

**INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE GUISBOROUGH CIVIL PARISH  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

EXAMINER: Patrick Whitehead DipTP (Nott) MRTPI

Examination Ref:01/PW/GNP

Neil Hunter  
Chair of the Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Rebecca Wren  
Planning Strategy Manager  
Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council

14 January 2026

Dear Mr Hunter and Ms Wren

Following the submission of the Guisborough Civil Parish Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) for examination, I would like to clarify several initial procedural matters. I also have a number of questions for Guisborough Town Council (GTC) and for Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (RCBC) to which I would like to receive written responses by **Wednesday 28 January 2026**, if possible.

1. Examination Documentation

I can confirm that I am satisfied that I have received a complete submission of the draft Plan and accompanying documentation, including the Basic Conditions Statement; the Consultation Statement; the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report; and the Regulation 16 representations to enable me to undertake the examination.

Subject to my detailed assessment of the draft Plan, I have not at this initial stage identified any very significant and obvious flaws in the Plan that might lead me to advise that the examination should not proceed.

2. Site Visit

I will aim to carry out a site visit to the neighbourhood plan area during the week commencing 19 January 2026. The site visit will assist in my assessment of the draft Plan, including the issues identified in the representations.

The visit will be undertaken unaccompanied. It is very important that I am not approached to discuss any aspects of the Plan or the neighbourhood area, as this may be perceived to prejudice my independence and risk compromising the fairness of the examination process.

I may have some additional questions, following my site visit, which I will set out in writing should I require any further clarification.

3. Written Representations

At this stage, I consider the examination can be conducted solely by the written representations procedure, without the need for a hearing. However, I will reserve the option to convene a hearing

should a matter come to light where I consider that a hearing is necessary to ensure the adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case.

#### 4. Further Clarification

From my initial assessment of the Plan and supporting documents, I have identified a number of matters where I require some additional information and clarification from the GTC and RCBC. These are set out in the Annex to this letter. I would be grateful if a written response can be provided by **Wednesday 28 January 2026**, if possible.

#### 5. Examination Timetable

As you will be aware, the intention is to examine the Plan (including conduct of the site visit) with a view to providing a draft report (for 'fact checking') within around 6 – 8 weeks of submission of the draft Plan. However, as I have raised a number of questions, I must provide you with sufficient opportunity to reply. Consequentially, and dependent on when you are in a position to respond, the examination timetable may be extended. Please be assured that I will aim to mitigate any delay, should it arise, as far as is practicable. The IPe office team will seek to keep you updated on the anticipated delivery date of the draft report

If you have any process questions related to the conduct of the examination, which you would like me to address, please do not hesitate to contact the office team in the first instance.

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure a copy of this letter and any subsequent response is placed on the GTC, RCBC, and the North York National Moors Park Authority (NYMNP) websites.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Yours sincerely

*Patrick T Whitehead*

Examiner

## ANNEX

From my initial reading of the Guisborough Civil Parish Neighbourhood Plan and the supporting evidence, I have the following questions for GTC and RCBC. If NYMNP has any observations on the questions, these would also be welcome. I have requested the submission of responses by **Wednesday 28 January 2026**, although an earlier response would be much appreciated.

Where I am requesting additional clarification, suggested text and similar, this is with a view to informing the specific terms of any relevant examiner modification(s) that I may recommend. Accordingly, all of the points set out below flow from the requirement to satisfy the Basic Conditions.

1. Can the GTC confirm the dates of publication for the Pre-Submission Draft Consultation Statement, and the Statement of Public Consultation?

The Pre-Submission Draft Consultation Statement and the Statement of Public Consultation were published by RCBC. RCBC have provided us with the date: "The consultation statements were published on our website on the 4<sup>th</sup> November 2025, in advance of the start of the consultation."

2. Can RCBC, in consultation with NYMNP, provide a response to the objection submitted at Regulation 16 stage on behalf of Teesmouth Bird Club, GNP/004, regarding the findings of the SEA Screening Assessment?
3. Whilst I am able to access the documentation relating to application R/2025/0579/FFM, submitted 14.08.2025, through the RCBC online planning register, I understand a decision may be imminent. Could RCBC please keep me informed of the progress in determining the application?

