

North Yorkshire Council

Strategic Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at County Hall, Northallerton on Tuesday, 10 December 2024 at 10am.

Present:-

Councillors Andy Paraskos (Chair), Andy Brown, John Cattanach, Richard Foster, Hannah Gostlow, David Hugill, Tom Jones, Andrew Lee, John McCartney, Bob Packham, Yvonne Peacock, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers, Andrew Timothy and Steve Watson (as substitute for John Mann).

Apologies were received from Councillor John Mann

Other Members – Councillor Caroline Goodrick (speaking on applications).

Officers present: Martin Grainger, John Worthington, Nick Turpin, David Walker, Kate Broadbank, Nick Howard, Fiona Hunter, Sam Till, Gerard Walsh, Glenn Sharpe and Steve Loach

There were approximately 40 members of the public.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

72. Minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2024

Resolved -

That the amended minutes of the meeting of Strategic Planning Committee, held on 8 October 2024, be confirmed by Members and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

73. Declarations of Interest

All Members declared that they had received correspondence from either supporters, objectors or both to the applications being considered but, unless otherwise stated below, would form their opinion based on the evidence provided at the meeting.

Councillor Timothy declared that he works as a case worker for Tom Gordon MP, who had received representations from members of the public relating to Item 4 on the agenda. He declared that he had an open mind.

74. ZC23/04361/EIAMAJ - Erection of ground mounted solar farm (up to 43MW) and associated infrastructure including access to the A61, internal access tracks, customer substation, DNO building, storage container, 2no. power stations, pole mounted CCTV, fencing and landscaping - Land East Of Wormald Green, Wormald Green, North Yorkshire

Considered -

The report of the Head of Development Management – Community Development Services requesting Members to determine a planning application for the erection of ground mounted solar farm (up to 43MW) and associated infrastructure including access to the A61, internal access tracks, customer substation, DNO building, storage container, 2no. power stations, pole mounted CCTV, fencing and landscaping - Land East Of Wormald Green, Wormald Green, North Yorkshire.

The application was brought to the Committee as it was an application accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment that was recommended for approval.

A Planning Officer presented the Committee report highlighting the proposal; the site location, viewpoints and description; the context to the application; planning guidance; and policy and planning considerations. The report also provided a conclusion and recommendation.

Councillor Keith Townson - Burton Leonard Parish Council addressed the Committee highlighting the following:-

- Flooding issues affecting local communities in that area.
- Surface water issues being exacerbated should the application be approved.
- The impact on the local community of materials being transported onto the site and security lighting

Frances Nicholson of Harmony Energy, the applicant, addressed the Committee highlighting the following.

- The recommendation for approval was welcomed.
- The development would assist with addressing the climate emergency and achieving net zero carbon emissions.
- It would provide a significant contribution to energy supplies.
- A substantial biodiversity net gain would be achieved.
- The land being utilised for the development was not fertile.
- It also supported farming diversification issues.

Members discussed the application and the following issues were raised:-

- Clarification was provided in respect of the connection to the Grid and it was noted that a separate application would be required in respect of the routing of the cables. Details of the proposed route for the cables were outlined. It was noted that the provision of the cables and development of a sub-station could potentially be dealt with through delegated authority, however, if required, the details would be brought before the Committee.
- Proximity to the salt barns was clarified.
- It was noted that lighting matters would be addressed through the condition 10. Members stressed the importance of controlling lighting in predominantly rural areas.
- A Member suggested that the maintenance of the ground on which the panels were situated should use grazing rather than spraying to enhance environmental benefits. In response it was stated that consideration would be given to conditioning this.
- Overall the benefits of the proposed development outweighed the disadvantages.
- It was suggested that it be ensured the access track be implanted as early as possible in the development to prevent the over use of local roads.
- Members considered it appropriate to allow the case officer to negotiate with the applicant the additional factors suggested during consideration of the application.

Resolved

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions listed in the report and the completion of a S106 agreement with terms as detailed in Table 1 of the report.

The voting on this resolution was unanimous.

