

North Yorkshire Council

Strategic Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at County Hall, Northallerton on Tuesday, 8 April 2025 at 10.01am.

Present:

Councillors Andy Paraskos (Chair), Andy Brown, Richard Foster, David Hugill, George Jabbour (substitute for John Mann), Tom Jones, Andrew Lee, Yvonne Peacock, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers and Andrew Timothy.

Apologies were received from Councillors John Cattanach, Hannah Gostlow, John Mann, John McCartney and Bob Packham.

Officers present: David Walker, Development Service Manager; Sam Till, Minerals and Waste Technical Advisor; Glenn Sharpe, Senior Solicitor (Planning); Stephen Loach, Principal Democratic Services Officer; and David Smith, Senior Democratic Services Officer.

There were 7 members of the public.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

102 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors John Cattanach, Hannah Gostlow, John McCartney and Bob Packham. Cllr George Jabbour substituted for Cllr John Mann.

103 Minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2025

That the minutes of the meeting of Strategic Planning Committee, held on 11 March 2025, be confirmed by Members and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

104 Declarations of interest

There were none.

105 C8/2022/1115/CPO - Removal of condition no. 7 of planning permission ref. C8/2009/1066/CPO to allow blasting in the Southern extension area land to the South of existing quarry, Jackdaw Crag Quarry, Moor Lane, Sutton, Tadcaster, LS24 9BE

Considered

The report of the Assistant Director of Planning – Community Development Services requesting Members to determine a planning application for the removal of condition No.7 of Planning Permission Ref. C8/2009/1066/CPO to allow blasting in the southern extension area on land to the south of existing quarry, Jackdaw Crag Quarry, Moor Lane, Sutton, Tadcaster, LS24 9BE.

This application received objections, primarily on the grounds of disturbance to amenity due to blasting, and therefore was reported to the Committee for determination.

The Planning Officer presented the Committee report highlighting the proposal; context to the application; site location, outline and description; details regarding the changes to the conditions; and the planning policy considerations. The Officer recommendation was highlighted.

The Planning Officer raised that two objections had been received since the publication of the report and these were summarised as below.

- A query relating to a typographical error. The Planning Officer confirmed that the word 'object' in paragraph 2.4 should not be in italics.
- A query regarding the frequency of blasts. The Planning Officer confirmed that at paragraph 10.45 of the report, it is stated that there would be 'at most five blasts every month, with on average one blast a week'.
- A concern related to consultation with neighbours. The Planning Officers informed Members that neighbour consultation had been undertaken, despite there being no statutory requirement for consultation on conditions.
- A concern regarding the impact of blasting on livestock. The Planning Officer confirmed that the impact on livestock was considered minimal with the proposed conditions.
- A concern regarding the impact of blasting on the aquifer. The Planning Officer highlighted that the report covered the impact on the aquifer, concluding that there would be no significant issues from blasting.

Mr Peter Hunt, a neighbouring objector, addressed the Committee and raised the following points.

- That when the application had been reviewed by the Secretary for State, it was made clear that blasting with explosives would not take place. Mr Hunt questioned what had changed since then.
- Whether blasting, rather than other methods of extraction, was necessary for accessing the remaining material. Mr Hunt queried how the applicant had managed to operate without blasting.
- Concerns that damage would be done to nearby properties and that livestock would be negatively impacted.
- Concerns regarding increased traffic movements were raised.

The agent for the applicant, Alistair Hoyle, addressed the Committee highlighting the following.

- That hard or consolidated rock required blasting, rather than other methods of extraction, and that without it there would be an impact on site operations and all permitted limestone reserves may not be extracted.
- That blasting would only be done when necessary, would be infrequent and that seven days prior to carrying out a blast, details would be provided to the parish council and the closest residents.
- That aside from the use of blasting to extract the rock, there would be no change to how the quarry operates.
- Details regarding the assessment of vibrations, noise and air quality were provided.

Members asked Officers to clarify the following points.

- That the proposed blasting would use a similar method to the blasting previously carried out at the site, but that standards have improved since and that there would be a greater level of control provided with these conditions. Specifically, there would be a maximum number of blasts.
- That the specified blasting hours are 8.00am to 6.00pm as this is what the applicant

applied for, the Environmental Health Officer had no concerns with the condition as worded, and there was no policy reason for these to be reduced.

- That the permission is valid until 1 June 2028 and that any extension beyond that date would require an amendment to the condition. If the material was not extracted within the permitted period, a new application for the variation of condition 4 of the permission would be required, and the blasting operations would be reassessed.
- That the Secretary of State's decision to approve the previous application had not relied on the absence of blasting from the application as the application did not have any analysis or evidence supporting blasting.
- It was reiterated that there were no concerns about the impact on livestock from the blasting operations.
- It was clarified that Warren House Cottage was the closest property, approximately 25 metres from the site, and Condition 9 was explained to Members.
- It was confirmed that some of the 6.9 million tonnes of material had already been extracted since the start of operations in 2018.

Members considered the application and the following issues were highlighted.

- Members suggested that the proposed blasting is more controlled than in the past and that the suggested controls would negate any negative impacts.
- Members hoped that the applicant would be mindful of the community's concerns.
- Members raised that the blasting and the impact of this on nearby properties should be properly monitored.

A proposal to approve the application, in line with the recommendation in the report, subject to the prior completion of a Deed of Variation and the published conditions was seconded, and voted upon.

Voting record

10 for
1 abstention

Resolved

That the application be **APPROVED**, in line with the recommendation in the report, subject to the prior completion of a Deed of Variation and the published conditions.

106 Any other items

There were none.

107 Date of next meeting

Tuesday, 13 May 2025 at 10.00am.

The meeting concluded at 10.44 am.