

# North Yorkshire Council

## Selby and Ainsty Area Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 13 May 2026 commencing at 2.00 pm.

Councillor John Cattanach in the Chair plus Councillors Bob Packham, Karl Arthur, Mark Crane, Cliff Lunn, Steve Shaw-Wright and Arnold Warneken

Officers present: Kate Lavelle - Solicitor, Planning and Environment, Hannah Blackburn – Development Management Team Manager, Linda Drake – Principal Planning Officer, Ryan King – Senior Planning Officer, Emma Booth-Dale (observing); and Dawn Drury – Democratic Services Officer.

---

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

---

### **144 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **145 Minutes for the Meeting held on 8 April 2026**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 8 April 2026 were confirmed and signed as an accurate record

### **146 Declarations of Interests**

Councillor Arthur declared a personal interest in agenda item number 5 as he was employed by Network Rail, however this application did not impact on his employment, and he confirmed that he would speak and vote on the items.

### **147 2023/0030/FULM - Land Off Mill Lane, Brayton, Selby, North Yorkshire**

Prior to the start of the presentation, the Development Management Team Leader informed Members that the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2026, made on 31 March 2026, came into force on 11 May 2026. The Direction required that where a local planning authority was minded to refuse planning permission for any development for 150 dwellings or more, the authority must consult the Secretary of State before issuing the decision notice. The consultation would give the Secretary of State the opportunity to decide whether to call in the application under section 77 of The Town and Country Planning Act. The Direction applied to applications not determined before 11 May 2026.

The Assistant Director, Community Development Services sought determination of an application for full planning permission for residential development of 204 residential dwellings at land off Mill Lane, Brayton, 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 Principal Planning Officer presented the report, outlining the site location and description and informed Members that there was an officer update note on the application. A correction had been made to Condition 10 (point 1) to align with the Highways recommendation, such that the new footway at Mill Lane, between the main site entrance

and the existing footway at 2 Mill Lane, was to be completed prior to the occupation of the first dwelling, rather than prior to occupation of 50% of the dwellings as stated within the agenda pack.

Ann Vickers, spoke in objection to the application.

The agent, Mark Johnson 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 as to whether the Direction referred to at the beginning of the item would apply irrespective of the local planning authority's ability to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply.
- With reference to paragraph 10.12 of the report, clarification was sought as to whether the five-year housing land supply should continue to be assessed on the basis of the Selby legacy area or across the whole authority.
- Members queried whether, based on appeal decisions to date, Inspectors were continuing to assess the five-year housing land supply on the basis of the Selby legacy area.
- In relation to affordable housing, and with reference to paragraph 10.22 of the report, a query was raised as to whether the stated provision of 20% affordable housing units should instead read 10%.
- In relation to paragraph 10.33, Members queried as to whether the site, identified as Grade 3 agricultural land in the Yorkshire and Humber Agricultural Land Classification, is classified as Grade 3a or 3b, given the distinction in national policy.
- Members queried whether the objections raised by the Landscape Officer and the Urban Design Officer had been addressed.

During the debate, the Division Member raised concerns regarding the density of the proposed development and the impact on the surrounding road network. He stated that the scale and design of the dwellings were not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

The Member also expressed disappointment that neither the agent nor the applicant had contacted him to discuss the proposals or explore potential improvements to the scheme. He emphasised that the number of houses proposed was excessive for the site and that the development appeared to encroach too closely on existing neighbouring properties. Whilst acknowledging that the application offered certain benefits, including a financial contribution towards traffic lights at Brayton crossroads, he urged that further work be undertaken with the local Member and planning officers to develop a scheme that was more in keeping with the character of the area.

Members raised concerns about the potential loss of high-quality agricultural land should it be classified as Grade 3a rather than 3b. They considered that objections from the Council's Landscape and Urban Design Officers had not been adequately addressed. The affordable housing provision of 10% was viewed as insufficient, although Members welcomed the increase in social rented units. Concerns were also expressed regarding future school capacity, and it was noted that more up-to-date information on the five-year housing land supply was required to support robust decision-making.

Members accepted the principle of development but emphasised that density and landscape impacts required careful consideration. It was felt that the size and style of houses and gardens have diminished over time, and that the scheme should be revisited. Members stressed the need to rethink the design, layout and overall density to ensure the development reflected the character of the surrounding area.

One Member commented that the Committee was in a difficult position due to the absence

of a five-year housing land supply within North Yorkshire Council, and stated that, if the Members were minded to refuse the application, it would be referred to the Secretary of State and could be approved more quickly.

Councillor Cattanach proposed approval of the application; however, the proposal did not receive a seconder and therefore the motion fell.

Councillor Crane proposed, and Councillor Warneken seconded, that determination of the application be deferred on the grounds that the scheme was not in keeping with the local surroundings. The purpose of the deferral was to allow discussions to take place between the Applicant, the Division Member and Planning Officers to explore potential amendments to the scheme to better reflect the character of the area in terms of density and appearance, and to allow time for clarification of the agricultural land classification.

The decision

That Members DEFER the decision for the reason below.

- To allow discussions to take place between the Applicant, the Division Member and Planning Officers to explore potential amendments to the scheme to better reflect the character of the area in terms of density and appearance, and to allow time for clarification of the agricultural land classification.

Voting record

A vote was taken, and the motion was carried with 6 votes for, and 1 abstention.

#### **148 ZG2026/0070/FUL - Units 1 to 5 of Selby Business Centre, Station Road, Selby**

The Assistant Director, Community Development Services sought determination of an application for the demolition of units 1 to 5 of Selby Business Centre to facilitate the release of land for later redevelopment as part of the Selby Station Gateway Scheme, a major public-realm and regeneration project, at Unit 3, Selby Business Park, Station Road, Selby.

The application had been brought to Planning Committee as the application had been submitted by North Yorkshire Council.

The Senior Planning Officer informed Members that there was an officer update note on the application. Members were advised that the application related to the demolition of an unlisted building within the Selby Town Conservation Area and therefore constituted “relevant demolition” under Regulation 4A of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended). As such, the Local Planning Authority was required to notify Historic England (HE) and allow a 21-day period for representations. Officers had notified HE on 6 May 2026, with the consultation period expiring on 28 May 2026.

Therefore, to ensure compliance with statutory consultation requirements, officers recommended an amendment to the recommendation within the original Committee report, namely that, if Members were minded to grant permission, the decision be delegated to the Head of Development Management subject to the expiry of the consultation period without objection and the conditions set out in the report. Any comments received from HE would be reviewed by officers and referred back to Members if necessary.

The Officer presented the report and highlighted that the application was purely for the demolition of the buildings to facilitate the future development of the Selby Station Gateway Scheme.

Members noted that HE had raised no objections to the previously approved Selby Station gateway redevelopment (ref. 2022/0031/EIA), which included demolition of the building; however, that permission had since lapsed and a new application (ref. ZG2026/0253/FUL) was pending.

There were no speakers on the application.

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

- Members queried whether works had already commenced at the site.

Councillor Warneken proposed, and Councillor Shaw-Wright seconded that the application should be minded to approve, with the decision then delegated to the Head of Development Management.

The decision

That Members were MINDED TO APPROVE planning permission and to delegate authorisation, subject to the expiry of the HE consultation period without objection and the conditions set out in the report, to the Head of Development Management.

Voting record

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

#### **149 Any other items**

There were no items of urgent business

#### **150 Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 10 June, 2026 at 2.00 pm.

The meeting concluded at 3.02 pm.