75. 22/01558/EIAMAJ - Outline planning application for the erection of up to 480 dwellings, provision of football pitches and ancillary building, provision of cricket pitch and pavilion, with associated access roads, car parking, landscaping, open space and infrastructure including works to the adopted highway to create site accesses. All outline matters reserved except for points of access - Land comprising field at Grid Reference 428025 453431, Beckwith Head Road, Harrogate, North Yorkshire

Considered -

The report of the Assistant Director Planning – Community Development Service requesting Members to determine an outline planning application for the erection of up to 480 dwellings, provision of football pitches and ancillary building, provision of cricket pitch and pavilion, with associated access roads, car parking, landscaping, open space and infrastructure including works to the adopted highway to create site accesses. All outline matters reserved except for points of access - Land comprising field at Grid Reference 428025 453431, Beckwith Head Road, Harrogate, North Yorkshire

The application was brought before the Committee because it was an application required to be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Statement and because the site was part of a wider ‘urban extension’ to the West of Harrogate.

A Planning Officer presented the Committee report, highlighting the proposal; the site location and description; the context to the application; planning guidance; and policy and planning considerations. The report also provided a conclusion and recommendations. Updates were provided in respect of further representations received after the publication of the papers in relation to the impacts of the building and the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

Matthew Richards – Homes England (the applicant) addressed the Committee and highlighted the following:-

- There was a need for substantially more homes across the country and this development, which accords with the local plan, assisted that.
- The principle of the development was well acknowledged and is in line with the plan.
- Various local amenities that would substantially enhance the area were included in the proposals.
- The aim was to provide a “Yorkshire Village” type development and deliver significant additional homes for the West of Harrogate.

Derek Spence, representing Beckwithshaw Parish Council and Harlow and Pannal Ash Residents’ Association, addressed the Committee and highlighted the following.

- The proposals would bring a huge change to the nature of the area
- The current infrastructure cannot support the level of development and the

- strategic infrastructure package does not adequately support it either.
- There would be increased congestion and risk of road accidents.
 - Negative environmental impact and the failure to better incorporate sustainable travel.
 - There had been little, if any consultation, with local residents regarding the proposals.

Members discussed the application and the following issues were outlined:-

- Concern was raised regarding the lack of consultation with local residents, as indicated by the speaker. In response it was noted that a series of events had been undertaken by the Council when the development plan, in which this was detailed, had been developed.
- The provision of 40% affordable housing within the scheme was welcomed, but it was noted that there was no conditioning in relation to how these would be integrated into the overall development. In response it was stated these issues would be determined at the reserved matters stage with further applications submitted for the Committee to determine.
- It was asked whether allotments could be added to the proposals to enhance the “Yorkshire Village” feel. In response it was stated that it would be difficult to accommodate these within the proposals for the site but a contribution could be provided for such a provision, off-site. The Member emphasised the need for these to be accessed by walking and it was stated that further consideration would be given to this matter at the reserved matters stage.
- Despite the number of positive developments within the proposals there was some concern that there had been little consultation with the local community and it was suggested that better liaison would greatly enhance the application.
- It was expected that local bus services would be extended to provide services to the new development and bus stops were included within the proposals.
- A Member considered that as this was an outline application that accorded with the local plan, approval should be given and further consideration of the exact details of the proposal should be undertaken at the reserved matters stage.
- It was re-emphasised that the developer should consider providing allotments within the boundary of the proposals.

A proposal to approve the application was seconded. The Committee’s Legal Representative informed Members that the Constitution provided that they may wish to consider a proposal to defer a decision to approve, to ensure that appropriate information, including a suite of conditions, could be made available, to enable Members to make an informed decision. Members agreed, therefore, to recall the initial proposal and replace that with a proposal to defer the application for the provision of additional information, including a suite of conditions. Details of the required information were outlined.

Resolved -

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions listed in the report and the completion of a S106 agreement with terms as detailed in Table 1 of the report.

