

Pre-Submission Draft Consultation for the Guisborough Civil Parish Neighbourhood Plan

This document should be read in conjunction with “Statement of Public Consultation for Guisborough CP Neighbourhood Plan” which covers all of the consultation and engagement prior to the pre-submission consultation period, including the preparatory actions.

Abbreviations

QB - Qualifying Body (which is Guisborough Town Council)

GNP – Guisborough Civil Parish Neighbourhood Plan

NP – Neighbourhood Plan

RCBC – Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council

LGS - Local Green Space

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

GTC – Guisborough Town Council

1.0 Summary of the Main Issues and Concerns Raised by the Consultees

1.1 The vast majority of those who expressed an opinion were supportive of the GNP.

1.2 Of those who expressed issues or concerns, these were limited to only a few areas of the GNP.

1.3 The non-statutory consultees issues and concerns mainly related to topics that they hadn't realised were covered in the NP, or were expressions of general dissatisfaction with public services or with all forms of development. In these cases, no changes to the GNP were made.

1.4 The informal officer comments from RCBC on 5th June 2025 (see Section 5.0) led to significant presentational and policy changes to prepare the plan for pre-submission consultation.

1.5 The response from Historic England (see Appendix 7) led to the amalgamation of two Built Environment policies. This removed the risk of not meeting the basic conditions and removed potential duplication between the two policies.

1.6 Many of the statutory consultees suggested wording changes and these were generally accepted and the changes made.

1.7 Sections 7 and 8 detail each and every response, including all the issues and concerns raised, the GTC response, and if / how the GNP was changed as a result.

2.0 Publicity

The Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan was published and publicised before the statutory consultation period. Publicity included posters on the town's public noticeboards including supermarkets and the library, a Facebook post by the town clerk's office onto 'Guisborough News and Views' – a popular local group with 31,000 followers, copies of the key documents on the GTC website with an attached feedback form and paper copies on request. The statutory consultation period specified by The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 Section 14 (as amended) ran for six weeks between 3rd July and 15th August 2025, with the pre-submission version of the GNP having been published on 24th June 2025. These gave residents the opportunity to read the draft plan with its supporting documents and provide their feedback responses. In order that members of the public could provide their full and honest feedback, no identification was required from the individual. Forty eight such responses were received and analysed – see below.

3.0 Statutory Consultees

All the relevant Statutory Consultees required to be consulted on the Pre-Submission Draft by The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 Section 14 (as amended) were notified and given the opportunity to comment. A list of those notified is at Table 1 below. Most Statutory consultees did not respond or just acknowledged receipt of the emailed consultation notification. The ten statutory consultees who did respond had their responses copied into Appendix 1 – 10 below (with individual's phone numbers and email addresses redacted) and analyses in Table 2 below. Their specific comments in relation to the GNP and other standard advice for neighbourhood plan bodies has been welcomed.

4.0 Response from Landowner prior to pre-submission consultation period

This email was received in response to GTC's recorded delivery letters to effected landowners sent on 21st February 2025 and 28th March 2025. Guisborough Town Council was not aware of any such application when it approved the Neighbourhood Plan for submission.

[Development Property & Land headed notepaper]

FAO Miss T Mangold

Sunnyfield House

36 Westgate

Guisborough

TS14 6BA

27th May 2025

To Whom it may concern,

Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan – Newstead Farm Drawing 06

You recently wrote to my client Mr Andrew Brunton of Scugdale Farm, Middlesborough Road, TS14 6RS asking him of his plans for his buildings and farmland (Neighbourhood plan ref 17, Description: Hutton Beck Meadows East, Map ref: 54.532207, 1.066619)

My client's intention is for it to go for housing, a pre application has been submitted and a detailed application will be submitted shortly. The area immediately adjoining the Beck will be a green corridor.

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me either via email or phone.

Kindest of regards

Jill White BSc(Hons) MRICS FAAV

[Footer: Development Property & Land – High Curragh | Ampleforth | York YO62 4DX

Mobile and email address REDACTED

Company Number 07072717 VAT No. 104467924]

5.0 Informal officer comments on last draft of GNP prior to pre-submission version

On 5th June 2025 informal officer comments were received from RCBC.

As a result of these comments:

1. Policy maps were created to show the location of all green spaces covered by policies
2. Contents page of NP document was reformatted to make policies more prominent.
3. Policy BE1, BE2 and BE3 were amended to improve clarity for those implementing them.
4. All of the Open Space policies were amended to designate the sites as Open Space in our NP – they previously referred to a Local Plan policy, and could be seen as seeking to influence RCBC future policy development. RCBC sent some examples of open space policies in other NPs and our amended wording was brought into line with these.
5. The two Local Green Space designations were reworded to clearly state that the sites are being so designated.
6. The parish aspiration for a new public toilet within the Guisborough Swim and Fitness Centre was reworded to positively support development proposals.

6.0 List of Statutory Consultees

Table 1

Schedule 1	Contacted by email	Response
Neighbourhood development plans		
1. For the purposes of regulations 14 and 16, a “consultation body” means—		
(a)where the local planning authority is a London borough council, the Mayor of London;	No - not relevant	Not applicable
(b)a local planning authority, county council or parish council any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority;	a) Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council b) Middlesbrough Council c) North Yorkshire Council d) North York Moors National Park e) Tees Valley Combined Authority f) Saltburn, Marske and New Marske Parish Council g) Skelton & Brotton Parish Council h) Lockwood Parish Council i) Loftus Town Council j) Nunthorpe Parish Council	a) Response on 21 st July 2025 b) No response c) No response d) Response 16 th July 2025 e) No response f) No response g) No response h) No response i) Response 6 th August 2025 j) No response
(c)the Coal Authority(1);	The Mining Remediation Authority	Response 8 th August 2025
(d)the Homes and Communities Agency(2);	Homes England	No response

Schedule 1	Contacted by email	Response
(e)Natural England(3);	Natural England	Response 14th August 2025
(f)the Environment Agency(4);	The Environment Agency	Response 31st July 2025
(g)the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage)(5);	Historic England	Response 12th August 2025
(h)Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (company number 2904587);	Network Rail	No response
(i)the Highways Agency;	National Highways	Response 9th July 2025
(j)the Marine Management Organisation(6);	a) Marine Management b) Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) c) Council for British Archaeology d) Sport England e) Tees Valley Nature Partnership f) Yorkshire Gardens Trust	a) No response b) No response c) No response d) No response e) No response f) No response
)any person—	a) Northern Gas Networks b) National Gas c) Northumbrian Water Limited	a) No response b) No response c) No response to Reg 14 request but wildlife info provided following separate request
	(i)to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003; and	

Schedule 1	Contacted by email	Response
	<p>(ii)who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority;</p> <p>a) British Telecom</p> <p>b) Virgin Media</p>	<p>a) No response</p> <p>b) No response</p>
<p>(I)where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area—</p>	<p>The South Tees Clinical Commissioning Group</p>	<p>No response</p>
	<p>(i)a Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006(7) or continued in existence by virtue of that section;</p> <p>The South Tees Clinical Commissioning Group</p>	<p>No response</p>
	<p>(ii)a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) and (c) of the Electricity Act 1989(8);</p> <p>Northern Powergrid</p>	<p>No response</p>
	<p>(iii)a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986(9);</p> <p>a) Northern Gas Networks</p> <p>b) National Gas</p>	<p>a) No response</p> <p>b) No response</p>
	<p>(iv)a sewerage undertaker; and</p>	
	<p>(v)a water undertaker; Northumbrian Water Limited</p>	<p>No response to Reg 14 request but wildlife info provided following separate request</p>

Schedule 1	Contacted by email	Response
(m) voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area;	a) The Ramblers b) Fields In Trust (formerly National Playing Fields Assoc) c) Gisborough Priory Project Ltd d) The Tees Valley Wildlife Trust e) The Gardens Trust	a) No response b) No response c) Response 12 th August 2025 d) No response e) No response
(n) bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area;	No - not relevant	
(o) bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area;	No - not relevant	
(p) bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area; and	Cleveland Police	Responded 11 th August 2025
(q) bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area.	No - not relevant	
References from Schedule 1 above		
(1) See section 1 of the Coal Industry Act 1994 (c.21) .		
(2) See section 2 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008 (c.17) .		
(3) See section 1 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (c.16) .		
(4) See section 1(1) of the Environment Act 1995 (c.25) .		
(5) See section 32 of the National Heritage Act 1983 (c.47) .		

Schedule 1	Contacted by email	Response
(6) See section 1 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (c.23) .		
(7) 2006 c.41 .		
(8) 1989 c.29 . Section 6 was substituted by section 30 of the Utilities Act 2000 (c.27) .		
(9) 1986 c.44 . Section 7 was amended sections 3(2), 76(1) and (3) of, and paragraphs 1 and 4 of Schedule 6 to, the Utilities Act 2000.		

7.0 Responses from Statutory Consultees

Note: Submissions are generally in order of their receipt.	Submitter	Submission Summary	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GNP
1	Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft Neighbourhood Plan.	Welcomed the large number of sources of natural environment information provided.	None
2	North York Moors National Park Authority	<p>a) Overall commendation for producing a thorough and well prepared plan.</p> <p>b) 3.04 / Section 5 – is it worth including Hutton Village?</p> <p>c) 9.2.14 – For information, the old railway line (from Aldenham Road to Guisborough Forest Visitors Centre) is designated as a ‘protected linear route’ in the North York Moors Local Plan (Policy CO5). This section is not covered by Redcar and Cleveland’s Local Plan Policy GS2 but is protected from development under the Local Plan for this Authority.</p> <p>d) 9.2.38 - This states that this Authority does not have the equivalent of RCBC’s open space policy. This is partially true, but we do have a policy protected Community Spaces (CO5). Hutton Village Green is not designated as such as most of it is a registered village green and hence is already protected from development. We did not include registered village greens within this designation.</p>	<p>a) General support welcomed.</p> <p>b) Yes Hutton Village should be included in these sections and will be added to the list of other villages in the Parish.</p> <p>c) This is very interesting and demonstrates how closely aligned all of the open space policies are.</p> <p>d) This is a very useful clarification and 9.2.38 amended accordingly and the associated table amended to show that Hutton Village Green has no expectation gap.</p>	<p>a) None</p> <p>b) 3.0.4 text amended to “... which together include the neighbouring villages of Newton under Roseberry, Dunsdale, Upleatham, Hutton Village and a very small part of Slapewath) is a rural and semi-rural community.” and Para 5.6 added to describe Hutton Village.</p> <p>c) None</p> <p>d) Para 9.2.38 was amended to “Hutton Village Green is in the North York Moors National Park and is ‘Registered Common Land’. One of the policies covering development in the National Park in the National Park Authority’s Local Plan (dated July 2020) is Policy CO5 – Protected Community Spaces. This policy does not seek to designate land which is registered and therefore already protected from development.”</p> <p>Para 9.2.39 was amended to remove National Park reference.</p>

