 4 – Worked Example, Parish with electorate of 3,250, 1 polling station	9

Why do we recharge?

Elections can be called at any time, when parish councillors are no longer in office due to resignations, death, or disqualification. Every parish election incurs costs such as the hire of polling stations, staffing, the printing of ballot papers and postal votes, and postage. By-elections also incur these types of cost, and the number of parish by-elections is unpredictable. Scheduled parish elections are held every 4 years. All parish, town and city councils will have scheduled elections in May 2027.

The Returning Officer for North Yorkshire Council (NYC) is responsible for organising and delivering elections for all parishes within North Yorkshire. Section 36 of the Representation of the People Act 1983 allows the Returning Officer to recover from local Town & Parish Councils administration fees and costs incurred.

The recharges to parishes are on a cost recovery basis only, and no income will be generated by NYC as profit.

When will recharges apply?

Recharges will apply for all parish elections and by-elections, whether contested or uncontested.

The costs associated exclusively with a parish election and by-election will be recharged in full to the parish council.

Where combined with the election of North Yorkshire Council councillors, only the additional costs of holding the parish elections will be recharged (for example the core cost of polling stations and polling staff will not be recharged as that cost would be incurred for the North Yorkshire Council elections anyway, only the staffing 'uplift' fees for combined poll will be recharged (see [schedule 2](#)).

What is recharged?

Parishes election costs depend on many variables, such as:

- parish electorate;
- number of postal voters;
- geographical area affecting number of polling stations and staffing required; and
- whether poll cards are issued or not.

Costs incurred at an election relate to:

Cost Element	
Hire of venues	Polling & count
Delivery of equipment to venues	Polling booths and or other equipment, if required
Printing	Poll cards, postal votes, ballot papers, election notices
Postage	Poll cards and postal votes, general administration
Staffing (& mileage)	At the polling station, the opening of postal votes, the count of votes, and for general administration
Returning Officer Fee	

Poll card issue

The issue of poll cards is optional for the parish but is strongly recommended.

Upon receipt of the necessary requests for a parish by-election, NYC will calculate the cost of production and postage of poll cards and inform the parish in advance to allow a decision to be made by the parish on whether to issue them or not. Whilst not issuing poll cards can reduce the cost of a by-election, the Returning Officer recommends issuing poll cards for all contested elections to increase awareness and turnout for improved democracy. For scheduled elections, poll cards will be combined with the North Yorkshire Council elections on one card.

Combined Polls

A list of the cost elements for an election, and the basis on which they can be shared with a combined poll, are set out in [schedule 1](#).

Staff working at the election are paid using rates of pay agreed by NYC. A schedule of staffing fees is provided in [schedule 2](#). Note that the rates of pay are subject to annual uplift in line with the national election fees schedule.

The costs incurred also vary depending on the prices charged by Royal Mail and service providers for a particular election. The anticipated costs incurred for printing and postage (outwards) can be found in [schedule 3](#).

An indicative example of the costs involved in a parish election under different recharging schemes can be found in [schedule 4](#).

Uncontested Election Fees – from April 2026

When a casual vacancy occurs, a Notice of Vacancy is published by the parish or town clerk giving electors 14 working days notice to request in writing that the vacancy be filled by election. If 10 such requests are received by North Yorkshire Council's Proper Officer with the 14 working day period, an election to fill the vacancy must be held.

Usually when this happens, sufficient candidates come forward to stand at the election for it to be contested. Occasionally however, there are insufficient candidates for a contested poll and those validly nominated stand elected uncontested.

Where the poll is uncontested, North Yorkshire Council still incurs costs. To prepare for an election, Electoral Services need to engage with a print supplier to prepare the printed materials needed should the poll be contested. This incurs a cost. Officer time is also required to produce the legal notices for the poll and to run candidate nominations.

For this reason, it is proposed that where a parish by-election is uncontested, the printer's setup costs could be recharged (actual cost incurred) to the relevant parish council and for all scheduled parish elections, an administration fee for an uncontested election charged at the following rates:

Number of Vacancies	Electorate in affected electoral area	Fee
Less than or equal to 7	Less than or equal to 1,000	£50
Less than or equal to 7	More than 1,000	£75
8 or 9	All	£100
10 or more	All	£125

How much will be recharged?

As explained in the above section, costs vary greatly between parishes due to many variables.

Indicative calculations can be provided upon request for each parish (or ward of a parish if warded), though it must be noted that these are estimates only.

By way of example, parish by-elections can cost anywhere between £1,500 and £10,000 depending upon the size of the electorate and geographical area.

Currently parishes should expect to receive an invoice from NYC for the cost of a by-election within 2 months of the date of the poll. This allows the costs incurred from external organisations (polling station hire, print and postage) to be received, paid and reconciled by NYC before calculating the total cost of a parish by-election.