The voting on this resolution was unanimous

76 22/00479/OUT - Outline planning permission with all matters reserved apart from access for the construction of a motorway service area comprised of an amenity building; petrol filling station; drive-thru coffee shop; parking facilities; internal access roads; services areas and other associated facilities including landscaping and amenity areas with a new roundabout junction and other highway works on the A6055 - Barton Motorway Truck Stop, Junction 56 A1(M), Barton, DL10 6NA

Considered -

The report of the Assistant Director Planning – Community Development Service requesting Members to determine an outline planning permission with all matters reserved apart from access for the construction of a motorway service area comprised of an amenity building; petrol filling station; drive-thru coffee shop; parking facilities; internal access roads; services areas and other associated facilities including landscaping and amenity areas with a new roundabout junction and other highway works on the A6055 - Barton Motorway Truck Stop, Junction 56 A1(M), Barton, DL10 6NA

The application was referred to the Committee due to the strategic nature of the proposal being a Motorway Service Area (MSA), raising significant material planning considerations that affect more than one area committee geography.

A Planning Officer presented the Committee report, highlighting the proposal; the site location and description; the context to the application; planning guidance; and policy and planning considerations. The report also provided a conclusion and recommendations.

An update to the report had been published prior to the meeting which corrected a small number of inaccuracies within the original report, provided details of additional representations received since the publication of the original report and an assessment in relation to provisions for abnormal loads.

Additional conditions were also suggested, as follows:-

- A. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into first use until a National Highways signage agreement has been obtained and such signage provided for direction signing for the Motorway Service Area from and to the A1(M).

Reason: For the safety and efficient operation of the Strategic Road network

- B. The internal road layout shall provide equivalent provisions as detailed by plan 7690_06 Rev G6 and be designed to accommodate abnormal loads.

Reason: For the safe and efficient operation of the development and to ensure it designed to an appropriate standard for this type of facility.

Councillor Carl Les, Divisional Member for Catterick Village and Brompton on Swale, submitted a statement that was read out by the clerk, which related to this application and the application detailed at Minute Number 77. He highlighted the following:-

- The applications related to two Motorway Service Areas within 10 miles of each other, one (Minute Number 76) a brownfield site and the other (Minute Number 77) a greenfield site.
- Local residents were opposed to the development detailed in Minute Number 77.
- There would be extraordinary number of rest sites and available facilities on a

relatively short stretch of road should both of the applications be approved.

- Support should be given to the development of the brownfield site (Minute Number 76) and not the greenfield site (Minute Number 77).

Councillor Angus Thompson, Divisional Member for North Richmondshire, submitted a statement that was read out by the clerk, highlighting the following:-

- The current facilities at Barton were neglected and in need of upgrading
- The application provided an opportunity to update the facilities, on a brownfield site that would assist all users of the road network
- There was a need ensure that large vehicles did not pass through nearby villages, to ensure that access for the immediate neighbours to the proposed site was not impeded and to ensure that the flooding issues in that area were addressed.

Steve Gibbon, a local resident, addressed the Committee, highlighting the following:-

- The need to address the flooding and drainage situation at the site through the proposed development.

Steve Hill, representing local residents in support of the application, addressed the Committee, highlighting the following:-

- A number of issues required addressing through the application but overall the development would be positive for the local area

Jess Lockwood, property director at Moto, representing the applicant addressed the Committee, highlighting the following:-

- There would be a £20m investment into the upgrade
- The development would address issues regarding the gap between motorway service areas as outlined by the Department for Transport
- This development was on a brownfield site and would have the least impact on the environment

Members discussed the application and the following issues were outlined:-

- It was emphasised that although the two MSA applications were close together each should be determined on its own merits and that there were strategic highway reasons given for the development of both.
- In relation to the issues raised in respect of flooding and drainage it was stated that these would be addressed through the development. It was emphasised that all parties should be fully engaged in relation to the measures that would be provided including the occupants of Quarry House to the North who have experience flooding in the past.
- The development may reduce visitors to Scotch Corner Services and thus reduce congestion at this junction and service area.
- Provision of solar panels on the proposed building are desirable and should be secured
- The road network situation around the proposed development would be carefully planned to take account of local concerns.
- A S278 agreement would be entered into to control and continue the abnormal

load route aspect of the proposals.

