

North Yorkshire Council

Selby and Ainsty Area Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 20 November 2025 commencing at 2.00 pm at County Hall, Northallerton.

Committee Members present: Councillor John Cattanach in the Chair and Councillors Bob Packham, Karl Arthur, Steve Shaw-Wright and Arnold Warneken

Officers present: Frances Maxwell – Solicitor, Planning and Environment, Emma Howson – Development Management Team Manager, Gareth Stent – Principal Planning Officer, Jenny Crossley – Senior Planning Officer, Victoria Day - Highway Development and Adoption Principal, Julie Turner - Senior Engineer, Transport and Development; and Dawn Drury – Democratic Services Officer.

Apologies: Councillors Mark Crane and Cliff Lunn

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

123 Apologies for Absence

Apologies had been received from Councillors Cliff Lunn and Mark Crane, Councillor Andy Paraskos acted as substitute for Councillor Lunn.

124 Minutes for the Meeting held on 3 November 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on the 3 November 2025 were confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

125 Declarations of Interests

Councillors Andy Paraskos and Arnold Warneken stated that they had been lobbied on agenda item number 5.

Councillor Karl Arthur stated that he had received a telephone call and lobbying regarding agenda item 4. He confirmed that, while he listened, he did not comment on the application. The Councillor also declared a personal interest in agenda item numbers 5 and 6. He informed the Committee that he was employed by Network Rail who were statutory consultees on both applications, however this did not impact on his employment, and he confirmed that he would speak and vote on the items.

Finally, he informed the Committee that he was a Member of Selby Town Council who were a consultee on agenda item number 6, however he had not expressed a view on the application and would therefore speak and vote on the item.

Councillor Bob Packham declared that he had received correspondence on agenda item numbers 4 and 5.

Councillors John Cattanach and Steve Shaw-Wright declared that they had received correspondence on agenda item numbers 4, 5 and 6.

126 2021/1176/FUL - Land at Junction of A19 and A163, York Road, Barlby, Selby, North Yorkshire

The Assistant Director Planning, Community Development Services sought determination of a planning application for the erection of a roadside service facility, including a petrol filling station, car wash bays and associated infrastructure at the junction of the A19 and A163, York Road, Barlby, Selby, North Yorkshire.

The application had been brought to Planning Committee at the request of the Head of Development Management as it raised significant planning issues. The Ward Councillor, Councillor Stephanie Duckett had also requested that the application go before the planning committee due to the number of community responses and concerns over highway safety.

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report and advised that an officer update had been published on the Council's website. Members were informed that four additional objections had been received, one of which had raised a new issue regarding the absence of a Health Impact Assessment. The officer confirmed that they did not consider this necessary due to the scale of the development and the fact that Environmental Health Officers had not requested it in their response. Members were also advised that, in November 2025, an objector had commissioned an independent Transport Audit, which in their view identified transport concerns. Finally, Members were advised that a drainage condition, recommended by the Environment Agency, had been omitted from the original report and was therefore included as an additional condition.

Chris Creighton spoke, objecting to the application.

The Division Councillor, Stephanie Duckett spoke, objecting to the application.

The agent, Rachael Bamford, spoke on behalf of the applicant, in support of the application.

During consideration of the above application, the Committee discussed the following

- A query was raised regarding the presence of a slip road to access the site entrance/exit, and whether an emergency access was proposed should the roundabout become gridlocked.
- Guidance was sought on the size of the kiosk and what it would be comparable to. Members expressed their understanding of a typical kiosk and noted that, in this case, the building appeared significantly larger.
- At paragraph 2.8, the implication was that the level of opposition to the application from local residents was a material planning consideration and it was queried if that was the case.
- Members queried whether the roundabout represented the minimum size required for an A-road junction.
- A query was raised as to whether there was any street lighting on York Road and whether the new petrol canopy height of 5.6m was necessary.
- Whether the proposed screening was adequate for the residential properties adjoining the site.
- Objectors had raised concerns about the impact on wildlife and it was queried if there was a need for a bat survey to be undertaken.
- Had consideration been given to the installation of acoustic fencing along York Road.
- The Chair asked the Highways officer to confirm the current capacity of the A19, how much it had changed in recent years, and how much additional traffic the proposed application would generate.

- Members had noted that Heavy Good's Vehicles (HGV's) would not be permitted to refuel on site; it was queried if access would be restricted to prevent HGVs entering for other purposes, such as purchasing food or drink, and, if so, how this would be communicated to the HGV drivers. They also asked what size of vehicle would be permitted to enter the site.
- How would delivery vehicles access the site.
- What the national speed limit was on the road into the site and on York Road.

Members expressed concerns that, while the application offered certain benefits, the site was considered too constrained. It was felt that the applicant was seeking to maximise the use of the site to the detriment of road safety and the amenity of local residents. Members further considered the site to be inadequately screened, that the nature and scale was not appropriate to the locality, and raised concerns regarding how the facility would prevent HGV's from entering the site. Members also felt that the application was contrary to the following planning policies:

- Policy SP2, as it lay outside the defined development limits.
- Policy SP13C, it was of an inappropriate scale in a rural area.
- Policy SP14, the impact on retail.
- Policy T9, there was no demonstrable need with other facilities two miles in either direction of the proposed site.
- Policy EM1, for the impact on the landscape.