Note: Submissions are generally in order of their receipt.	Submitter	Submission Summary	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GNP
3	National Highways	<p>a) It is assumed that the NP will be developed to be read alongside the current, and any future, RCBC local plan.</p> <p>b) National Highways interests are with regard to the Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>c) The NP and its policies do not seek to promote any additional development but do seek to ensure sustainable transport provision which can be supported by National Highways, and therefore there are no other specific comments on the Plan at this stage.</p>	<p>a) This is correct.</p> <p>b) None of the strategic roads named are in the NP designated area.</p> <p>c) Support for our focus on sustainable transport is noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>a) None.</p> <p>b) None.</p> <p>c) None.</p>
4	Environment Agency	The Environment Agency does not have any concerns over the content of this Neighbourhood Plan and generally welcomes the plan's aspirations to protect and enhance green spaces.	Support for our focus on green spaces is noted and welcomed.	None.
5	Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council	<p>a) Plan Period – it is recommended that the plan clearly states the time period during which the policies will have an effect.</p> <p>b) Para 3.0.1 – the NP will become part of the Statutory Development Plan rather than the Local Plan.</p> <p>c) Policy BE4 Point 2 – ensure important architectural details are not overlooked and remove the vague term 'decoration'.</p> <p>d) Policy BE4 Point 3 - may allow removal of non-original features that add architectural interest or historical character and reference only to 'special architectural interest' may allow the removal of features that are of little architectural interest but still add to the historic character. It is suggested that the point is reworded to "<i>The retention of features of special architectural interest and/or historic fabric that contribute to the significance of</i></p>	<p>a) Agreed</p> <p>b) Agreed</p> <p>c) Agreed – Policy BE4 was amalgamated with Policy BE2 and the word 'decoration' was removed.</p> <p>d) With policy BE4 being amalgamated with BE2 there is no longer a NP policy specifically covering designated heritage assets to provide additional support</p>	<p>a) "2015 to 1040" added to front cover of the plan and to Para. 1.0.1</p> <p>b) Para 3.0.1 amended as suggested.</p> <p>c) Policy BE2 Point 2 wording amended to "How the design reinforces the distinctive semi-rural character of the Parish by respecting the local character in terms of layout, form, scale, appearance, landscape, materials and detailing, whilst safeguarding and enhancing special architectural and landscaping features, the heritage assets of the area and the natural environment".</p> <p>d) None</p>

Note: Submissions are generally in order of their receipt.	Submitter	Submission Summary	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GNP
		<p><i>the asset</i>".</p> <p>e) Policy BE4 Point 4 – <i>"The retention of existing trees, hedgerows and landscape features with appropriate landscaping improvements incorporated into design proposals;"</i> – In some cases trees and landscaping features can change the character of a conservation area and harm the setting of a historic asset, such as where trees are self-seeded or features are more recent additions. It is suggested that this point could be improved by being reworded to include reference to features contributing positively to setting or character.</p> <p>f) Policy BE4 Point 5 - "The protection of important views and vistas, including those in to and out of the North York Moors National Park;" – Chapter 16 of the NPPF specifically refers to the significance and contribution of the setting of heritage assets and it is considered that the importance of setting could be included within this point. For example "The protection of important views and vistas, including those that contribute to the setting of the conservation area, the setting of other heritage assets and those in to and out of the North York Moors National Park"</p> <p>g) Open Space Policies Reference in the supporting text that sites 'clearly meet the criteria of RCBC's policy N3 Open Space and Recreation' when they are not designated under Policy N3 of the Local Plan, and are proposed for designation in the Neighbourhood Plan, are not needed and can be removed.</p> <p>h) Policy GS5 - The Field Next to Sea Cadets Hut – This</p>	<p>for the Conservation Area Management Plan. "Special architectural and landscaping features" are however included in NP Policy BE2.</p> <p>e) With policy BE4 being amalgamated with BE2 there is no longer a NP policy specifically covering designated heritage assets to provide additional support for the Conservation Area Management Plan. "existing hedgerows" are however included in NP Policy BE2.</p> <p>f) With policy BE4 being amalgamated with BE2 there is no longer a NP policy specifically covering designated heritage assets to provide additional support for the Conservation Area Management Plan. "key views and vistas such as those in to and out of the North York Moors National Park" are however included</p>	<p>e) None</p> <p>f) Policy BE2 amended to include "key views and vistas such as those in to and out of the North York Moors National Park".</p>

Note: Submissions are generally in order of their receipt.	Submitter	Submission Summary	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GNP
		<p>site, located in Belmangate, is described as being designated as Local Greenspace in recognition of its contribution to promoting biodiversity, providing local character and interest, and potentially providing a future healthy living recreational asset. However, the site is described as being disused and overgrown in the Council's 2023 Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy (PPOSS). The PPOSS explains that a disused playing field is one which is not being used by any users and is not available for community hire either. There are, therefore, concerns that the site does not currently have significant recreational value. In addition, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate a biodiversity value that would show alignment with NPPF para. 107 in relation to local significance.</p> <p>Chapel Beck Valley and Hutton Beck East – This site has no public access and the local significance of this site is explained as being in relation to its value for wildlife. The Green Sites Report states that this site is meadow grassland and a very significant haven for wildlife and for flood risk attenuation. It is also stated that it forms a major part of the wildlife corridor into the heart of the town from the south west. However, beyond this statement there is no further evidence to demonstrate this significance.</p> <p>The Council currently has concerns relating to the inclusion of these sites as Local Greenspace designations as it is not considered that evidence has been provided to</p>	<p>in NP Policy BE2.</p> <p>g) Agreed – references removed.</p> <p>h) This was as a misunderstanding since The Field Next to Sea Cadets Hut was proposed to be designated Open Space and not LGS, but more information describing its recreational value to the community added.</p> <p>Significant extra evidence added to the Evidence Base document, covering flood attenuation, historical significance and wildlife surveys demonstrating the richness of flora and fauna at the green spaces put forward for LGS designation.</p>	<p>g) All occurrences of references have been removed.</p> <p>h) Para. 4.5.12 added to the Evidence Base document, and Para. 9.2.29 in the NP reworded to make clearer the community value of The Field Next to the Sea Cadets Hut for generations of cadets and scouts.</p> <p>Para. 4.5.2 to 4.5.11 added to the Evidence Base document and Para. 9.2.28, 9.2.30 and 9.2.32 reworded in the NP to signpost to the extra Evidence Base paras.</p>

Note: Submissions are generally in order of their receipt.	Submitter	Submission Summary	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GNP
		clearly demonstrate that the sites hold a particular significance in relation to recreation and/or richness of wildlife. However, this could be reconsidered should appropriate evidence be provided that would demonstrate that they meet the NPPF requirements. This could include showing that the sites have notable species or habitats present or are part of a long-term study of wildlife by members of the local community.		
6	The Coal Authority	The Coal Authority's remit lies solely with coal mining legacy and they do not comment on other mineral extraction. No coal mining features are present within the NP area so no specific comments are made. However their records indicate the presence of Ironstone mine entries within the Guisborough woods area.	The absence of coal and presence of ironstone mining in the area is well-known locally. Areas of ironstone subsidence, such as Upleatham, are well understood and do not conflict with proposed NP policies.	None.
7	Historic England	<p>a) Policy BE2 Point 1 - it would be better to use the phrase "pay special attention" rather than "take into account" as that is stronger and accurately reflects the statutory duty in relation to conservation areas.</p> <p>b) Policy BE2 & BE4 - the term "<i>emerging</i>" dates the NP. Better to refer to the <i>Appraisal</i> (2024) and <i>Management Plan</i> (2025) documents by name.</p> <p>c) Policy BE4 Point 3 - consider rewording the list of design components to better reflect those given in the National Design Guide, which carries weight as a material consideration in planning decisions: "<i>layout, form, scale, appearance, landscape, materials and detailing</i>".</p>	<p>a) Agreed – wording amended as suggested.</p> <p>b) Agreed - wording amended as suggested.</p> <p>c) Agreed - wording amended as suggested.</p>	<p>a) Policy BE2 Point 1 "How special attention has been paid where relevant to the Guisborough Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan".</p> <p>b) see above</p> <p>c) Policy BE4 Point 3 "How the design reinforces the distinctive semi-rural character of the Parish by respecting the local character in terms of layout, form, scale, appearance, landscape, materials</p>

Note: Submissions are generally in order of their receipt.	Submitter	Submission Summary	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GNP
		<p>d) Policy BE2 - as this policy covers the entire plan area, it should refer to the other two conservation areas in the parish, not just Guisborough's, or the policy will be weaker when applied to those conservation areas.</p> <p>e) Policy BE3 - in this policy or the accompanying text, we should consider referring to "<i>Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency</i>" (Historic England Advice Note 18, July 2024) which was produced to provide clarity on key considerations and to support consistent decision making.</p> <p>f) Policy BE4 - Unless it is reworded, Policy BE4 risks not meeting the basic conditions required for a neighbourhood plan to proceed to referendum. It summarises and partially re-writes existing higher level policy rather than adding local depth to its application. It may not therefore follow para 041 Ref ID: 41-041-20140306 of the planning practice guidance (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>). The first sentence suggests conservation areas are not designated heritage assets; they are and thus do not need to be identified separately. It also applies the same policy requirement to all heritage assets regardless of designation or grade. This appears to be at odds with higher level policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, Dec 2024), which requires assets to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (see paras 202 and 212-216). For example, in summary, the legislative duty for listed buildings is to</p>	<p>d) Not agreed – only the town centre conservation area received support in the public consultations.</p> <p>e) Agreed - wording amended as suggested.</p> <p>f) Since Policy BE2 already covers many of the same points as Policy BE4 and to ensure complete adherence to the crucial basic condition requirements, the intentions of Policy BE4 were amalgamated into Policy BE2.</p>	<p>and detailing, whilst safeguarding and enhancing special architectural and landscaping features, the heritage assets of the area and the natural environment";</p> <p>d) None</p> <p>e) Para 9.1.15 amended to include: "For historic buildings, "<i>Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency</i>" (Historic England Advice Note 18, July 2024) is a good example of what can be achieved."</p> <p>f) See a) above for amendments to Policy BE2 point 1 and see c) above for amendments to Policy BE2 point 2. Amendment Policy BE2 point 3 to: How the design helps to reinforce and respect the existing streetscape, green spaces, amenity spaces, key views and vistas such as those in to and out of the North York Moors National Park, rights of way, existing hedgerows, and other typical features of a historic market town and its villages. Para 9.1.23 was amended to say "The town centre conservation area therefore forms an important part of this NP's Policy BE2: Design Principles and Maintenance of</p>

