

## Summary of Responses to Regulation 16 Consultation of the Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan

This document provides a summary of the main points of the consultation responses submitted to the consultation on the Draft Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012, which was held between 10<sup>th</sup> November 2025 and 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2025. It does not set out the full text of the responses as received. The full version of all responses has been submitted to the appointed Inspector in line with the requirements of the regulations.

Any responses received to the associated Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Reports are also summarised below.

**Table 1 - Comments on Draft Neighbourhood Plan**

Reference	Name / Organisation	Part of Plan	Support /Object /Comment	Summary of Comment	Notify When Plan made
GNP/001	Sunny Ali, National Highways	All	Comment	<p>As the Neighbourhood Plan identifies, Guisborough is located with the area covered by the Redcar &amp; Cleveland Local Plan. National Highways participated in the consultation of that Local Plan during its preparation, but we are also aware that the Redcar &amp; 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	

				On this basis, National Highways do not want to make any other specific comments on the Plan at this stage.	
GNP/002	S. Moulder	Page 31 (para. 9.2.4 and 9.2.5) and Policy GS5	Comments	<p>The documents state that the football club and bowls club are privately owned. This is incorrect. The whole site is owned by the council. The football and bowls clubs are leased from the council by the respective clubs. I note that this was raised in 2 responses to the Town Council and was wrongly dismissed with no changes made to documents.</p> <p>Belmangate scouts field - it is used for recreation by Scouts and sea cadets and there is talk of the rugby club using it for junior training due to capacity issues at their main ground. It could therefore be brought back into use as a playing field.</p>	
GNP/003	Louise Tait, Environment Agency	All	Support	The Environment Agency does not have any concerns over the contents of this Neighbourhood Plan and generally welcome the plans aspirations to protect and enhance green spaces.	
GNP/005	Cllr Bill Clarke	All	Support/ Comments	<p>I have the following comments to make about the Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan submitted by Guisborough Town Council. These are just comments as I commend this plan and hope it will be accepted by the LPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I see no mention anywhere in the plan about the hamlet on the outskirts of the town – Mount Pleasant. Possibly the whole hamlet is owned privately which includes the houses, the main road at the rear of Mount Pleasant or the allotments.... as it is unadopted repairs are a problem especially to the road. Public transport to and from the town centre was withdrawn years ago and never replaced.</li> <li>• The maps used in the document are difficult to focus even when enlarged.</li> <li>• Dunsdale does not have a village hall which in the past has been residents' aspiration to see if one could be established. The church is subject to confirmation privately owned.</li> <li>• High speed internet – good to see this highlighted.</li> </ul>	Yes

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Off street parking – I cannot see this changing particularly in the centre of Guisborough or the older outlying estates which did not foresee the increase in vehicles on our roads. Any answers to this problem are most welcome!</li> <li>• Guisborough shop fronts – The commercial grant scheme has already proved a quick improvement to some of the shop fronts with many more lined up. This scheme will complement the Conservation Area Management Plan.</li> <li>• Infrastructure – Public Services – a real “bone of contention” by many residents even though the plan does state that demographic data shows little change of population over 10 years.</li> <li>• Tourism and Leisure Facilities – the current swimming baths have been highlighted and need to be re-built. The existing facility opened in 1968 and is beyond in all reality its use. Finance is the major obstacle.</li> <li>• Bus Services – many residents will not know that the responsibility for this comes under the TVCA. The current bus services to certain key areas ... are not good enough. ..The Tees-Flex service was installed which really has not answered the problem of connectivity to and from the estates for access to the centre of Guisborough.</li> </ul>	
GNP/006	Jules Brown, Historic England	All	Comments	Historic England made a number of comments in relation to the pre-submission draft plan in August. We are pleased that these have largely been taken into account, and we have no further comments to make.	
GNP/007	Hilton Armstrong, GAMBOL_Miller	All, GS5	Support	<p>We would like to put on record our support for the GNP and all of its policies and in particular, the Green Space policy GS5 which aims to protect the best of the privately owned spaces.</p> <p>Our opposition to the development of these spaces in preference to more suitable sites on the edge of Guisborough is shown in the 450 plus responses opposing the latest planning application. Some of the opposition is against all development, but many more highlight how</p>	

