

# North Yorkshire County Council

## Planning and Regulatory Functions Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at County Hall, Northallerton on 27 July 2021 at 10.00 am.

### Present:-

County Councillors Peter Sowray (Chairman), David Blades, Eric Broadbent, Caroline Goodrick, Robert Heseltine, David Hugill, Mike Jordan, John McCartney, Richard Musgrave (as substitute for Zoe Metcalfe), Chris Pearson and Clive Pearson

Apologies were submitted by County Councillor Zoe Metcalfe.

Six members of the public were in attendance.

The meeting was available to watch live via the County Council's website and a recording of the meeting is now available on the website via the following link [www.northyorks.gov.uk/livemeetings](http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/livemeetings)

---

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

---

### **232 Welcome, Introductions and statement from Legal representative.**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and those present introduced themselves.

He explained how this was the first formal face-to-face meeting held by the County Council since restrictions were put in place in March 2020 due to the pandemic. With the need to remain cautious, due to infection levels rising, some restrictions remained and, therefore, due to limited capacity, the meeting was being live broadcast.

The Committee's Legal representative, Catriona Gattrell, highlighted the communication between the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) and Members of the Committee, regarding the perception of predetermination with the Committee having already considered this application previously. That was based on the information before the committee at that time and resulted in a vote on a recommendation to the Chief Executive, albeit that it was at an informal meeting. As a consequence of a number of issues it was considered more appropriate that the application be determined a fresh at a formal, in person meeting of the Committee, hence today's arrangements. The communication explained how members could take part, without having been seen to predetermine the application. Members welcomed the guidance.

### **233. Minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2021**

#### **Resolved -**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2021, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and confirmed, and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

## 234. Declarations of Interest

County Councillor Richard Musgrave declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of him having prior knowledge of the application and knowing, personally, a number of those that had raised objections to the application, including some of those that would be speaking in opposition at today's meeting. He emphasised that despite these facts he was approaching the consideration of the application with an open mind and would base his decision on the details provided at the meeting.

## 235. Public Questions or Statements

The representative of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) stated that, other than those that had indicated that they wished to speak in relation to the application below, there were no questions or statements from members of the public.

## 236. **NY/2019/0002/ENV (C8/2019/0253/CPO) - planning application for a 9.7 hectare quarry extension (Area 8) extending east from the current working (Area 7), with associated screening bunds and landscaping for the extraction of 4.9 million tonnes of Magnesian limestone over a period of eight years; and the progressive low level restoration of the worked out area of the quarry to grassland and planting using quarry limestone fines and reclaimed inert waste materials from the waste recycling facility located within the existing quarry - Land at Went Edge Quarry, Went Edge Road, Kirk Smeaton, Selby**

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services requesting Members to determine a planning application for a 9.7 hectare quarry extension (Area 8) extending east from the current working (Area 7), with associated screening bunds and landscaping for the extraction of 4.9 million tonnes of Magnesian limestone over a period of eight years; and the progressive low level restoration of the worked out area of the quarry to grassland and planting using quarry limestone fines and reclaimed inert waste materials from the waste recycling facility located within the existing quarry - Land at Went Edge Quarry, Went Edge Road, Kirk Smeaton, Selby.

A combined total of 282 representations have been received from individuals objecting to the application as initially submitted, amended and by making further representations, principally because of the:

- adverse impact of the proposal on the landscape;
- impact on the Green Belt;
- visual impact on the surrounding area;
- damage to the historic character of Wentbridge and Kirk Smeaton;
- loss of agricultural land;
- impact of the Brockadale Nature Reserve and Site of Special Scientific Interest;
- impact on the amenities of the area from noise, dust and vibration;
- impact of HGVs using Wentedge Road;
- cumulative impact of quarries in the area;
- there being a sufficient landbank for aggregate and failure of the current quarry operator to abide by planning conditions to the current planning permissions to the site.

Objections had also been received from Natural England; Kirk Smeaton Parish Council;

Little Smeaton Parish Council, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust; Brockadale Nature Reserve Supporters Group, Brockadale Action Group, Plantlife, Darrington Parish Council, Wakefield Badger Group and the Ramblers Association.

Prior to the presentation of public statements the Planning Officer stated that there had been a request for a further site visit, from representatives of Brockadale Nature Reserve, and he asked that Members gave consideration to that matter before full consideration of the report and statements were undertaken. He noted that there had been a visit, by the Committee, to the site area in February 2020. The Planning Officer stated that there had been no material changes since the Committee's previous visit and that his presentation to the Committee would provide further context to the application and the surrounding area.

A Member noted the length of time that had elapsed since the Committee visited the site, and noted that the previous site visit had not provided members with an opportunity to view the Nature Reserve, with this having been driven past and observed from a distance. He stated that it would be useful for Members to view this before undertaking consideration of the application.

**Resolved –**

That the request for a further site visit be approved, with this taking place before consideration of the application, allowing Members to be better informed of the area surrounding the application site. Consequently arrangements for the visit would now be made in consultation with Members.

The meeting concluded at 10.20

SL