Note: Submissions are generally in order of their receipt.	Submitter	Submission Summary	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GNP
		<p>have 'special regard' to the desirability of preserving them, whilst the policy requirement for non-designated heritage assets is simply to see the impact of development 'taken into account'. Instead of re-writing these requirements, we suggest the policy is refocused to set out specific themes, characteristics or features to be protected when applying higher level policy, or to set out what measures would be acceptable to mitigate the impact of development that higher level policy might allow. Your policy begins to do this in the later bullets, but more detailed and specific points should be made, for example to avoid the use of "etc" in the third bullet, and to define more clearly what "important views", "appropriately landscaped" and "appropriately designed" mean in your plan area. This clarity could come from use of a Design Code linked to a re-worded policy, as set out in government planning practice guidance (see <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/design> para 008 Ref ID: 26-008-20191001).</p> <p>This approach would align with para 132 of the NPPF, which says neighbourhood plans can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of the area and explain how this should be reflected in development.</p> <p>g) The eight policies on "green spaces" appear unclear. They refer to NPPF para 104, which relates to "open spaces", a topic which planning practice guidance suggests is for local planning authorities rather than</p>	<p>g) There are a number of made neighbourhood plans which contain open space policies, including:</p> <p>Morpeth, made May 2016, Policy ENV3 – Protected Open Space</p> <p>Acomb, made Feb 2019 - Policy 2 – Acomb Playing Field</p> <p>Cramlington, made March</p>	<p>Distinctive Character".</p> <p>g) None</p>

Note: Submissions are generally in order of their receipt.	Submitter	Submission Summary	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GNP
		<p>neighbourhood plan groups (see <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space> para 001 Ref ID: 37-001-20140306). The type of open space designation neighbourhood plans can make is Local Green Space as defined by NPPF para 107 (see para 006 Ref ID: 37-006-20140306) but only one of your policies appears to refer to this. The need for clarity is important in deciding if your plan meets the basic conditions. It would be better for your plan only to designate Local Green Space that has been assessed using the criteria in para 107, including from our perspective whether a space is demonstrably special for its historic significance. You should also consider whether land in the National Park or Green Belt should be designated as Local Green Space as it is unlikely to add extra protection.</p> <p>h) We suggest some aspects of your document that have been debated and discounted could usefully have a policy included in your plan to support higher level policy. For example, you could include a policy to support new tourist accommodation, a topic you appear to support in general. Your plan could identify broad or specific locations where such accommodation would be welcome, the type of accommodation desirable, or the design characteristics that you would wish to see. This would add local depth to high</p>	<p>2020, Policy CNP19: Open Space</p> <p>Belford, made April 2024, Policy 3: Recreational Open Space</p> <p>Humshaugh, made march 2025 Policy 2: Protected Open Space.</p> <p>Northumberland County Council produced an advice note in May 2024 including open space designations in NPs and it seems to have become accepted custom and practice. This this approach is generally supported by RCBC.</p> <p>h) Tourist accommodation is supported in the RCBC local plan. Inclusion of further detail or as a policy was discussed and discounted due to little support from public engagement and concern that it may become inadvertently counterproductive.</p>	<p>h) None</p>

Note: Submissions are generally in order of their receipt.	Submitter	Submission Summary	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GNP
		<p>level policy, such as para 88(c) of the NPPF which encourages a prosperous rural economy, which your plan's vision is in line with.</p> <p>i) We also suggest your plan includes the issues of non-designated heritage assets and heritage at risk, which are discuss in the tailored comments further down the response.</p> <p>k) Finally, it is important that you consider whether or not the plan would be likely to have significant environmental effects and thus require Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). This is established by following the Environmental Assessment of Plans & Programmes Regulations 2004, which require the neighbourhood plan qualifying body to consult us on the matter in the form of a Screening Opinion. The local planning authority can advise on this, and we publish HE Advice Note 8, Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment to support this process (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/sustainability-appraisal-and-strategic-environmental-assessment-advice-note-8/).</p>	<p>i) Support from public engagement during the NP process was focussed on the town centre conservation area which is covered by RCBC's appraisal and management report.</p> <p>k) RCBC and North York Moors National Park Authority have agreed to issue a joint screening report for both Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA). This will enable due consideration of the need for an SEA and / or an HRA.</p>	<p>i) None</p> <p>k) None, but the screening reports will be added to the 'Basic Conditions Statement for Guisborough CP NP' document.</p>
8	Loftus Town Council	Loftus Town Council supports our proposals and wishes us well in this endeavour.	Support and good wishes noted and welcomed.	None.
9	Cleveland Police	Cleveland Police suggested the inclusion of the guidelines of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and the 'Secured by Design' (SBD) initiative into the NP.	Agreed.	Para. 3.2.3 added to the Evidence base document, point 9 added to Policy BE2 and Para. 9.1.14 of the NP amended to "...sustainable and secure development".

Note: Submissions are generally in order of their receipt.	Submitter	Submission Summary	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GNP
10	Gisborough Priory Project	<p>Two corrections identified that need to be made and some information about the use of Guisborough and Gisborough when referring to the town.</p> <p>a) 5.5.6 it was Robert de Brus 1 that founded the Priory. There is a lot of old documentation that attributes the Priory to Robert 11 however this has now been disproved as the Robert who founded the Priory was the first Robert de Brus to be given land in England by the King. At the time it was King Henry 1 – references ae available if needed.</p> <p>b) 9. 2. 4. Guisborough Estates should be Gisborough Estates (see comment below)</p> <p>Guisborough and Gisborough</p> <p>c) The spelling of Gisborough comes from when Richard Godolphin Walmsley Chaloner (1856 – 1938) was elevated to the House of Lords in 1917 and took the title of Lord Gisborough, based on his research of the origins of the name of what is now the town of Guisborough. All land and property of Lord Gisborough is identified by the use of Gisborough as in Gisborough Hall, Gisborough Estates and Gisborough Priory. GPP have other histories and derivation of what is now Guisborough and if you are interested can provide you with some of them, however for the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan this is not necessary, whoever you may want to rephrase that section.</p>	<p>a) Agreed – attribution amended as suggested.</p> <p>b) Agreed – spelling corrected.</p> <p>c) Historical background information noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>a) 5.5.6 amended to “... In 1119 Robert de Brus 1 founded and lavishly endowed Guisborough’s Augustinian Priory...”</p> <p>b) 9.2.4 amended to “...The Gisborough Football Ground is owned by three private individuals and the King George V Bowling Green is owned by Gisborough Estates...”</p> <p>c) None</p>

Note: Submissions are generally in order of their receipt.	Submitter	Submission Summary	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GNP
		<p>d) GPP want to commend the Town Council on their hard work that has gone into producing the Neighbourhood Plan. It gives a clear and concise statement of what is and is not the Town Council's responsibility, along with what they can and cannot influence. Well done to everyone for producing such an excellent document.</p>	<p>d) Support for our Neighbourhood Plan is noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>d) None</p>