				<p>special the remaining green spaces including Hutton Beck Meadows are to local residents for their ecology.</p> <p>A report of the ecology of Hutton Beck Meadows East professionally describes just how special the ecology of this land is, and is submitted in objection to the Miller Planning application.</p> <p>For these reasons, we believe that Hutton Beck Meadows East deserves the designation of “Local Green Space” and the level of protection that comes with it. We also support the other Green Space policies and the parish aspiration for Hutton Beck meadows West (which shares much of the same ecology).</p>	
GNP/008	Susan Alexander	All	Support	I support the Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan. Green spaces are vitally important and more building on them will be detrimental to Guisborough.	
GNP/009	Ian Alexander	All	Support	I am writing to support the Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan which is comprehensive. It covers many of the issues which would be suitable for Guisborough. Certainly, the green spaces are extremely important; there have already been too many lost to crammed in buildings.	
GNP/010	Sheila McConnell	All, Policy GS5	Support	<p>I strongly support this neighbourhood plan. In particular, I agree with section 9.2.28 relating to Hutton Beck Meadows (East and West). Under policy G5, privately owned Meadows. I am pleased to see that Chapel Beck Valley and Hutton Beck Meadows East are already designated as Local Green spaces as they meet the criteria laid out by the National Policy Framework for Local Green Space Designation (LGS).</p> <p>This should mean that a planning application to build on this land should not be permitted and yet there is now a new live planning application for this area by Miller Homes to build a new estate of 71 houses. If this succeeds, although the plans show no houses on the area next to Hutton Lane, there will be construction traffic and equipment in this area for a long period of time and a new road will be constructed. I am afraid that all the noise and traffic will drive the rich and diverse wildlife away.</p>	

				<p>For similar reasons, I also support the Parish Aspiration to designate Hutton Beck Meadows West as an LGS if the current live planning application is rejected.</p> <p>We must protect all our green spaces in Guisborough at all cost as they are very important for our wellbeing and for our wildlife.</p>	
GNP/011	Melanie Lindsley, The Coal Authority	All	Comments	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 the Planning team 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.	
GNP/012	James Campbell, North Yorkshire Council	All	Comments	We have reviewed the plan and can confirm that we have not identified any cross-boundary issues and as such have no comments to make.	
GNP/013	Rebecca Wren, Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council	All	Comments	<p>The Council has no further comments to make in the content of the Regulation 16 Draft of the Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan, having submitted detailed comments to the pre-submission draft on 21/07/25. However, it is important to draw attention to the submission of planning application R/2025/0579/FFM, for the residential development of 71 homes with biodiversity zone, associated infrastructure and landscaping, on land at Newstead Farm, Hutton Lane, Guisborough. This application was made valid by the Council on 17/09/2025 and involves land which is known as Hutton Meadows East in the Draft Guisborough Neighbourhood Plan and covered by Policy GS5. The planning application has not yet been determined but a decision is currently expected at the beginning of 2026.</p>	
GNP/014	Sally Wintle, Natural England	All	Comments	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	
GNP/015	Robert Curtis Haigh, Lichfields, on behalf of Miller Homes	Policy GS5	Object	The letter sets out how Policy GS5's proposed designation of this land as Local Green Space (LGS) would be inconsistent with the basic conditions set out in Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). It also explains how the evidence base which has informed Policy GS5 is insufficient and is therefore contrary to both	Yes