### *The Built Environment*

4. Would the GTC consider an appropriate reference to the Local Plan Policy H2: Type and Mix of Housing as part of the supporting text to Policy BE1 within paragraphs 9.1.1 – 9.1.4?

Yes. We could add onto para. 9.1.4 "All these recent developments have been in line with RCBC Policy H2 – Type and Mix of Housing. This policy addresses housing needs across the borough, but it was identified that Guisborough CP has an age distribution heavily skewed towards older age groups (see paragraph 5.5.17 above). Since the housing needs of the elderly are different from younger age groups, special regard should be given in future development applications."

5. Policy BE2: Design Principles, refers specifically to the Guisborough Conservation Area Management Plan. The Conservation Area covers a substantial part of the Neighbourhood Plan area, and includes Article IV Directions for a significant number of buildings. Whilst development proposals must meet policies HE1 and HE2 of the Local Plan, does the GTC consider that the supporting text should clarify the relationship between the NP Policy BE2 and the Local Plan, and the Conservation Area Management Plan?

Yes. We could add to para 9.1.13 the following sentence: For development proposals within the parish's conservation areas, Policy BE2 para. 1 and 2 (above) give a local nuance to the requirements of RCBC's Local Plan Policies HE1 and HE2, and such proposals should give due regard to the relevant Conservation Area Management Plan.

6. Would the GTC consider the inclusion of a map showing the Conservation Area boundary in the GCPNP?

Yes. These were provided through RCBC and are attached.

7. Does the GTC consider that Policy BE2 or its supporting text should make reference to the Redcar and Cleveland Urban Design Guidelines SPD and the Design of Residential Areas SPD?

Yes. We could combine paras. 9.1.9 and 9.1.10 into one para and add a new para below Policy BE2 and renumber the paras. accordingly. The new para would read "Policy BE2 should be read alongside the RCBC Urban Design Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the Design of Residential Areas SPD."

8. The RCBC document, Urban Design Guidelines SPD, page 23, refers to the need to secure domestic energy efficiency (paragraph 4.37). Does the GTC consider that the supporting text for Policy BE3 should make specific reference to this document in support of the Policy requirements?

Yes. We could amend para. 9.1 15 by inserting the following text ahead of the final sentence: "Policy BE3 should be read alongside RCBC's Urban Design Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which provides guidance on sustainable building and design innovation and demonstrated true strategic leadership in low-carbon development. Para. 4.37 of the guidelines states "Energy use in buildings accounts for nearly 50% of UK carbon emissions. There is a duty on Local Authorities to secure a significant improvement in domestic energy efficiency across all housing tenures."

#### *Green Spaces*

9. Policy GS5: Could GTC provide a response to the objection GNP/015 submitted at Regulation 16 stage on behalf of Miller Homes Ltd relating to land forming part of Hutton Beck Meadows East?

Yes. We have prepared a response in a separate document entitled "Guisborough Town Council's response to the Lichfields / Miller Representation During the Reg. 16 Consultation on the Submitted Guisborough CP Neighbourhood Plan."

10. The privately owned Hutton Beck Meadows East is included within the designation as Local Green Space in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 106-108. This requires that the Policy should be consistent with national policy for Green Belts set out in chapter 13 of this Framework. Would the GTC consider distinguishing the Policy from other green space designations and including appropriate policy text as follows: "*this Local Green Space will be protected from inappropriate development unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated, or where development supports its role and function as a Local Green Space*"?

Yes. We will add the suggested text to Policy GS5, so it would read:

#### **Policy GS5A: Privately-owned Meadows – Open Space**

The field next to Sea Cadets hut, which is defined in the Policy Maps in Appendix 1, is designated as 'Open Space' in recognition of its contribution to promoting biodiversity, providing local character and interest, and potentially providing a future healthy living recreational asset. Development will not be permitted unless an assessment has been

undertaken which has clearly shown the field to be surplus to requirements or the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of size and quality in a suitable location.