8.0 Neighbourhood Plan responses via GTC Webpages

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
1	Congratulations to the author for recognising the importance of retaining Guisborough's identity. We are quickly losing this through no fault of it's residents. It's time the councils listened to its constituents and endeavour to protect our diminishing green spaces. Hutton Beck Meadows should be left as undisturbed wildlife areas. We should not allow further noise and light pollution to the residents and visitors alike.	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
2	I have read the plan and feel very strongly that we should try to make the green corridor protected. It is essential this is kept as it is for the biodiversity and precious wildlife and fauna. We also need to make the improvements highlighted but also stop developers building as I am sure guisborough has had more than the recommended quota without the infrastructure support to cope with it.	Supportive (assuming the 'green corridor' mentioned is Hutton Beck Meadows or Chapel Beck Valley)	No (assuming the 'green corridor' mentioned is Hutton Beck Meadows or Chapel Beck Valley)	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
3	This development would make an already busy road a danger to other road users as it is on a blind bend and anyone turning right would be pulling out without being able to see the oncoming traffic coming over the old bridge. The turning out of the site floods ever time we have any heavy rain meaning you need to drive through the middle one car at a time and this development would therefore cause even more chaos. Guisborough as a town is already suffering from a lack of doctors' appointments and more houses would make this situation even worse.	Supportive (assuming 'this development' refers to Hutton Beck Meadows East)	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
4	Guisborough does not need more new homes, I have lived in Guisborough my whole life and it is getting too big, our lovely green spaces and rural feel is being spoiled by all these new houses and a heavier flow of traffic, our once small and pretty town is becoming ruined by monstrosities being built which are not needed. Guisborough does not need to grow.	No Overall Opinion.	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
5	Please no more we already have to get a telephone appointment at the doctors and you cannot get a NHS dentist we have not got the facilities for anymore houses.	No Overall Opinion.	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development. Infrastructure / Public Services section of Para. 9.1 of the NP deals with doctors and dentists.	No changes proposed
6	This is very simple. Not one single person in Guisborough wants any more houses to be built. One of Guisborough's greatest strengths is or was that the town was a beautiful quiet place. Now with the additional homes built, the roads are too busy, it's a struggle to get parked in town, the shops, doctors and schools are not sufficient to take any more. The people have already spoken time and time again, we do not want more houses ! Property developers and their brown envelopes need to bugger off and find somewhere else	No Overall Opinion	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development. Infrastructure / Public Services section of Para. 9.1 of the NP deals with doctors and dentists.	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
7	Why do we need more houses to be built on greenfield sites if we have a more or less static population with a disproportionate number of elderly meaning that houses will come onto the market in about 10 years time, doesn't make sense. Can we not tackle empty property first and, dare I say holiday let's that are empty for more than 4 months of the year.	No Overall Opinion.	Yes - increase housing supply by 'tackling' empty property	Identifying and addressing the causes of empty property is outside the scope of this NP.	No changes proposed
8	In relation to the Westgate area being a conservation area why are businesses allowed to alter the image by putting up horrendous plastic shop name signs I.e Tasty Curry, near the bus stop. That end of the row of shops is a disgrace, vape shop with smashed window. Dirty pavement from take away business etc etc. None of these enhance the feel of a prosperous historic market town. The shop owners that do care are to be congratulated in trying to, in particular Chalenor street.	No Overall Opinion	Yes - enforce town centre conservation area restrictions on shop fronts	RCBC have been augmenting their conservation enforcement resource to be better able to implement the Conservation Area Management Plan	No changes proposed
9	As a person born in guisborough seventy years ago I strongly object to more green land been used for houses .Why is our once beautiful town been destroyed .	No Overall Opinion	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development.	No changes proposed
10	I note the section 'whilst RCBC and Guisborough Town Council have been supportive of recent housing developments' there is a limit. There is a fine line in protecting Guisborough's identity. Sufficient additional development has/is taking place and we must protect our remaining rural areas. Hutton Beck Meadows should be left as undisturbed land to support biodiversity and protect wildlife.	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
11	I would like to thank the author for acknowledging Hutton Beck Meadows East & West as being rare examples of undisturbed, tranquil areas and a haven for wildlife thus being special places for biodiversity. We need to cherish such areas before they're lost. Guisborough would lose its identity if we lose the semi-rural character of the town. I fully support keeping these areas untouched. Thank you.	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
12	I support this plan and note the section on improving leisure and tourism. Keeping our town as a semi rural market town is paramount to this. We MUST capitalise on our natural assets particularly retaining our green spaces. Housing development MUST NOT be allowed on our diminishing green areas. Hutton Beck Meadows East and West should be protected. Guisborough must not lose it's identity.	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
13	Yes we don't need anymore houses we are already over loaded with more than our fair share .why can't we have some green space land for our children	No Overall Opinion.	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development	No changes proposed
14	I am writing in response to the draft neighbourhood plan currently under consultation. While I appreciate the effort to plan for future growth and ensure housing needs are met, I have significant concerns about the proposed increase in housing developments within our area.	No Overall Opinion.	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
15	The scale of new housing appears disproportionate to the existing infrastructure. Our roads, schools, medical facilities, and public services are already under pressure. Adding a large number of new homes without clear, funded plans to expand these essential services risks lowering the quality of life for existing residents.	No Overall Opinion.	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development. Infrastructure / Public Services section of Para. 9.1 of the NP deals with doctors and dentists.	No changes proposed
16	I am concerned about the impact on the character of our neighbourhood. Many people choose to live here because of its green spaces, open feel, and community atmosphere. Overdevelopment could lead to the loss of valuable green areas and wildlife habitats, undermining what makes our neighbourhood special. I would like to see stronger commitments to sustainable development with real investment in public transport, cycling, and pedestrian infrastructure to reduce reliance on cars. I hope these concerns will be seriously considered, and that the final neighbourhood plan will strike a better balance between growth and protecting what our community values most. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	Unsupportive - plan should have stronger commitment to sustainable development.	Yes - real investment in low / no carbon transport to reduce reliance on cars.	Focus and investment on cycling and pedestrian infrastructure is detailed throughout this NP, including Policy GS2, the Cycle Routes / Footpaths section of Para. 9.4 which includes the Guisborough Active Travel Route project.	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
17	Yes, I'd like to refer to the open spaces in Guisborough. The need to keep these free of development. Particulaly thinking of the artery of land known as the Hutton Beck Meadows East and West. These are very clear areas of beauty seen magnificently from Highcliff, Park Wood and other high locations. These areas form the character and charm of Guisborough and must be left unspoilt. They are a haven for wild life. They keep the balance right between, modern man-made environmental damage, and nature. Without these green luscious areas the balance is effected. Many thanks [Name REDACTED]	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
18	I would just like clarification. In policy GS5 it says Hutton Meadows East meets the LGS criteria but that West has a live planning application. If this is the Newetts application it is on East not West as it says.	No Overall Opinion	No	The policy has been checked and wording is correct.	No changes proposed
19	Insufficient detail in parts. Binding emphasis should be brought upon housing developers to:1. Equip each house with solar panels. 2. Pay an education tariff towards the extension of places at Laurence Jackson school which is over capacity as of 2025, and needs funding for provision of examination spaces and furniture 3. Ensure that adequate capacity for water supply and disposal is provided by developers 4. Contributing to cost of restoration and refilling of Westworth reservoir to mitigate likely future water shortages.	No Overall Opinion	Yes	Binding developer contributions to local infrastructure is generally a matter for Local Planning Authorities rather than NPs	No changes proposed
20	How can we get again be considering ruining an area of rich biodiversity and much needed green space. We are so sick of having our way of life threatened to benefit the few already rich and selfish people who do not have to endure the effects of what is being proposed!	No Overall Opinion.	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development.	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
21	Ieolid like the planto be available in clear English. Basically, tell us what you are planning yo destroy and build more unwanted anbeccesary houses on so tnat we can object. The written plan is full of waffle and doesnt mentionprotecting our history or themental health of its resident home owners who face the threat of destroying their environment by yourselves every day. You vlsim this pkan is accessible, i claim otherwise. Itsbogged fown in legal jargon intended to cobfuse. Yeswe needmore elderly bungalows, rebuild the wilton lane estate and make it desireable. The awful weird shaped glats on park lane look dreadfuland are not in keepung with Guisboroughd history. Just state what you plan to do, vlearly and honesty. Then lusen to the people whose taxes etc pay your wages. Mbro vouncil didnt listen and home owners are leaving in their droves. Do not make that mistske.	Unsupportive	Yes - greater clarity needed in the plan.	Particular attention was paid to using clear everyday language in the NP but it does need to be legally accurate and supported by evidence.	No changes proposed
22	All existing green spaces in the town should be protected from development. The housing mix needs to be assessed and there should be more control over what is built. Guisborough, and Redcar and Cleveland in general has an aging population yet the houses being imposed on us are 4/5 bed family homes. We know there are a large number of elderly people living in family homes due to a lack of suitable housing such as bungalows and assisted living projects. Hopefully the two new projects on Park Lane and Rectory Lane will help with this, however, more bungalows and smaller homes should be built to assist older residents to downsize. Family homes on existing estates at reasonably prices would then be freed up for first time buyers and others who are priced out of the new builds. Existing estates are now looking neglected, roads need resurfacing and open spaces need maintaining. Whilst tourism is good for the town in some ways, the number of holiday lets is increasing and thought needs to be given to how to control this before we end up like Saltburn with too many holiday lets and everything being geared towards tourists rather than residents.	Supportive	Yes - restrictions on number of holiday lets. All other concerns expressed are already addressed in the NP.	General support welcomed. Tourist accommodation and the proposed short-term lets registration scheme are handled at the RCBC level for borough-wide oversight.	No changes proposed.

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
23	<p>I am in disagreement with the above proposed plan. I believe that the building of such properties will have a negative impact on our local environment. The area in question is home to a variety of animals (which include, rabbits, hedgehogs and the occasional fox) and to remove such natural green space therefore means it will cause the loss of such life. As my home backs onto the proposed plot, I would very much miss the wildlife I receive in my garden every year. Similarly, 10 meters is not that far a distance. I feel that my privacy will be majorly affected as the new houses would be able to see directly into my home from their proposed location.</p> <p>As a town, we have seen momentous growth from new housing estates. As welcome as these individuals are to our area, the town is not suited to accommodate them. Already, we have traffic from Rectory Lane onto Hutton Lane and then to Westgate. Additional houses on that end increase the already compact road system available.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed exit onto Hutton Lane is an area that will regularly flood with general rain. The available green space field helps to act as a natural flood barrier absorbing much of the access water. By removing this, the water will have nowhere to go and cause increased transport problems. How can we have more housing if the current infrastructure is already struggling with the current situation?</p> <p>This area is right outside Rosedene Nursery. As the road is already extremely busy, the increased traffic will make it more dangerous to cross from Thames Avenue. Putting the youngest member of our community at great risk. I see no proposed plans on how to increase safety when crossing that road.</p> <p>It would be better perhaps to find ways to entice businesses into our town highstreet and fix current issues that are long-standing. Better yet, transform the proposed area into a community area that can be used by the public and embraces the wildlife that inhabit the area.</p> <p>In conclusion, whilst the additional homes show the growth of population in our town, I am fully against the building of such properties. The loss of green space, wildlife and current issues that would be exacerbated is not worth continued increase of population.</p> <p>I hope you fully reconsider the proposed plan to build housing in the proposed area.</p> <p>I strongly oppose to any further residential building developments in Guisborough. We as an area have surpassed our development quota, therefore do not need to develop further.</p> <p>Open Space at Hutton Beck Meadows West & East should remain undeveloped as they offer biodiversity and a home to nature.</p>	No Overall Opinion - the respondent seems to have confused the Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan with a housing development application.	No	The town council's NP webpages contains an explanation of the background and context of a Neighbourhood Plan.	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
24	Yes . As a resident of guisborough for 35 years I opposed any more housing developments. We do not have the infrastructure to support any more people in the town. Roads are overcrowded. Doctors surgeries - impossible to get appointments. Dentists - full and impossible to get appointments. Schools - full ? . We need the infrastructure before adding more developments. Not to mention green space. Guisborough does not need to become a concrete jungle.	No Overall Opinion	Yes - add infrastructure before adding more developments.	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development. Infrastructure / Public Services section of Para. 9.1 of the NP deals with doctors and dentists.	No changes proposed
25	I would support this plan and thank the author. In particular acknowledgement in relation to adopting Hutton Beck Meadows as Local Green space. Section 9.2.32 clearly recognises public engagement demonstrates more than 70% were concerned or very concerned about meadows and fields and demonstrates support for this type of amenity.	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
26	I fully support and thank the author for the recognition for keeping Hutton Beck Meadows East and West as green areas. Guisborough needs to retains its identity as semi rural and not lose our history or the little biodiversity that remains.	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
27	The people who live in guisborough and have family history in this town, do not want more houses built in vast quantities, with not thought for how it is effecting those who live there. Roads are over crowded, the main street is small, small businesses are not helped or encouraged, there is minimal resources for those who already live there such as GP practices. Overcrowding should be considered a serious problem, and those who live here should have a say. Guisborough is a proud countryside town, if you keep building on land, that houses that countryside, it will no longer be that. You are removing greenspaces and endangering wildlife.	No Overall Opinion.	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development.	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
28	The town is becoming majorly over developed. I agree particularly with the intimation that Hutton Beck Meadows should become a designated site and therefore NOT available for development. It's an extremely important area for wildlife and it would be utterly heinous to make any attempts to build on it now or in the future.	No Overall Opinion.	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development.	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
29	<p>I am writing to offer minor comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Overall, we commend the Town Council in producing a thorough and well prepared plan . For information, the area of the Parish within the National Park Local Planning Authority area includes Hutton Village, Charltons, the eastern part of Newton under Roseberry (east of the Guisborough/Great Ayton Road) and a small corner of the Hunters Hill estate (Aldenham Road/Fryup Crescent/Roxby Avenue area).</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>3.04/Section 5 – is it worth including Hutton Village? For Hutton Village we have some background text that may be use as part of our forthcoming Design Code and there is a Conservation Appraisal available dating back to 2003.</p> <p>9.2.14 – For information, the old railway line (from Aldenham Road to Guisborough Forest Visitors Centre) is designated as a ‘protected linear route’ in the North York Moors Local Plan (Policy CO5). This section is not covered by Redcar and Cleveland’s Local Plan Policy GS2 but is protected from development under the Local Plan for this Authority.</p> <p>9.2.38 - This states that this Authority does not have the equivalent of RCBC’s open space policy. This is partially true, but we do have a policy protected Community Spaces (CO5). Hutton Village Green is not designated as such as most of it is a registered village green and hence is already protected from development. We did not include registered village greens within this designation.</p> <p>I wish you success when taking the Plan through to completion, and if I can be any help please ask.</p> <p>Paul Fellows Head of Strategic Policy, North York Moors National Park Authority</p>	Supportive	<p>Yes include Hutton Village in Para 3.04 and Section 5 Para 9.2.14 the old railway line (from Aldenham Road to Guisborough Forest Visitors Centre) is designated as a ‘protected linear route’ in the NYM Local Plan (Policy CO5)</p> <p>Para 9.2.38 NYM do have a protected community space policy (CO5) and Hutton Village Green is already registered.</p>	See ‘Responses from Statutory Consultees’ section of this document above.	See ‘Responses from Statutory Consultees’ section of this document above.