- It was noted that although the two MSA applications had to be determined on their own merits, there appeared to be more parking space provided in a smaller area for this application. In response it was noted that there were additional buildings required for the subsequent application, therefore, less dedicated parking space.

Resolved -

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions listed in the report, together with the additional conditions detailed above and the additional condition detailed below, and the completion of a S106 agreement with terms as detailed in Table 1 of the report.

Prior to any works above existing ground level a detailed low carbon and renewable energy strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall demonstrate how opportunities to deliver carbon savings in excess of Building Regulation requirements have been considered and demonstrate that carbon savings have been maximised.

The development shall there afterwards take place in full accordance with the approved details and any associated technology installed and made fully functional prior to first occupation. The approved measures shall be retained and maintained in perpetuity unless replaced for a more sustainable system which is more energy efficient.

Reason: To improve upon Building Regulations Part L (as of date of decision) as required by Policy CP2 of the Richmondshire Local Plan 2012-2028 Core Strategy adopted 2014.

The voting on this resolution was unanimous

- 77. 19/00473/FULL - Full Planning Permission for Motorway Service Area Comprising Amenity Building, (Shops, Restaurants, Lounges, Tourist Information, Gaming Room and Cash Machines, Toilet Facilities, Administration Offices and Staff facilities, Servicing, Storage Areas, and Ancillary Uses), 100 Bedroomed Hotel, Drive Thru Costa and McDonald's Restaurants, Fuel Filling Station with Shop (total 10,855 sq. m Gross Floorspace), Car, Lorry, Motorbike, Cycle, Caravan and Coach Parking, Electric Vehicle Charging Facilities, Amenity Lake and Associated Landscaping with Dog Walking Facilities and Landscaping with Access to J52 on the A1(M) (As Amended) - Land East of Junction 52 on the A1(M) At Catterick, Pallett Hill Farm, Catterick Village, DL10 7PG**

Considered -

The report of the Head of Development Management – Community Development Service requesting Members to determine an application for full Planning Permission for Motorway Service Area comprising amenity building, (Shops, Restaurants, Lounges, Tourist Information, Gaming Room and Cash Machines, Toilet Facilities, Administration Offices and Staff facilities, Servicing, Storage Areas, and ancillary uses), 100 bedroomed hotel, Drive Thru Costa and McDonald's Restaurants, fuel filling station with shop (total 10,855 sq. m Gross Floorspace), car, lorry, motorbike, cycle, caravan and coach parking, Electric Vehicle Charging facilities, amenity lake and associated landscaping with dog walking facilities and landscaping with access to J52 on

the A1(M) (as amended) - Land East of Junction 52 on the A1(M) At Catterick, Pallett Hill Farm, Catterick Village, DL10 7PG

The application was referred to the Committee due to the strategic nature of the proposal being a Motorway Service Area (MSA), raising significant material planning considerations that affect more than one area committee geography.

A Planning Officer presented the Committee report, highlighting the proposal; the site location and description; the context to the application; planning guidance; and policy and planning considerations. The report also provided a conclusion and recommendations.

An update to the report had been published prior to the meeting which corrected a small number of inaccuracies within the original report, provided details of additional representations received since the publication of the original report and an assessment in relation the Scheduled Ancient Monument.

Updates to the conditions highlighted the following:-

Condition 2 Edits

Approved Plan Condition (2) updated to delete the following documents, as these are informative rather than aspects needing to be complied with OR they are secured by the S106:

- Statement of Community Involvement
- Comparative Analysis of MSA Applications by Montagu Evans dated 3rd April 2024
- East Cowton proposed flood plain grassland nature conservation area. Lower Ure Conservation Trust dated March 2024.
- ADAS letter Ecological opinion dated 03 April 2024
- Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment ADAS document dated 23rd January 2024

Add:

- Landscape Masterplan 1836.10J

Replace:

218257/01 OVERALL LAYOUT with Overall Layout 218257-D01-P5B

Condition 2 and 14 Edit

Flood risk assessment changed to refer to approved document: 881624-R1(01)-FRA Flood Risk Assessment & 881624_L01_KJ Flood Risk Addendum

Liz Dinsmore of the Campaign to Save Catterick addressed the Committee, highlighting the following:-

- There was no evidence of need with a number of similar facilities already in place.
- There was a mandate from the Government to protect the countryside and the proposals were contrary to this.
- The site had a large amount of biodiversity, was a nature conservation site, and housed a number of protected species.
- The data provided with the report was not up-to-date.
- The area was within the flood plain.
- A new infrastructure around the facilities would be required adding further development to the area.

