North Yorkshire Council

Strategic Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 19 May 2026 commencing at 10.00 am.

Councillor Andy Paraskos in the Chair and Councillors Bob Packham, Derek Bastiman, Andy Brown, John Cattanach, Hannah Gostlow, David Hugill, Tom Jones, Andrew Lee, Cliff Lunn, John McCartney, Neil Swannick, Roberta Swiers, Andrew Timothy and Robert Windass.

Officers present: Vicky Day – Highway Development & Adoption Principal Officer, Linda Drake - Principal Planning Officer, Martin Grainger, Head of Development Management, Kate Lavelle - Solicitor and Nicki Lishman - Senior Democratic Services Officer.

Apologies: Councillor Yvonne Peacock.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

---

152 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Yvonne Peacock, Councillor Cliff Lunn substituted.

153 Minutes of the meetings held on 14 April and 24 April 2026

The minutes of the meetings held on 14 and 24 April 2026 were agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

154 Declarations of interest

The Chair confirmed that all Members of the committee had been lobbied.

The Solicitor reminded Members that disclosable interests may affect councillors' ability to take part in the decision-making process. In order to maintain the integrity of the planning system, councillors should consider or be careful to ensure that such interests do not unduly influence their decision or give rise to a perception of predetermination or bias in decision making. Such interests may mean that a councillor was involved with a planning application before it came to committee. Such involvement need not to bar a councillor from participating, providing the councillor had not already decided how they will vote on the matter.

Councillors should always consider carefully whether they could reasonably be seen to approach the planning merits of the application with an open mind. If a councillor considered that was not possible, they should consider withdrawing from the item. If a member of the planning committee had involvement with a group or individual campaigning for or against the application, they should advise of their involvement at the beginning of the meeting and, provided that they've not already decided how to vote, they should make a transparency statement to confirm they were of an open mind, could consider the planning application on its own merits and had not predetermined the application.

For the purposes of transparency Councillor John Cattanach advised that an objector to the

application was featured on BBC Radio York earlier that day.

For the purposes of transparency Councillor John McCartney advised that a newspaper article about this site, first published several years ago and including quotes from Councillor McCartney, had been recently republished. However, he confirmed that he was attending the meeting with an open mind.

155 ZG2023/1037/EIA - Land at Weeland Road, Eggborough

The Head of Development Management sought determination of an outline planning application (all matters reserved) for residential development, extra-care facility, local centre, primary school and associated infrastructure and landscaping with access from Weeland Road and Kellington Lane at land to the western boundary of Eggborough, Weeland Road, Eggborough.

The application was referred to Strategic Planning Committee for determination as the application was accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment.

Members were advised by the Head of Development Management that the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2026 came into force on 11 May 2026. The Direction required that where a local planning authority is 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 gave the Secretary of State the opportunity to decide whether to call in the application under section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act. This applied to planning applications not determined before 11 May 2026.

The Principal Planning Officer advise that 3 letters of objection had been received but no new grounds of objection had been received. In addition, condition 5 and 34 had been amended to reflect the correct plan revision number following minor amendments.

The Officer then presented a detailed series of photographs and plans showing the location of application, the views of the site from various directions, the design code which set out the requirements in terms of design, character and appearance, the access parameters and planned highway improvements.

Angela Rushton spoke to object to the application.

Susan Jackson spoke on behalf of Eggborough Parish Council and Mary McCartney spoke on behalf of Kellington Parish Council.

Lee Dowson, local resident and James Seabury, applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Members questioned the Officer on a number of matters including:

- Planning process and governance - why the application was been brought to the Strategic Planning Committee, whether correct procedures and consultation processes have been followed. Members had concerns about the lack of responses from some key consultees.
- Affordable housing provision – Members raised strong concerns that 10% affordable housing was too low for a development of this scale and questioned the evidence base and justification for 10% vs higher targets elsewhere (e.g. 20% or 40%).
- Housing mix and local need - concerns were raised on the balance of proposed homes, particularly the very low number of 1-bedroom properties (2%) and whether the mix reflected the local demographic need.

OFFICIAL

- The scale and strategic impact of development - the size of the development and the implications of population growth were of concern and whether the development would respect the existing village character.
- Transport and connectivity – Members had concerns on the impact on transport infrastructure capacity, road congestion and junction performance (especially M62 Junction 34), the adequacy of highway improvements and modelling assumptions and existing traffic safety and accident history. There were questions on public transport viability, especially the rail service frequency and potential upgrades.
- Sustainability and environmental standards – questions were asked on how sustainable the development would be in practice, such as the use of renewable energy and whether the proposals went beyond minimum building regulations.
- Environmental and land use impacts – concerns were raised about the loss of agricultural land and the impacts on landscape and character, including the loss of separation between settlements.
- Infrastructure provision and funding – Members asked how infrastructure would be delivered and funded, including schools, rail and transport improvements and sewerage and drainage capacity.
- Economic and social benefits – what benefits would there be in terms of jobs, local facilities, and services and if there would be opportunities for apprenticeships and training via the planning obligations.

The Chair opened the debate and invited comments from Members.

The benefits of the proposal were acknowledged, including addressing national housing need, provision of supporting infrastructure (station improvements, school, extra care provision and employment opportunities), and increased housing supply. There were concerns, particularly regarding the sustainability of the location and the overall scale of development. It was emphasised that the scheme would result in approximately a 140% increase in the population of the settlement, which may be considered excessive and inappropriate for a designated service village. Additional concerns included the loss of approximately 50 hectares of Grade 3A agricultural land and adverse landscape impacts.

There were several objections to the 10% affordable housing provision, with several Members advocating alignment with higher North Yorkshire targets (circa 30–40%). Concerns about housing mix, sustainability measures, sewerage infrastructure, highways impacts, and unclear education funding arrangements were highlighted.

The nearby M62 junction was described as inadequate, unsafe and not fit to accommodate the projected increase in traffic.

Members supported elements of earlier comments, recognising the benefits of the development and the value of the infrastructure package secured through negotiations. However, concerns were raised regarding the low level of affordable housing and delays in securing agreements with Network Rail for rail improvements to encourage sustainable travel patterns.

Further contributions from Members included:

- Issues relating to design and housing compatibility, including criticism of three-storey dwellings in predominantly lower-rise areas.
- Observations that the proposal represented a missed opportunity to deliver higher standards of sustainability (e.g. renewable energy, heat systems).
- Recognition that the Council's lack of a five-year housing land supply and recent national policy changes could limit decision-making options.

Councillor Andy Brown proposed and Councillor Derek Bastiman seconded that the decision be deferred for an independent assessment on the provision of affordable housing,

to review the mix of housing at the site and to review the use of CIL and S106 funds.

Upon being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously.

Councillor Neil Swannick proposed and Councillor Derek Bastiman seconded an amendment to the motion that further consultation and engagement be undertaken with Network Rail on improvements to the rail service.

Upon being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously.

Councillor John McCartney proposed and Councillor Hannah Gostlow seconded an amendment to the motion that a site visit be arranged prior to the application being brought back to the committee.

Upon being put to the vote the motion was carried by 10 votes for, 3 against and 1 abstention.

Resolved

That:

a) a decision on the application be deferred for an independent assessment on the provision of affordable housing provision and to review the mix of housing at the site and to review the use of CIL and S106 funds.

b) that further engagement be undertaken with Network Rail on improvements to the rail service.

c) that a site visit be arranged prior to the application being brought back to the committee.

156 Any other items

There were no items of urgent business.

157 Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday, 9 June 2026.

The meeting concluded at 11.55 am.