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
30	<p>A lot of thought has gone into this, well done! The points I would make are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raising the importance of safe cycle routes to reduce the use of the car in an urban environment. 2. An aspiration to a 20mph speed limit in the town and on the estates as in other towns and villages in the region. I appreciate that speed limits are not your remit. 3. A more determined approach to preserving the green spaces (public and private). Once they are gone, they will never come back. It is those green spaces that are good for nature, the environment and the people who live near or have access to them. 	Supportive	Yes - promote safe cycle routes to reduce car use, 20mph speed limit in Guisborough, and preserving green spaces.	Cycle routes are covered in the Cycle Routes / Footpaths section of Para. 9.4 which includes the Guisborough Active Travel Route project. Speed of vehicles is also covered in Para. 9.4 and no evidence was seen to support a 20 mph limit across the whole town. Green spaces have been given the most determined approach available according to their attributes.	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
31	The planning application on Hutton meadows (16 in the green spaces) should be rejected and it should be designated under the uk biodiversity action plan as a priority habitat as it is lowland meadow	No Overall Opinion - the respondent seems to have confused the Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan with a housing development application.	No	The town council's NP webpages contains an explanation of the background and context of a Neighbourhood Plan.	No changes proposed
32	100% supportive of this plan and the comments in relation to protecting green spaces. In particular we need to stop further development in inappropriate areas that would cause nuisance and spoil the town. Hutton Beck Meadows should be granted local green spaces. Let's protect our identity and our wildlife before it's too late!!	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
33	As a resident in guisborough I cannot believe a housing development has been approved by Miller homes at Newstead farm. The infrastructure of the town cannot handle the increased traffic in the area, the safety of pedestrians and the destruction of green belt land. This has not been thought through and will have a massive negative influence on every single local resident in the area.	No Overall Opinion	No	No housing development has been approved at Newstead Farm.	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
34	<p>• Respondent: [Name REDACTED] , [Postcode REDACTED]</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is well researched and presented and provides an informative overview of the parish. Its vision and aims are supported by this respondent.</p> <p>However the negative impact of traffic on the parish is understated.</p> <p>9.4.3 The speed at which vehicles travel around the parish was mid-way down the list of concerns, with 59% of respondents extremely or very concerned.</p> <p>Another interpretation of this statistic is that a majority of respondents are extremely or very concerned about traffic speeds.</p> <p>9.4.5 However, it was also noted in paragraph 6.5.1 that RCBC has a traffic calming webpage with an easy-to-use process for reporting concerns about the speed of vehicles on the public highway and the measures in place to control it. This process can be used to report both vehicles travelling too fast and to report unwanted restrictions. Contrary to this statement the traffic calming webpage is not easy to use and requires an account login to access it. However, the system worked well once the hurdles were overcome with a reply received within 24 hours.</p> <p>9.4.7 The feedback from public consultation does not seem to suggest that the speed of vehicles around new housing developments is a particular issue, so it appears an NP policy in this area would not be justified.</p> <p>My informal research with some residents of the parish show a majority who are concerned about the speed of vehicles around housing estates.</p> <p>9.4.4 It was noted in the Evidence Base (paragraph 6.0.1) that many transport issues are not planning issues and therefore cannot be dealt with in a Neighbourhood Plan, and speed of vehicles is generally one of them.</p> <p>Transport issues should be part of the planning process and would enable control of vehicle speeds to be built into developments.</p> <p>9.4.8 Given the reporting process described above, it seems that either this website isn't sufficiently publicised, or reports are not being acted upon in a way that meets expectations.</p> <p>See my earlier comment regarding why this website is underused.</p> <p>Regarding green spaces within the parish, page 37 of the plan;</p> <p>Parish Aspiration - Hutton Beck Meadows West</p> <p>Hutton Beck Meadows West, which is defined in the 'Green Space Site Reports for Guisborough CP Neighbourhood Plan' document, currently has a live planning application on it, but would otherwise meet the criteria for LGS designation in the same way that Hutton Beck Meadows East does. If this application is rejected, Guisborough Town Council aspires to submit appropriate evidence at the appropriate time through the Local Plan process for RCBC to designate Hutton Beck Meadows West as Local Green Space.</p> <p>It is odd therefore that the planning application referenced contains the following statement:</p> <p>Please be advised that Guisborough Town Council "do not object" to the above planning application.</p> <p>Hutton Beck Meadows West should be designated a Local Green Space.</p>	Supportive apart from speed of vehicles issues.	No	Traffic calming measures can be and often are part of a new development and can be mandated through planning, but there was insufficient support for a policy in this NP.	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
35	Appalling lack of foresight to have progressed to this stage. That we have an opportunity to comment is welcome but disheartening because it should have been considered for obvious reasons. Infrastructure, facilities, and more importantly, the whole character of our once beautiful rural community destroyed. Too many people, many undesirable, unprecedented levels of crime, and the gradual disappearance of the beautiful countryside that drew us here initially. Over 50 years of deterioration and still continues! The whole character destroyed! Just another, ugly urban sprawl. It's heartbreaking.	No Overall Opinion.	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development.	No changes proposed
36	The ownership of the playing fields at Howbeck Road (KGV) is incorrect. The whole of the site including the Football Stadium and Bowls Club is Council owned and leased to the respective clubs rather than owned by them.	No Overall Opinion	No	The comment is incorrect according to the HM Land Registry.	No changes proposed
37	Looking at Guisborough on the ground and also on the map it is self evident how connected we are to nature and green spaces, Hutton Meadows East and West are a prime example of this and I feel that these spaces need to be protected in some way, building on them is not the answer and would cause other knock on issues with sewage and rain water dispersal not to mention general infrastructure.	No Overall Opinion	No.	These concerns are addressed in the NP's policies	No changes proposed
38	The green space behind Hutton meadows has always had a rich supply of nature including newts, owls, bees, and insects. We all know how important this is to our wellbeing as well as the wellbeing of other mammals and ecosystem. We seem no to think twice about spoiling such a beautiful space which has matured over hundreds of years, all in the name of a few greedy thugs who want to get rich. They don't care, they cannot see beyond the end of their own nose, serving their own selfish agenda only! This land is sacred and needed, and I wholeheartedly object. The fact that it is repeatedly considered for building or 'destroying' which is the real truth is shame worthy. For once, can the council act on behalf of the public rather than thinking of their own pockets! People might actually start thinking you work for us rather than yourselves.	No Overall Opinion - the respondent seems to have confused the Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan with a housing development application.	No	The town council's NP webpages contains an explanation of the background and context of a Neighbourhood Plan.	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
39	I do not agree with any more house building in guisborough. The trefoil development is a disgrace and will destroy one of our last remaining green belts. I object to this very strongly. I also disagree with pedestrianising challoner st. RCBC has no idea how to care for guusborough or its high paying rate residents. Its about time you listened. Clean up the high st. Force landlords to take proper care of their properties, stop antisocial behaviour, re-build wilton lane council estate and remove those who constantly commit crimes. Our town hall should fly the union jack.	No Overall Opinion	Yes - Clean up the high street. Force landlords to take proper care of their properties, stop antisocial behaviour, re-build Wilton lane council estate and remove those who constantly commit crimes. Our town hall should fly the union flag.	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development. Pedestrianizing Challoner St. and cleaning up the high street are addressed in NP Para. 9.1.20 to 9.1.22. Other issues are outside the scope of a neighbourhood plan.	No changes proposed
40	I am strongly opposed to the proposed development by Miller Homes on The Newstead Farm site. This land forms part of our cultural heritage. Guisborough is vastly becoming overly developed and these green species need protecting to retain Guisborough's semi rural identity and to protect our ecological biodiversity.	No Overall Opinion - the respondent seems to have confused the Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan with a housing development application.	No	The town council's NP webpages contains an explanation of the background and context of a Neighbourhood Plan.	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
41	I would support section 9.2.28 in terms of Hutton Beck Meadows. I believe the wildlife to be a significant issue within this area and would be highly concerned should this be disturbed. I find this section of the plan interesting and integral to any future planning applications.	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
42	From someone who brought my family up in Guisborough I have seen many changes. Guisborough is losing its identity we don't need more houses we have had our quota. I support keeping our green spaces and particularly those that are undisturbed and support our diminishing wildlife. Protect Hutton Meadows housing should not be built on East or West.	No Overall Opinion.	No	The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development.	No changes proposed
43	I am particularly enthused by the Town council's recognition that green space is important for a variety of reasons including wildlife biodiversity and flood risk attenuation, Particularly in the areas of 16 and 17 in the plan. These vital areas need all the protections that local government can provide. They are greatly valued by the community and are essential for the wellbeing of flora and fauna as well as maintaining an essential balance between the natural environment and built on land.	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
44	This is a great plan. The section on green spaces (section 9.2) is very important especially with regards to the various privately owned meadows. There are plans for these to be built on which will drastically impact the green corridors and wildlife within Guisborough. These natural green spaces are vital to the ecology of the area and the well being of Guisborough residents. The areas of Hutton Beck Beck Meadows (see page 58) is one of the largest areas of green space within Guisborough town and should be protected from development.	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed
45	I would like to discuss the Green Space Hutton Beck Meadows, ie plot 17, known as Newstead Farm. Due to the possibility of planning permission being sought on this site i would like to make reference to the importance of the Neighbourhood Plan in particular to the survey data around the importance of the ancient meadows and hedgerows on the site which has been undamaged for many years and the haven fit is for wildlife, fauna and flora. It is also a special place for biodiversity. It is also highlighted that this site is also a natural flood plane. I would oppose any building of houses on the site due the reasons aforementioned.	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
46	<p>The key issue with Guisborough stems from excessive house building which in itself brings me onto the issues we now face such as a shortage in essential services for medical and dental. Whilst I acknowledge the introduction of a new hospital facility, it falls short of what could be offered. By observation the hospital is over staffed for the limited service it offers. Further to the question of house building, there continues this program of building any available plot of land regardless of the consequences to ecology, the environment, flooding. It is noted that land is now selected as suitable for building were as previously it was considered unsuitable for reasons of flooding, access, or the need to conserve and preserve. The future of Guisborough should be determined by its residents and not by Councillors who have no connection or interest in our small beautiful town.</p>	No Overall Opinion.	No	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not and cannot impede sustainable development. Infrastructure / Public Services section of Para. 9.1 of the NP deals with doctors and dentists.</p>	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
47	<p>Overall, I am in agreement with the aims and concerns expressed. I agree that any developments or changes should consider the historic and rural nature of the town and not 'urbanise' it.</p> <p>The following comments are as brief as possible but I would be happy to discuss further if needed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am not sure the ownership details of the Guis Town Football stadium , bowling green area is correct -I believe these are leased. 2. The field adjacent to the Sea Cadet hut is used by the Sea Cadets, Scouts, horse owners and has also been used by the Hard Moors Fell Race on a few occasions each year as a base for their runners and supporters. 3. Allotments on Belmangate may be missing from your list (privately owned I think) <p>As regards housing mix and the desire to keep green spaces:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I note the number of family homes owned by older people. Age distribution of this area is unusual and there is insufficient downsizing property available. Need to encourage development tailored to local needs and not the needs of housebuilders profit margins. 2. A recent report in The Times stated that 50% of house sales in R&C are now going to investors. This is a shocking and concerning figure. Potentially our green spaces are being eroded for the holiday market and the rental market for investors from outside the area. This may raise prices and further hamper the efforts of our local people to buy a house. It also risks damaging communities with a lack of permanent residents and other issues linked to transient residents. <p>Is there some way our Neighbourhood Plan can consider these problems alongside the Planning Authority. A licensing scheme for short term lets or second homes and/ or a requirement to apply for planning permission for change of use would at least allow the authority to be aware of trends in this area.</p> <p>Town Centre</p> <p>Please ensure that the Plan requires all businesses/ owners to be aware of their responsibility to maintain condition and appearance of shop fronts and upper storeys and enforce against those who do not comply. Encouraging progress made so far with match funding but still some notable exceptions.</p> <p>Thank you for the work that has gone into this document</p> <p>[Name REDACTED]</p>	Supportive	No	<p>General support welcomed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ownership correct according to HM Land Registry. 3. Allotments on Belmangate considered too small and too few users for inclusion. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy BE1 is specifically aimed at meeting local needs. 2. Tourist accomm'n, the proposed short-term lets registration scheme and Conservation Area enforcement are handled at the RCBC level for borough-wide oversight. 	No changes proposed

