

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

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?

- 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”*?
- 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.