				<p>Paragraph 107 of the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 040.</p> <p>We note that a Basic Conditions Statement has been prepared to accompany the GCPNP. However, for the reasons set out below, Policy GS5 conflicts with the basic conditions as it (a) does not comply with national policy and advice, (b) does not contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development, and (c) would not conform with strategic local policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NPPF para.106 - By approving Policy GS5, the Neighbourhood Plan could directly prevent the development of 71 homes on land that is subject to a live planning application. This conflicts with the above NPPF paragraph, which expects Local Green Space designation to complement investment in housing, rather than obstructing it. Paragraph 106 also requires the designation of land as LGS to be consistent with sustainable development.</li> <li>• NPPF para.107 - The supporting text of the proposed policy states that the land has a “lack of public access”. On this basis, the land is clearly not “reasonably close” to the community, as required by criteria a. In terms of criteria b, the proposed policy and accompanying evidence base does not “demonstrably” prove that the site has a richness of wildlife. This is explored in greater detail later in the letter. The proposed policy also fails to explain how the site is local in character, as it does not include any commentary on exactly what makes the land distinctive to Guisborough. This fails to satisfy criteria c. On the basis of the above, the proposed policy fails to satisfy the required criteria of Paragraph 107. It is therefore contrary to the NPPF and the basic conditions.</li> <li>• Sustainable Development - At present, Redcar and Cleveland do not have a 5YHLS. Thus, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is triggered.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>The aforementioned live application on Hutton Beck Meadows East (ref. R/2025/0579/FFM) complies with the criteria set out in Paragraph 11(d). Taken together, the proposed development would not cause any adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of addressing the identified housing need, reducing flooding, and providing a 10% biodiversity net gain. By approving Policy GS5, the Neighbourhood Plan could prevent this contribution to sustainable development as it would prevent a site coming forward that currently meets the criteria listed at Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF. This would be in direct conflict with a clear national objective of delivering the homes that the country needs in sustainable locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan - For the same reasons set out above, GS5 would conflict with Policy SD1 ‘Sustainable Development’ of the RCBC Local Plan.</li> <li>• Insufficient Evidence Base - Notwithstanding Policy GS5’s conflict with the basic conditions, there are significant gaps in evidence to support the claim that Hutton Beck Meadows East is “demonstrably” special due to the “richness of its wildlife” in accordance with Paragraph 107(b) of the NPPF.</li> </ul> <p>At present, the evidence refers to statements from a consultant ecologist, who refers to the presence of priority species but this is not supported by quantified biodiversity metrics and surveys. By contrast, the live planning application for the site is accompanied by a comprehensive Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment prepared in June 2025. The findings confirm that the site comprises predominantly modified grassland of low distinctiveness, with areas of poor to moderate condition, and small parcels of woodland and scrub also assessed as poor or moderate. There is no evidence of irreplaceable habitats or exceptional ecological richness. The evidence provided is neither robust nor proportionate to the claims made. More up to</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>date evidence suggests that the site is not demonstrably special due to the richness of its wildlife. The policy should therefore not be allowed on this basis.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this letter, the policy should be amended to remove Hutton Beck Meadows East.</p>	
GNP/016	Rob Murphy, Lichfields on behalf of TCC Land Limited	All	Support and Comments	<p>TCC LL has recently submitted an outline planning application to Redcar and Cleveland Council (“RCC”) for the residential development of up to 117no. residential dwellings on land to the south of Stokesley Road. This site is located on the western edge of Guisborough. This application is currently pending validation by RCC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We note that the GNP identifies at paragraph 5.5.17 that Guisborough has an ageing population, with a pronounced skew towards people in their fifties, sixties and seventies. This is then reflected in Policy BE1 (Housing Mix) of the GNP. With direct regard to this, the application submitted recently by TCC LL included the provision of a number of bungalows...The wider site layout ... offers significant areas of green space in the southern part of the site which provide a more relaxed and tranquil environment, while the site provides connected routes (linking to the proposed Active Travel route along Stokesley Road to the north which is referenced within the GNP at paragraph 9.4.23). As such, TCC LL is supportive of the principle of Policy BE1 and, indeed, consider the recently submitted application to be in alignment with this.</li> <li>• We note that paragraph 9.1.7 of the GNP states that – Both RCBC and Guisborough Town Council have been supportive of the recent large housing developments on the north-west edge of Guisborough town..... The proposed development is situated in this broad growth location and is directly adjacent to the recent residential development to the east. With regard to sustainable transport options, this will only be boosted further by the proposed Active Travel route to the north which will provide increased walking and cycling options in this direction</li> </ul>	



				<p>both into and out of Guisborough and beyond. To this end, TCC LL has been engaged with the Council as the Active Travel scheme evolves and their submitted scheme reflects the positive discussions on this which will aid delivery of the route. We consider that the supporting text also offers a realistic appraisal as to where Guisborough can and indeed should look to expand in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCC LL is entirely supportive of the contention within the supporting text that development in Guisborough should be located where the infrastructure and sustainable transport options are maximised in the north-west of the settlement..... Were the Town Council to seek to make the GNP clearer on this locational point, TCC LL suggest that consideration be given to adding a policy that sets out the broad location of residential development that they consider to be acceptable. This could provide greater weight on this issue rather than relying on supporting text for clarity on this matter.</li> <li>• Policy BE2 -TCC LL has, within their recently submitted application, sought to reflect these points within the design. ...TCC LL consider the requirement of Policy BE2 to be reasonable and reflective of the character of Guisborough as a settlement.</li> </ul> <p>TCC LL is supportive of the broad location for residential development identified within the supporting text (paragraph 9.1.7) of the GNP as it is clear that options to expand the settlement to the north, east and south are significantly constrained by a number of varying factors.</p>	
GNP/017	Paul Chester	All and Policy GS5	Support	<p>I wish to support the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Guisborough. I am particularly pleased that the corridor associated with the Hutton Beck Meadows East site is included in this plan. This represents a major benefit not only to the people of Guisborough but also but also the important flora and fauna which the town supports.</p>	