	Submissions received via feedback form on Neighbourhood Plan webpages on Guisborough Town Council website during pre-submission consultation period.	Supportive / Unsupportive / No overall opinion	Specific changes identified? (Yes / No)	QB Response to Submission	Consequential Changes to GCPNP
48	<p>My postcode is [REDACTED]</p> <p>The Draft Neighbourhood Plan is a well crafted document and I am fully supportive of its vision and aims</p> <p>Policy BE2</p> <p>I fully support this policy which is critical to Guisborough's future character and prosperity. Guisborough is being overdeveloped and the quality, character siting and density of housing needs fundamental review.</p> <p>Green Spaces</p> <p>I fully support the green spaces section of the draft plan and all the proposed policies within it and in particular Policy GS5 and the 'Public Aspiration' with reference to Hutton Beck Meadows West</p> <p>Each of these internal green spaces are an intrinsic part of the semi rural character of Guisborough and provide valuable space, hedgerows, trees and ground cover for a wide variety of Flora and Fauna to flourish. They absorb rain fall and avoid even further flooding of the streets.</p> <p>They are crucial to human well being providing green lungs that improve air quality, noise absorption, bird song, places of recreation and much more. They promote mental health in a variety of ways.</p> <p>The loss of these internal green 'firebreaks' will result in a depressing urban sprawl and destroy the very essence of why people wish to live here.</p>	Supportive	No	General support welcomed	No changes proposed

9.0 Further Correspondence with Historic England

The email copied below was received from Historic England on 4th September 2025. It shows agreement with the approaches taken to amend the GNP in response to Historic England's concerns. This includes the amalgamation of Policies BE2 and BE4, open space designations, the historic content of the Local Green Space designations and the increase distinction between plan policies and parish aspirations. The response to their Strategic Environmental Assessment comment was added to Section 7 of this document.

Hi Neil

Thanks for both of these emails. What you've sent is clear and useful.

- The way you've set out the responses to our comments in the draft consultation statement is acceptable. You should add a response to the comment in our letter about Strategic Environmental Assessment.
- I'm happy with the approach you've concluded on Policy BE4: to omit it and roll relevant content in to BE2.
- I'm happy with your conclusions on the point I raised about open space designations. You've explored comparator neighbourhood plans, now made, that include open space designations in addition to Local Green Space, and concluded that this is the right approach for your plan. I am happy that, as far as our interests are concerned, the Local Green Space designation you are making is acceptable.
- I agree with the approach you've taken when presenting your plan to give clearer distinction between plan policies and community aspirations.

I hope this helps you move forward. Kind regards.

Jules

Jules Brown | Historic Places Adviser, North East & Yorkshire

Historic England | Bessie Surtees House | 41-44 Sandhill | Newcastle upon Tyne | NE1 3JF

Appendix 1 – Response from Natural England

Date: 14 August 2025
Our ref: 518092
Your ref: Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan



Guisborough Town Council

Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ
T 0300 060 3900

BY EMAIL ONLY

office@guisboroughtowncouncil.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan - Pre-submission Regulation 14 Consultation

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 03 July 2024.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.

However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information.

Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in [Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species](#).

Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission [standing advice](#).

We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.

Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.

For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours faithfully
Sally Wintle
Consultations Team

Annex 1 - Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities

Natural environment information sources

The [Magic](http://magic.defra.gov.uk/)¹ website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: **Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on the Ordnance Survey base map)** and **Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones)**. Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment. A list of local record centres is available from [the Association of Local Environmental Records Centres](http://associationoflocalenvironmentalrecordscentres.org.uk/).

Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation, and the list of them can be found [here](#)². Most of these will be mapped either as **Sites of Special Scientific Interest**, on the Magic website or as **Local Wildlife Sites**. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.

National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan. NCA information can be found [here](#)³.

There may also be a local **landscape character assessment** covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online.

If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a **National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty** (AONB), the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape. You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website.

General mapped information on **soil types** and **Agricultural Land Classification** is available (under 'landscape') on the [Magic](http://magic.defra.gov.uk/)⁴ website and also from the [LandIS website](http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm)⁵, which contains more information about obtaining soil data.

Natural environment issues to consider

The [National Planning Policy Framework](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework)⁶ sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. [Planning Practice Guidance](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-practice-guidance)⁷ sets out supporting guidance.

Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.

Landscape

Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.

If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.

¹ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england>

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making>

⁴ <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>

⁵ <http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm>

⁶ [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2)

⁷ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/>

Wildlife habitats

Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed [here⁸](#)), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or [Ancient woodland⁹](#). If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.

Priority and protected species

You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed [here¹⁰](#)) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice [here¹¹](#) to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.

Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 112. For more information, see [Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land¹²](#).

Improving your natural environment

Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment and should provide net gains for biodiversity in line with the [National Planning Policy Framework](#). If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you should follow the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy and seek to ensure impacts on habitats are avoided or minimised before considering opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. You may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development and how these could contribute to biodiversity net gain and wider environmental goals.

Opportunities for environmental enhancement might include:

- Restoring a neglected hedgerow.
- Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.
- Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.
- Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.
- Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.
- Think about how lighting can be best managed to reduce impacts on wildlife.
- Adding a green roof to new buildings.
- Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way.

Site allocations should be supported by a baseline assessment of biodiversity value. The statutory [Biodiversity Metric](#) may be used to understand the number of biodiversity units present on allocated sites. For small development allocations the [Small Sites Metric](#) may be used. This is a simplified version of the statutory [Biodiversity Metric](#) and is designed for use where certain criteria are met. Further information on biodiversity net gain including [planning practice guidance](#) can be found [here](#)

You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:

- Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists) in your community.
- Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision. Natural England's [Green Infrastructure Framework](#) sets out further information on green infrastructure standards and principles
- Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see [Planning Practice Guidance¹³](#)).
- Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks or on verges, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency).

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england>

⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences>

¹⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england>

¹¹ <https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals>

¹² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land>

¹³ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space>

- Planting additional street trees.
- Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links.
- Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore).

Natural England's [Environmental Benefits from Nature tool](#) may be used to identify opportunities to enhance wider benefits from nature and to avoid and minimise any negative impacts. It is designed to work alongside the statutory [Biodiversity Metric](#) and is available as a beta test version.

Appendix 2 – Response from North York Moors National Park Auth.



North York Moors
National Park
Authority

Tom Hind
Chief Executive

Date: 16 July 2025.

Neil Hunter
Guisborough Town Council
Sunnyfield House
36 Westgate
Guisborough
North Yorkshire
TS14 6BA

By email

Dear Neil,

Draft Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan

I am writing to offer minor comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Overall, we commend the Town Council in producing a thorough and well prepared plan.

For information, the area of the Parish within the National Park Local Planning Authority area includes Hutton Village, Charltons, the eastern part of Newton under Roseberry (east of the Guisborough/Great Ayton Road) and a small corner of the Hunters Hill estate (Aldenham Road/Fryup Crescent/Roxby Avenue area).

Comments

3.04/Section 5 – is it worth including Hutton Village? For Hutton Village we have some background text that may be used as part of our forthcoming Design Code and there is a Conservation Appraisal available dating back to 2003.

9.2.14 – For information, the old railway line (from Aldenham Road to Guisborough Forest Visitors Centre) is designated as a 'protected linear route' in the North York Moors Local Plan (Policy CO5). This section is not covered by Redcar and Cleveland's Local Plan Policy GS2 but is protected from development under the Local Plan for this Authority.

9.2.38 - This states that this Authority does not have the equivalent of RCBC's open space policy. This is partially true, but we do have a policy protected Community Spaces (CO5). Hutton Village Green is not designated as such as most of it is a registered village green and hence is already protected from development. We did not include registered village greens within this designation.

*Working together to sustain the landscape and life of the
North York Moors for both present and future generations to enjoy*

The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York YO62 5BP
01439 772700 general@northyorkmoors.org.uk
planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk northyorkmoors.org.uk



Your ref:

Our Ref:

Date:

I wish you success when taking the Plan through to completion, and if I can be any help please ask.

Yours

Paul Fellows

Paul Fellows

Head of Strategic Policy

Working pattern: Full time (Monday-Friday)

Appendix 3 – Response from National Highways

From: Sunny Ali <email address REDACTED>

Date: Wed, 9 Jul 2025 at 15:30

Subject: re: Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan Reg 14 Notification of Pre-submission - National Highways response

To: office@guisboroughtowncouncil.gov.uk <office@guisboroughtowncouncil.gov.uk>

RE: Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan Reg 14 Notification of Pre-submission

Dear Neighbourhood Plan team,

Thank you for consulting National Highways in relation to the Pre-submission draft of the Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan.

As the Neighbourhood Plan identifies, Guisborough is located with the area covered by the Redcar & Cleveland Local Plan. National Highways participated in the consultation of that Local Plan during its preparation, but we are also aware that the Redcar & Cleveland Local Plan is in the process of being updated, having been recently subject to a Call for Sites stage. It is assumed that the Neighbourhood Plan will be developed (or made adaptable) in a manner that enables it to be read alongside the current Local Plan, but also any future adopted Local Plan.

National Highways interests are with regard to the Strategic Road Network, which in this general area includes the A174 between the A19 and A1053; the A19 and the A1053. Our role in seeking to assist the delivery of sustainable development is identified in '[DfT Circular 01/2022 \(Strategic road network and the delivery of sustainable development\)](#)'.

Having considered the Neighbourhood Plan and the policies contained within it, it is not apparent that it seeks to promote any additional development. It is also clear from the transport section that it seeks to ensure sustainable transport provision which can be supported by National Highways.

