

Public Document Pack

North Yorkshire Council

Harrogate and Knaresborough Area Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 16 December 2025 commencing at 2.00 pm.

Councillor Aldred in the Chair, plus Councillors Mann, Broadbank, Haslam, Lacey and Windass

Officers present: Kate Lavelle, Solicitor (Planning); Kate Broadbank, Development Management Team Manager, Mike Parkes, Senior Planning Officer, Edward Maxwell, Senior Democratic Services Officer; and Dawn Drury, Democratic Services Officer

Apologies: Councillor Hannah Gostlow

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

59 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Hannah Gostlow.

60 Minutes for the Meetings held on 28 October and 25 November 2025

The minutes of the meetings held on 28 October and 25 November 2025 were agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record

61 Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

62 HGTZC25/01133/FUL - 12 Iles Lane, Knaresborough, HG5 8DY

The Assistant Director Planning, Community Development Services sought determination of a planning application for the construction of two dwellings on land at 12 Iles Lane, Knaresborough, HG5 8DY.

The application had been referred to Committee at the request of the Divisional Member.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report and highlighted the site's location and description. Members were advised that a previous application for the site had been refused in 2021, with the reasons cited as the loss of a boundary wall and the impact on trees. A site visit had been undertaken by Members prior to the meeting.

Providing an update to their report, the officer advised Members of the following.

- Two further representations had been received by the authority, it was confirmed that the majority of the matters raised by the first representation had already been addressed within the Committee report, with the exception of a concern that Knaresborough had already made a disproportionately high contribution to housing provision. The officer explained that there was no

planning policy which sought to balance housing between individual settlements.

- The second representation received expanded on an earlier submission which raised the following concerns: -

- There would be a permanent change to the setting of a listed building. The officer advised that the relationship between the listed building and the application site was already obstructed by properties at 10A and 12 Iles Lane; therefore, the proposed development would have no impact on the listed building.
- Reference had been made to the previously refused application due to the ecological value of the grassland which had existed, the use of the grassland for residential development at that time had not been opposed.
- Due to the size of the site, consultation with Historic England (HE) was required. The officer confirmed that the consultation had been undertaken; however, for applications of this nature, HE would normally defer to the advice of the authority's Conservation Officer. The Conservation Officer had advised that, while there would be less than significant harm to the conservation area, the setting of the listed building would not be adversely affected.
- There was reference to the spaces being as important as the buildings in the conservation area; however, the character appraisal did not identify this land as being of any particular significance.
- The regularisation of the stone boundary wall frontage, the officer clarified that this referred to the existing gatepost. Permission had been refused in the earlier application; however, this matter was considered incidental and was not part of the application before Members.
- The location of a pond in the grounds at the listed building, the officer highlighted that there were two ponds, one of which was an active frog pond. No evidence of great crested newts had been reported; however, should Members consider it appropriate, an informative could be attached to the application.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the recommendation was for approval, but with the variation that should Historic England raise objections, the application would be referred back to the Committee.

The clerk read out a statement on behalf of the Division Councillor, Matt Walker, objecting to the application.

Rachel Reaney spoke on behalf of the applicant, in support of the application.

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

- Members queried why, given the shortage of building land supply, the site could not accommodate three or four houses.
- It was queried how the area should be restored following construction works, particularly in relation to planting, and how they might influence any conditions attached to the application.

- The Chair expressed concerns regarding access to the site, noting that the access currently passed the applicant's residence and queried whether this access would remain protected in perpetuity should the applicant relocate.
- The Chair sought clarification that the application would return to the Committee should Historic England raise any objections and that the site was classed as a green area.
- During the site visit, Members had noted the prevalence of Laurel trees, which were not conducive to supporting other plant species. It was queried whether an informative could be added which sought removal of the Laurel trees and the planting of species that promoted greater biodiversity. Following officer advice, all Members voted to agree that an informative should be added to the application.
 - The Chair queried whether Members could specify that any off-site Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) should be delivered within the parish of Knaresborough, rather than across the wider North Yorkshire area, to ensure the benefit was realised locally. Officers agreed that an informative could be added to the application to specify that any off-site BNG be secured as locally as possible.

Members supported the application, expressing the view that the site should not have been allowed to deteriorate to its current state. They agreed that the proposed development would improve and enhance the area and, on balance, make a positive contribution.

Councillor Mann proposed, and Councillor Broadbank seconded, that Members were minded to approve the application, subject to the conditions listed at item 12 of the agenda pack, the prior completion of a S106 Agreement, written confirmation from Historic England that they have no objections to the proposal; and the additions of an informative requiring the removal of Laurel trees and the planting of species that promote greater biodiversity, and an informative to ensure that any off-site Biodiversity Net Gain be secured as locally as possible, with the decision then delegated to the Head of Development Management.

The decision

That Members were MINDED TO APPROVE planning permission subject to the conditions listed at item 12 of the agenda pack, the prior completion of a S106 Agreement, written confirmation from Historic England that they have no objections to the proposal; and the addition of an informative requiring the removal of Laurel trees and the planting of species that promote greater biodiversity, and an informative to ensure that any off-site Biodiversity Net Gain be secured as locally as possible, with the decision then delegated to the Head of Development Management.

Voting record

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

63 Any other items

There were no items of urgent business.

6 Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday, 27 January 2026 at 2.00pm.

The meeting concluded at 2.47 pm.