#### **Policy GS5B: Privately-owned Meadows – Local Green Space**

Chapel Beck Valley and Hutton Beck Meadows East, which are defined in the Policy Maps in Appendix 1, are designated as Local Green Spaces in recognition of their meeting of the criteria laid out the National Planning Policy Framework for Local Green Space Designation (LGS). These Local Green Spaces will be protected from inappropriate development unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated, or where development supports their role and function as a Local Green Spaces.

11. Policies GS1 – GS4 and GS6 – GS8 reiterate that the locations “*will be subject to the conditions of NPPF Paragraph 104*”. The NPPF, paragraph 16(f) indicates that plans should avoid “*..unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)*”. Could the GTC advise whether a specific locally derived policy statement could be substituted in these policies? An example might be “*Development will not be permitted unless.....*” with criteria tailored to each location.

Yes. We will amend the policies as follows:

#### **Policy GS1: Nightingale Road Park**

Nightingale Road Park, which is defined in the Policy Maps in Appendix 1, is designated as ‘Open Space’ in recognition of its contribution to promoting healthy living, being an accessible and affordable (free) recreational asset, providing local character and interest, promoting biodiversity and as part of the town’s ‘Green Lungs’. Development will not be permitted unless the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.

#### **Policy GS2: The Branch Walkway**

The Branch Walkway, which is defined in the Policy Maps in Appendix 1, is designated as ‘Open Space’, from Kemplah Park to Belmangate, in recognition of its contribution to promoting healthy living, being an accessible and affordable recreational asset, providing local character and interest, promoting biodiversity and as part of the town’s ‘Green Lungs’. Development will not be permitted unless the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of size and quality in a suitable location.

#### **Policy GS3: Rufford Close Link**

Rufford Close Link, which is defined in the Policy Maps in Appendix 1, is designated as ‘Open Space’ in recognition of its contribution to promoting healthy living and being an accessible and affordable recreational asset. Development will not be permitted unless the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quality and community value in a suitable location.

#### **Policy GS4: Allotment Gardens**

The privately-owned allotment gardens in Guisborough Civil Parish, namely Dorset Road, Jubilee Lane, Wilton Lane (West) and Dunsdale, which are defined in the Policy Maps in Appendix 1, are designated as 'Open Space' in recognition of their contribution to promoting healthy living and being an accessible and affordable recreational asset. Development will not be permitted unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the allotments and buildings to be surplus to requirements or the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better allotments in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location.

Policy GS5 – see above

Policy GS6: Dorset Road Green

Dorset Road Green, which is defined in the Policy Maps in Appendix 1, is designated as 'Open Space' in recognition of its contribution to community cohesion and social interaction, promoting healthy living and being an accessible and affordable recreational asset. It also provides local character and interest to the housing surrounding it. Development will not be permitted unless the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quality and social value to surrounding housing and in a suitable location.

Policy GS7: Highway verges

The Thames Avenue / Severn Drive Green Space and the Hutton Lane / Rectory Lane North Side Verge, which are defined in the Policy Maps in Appendix 1, are designated as 'Open Space' in recognition of their contribution to the community's biodiversity and 'green lungs', providing local character and interest to the housing surrounding them. They also promote healthy living, each one being an accessible and affordable recreational asset. Development will not be permitted unless the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quality, aesthetic value and biodiversity to surrounding housing.

Policy GS8: Amenity Spaces

Spring Lodge Gardens (3 parts), Derby Road Cluster and Canvey Walk Green, which are defined in the Policy Maps in Appendix 1, are designated as 'Open Space' in recognition of their contribution to the community's biodiversity and 'green lungs', providing local character and interest to the housing surrounding them. They also promote healthy living, each one being an accessible and affordable recreational asset. Development will not be permitted unless the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quality, aesthetic value and biodiversity to surrounding housing or the development is for sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current use.