On this basis, National Highways do not want to make any other specific comments on the Plan at this stage.

Kind regards



Sunny Ali MRTPI | Spatial Planner

Operations Yorkshire, North East and Humberside, National Highways

Mobile: <phone number REDACTED>

Appendix 4 – Response from Environment Agency

creating a better place
for people and wildlife



Guisborough Town Clerk's office,
Sunnyfield House
36 Westgate
Guisborough
North Yorkshire
TS14 6BA

Our ref: NA/2016/113145/OR-02/PO1
Your ref: Guisborough CP
Neighbourhood Plan
Date: 31 July 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

Guisborough CP Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Notification of Pre-submission Consultation

Thank you for consulting us on the Guisborough CP Neighbourhood Plan, which we received on 3 July 2025.

The Environment Agency does not have any concerns over the contents of this Neighborhood Plan and generally welcome the plans aspirations to protect and enhance green spaces.

Further information

Together with Natural England, English Heritage and Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans.

This is available at:

http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding the advice in this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Cameron Chandler
Planning Advisor

Direct dial

Direct e-mail

Team e-mail: planning.nane@environment-agency.gov.uk

Appendix 5 – Response from Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council



Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
Growth, Enterprise and Environment
Planning Strategy
Seafield House
Kirkleatham Street
Redcar
TS10 1SP

Mr Neil Hunter
Guisborough Town Council
Seafield House
Guisborough
NE14 6BA

Our Ref:
Your Ref:
Contact: Rebecca Wren
Direct line: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Neil Hunter

21/07/25

Consultation Draft Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan May 2025

Thank you for consulting Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council on the Draft Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan. Our comments on the content of the draft document are set out below.

Plan Period – It is noted that the Summary and Introduction sections make reference to the policies of the plan delivering the vision over the next 15 years. In the interests of clarity and in order to match the Basic Conditions Statement, it is recommended that the plan clearly states the time period during which the policies will have an effect.

Paragraph 3.0.1 - When adopted, the Neighbourhood Plan would become part of the Statutory Development Plan rather than Local Plan so it is recommended that the final sentence of this paragraph is amended.

Policy BE4 Point 2 – “The design, height, orientation, massing, means of enclosure, materials, finishes and decoration proposed;” – It is suggested that this point could be reworded to ensure that important architectural details, such as window proportions or rebates, are not overlooked and to remove reference to ‘decoration’ which may be a vague term in this situation and which could be encompassed by the following suggestion -

“The design, height, orientation, massing, architectural style, materials, finishes and means of enclosure proposed;”

Policy BE4 Point 3 – “The retention of original features of special architectural interest such as walls, gateways, chimneys etc.;” – It is considered that point 3 may allow the removal of non-original features that add architectural interest or historical character despite being added after the initial completion of the asset, and that reference only to special architectural interest may allow the removal of features that are of little interest architecturally but still add to the historic character of the asset.

It is suggested that this point may better support the protection of historic assets by being reworded as follows – “The retention of features of special architectural interest and/or historic fabric that contribute to the significance of the asset”.

Policy BE4 Point 4 – “The retention of existing trees, hedgerows and landscape features with appropriate landscaping improvements incorporated into design proposals;” – In some cases trees and landscaping features can change the character of a conservation area and harm the setting of a historic asset, such as where trees are self-seeded or features are more recent additions. It is suggested that this point could be improved by being reworded to include reference to features contributing positively to setting or character.

Policy BE4 Point 5 – “The protection of important views and vistas, including those in to and out of the North York Moors National Park;” – Chapter 16 of the NPPF specifically refers to the significance and contribution of the setting of heritage assets and it is considered that the importance of setting could be included within this point. For example “The protection of important views and vistas, including those that contribute to the setting of the conservation area, the setting of other heritage assets and those in to and out of the North York Moors National Park”

Open Space Policies - Reference in the supporting text that sites ‘clearly meet the criteria of RCBC’s policy N3 Open Space and Recreation’ when they are not designated under Policy N3 of the Local Plan, and are proposed for designation in the Neighbourhood Plan, are not needed and can be removed.

Policy GS5 –

Field Next to Sea Cadets Hut – This site, located in Belmangate, is described as being designated as Local Greenspace in recognition of its contribution to promoting biodiversity, providing local character and interest, and potentially providing a future healthy living recreational asset. However, the site is described as being disused and overgrown in the Council’s 2023 Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy (PPOSS). The PPOSS explains that a disused playing field is one which is not being used by any users and is not available for community hire either. There are, therefore, concerns that the site does not currently have significant recreational value. In addition, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate a biodiversity value that would show alignment with NPPF para. 107 in relation to local significance.

Chapel Beck Valley and Hutton Beck East – This site has no public access and the local significance of this site is explained as being in relation to its value for wildlife. The Green Sites Report states that this site is meadow grassland and a very significant haven for wildlife and for flood risk attenuation. It is also stated that it forms a major part of the wildlife corridor into the heart of the town from the south west. However, beyond this statement there is no further evidence to demonstrate this significance.

The Council currently has concerns relating to the inclusion of these sites as Local Greenspace designations as it is not considered that evidence has been provided to clearly demonstrate that the sites hold a particular significance in relation to recreation and/or richness of wildlife. However, this could be reconsidered should appropriate evidence be provided that would demonstrate that they meet the NPPF requirements. This could include showing that the sites have notable species or habitats present or are part of a long-term study of wildlife by members of the local community.

Yours Sincerely



Rebecca Wren
Planning Strategy Manager

Appendix 6 – Response from The Coal Authority



The Coal Authority

200 Lichfield Lane
Mansfield
Nottinghamshire
NG18 4RG
T: 01623 637 119 (Planning Enquiries)
E: planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk
W: www.gov.uk/coalauthority

For the attention of: Guisborough Town Council

[By email: office@guisboroughtowncouncil.gov.uk]

8th August 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Redcar & Cleveland - Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for your notification of the 3rd July 2025 seeking the views of the Coal Authority on the above.

The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. As a statutory consultee, the Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas.

Our records indicate the presence of Ironstone mine entries within the Guisborough woods area. For clarity our remit lies solely with coal mining legacy and we do not comment on other mineral extraction.

On the basis that no coal mining features are present within the Neighbourhood Plan area we have no specific comments to make on this document.

Yours faithfully

Melanie Lindsley

Melanie Lindsley BA (Hons), DipEH, DipURP, MA, PGCertUD, PGCertSP, MRTPI
Principal Planning & Development Manager



Making a **better future** for people
and the environment **in mining areas**

Appendix 7 – Response from Historic England



Historic England

Sir/Madam Guisborough Town Council
Guisborough Town Council

Direct Dial: 07880 717925

Our ref: PL00799284
12 August 2025

Dear Sir/Madam Guisborough Town Council

Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012: Regulation 14 Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan: Pre-Submission Draft, May 2025

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the pre-submission draft of the above neighbourhood plan. Historic England is a public organisation that protects and brings new life to the heritage that matters to us all, so it lives on and is loved for longer. We are pleased to offer our comments.

Historic England is keen to ensure protection of the historic environment is appropriately taken into account in neighbourhood plans. The plan area contains a number of designated heritage assets (including conservation areas, listed buildings and scheduled monuments) as well as the potential for non-designated heritage assets. Having reviewed the information provided in correspondence of 3 July 2025, we write with detailed comments and some general advice tailored to this plan.

Detailed comments

As it stands, your draft plan does not provide sufficient clarity to support your ambition of protecting the historic environment. We suggest the plan's approach requires some amendment to be more coherent or thorough:

- In Policy BE2 (1), it would be better to use the phrase "pay special attention" rather than "take in to account", as that is stronger and accurately reflects the statutory duty in relation to conservation areas. Also (and in Policy BE4), using the term "emerging" for the conservation area documentation dates your plan. It would be better to refer to Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council's two Guisborough Conservation Area documents by name: the *Appraisal* (2024) and *Management Plan* (2025), which work together to set out what is special about the area and how should best be managed to meet the statutory duty to preserve or enhance its special interest. Both documents are likely to be adopted by the time your plan is made (if they are not already).
- In Policy BE2 (2), you should consider rewording your list of design components to better reflect those given in the National Design Guide: layout, form, scale, appearance, landscape, materials and detailing. The National Design Guide (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-design-guide>) carries weight as a material consideration in planning decisions, so your policy would be strengthened by aligning with it.



BESSIE SURTEES HOUSE 41-44 SANDHILL NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE NE1 3JF

Telephone 0191 403 1635

HistoricEngland.org.uk

Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.



- As Policy BE2 covers the entire plan area, it should refer to the other two conservation areas in the parish, not just Guisborough's, or the policy will be weaker when applied in those conservation areas.
- In Policy BE3 or the accompanying text, you should consider referring to *Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency* (Historic England Advice Note 18, July 2024), which we have produced to provide clarity on key considerations and to support consistent decision making.
- Unless it is reworded, Policy BE4 risks not meeting the basic conditions required for a neighbourhood plan to proceed to referendum. It summarises and partially re-writes existing higher level policy rather than adding local depth to its application. It may not therefore follow para 041 Ref ID: 41-041-20140306 of the planning practice guidance (<<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning-2>>). The first sentence suggests conservation areas are not designated heritage assets; they are and thus do not need to be identified separately. It also applies the same policy requirement to all heritage assets regardless of designation or grade. This appears to be at odds with higher level policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, Dec 2024), which requires assets to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (see paras 202 and 212-216). For example, in summary, the legislative duty for listed buildings is to have 'special regard' to the desirability of preserving them, whilst the policy requirement for non-designated heritage assets is simply to see the impact of development 'taken into account'. Instead of re-writing these requirements, we suggest the policy is refocused to set out specific themes, characteristics or features to be protected when applying higher level policy, or to set out what measures would be acceptable to mitigate the impact of development that higher level policy might allow. Your policy begins to do this in the later bullets, but more detailed and specific points should be made, for example to avoid the use of "etc" in the third bullet, and to define more clearly what "important views", "appropriately landscaped" and "appropriately designed" mean in your plan area. This clarity could come from use of a Design Code linked to a re-worded policy, as set out in government planning practice guidance (see <<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/design>> para 008 Ref ID: 26-008-20191001). This approach would align with para 132 of the NPPF, which says neighbourhood plans can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of the area and explain how this should be reflected in development.
- Your eight policies on "green spaces" appear unclear. They refer to NPPF para 104, which relates to "open spaces", a topic which planning practice guidance suggests is for local planning authorities rather than neighbourhood plan groups (see <<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space>> para 001 Ref ID: 37-001-20140306). The type of open space designation neighbourhood plans can make is Local Green Space as defined by NPPF para 107 (see para 006 Ref ID: 37-006-20140306) but only one of your policies appears to refer to this. The need for clarity is important in deciding if your plan meets the basic conditions. It would





be better for your plan only to designate Local Green Space that has been assessed using the criteria in para 107, including from our perspective whether a space is demonstrably special for its historic significance. You should also consider whether land in the National Park or Green Belt should be designated as Local Green Space as it is unlikely to add extra protection.