Jennifer Smith of Smith Jenkins Planning and Heritage (at the discretion of the Chair) addressed the Committee and outlined the following:-

- As the facilities at Barton had just been approved there was no need for the provision of this MSA.
- The close proximity of the two facilities would lead to them not being viable, as they would compete against each other.
- The local wildlife status of part of the site.

Councillor Lin Ryan of Catterick Parish Council addressed the Committee, highlighting the following:-

- Local residents and the Parish Council had a strong objection to the application with concerns continually raised.
- There was real need for this development given the number of similar facilities in the nearby areas, and following the approval of the Barton application.
- The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust had concerns regarding the development in that area. The proposals went against nature conservation and biodiversity and needed to be protected.
- There were significant flooding issues in that area which also impacted the motorway.

Mark Fox, CEO of Roadchef and Simon Warwick of Roadchef addressed the Committee highlighting the following:-

- Supported the recommendation to approve the application.
- The basis for the application had previously been approved by the former Richmondshire District Council.
- The proposals included improvements in comparison to the previously approved application with several offsite mitigation measures to address the loss of the wildlife land.
- Work was to be carried out with the developers alongside local residents in respect of the mitigating measures.
- A good and appropriate site had been identified that would attract the displaced wildlife.
- The application provided an opportunity for the area to be enhanced.

Members discussed the application and the following issues were outlined:-

- It was clarified that the application site is not within the greenbelt, but falls within the countryside and is a 'greenfield' site.
- It was noted that many migrating birds returned to the same site year on year, and the development of the site could cause displacement, however, it was emphasised that there were many suitable locations within the Swale Valley for birds to resettle.
- Details of the Richmondshire District Council planning committee resolution July 2022 were set out. The decision notice was never issued as a legal challenge was received from a third party, which included raising the uncertainty that Richmondshire District Council could find and secure suitable biodiversity net gain land using the proposed S106 contribution. Officers consider this point valid and worked with the applicant to agree amended Heads of Terms.
- The same application is now referred to North Yorkshire Council Strategic Committee with amended Heads of Terms and documentation. It was considered

that the application had evolved positively since the initial application and noted that Members should consider the previous resolution, however, are not compelled to make the same decision.

- It was clarified that there was no minimum distance requirement between MSAs. Need was taken into account and National Highways considered that the Barton facility would be utilised by those travelling north while the Catterick MSA would be used by people travelling south or joining/leaving the road at the A66.
- It was noted that on the previous consideration the matter had been referred to the Secretary of State, as there was an Environmental Statement, however no comment had been received as a result of this.
- Disappointment was expressed that there were no solar panels required through conditioning and there appeared to be a probability that the gravel/sand peat bogs would be lost. In response it was stated that the final energy strategy would be agreed via condition. A member emphasised the need to ensure that new developments such as this had solar panels fitted, particularly when green field were now being taken up by these.
- It was suggested that the original application had a flawed approach in that the S106 was being utilised to find appropriate land and that the proposal now was much better, with biodiversity net gain being achieved. Clarification was also provided as to the reimposition of the S106 agreement with this being utilised to address environmental impacts, given that the application was accompanied with an Environmental Statement.
- It was noted that the approach to the current application had been fairly similar to the 2022 application, the major differences been the biodiversity mitigation off-site having been identified and improvements in biodiversity net gain.
- It was again clarified that Members need not make the same resolution as the previous committee, however, they should clearly explain the reasons for any deviation.
- The need for the facility was discussed including other existing non-MSA motorway services.
- The development would bring a major boost to the local economy, would reduce the impact on the local road network and existing facilities and had several environmental improvements in comparison to the previous application. The proposal would serve different travellers to those using Barton due to the strategic placement of the two MSAs.
- There was some disagreement with the application particularly in relation to the loss of countryside land, the impact on the local environment and the loss of local habitat for migrating birds. There was also some empathy with the issues outlined by representatives of the local community. Some of the biodiversity net gain outlined could not be guaranteed as this relied on migrating birds relocating.