The officer recommendation was to approve the application; however, the motion did not receive a proposer and therefore was not carried.

The Chair sought advice from the Principal Planning Officer on whether Members had sufficient grounds for refusal. The officer confirmed that reasons had been identified during the discussions, to include concerns over the layout, overdevelopment of the site, it's cramped nature, inadequate screening which would impact on the landscape and character of the area, the site being outside the defined development limits, the disproportionate size of the kiosk, the adverse impact on residential properties, and highway safety issues relating to roundabout capacity and the impact on York Road.

Councillor Warneken proposed, and Councillor Packham seconded that contrary to the officer recommendation, the application should be minded to refuse, with the detailed reasons for refusal delegated to officers in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair.

The decision

That Members were MINDED TO REFUSE planning permission, with the detailed reasons for refusal delegated to officers in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair.

Voting record

A vote was taken, and the motion was carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at this point for a short break.

127 ZG2023/1293/FULM - Former Kellingley Colliery, Turvers Lane, Kellingley

The Assistant Director Planning – Community Development Services sought determination of a full planning application for the proposed erection of 15no. units for uses within Class E(g)(iii), B2, B8 and F2 with ancillary offices, erection of up to 5no. units within Class E and F1 with ancillary outdoor amenity space, open storage plot, an EV charging station, parking provision, a new access road from Weeland Road, internal

access roads, associated infrastructure and landscaping at the former Kellingley Colliery, Turvers Lane, Kellingley.

The application had been brought to Planning Committee at the request of the Corporate Director of Community Development as it raised significant planning issues.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report highlighting the site location and access; context of the site; proposal; and officer recommendation.

The agent, James Hall, spoke on behalf of the applicant, in support of the application.

During consideration of the above application, the Committee discussed the following

- It was questioned whether the application had been brought before Members prematurely, given that of the 38 consultations issued, only two organisations had submitted objections, eighteen had indicated either no comments or objections, and twelve had yet to respond. Clarity was also requested on the response received from the Environment Agency.
- Clarification was sought regarding the weight to be afforded to the Selby Local Plan in Members' deliberations, and whether the site in question formed part of an allocated area within that Plan.
- In relation to the loss of transport provision, clarification was sought as to whether any preliminary discussions had taken place regarding the establishment of a railway halt at the site for passenger services.
- It was queried if a Section 106 agreement had been secured in relation to highways improvements as officers had highlighted that there would be a significant impact on the highways infrastructure.
- Clarification was sought on whether the mine shafts had been appropriately capped and filled.

Members discussed the potential deferral of the application, noting that a number of outstanding issues required addressing. In view of the applicant's willingness to engage in further negotiations, it was considered appropriate to allow time for the applicant and officers to seek to resolve these matters; however, should this prove unsuccessful, the application would be brought back before Members for determination. Officers advised that the application had been under consideration for a period of two years and therefore recommended that, should Members agree to defer the application, then a definitive time limit be imposed.

Councillor Cattanach proposed that, as per the officer recommendation, the application be refused, however the motion did not receive a seconder, therefore the motion fell.

Councillor Packham proposed, and Councillor Warneken seconded that the application be deferred with an extension of time attached, to enable further discussions between the applicant and officers regarding the reasons for refusal and any matters that may be resolved.

The decision

That consideration of the planning application be DEFERRED to allow officers, in the first instance, to secure an extension of time with the applicant, as the application was approaching the expiry of the statutory determination period, and thereafter to facilitate discussions regarding the reasons for refusal and measures to mitigate the identified issues.

Voting record

A vote was taken, and the motion was carried unanimously.

Councillor Warneken left the meeting at this point and did not return.

128 2018/0934/FULM - Osborne House, Union Lane, Selby

The Assistant Director Planning – Community Development Services sought determination of a full major planning application for the erection of 24 assisted care apartments with associated car parking and landscaping on land to the east of the existing care home known as Osborne House, Union Lane, Selby, YO8 4AU.

The application had been brought to Planning Committee at the request of the Head of Development Management as it raised significant planning issues.

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report and advised Members that an officer update note had been issued. This included the addition of a condition at number 27 relating to electric vehicle (EV) charging, supplementary information on flood risk to ensure compliance with paragraphs 181 and 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and a further condition at number 28 requiring submission of an Environment Agency 24 Flood Warning System and a Flood Evacuation Plan. In addition, a correction had been made to the wording at paragraph 10.106 of the original report. Full details were available on the North Yorkshire Council website.

The agent, Katherine Pimblott spoke on behalf of the applicant, in support of the application.

During consideration of the above application, the Committee discussed the following

- It was queried whether, had the proposed development comprised standard apartments, any provision for affordable housing would have been required, and the Officer was asked to explain why the current proposal was treated differently
- Clarification was sought as to whether there was any variation in ground levels between the dwellings situated on the northern road and the property itself.
- Whether additional parking facilities would be provided to mitigate the potential for increased on-street parking along Union Lane.

Councillor Shaw-Wright proposed, and Councillor Paraskos seconded that the application be granted.

The decision

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions listed at section 12 of the Committee report, and the officer update note; with the prior completion of a Section 106 legal agreement.

Voting record

A vote was taken, and the motion was carried unanimously.

129 Any other items

There were no items of urgent business.

130 Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 10 December 2025 at 2.00 pm.

The meeting concluded at 4.57 pm.