- We suggest some aspects of your document that have been debated and discounted could usefully have a policy included in your plan to support higher level policy. For example, you could include a policy to support new tourist accommodation, a topic you appear to support in general. Your plan could identify broad or specific locations where such accommodation would be welcome, the type of accommodation desirable, or the design characteristics that you would wish to see. This would add local depth to high level policy, such as para 88(c) of the NPPF which encourages a prosperous rural economy, which your plan's vision is in line with.
- We also suggest your plan includes the issues of non-designated heritage assets and heritage at risk, which we discuss in the tailored comments below.

General comments tailored to this plan

We publish *Neighbourhood Planning & the Historic Environment* (HE Advice Note 11, Second Edition; <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/neighbourhood-planning-and-historic-environment-advice-note-11/>), which explains why and how to consider the historic environment in your plan. It signposts a number of other resources, including case studies on our website (<http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/>).

The NPPF says neighbourhood plans have the power to develop a shared vision for their area, to shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development (para 30). Specifically, this can include detailed policies on conserving and enhancing the historic environment and on design (para 29). The planning practice guidance is clear that, where relevant, neighbourhood plans should include enough information about heritage to guide planning decisions and to put strategic heritage policies into action at a neighbourhood scale.

It is therefore important that your plan identifies heritage assets in the area and includes a positive strategy to safeguard those elements that contribute to their significance. This will ensure they can be appropriately conserved and enjoyed now and in the future. For example, policies might address the following:

- Considering how the plan's objectives can be achieved by maximising the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits flowing from heritage, eg. regeneration, tourism, learning, leisure, wellbeing and enjoyment. (See the comments above about tourist accommodation.)
- Locating new development to protect heritage assets and their settings.
- Giving detail on the expected layout, form, scale, appearance, landscape,



BESSIE SURTEES HOUSE 41-44 SANDHILL NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE NE1 3JF

Telephone 0191 403 1635

HistoricEngland.org.uk



materials and detailing of new development. (See comments above.)

- Offering solutions to heritage assets that are at risk from their condition or vacancy, or are vulnerable to becoming so during the life of the plan. The plan area contains five entries on the national Heritage At Risk Register (all Scheduled Monuments), and Guisborough Conservation Area is identified as Vulnerable, having been downgraded from At Risk and removed from the register in 2022. Your plan could address the risk factors for these designated heritage assets. The national register does not ordinarily cover Grade II listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets, so your plan could also usefully consider whether any are at risk.
- Considering how heritage assets can be enhanced.

As well as designated heritage assets, your plan is an important opportunity to include a positive strategy for non-designated heritage assets, which can include buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes important to local people for their heritage value. When identifying these, your plan should include enough information to set out the elements that make them special so they, too, can be appropriately conserved and enjoyed. More information is given in our advice note.

The strategy and policies in your plan should be based on proportionate, robust evidence. Rather than just the presence or absence of heritage assets, evidence should focus on what makes them significant and, where relevant, vulnerable. This helps you to identify the issues and options for your policies to address. For conservation areas, this evidence is provided in the appraisal and management plan adopted by the local planning authority. Where up to date documents do not exist, your plan could usefully encourage them in parish aspirations. More information is given in our advice note.

Your local authority should be able to support you in preparing your plan, including providing evidence on heritage assets and mapping. The local Historic Environment Record will contain information on designated and non-designated heritage assets, whilst the conservation officer and/or archaeology adviser might be able to assist in using this information. You could involve civic and amenity societies or local history groups with an interest in your area's heritage. Locality provides funds to enable you to hire suitable historic environment expertise, for example to help prepare evidence, develop policy and produce the plan. More information is given in our advice note.

Neighbourhood plans also give you the opportunity to tackle other issues important to the heritage, more on which can be found in our advice note. These include:

- You can make allocations for new development such as housing or commercial uses; these can include small and medium-sized housing sites (NPPF para 74).
- You can designate Local Green Space important to the community, for example because of its historical significance (NPPF paras 106-108). See above for discussion of this for your draft plan.





- You can include design policies and codes to identify the special qualities of the plan area and explain how this should be reflected in development (NPPF paras 132, 134). See above for discussion of this for your draft plan.
- You can identify future actions or aspirations, including those on topics beyond land use and development, setting them out separately in an annex to the plan (PPG para 41-004-20190509). For example, you could consider suggesting the local planning authority assesses whether a conservation area should be designated at Newton-under-Roseberry.

Finally, it is important that you consider whether or not the plan would be likely to have significant environmental effects and thus require Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). This is established by following the Environmental Assessment of Plans & Programmes Regulations 2004, which require the neighbourhood plan qualifying body to consult us on the matter in the form of a Screening Opinion. The local planning authority can advise on this, and we publish HE Advice Note 8, *Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment* to support this process (<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/sustainability-appraisal-and-strategic-environmental-assessment-advice-note-8/>).

You can familiarise yourself with the terminology of historic environment planning (such as “historic environment”, “conservation”, “significance”, “heritage asset”, and “setting”) by referring to the glossary in the NPPF. Where relevant, we recommend accurately copying these and other terms across to your plan’s own glossary. Other Historic England advice that may also be of use includes:

- HE Advice Note 2 - *Making Changes to Heritage Assets*:
<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/making-changes-heritage-assets-advice-note-2/>
- HE Advice Note 7 - *Local Heritage Listing*:
<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7>

Our comments are based on the information supplied to date; I hope they are useful. Our opinion may change should the plan change materially in content and direction. We should be consulted again under regulation 16 of the above regulations (submission stage) if our interests are affected. Please contact me should you require any clarification.

Yours sincerely,

Jules Brown

Jules Brown
Historic Places Adviser

.org.uk



BESSIE SURTEES HOUSE 41-44 SANDHILL NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE NE1 3JF

Telephone 0191 403 1635
HistoricEngland.org.uk

Appendix 8 – Response from Loftus Town Council

From: **Loftus Town Council** <office@loftustowncouncil.gov.uk>

Date: Wed, 6 Aug 2025 at 12:17

Subject: Re: Guisborough CP Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Notification of Pre-submission Consultation

To: Office GTC <office@guisboroughtowncouncil.gov.uk>

Morning,

Loftus Town Council Planning Committee have today considered the proposals in your draft Neighbourhood Plan and supports the proposals and wishes you well in this endeavour.

Kind Regards

Sarah Yates

Loftus Town Council

Town Hall

Loftus

TS13 4HG

[Phone number REDACTED]

Office Hours Monday - Friday 9am-3pm



Appendix 9 – Response from Cleveland Police

From: DOCO - Design out crime <doco@cleveland.police.uk>

Date: Mon, 11 Aug 2025 at 08:04

Subject: RE: Guisborough CP Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Notification of Pre-submission Consultation

To: Office GTC <office@guisboroughtowncouncil.gov.uk>

Good morning.

In relation to the Guisborough CP Neighbourhood Plan could I request that the below be considered for inclusion.

Suggested Generic Reference To Embedding Us Within Policy

Cleveland Police encourages applicants to build/refurbish developments incorporating the guidelines of [Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design](#) (CPTED).

Cleveland Police also promotes the “Secured by Design” initiative.

Secured by Design (SBD) is the official police security initiative that works to improve the security of buildings and their immediate surroundings to provide safe places to live, work, shop, and visit.

Applicants should actively seek Secured by Design accreditation; full information is available within the SBD Guides at www.securedbydesign.com

Even if SBD Certification is not achievable you may incorporate some of the measures to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour.

Once a development has been completed the main opportunity to design out crime has gone.

The local Designing Out Crime Officer should be contacted at the earliest opportunity, prior to submission and preferably at the design stage.

To Be Included In PolicyBE2 Comments

Secured by Design (SBD) is the official police security initiative that works to improve the security of buildings and their immediate surroundings to provide safe places to live, work, shop and visit.

Regards

c8609 Steve Cranston

Designing Out Crime Officer

Middlesbrough Police Office | Bridge Street West | Middlesbrough | TS2 1AB

Telephone: 01642 303171 Mobile: 07921937670

[Website](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#)



Public Service | Transparency | Impartiality | Integrity

“Delivering outstanding policing for our communities”

Please do not use social media or email to report crime as we do not monitor these accounts 24/7. Dial 999 in an emergency or visit the [contact us](#) section of our website for all reporting options

POLICING CLEVELAND TOGETHER



Please do not use social media or email to report crime as we do not monitor these accounts 24/7. Dial 999 in an emergency or visit the [contact us](#) section of our website for all reporting options.

The attached image is copyright of Cleveland Police and permission to publish lasts for seven days.

Should the image be reused, permission must be sought from Cleveland Police prior to publication.

Public Service | Transparency | Impartiality | Integrity



Appendix 10 – Response from Gisborough Priory Project

From: <gppltd2003@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, 12 Aug 2025 at 13:01

Subject: FW: Guisborough CP Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Notification of Pre-submission Consultation

To: <office@guisboroughtowncouncil.gov.uk>

Thanks you Town Council for asking GPP to comment on the Neighbourhood Plan.

We have identified two corrections that need to be made and some information about the use of Guisborough and Gisborough when referring to the town.

5.5.6 it was Robert de Brus 1 that founded the Priory. There is a lot of old documentation that attributes the Priory to Robert 11 however this has now been disproved as the Robert who founded the Priory was the first Robert de Brus to be given land in England by the King. At the time it was King Henry 1 – references ae available if needed.

9. 2. 4. Guisborough Estates should be Gisborough Estates (see comment below)

Guisborough and Gisborough

The spelling of Gisborough comes from when Richard Godolphin Walmsley Chaloner (1856 – 1938) was elevated to the House of Lords in 1917 and took the title of Lord Gisborough, based on his research of the origins of the name of what is now the town of Guisborough. All land and property of Lord Gisborough is identified by the use of Gisborough as in Gisborough Hall, Gisborough Estates and Gisborough Priory. GPP have other histories and derivation of what is now Guisborough and if you are interested can provide you with some of them, however for the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan this is not necessary, whoever you may want to rephrase that section.

GPP want to commend the Town Council on their hard work that has gone into producing the Neighbourhood Plan. It gives a clear and concise statement of what is and is not the Town Council's

responsibility, along with what they can and cannot influence. Well done to everyone for producing such an excellent document.

On another notes [administrative request on an unrelated subject REDACTED]

Many thanks

Christine Clarke

Company Secretary Gisborough Priory Project

gpltd2003@gmail.com

phone [REDACTED]

www.gisboroughprioryproject.org.uk

Gisborough Priory Project Ltd Registered charity number 1109285 Company number 4684000, registered in England Registered Office: 3 Langdale Guisborough TS14 8EZ

Gisborough Priory Project protects your personal information as required by GDPR 2018. To see our full Data Protection Policy, including Privacy Policy and Privacy statement please follow the link: <https://gisboroughprioryproject.org.uk/privacy-policy/>