Resolved -

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions listed in the report, together with the revised conditions detailed above, and the completion of a S106 agreement with terms as detailed in Table 1 of the report.

The voting on this resolution was as follows:-

For – 9

Against – 4

Abstain – 2

There was a break in the meeting at this stage during which Councillors Cattanach, Jones and McCartney left.

78/79 78C3/22/01304/CPO - Proposed extension to Settrington Quarry with restoration to nature conservation habitat on land at Settrington Quarry, Back Lane, Settrington, Malton, YO17 8NX.
and
NY/2022/0278/73 - Application to vary condition No. 1 of Planning Permission Ref. C3/19/01386/CPO to allow an extension of time to recover remaining mineral resources on land at Settrington Quarry, Back Lane, Settrington, Malton, North Yorkshire, YO17 8NX

The following applications (Minutes 78 and 79) were the subject of a single presentation as both related to the same site. Public speaking time was extended to take account of there being two applications.

Considered -

The reports of the Assistant Director Planning – Community Development Service requesting Members to determine applications to extend Settrington Quarry with restoration to nature conservation habitat on land at Settrington Quarry, Back Lane, Settrington, Malton, YO17 8NX.

and

to vary condition No. 1 of Planning Permission Ref. C3/19/01386/CPO to allow an extension of time to recover remaining mineral resources on land at Settrington Quarry, Back Lane, Settrington, Malton, North Yorkshire, YO17 8NX

The applications related to a sizeable quarry operation that were subject to objections raised in respect of a range of material planning issues and were, therefore reported to the Committee for determination.

A Planning Officer presented the two Committee reports, highlighting the proposals; the site location and description; the context to the applications; planning guidance; and policy and planning considerations. The reports also provided conclusions and recommendations.

Updates to the reports highlighted alterations to Conditions 2 and 9, an increase in the number of objections and details of a further objection received after the publication of the reports.

Kenelm Storey a local resident objecting to the proposals addressed the Committee highlighting the following:-

- Settrington was a quiet rural village
- The quarry should now be for restoration only.
- The workings at the quarry, particularly the blasting and pecking, had been a major inconvenience for those in the village, specifically those that lived nearby, for many years.
- There had been previous complaints regarding noise, local residents did not agree with the issues set out by the Case Officer and the reports under exaggerated the impact of the work on the local community.
- The restoration plan was unacceptable.
- There were large numbers of HGVs entering and leaving the site on a daily basis, beyond what was detailed in the report. These were damaging the local roads and verges and creating pollution. There had been a recent fatal accident near to the site.

- The quarry was close to a number of sensitive areas, including an SSI, and Settrington was a conservation area.
- The negatives of the continuation of the quarry far outweighed the benefits and much tighter conditions would be required should the applications be approved.
- The suggested working hours were beyond what could be tolerated by the local community.

Councillor Dean Wise the Vice-Chair of Settrington Parish Council addressed the Committee highlighting the following:-

- The conditions should be amended to reflect the nuisance caused to the local community.
- He outlined preferred conditions for the routing of HGVs, the number of vehicles per day in and out of the quarry avoiding school times, working time restrictions.
- Insist that details are provided in relation to when blasting and extractions were to take place.
- Some noise could be accepted but details of when that was to occur, within the suggested revised working times, would be of benefit to the local community.
- He emphasised the need to control traffic movements, ensure that the local community was satisfied with the planning conditions and provide details of the restoration programme.