				<p>This area is a fundamentally important habitat in the Guisborough connect and undoubtedly of wider ecological importance in the wider Borough. Key points relative to its importance include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a well-defined habitat corridor linking Guisborough to the wider countryside to the west.</li> <li>• The stream and immediate corridor is locally designated for the legally protected Water Vole which is also a Species of Principal Importance for the Conservation of Biodiversity in England).</li> <li>• It is a very important corridor in the context of the town for a variety of wildlife e.g., commuting bats, riverine species such as Otter, Water Vole etc. Such corridors regarded as important in policy terms and very difficult to replace.</li> <li>• Great Crested Newt is present locally with several breeding ponds either side of the corridor and core terrestrial habitat within it. A pond within the site itself, whilst dry in 2025, could support breeding numbers in a spring/summer with normal weather conditions.</li> <li>• It has the potential to support a variety of legally protected and/or NERC S41 priority animals, for example, Harvest Mouse, Hedgehog, Otter (temporary occupation), Water Vole, several species of bats (foraging and roosting).</li> <li>• It supports a diverse range of nesting and wintering bird habitats. The local area is known to support a variety of Species of Principal Importance for the Conservation of Biodiversity in England and/or British Trust for Ornithology Red List birds of High Conservation Concern, for example, Bullfinch, Dunnock, House Sparrow, Marsh Tit, Mistle Thrush, Song Thrush, Starling and Tree Sparrow. Specially protected Barn Owl likely to nest on site. Specially protected Kingfisher known to breed locally.</li> <li>• The habitat has some potential habitat for reptiles, particularly Slow-worm.</li> <li>• Old pastures are likely to retain significant botanical interest if managed appropriately.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certain hedgerows/boundaries are likely to be of considerable antiquity.</li> <li>• The stream is part of the Saltburn Beck catchment which supports populations of resident Brown Trout and migratory Salmonids (predominantly Sea Trout) both of which are NERC S41 Species of Principal Importance for the Conservation of Biodiversity in England. Impacts to this watercourse likely to be an essential requirement for any planning application.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

**Table 2 – Comments on SEA and HRA Screening Reports**

Reference	Name / Organisation	HRA/SEA	Support /Object /Comment	Summary of Comment	Notify When Plan made
GNP/003	Louise Tait, Environment Agency	SEA	Comment	We advise that the plan will result in no significant environmental impacts within our remit. However, please note that we do not advise on whether the plan falls under the requirements of the SEA Directive. Should the local authority determine that the plan does require SEA, we ask to be consulted on the scope to ensure our key environmental issues are addressed.	
GNP/004	Debbie Lawson, Teesmouth Bird Club	HRA	Object	<p>Teesmouth Bird Club refers you to Guisborough CAMP HRA, Screening pdf (clause 3.1). It states that Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 need not be considered in the screening exercise. Teesmouth Bird Club strongly disagree and would urge consideration of the following suggestions.</p> <p>The Swift is a ‘Category Red Species of Concern’ and is also a species included in the Tees Valley Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). One of the chief reasons for the bird’s decline is the loss of nesting cavities in buildings, which in Europe is an obligatory nesting location. The main driver of this is the demolition and restoration of old buildings where dynastic colonies of pairs have lived for centuries.</p>	

				<p>Guisborough West Gate is a local example of a small colony persisting in today's modern world.</p> <p>In principle, in order to protect nesting sites requires them first to be identified and then provision made to ensure their protection during the restoration process of the buildings.</p>	
GNP/006	Jules Brown, Historic England	SEA		<p>Based on the analysis set out in the Screening Opinion, and within the areas of interest to Historic England, we agree that the emerging plan is unlikely to result in significant environmental effects and, therefore, it does not need SEA.</p> <p>From the perspective of our area of interest, the need for SEA of the draft plan can be screened out as it is unlikely to result in significant environmental effects.</p>	
GNP/014	Sally Wintle, Natural England	Both	Comments	<p>It is Natural England's advice, on the basis of the material supplied with the consultation, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• significant effects on statutorily designated nature conservation sites or landscapes are unlikely; and,</li> <li>• significant effects on Habitats sites, either alone or in combination, are unlikely.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed neighbourhood plan is unlikely to significantly affect any Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection areas (SPA), Ramsar wetland or sites in the process of becoming SACs or SPAs ('candidate SACs', 'possible SACs', 'potential SPAs') or a Ramsar wetland. The plan area is unlikely to have a significant effect on a National Park, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Heritage Coast, and is unlikely to impact upon the purposes for which these areas are designated or defined.</p>	