Paying the recharges

Parishes receive a precept via the Local Authority Council Tax to run the parish and this includes services such as allotments, lighting, cemeteries etc. Parishes need to factor the contingency cost of by-elections into their budget setting activity, and ensure they have sufficient funds to cover elections.

Invoices for by-election recharges must be paid in full, within 30 days.

Invoices issued by NYC can be paid by following the information provided on the back of the invoice, which explains how to pay the invoice by any of the following methods:

- via the council website using a debit or credit card
- by telephone – automated payment line
- by bank transfer
- at the bank
- by post (cheque)

If any parish is struggling to pay their election recharges, they should contact electoral services on the details below.

Schedule 1 - Cost Elements for a Parish Election (Combination share)

The following table lists the cost elements of an election, and the basis on which they will be shared if combined with another poll on the same day:

Chargeable Service or Item	Cost recharged to parish at by-election	If combined with another poll (as will be the case for scheduled parish elections):
Hire of polling stations (varies by venue)	actual cost	no cost to parish council
Production of Poll cards (optional for the parish)	Refer to schedule 3	no cost to parish council (if able to issue combined poll cards)
Postage of Poll Cards (optional for the parish)	Refer to schedule 3	no cost to parish council (if able to issue combined poll cards)
Production of ballot papers (and other election stationery)	Refer to schedule 3	Actual cost of parish element
Production/print of postal votes	Refer to schedule 3	If not possible to combine - full cost recharged. If possible to combine, no cost to parish council
Outward postage of postal votes	Refer to schedule 3	If not possible to combine - full cost recharged. If possible to combine, no cost to parish council
Inward postage votes	In line with Royal Mail	If not possible to combine - full cost recharged. If possible to combine, no cost to parish council
Hire of count venue	Actual (varies per venue)	no cost to parish council
Staffing (polling staff & count staff etc)	Refer to schedule 2	Polling – only additional cost recharged to parish Count – 100% to parish for specific staff time counting parish ballot papers
Returning Officer Fees	Refer to schedule 2	Unable to share if combined
Mileage incurred by staff	45p per mile	no cost to parish council

Schedule 2 - Election staff rates of pay

North Yorkshire Council agreed schedule of fees (as at 2025/26)

Job / Role	Rate of Pay
Returning Officer	8p per elector, or £56 (whichever is the greater)
Presiding Officer	£278.80 / day
Uplift for combination poll	£55.76 / day
Poll Clerk	£201.60 / day
Uplift for combination poll	£40.32 / day
Polling Station Inspector (if required)	£303 / day
Attendance at training (if required)	£18.05 / hour
Coordinator Role: • Poll Card Checks / Issue • Postal Vote Issue / opening	£21.86 / hour – day £32.80 / hour – eve
Supervisor Role • Poll Card Checks / Issue • Postal Vote Issue / Opening	£18.05 / hour – day £27.07 / hour – eve
Assistant Role Postal Vote issue / opening	£14.05 / hour – day £21.08 / hour – eve
Senior Count Manager / Supervisor	£29.85 / hour – day £42.07 / hour – eve
Count Supervisor	£20.09 / hour – day £30.14 / hour - eve
Count Assistant	£14.05 / hour – day £21.08 / hour – eve
Clerical (supervisory level)	£15.50 / hour - day £23.25 / hour – eve
Clerical (admin level)	£14.04 / hour – day £21.08 / hour - eve
Staff mileage	45p / mile

Schedule 3 – External Print and Postage Costs

The following table details our contracted rates for the production, printing and postage for election material by NYCs specialist contracted provider:

Element	Cost
Job setup costs	Under £1k
Poll card printing	contracted rate
Poll card postage	£0.60 per poll card
Postal vote printing	contracted rate
Postal vote postage – outward	£1.25 per postal vote envelope
Postal vote postage – return	£1.67 per envelope (Royal Mail costs)
Ballot papers – ordinary	contracted rate
Ballot papers – tendered	contracted rate

Schedule 4 – Worked Example, Parish with electorate of 3,250, 1 polling station

Chargeable Service or Item	Cost recharged to parish at <u>by-election</u> (not combined)	Cost to parish at <u>scheduled election</u> (additional costs of parish election to be recharged)
Hire of polling stations (varies by venue)	£346.50	£0
Production of Poll cards	£431.14	£0
Production of Postal votes	£758.75	£758.75
Postage of Poll Cards (optional for the parish at by-elections)	£1,897.76	£0
Postage of Postal Votes (outward)	£833.25	£833.25
Production of ballot papers (and other election stationery)	£361.60	£361.60
Inward postage (postal votes)	£811.62	£811.62
Hire of count venue	Usually count at one of polling stations (no extra cost)	£0
Staffing (polling staff &, count staff etc)	£750	£236.40
Returning Officer Fees	£259.68	£259.68
TOTAL	£6,450.30	£3,261.30