Councillor Caroline Goodrick the Divisional Councillor addressed the Committee highlighting the following:-

- The proposal of the development was well established.
- The Ryedale Local Plan highlighted the need to protect residential amenity and ensure development did not have a major adverse impact on their lives.
- The operations in the quarry and the HGV movements did not accord with the Local Plan, therefore.
- The proposal for vehicle movements. In and out of the quarry, was not sustainable and movements were exceeding the set targets. A further extension of the movements of HGVs, as suggested in the reports, would have a major detrimental effect on the local area.
- Amendments to the working hours were also suggested.
- Further consideration of the conditions would be required should the application be approved.

Dan Walker a Chartered Surveyor representing the applicant addressed the Committee highlighting the following:-

- The quarry was a family run business and was well established.
- It was in the Council's Mineral and Waste Plan.
- There was a lack of the quality of the mineral produced at the quarry in the east of the County.
- The complaints re blasting had been taken onboard with a revised timetable in place to try and prevent noise nuisance.
- The applicant had no intention of increasing the number of HGV movements to and from the site nor were there plans to increase the removal of the mineral.
- There had been no recent HGV movements as the quarry had not been operational.
- The applications had been subject to robust consultations.
- Many of the concerns of local residents had been addressed and conditioning

ensured that the issues outlined by the public speakers were being taken account of and there was a willingness to co-operate to try and improve the situation.

Members discussed the applications and the following issues were outlined:-

- Why were there three routes out of, and in to, the quarry. In response it was stated that highways did not have any issues with the routes being used as they did not cause any detriment to the local highways network and, therefore, each was acceptable to use. Clarification was provided as to which major road each of the routes connected to.
- It was suggested that the mineral obtained from the quarry may not be of great need as quarrying operations had been paused from 2022/23. It was noted that during 2022 120 tonnes of mineral had been extracted from the site.
- It was noted that the applicant operated on the site on a temporary basis to meet the demand for the mineral when it was required. It was suggested that the mineral could be extracted much more effectively should the extraction process be undertaken all at once and then stockpiled for when it was required. This would also shorten the extraction process and be less of a nuisance to the local community. It was noted that the extraction hours had been agreed with Environmental Health in terms of the impact on the local community, although it was suggested that further discussions were required in respect of these given the concerns raised.
- An adjacent railway track to the site was noted and it was asked whether consideration had been given to using this to move the mineral. In response it was noted that this had not been used previously.
- Concern was raised regarding vehicle movements that were able to take place from 6am and also on week-ends, as vehicles were likely to arrive early and cause disruption to the local community by waiting to access the site.
- Initially there was a proposal to refuse the applications based on the impacts on the local community detailed at this meeting. It was emphasised, however, that despite reservations around the applications in view of the serious impacts on the local area, the principle of the applications and the nature of the work carried out at the site were well established and it was an allotted sit for this purpose in the Local Plan. Members emphasised, therefore, that there was a need to undertake further consultation between the applicant and the local community, including elected representatives, to develop a solution that would take account of the health and wellbeing of those in the local area.

Resolved -

That that the applications referred to at Minute Numbers 78 and 79 be **DEFERRED** for further consideration at a subsequent meeting of the Committee to allow further consultation, on the issues raised during consideration of these applications, between the applicant and the local community, including elected representatives, to develop a solution that would take account of the health and wellbeing of those in the local area.

Councillor Hugill left the meeting.

80. **C8/2022/115/CPO - Planning application for 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**

Considered -

The report of the Assistant Director Planning – Community Development Service requesting Members to determine an application for 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.

The application was subject to objections having been raised primarily on the grounds of disturbance to amenity due to blasting and was, therefore, reported to the Committee for determination.

Prior to the consideration of the report the Committee's Legal Representative highlighted a communication received overnight from the legal representatives representing Sam Smiths Brewery objecting to the recommendation for approval. He stated that this was a lengthy and complex objection that would require more time to determine the implications to the application of the issues raised. He suggested therefore that the application be deferred to allow this to take place.

Resolved -

That that the application be **DEFERRED** for further consideration at a subsequent meeting of the Committee to allow more time to determine the implications to the application of the issues raised in the submission by the legal representatives of Sam Smiths Brewery.

81. Other Urgent Business

There was none.

The meeting concluded at 3.00pm