



The countryside charity  
North and East Yorkshire

PO Box 189 York YO7 9BL  
[www.cpreney.org.uk](http://www.cpreney.org.uk)  
Tel: 07983 088120  
Email: [info@cpreney.org.uk](mailto:info@cpreney.org.uk)

Branch Chair Mrs Jan Arger

**Authority:** Richmondshire District Council

**Type of consultation:** Planning application

**Full details of application/consultation:** R/2023/0746/RSM - residential development of 56 houses with associated access, open space, landscaping, parking and drainage infrastructure

**At land:** off Trefoil Close and Meynell Avenue, Guisborough

**Type of response:** Objection

**Date of Submission:** 17<sup>th</sup> November 2023

All responses or queries relating to this submission should be directed to the Secretary for the Trustees at the contact details shown above on this frontispiece.

All CPRE North and East Yorkshire comments are prepared by the charity using professional planners whose research and recommendations form the basis of this response in line with national CPRE policies.

External planning consultant used in this response:



KVA Planning Consultancy  
Katie Atkinson, BA (Hons), Dip TP, MA  
MRTPI  
[www.kvaplaning.co.uk](http://www.kvaplaning.co.uk)



## Comment

CPRE North Yorkshire provided a written representation to Redcar and Cleveland Council objecting to a previous application (R/2021/0986/FFM) on this site, dated 24<sup>th</sup> January 2022. The description of that application was '*residential development of 65 houses with associated access, open space, landscaping, parking and drainage infrastructure.*' Redcar and Cleveland Council ('the Council') refused planning permission for the proposal ('the previous application') at the Meeting of Regulatory Committee on 10th November 2022, against their Officer recommendation, on the grounds that:

*'The proposed development, by reason of the number of units and the detailed design and layout, would not reflect the character and appearance of wider established residential area. The development would therefore be contrary to parts J and K of policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan (2018).'*

CPRE North and East Yorkshire ('CPRENEY') have been invited to comment on this revised application for 56 dwellings which has been submitted with the aim of satisfying the reasons for refusal of the previous application. The documents submitted in support of the revised planning application detail the key changes between the applications; and address the reasons for refusal of planning permission for the previous application.

Having considered the revised documents, it is considered that the majority of the concerns raised by CPRE in 2022 have not been addressed, therefore, CPRENEY continue to strongly object to this proposal.

The following section of this report sets out the planning context for the proposal. Given the nature and similarities of the two schemes, the context is largely the same but has been amended where appropriate in light of the revised proposal.

## Planning Context

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that an application should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise.

The National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') as updated, September 2023, sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The NPPF is, therefore, a material consideration which should be taken into account in determining this application.

The planning system should contribute to achieving sustainable development. The NPPF aims to deliver sustainable development through the implementation of its policies. Paragraph 11 states that for decision making this means:



c) *'approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; [...]*

The Development Plan relevant to this application consists of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan 2015-2032 ('LP'). The LP is considered up to date by CPRENEY, having been found sound by an Independent Inspector and adopted by the Council in May 2018, therefore, full weight can be afforded to the relevant policies within the development plan when determining this application, in line with paragraph 11 of the NPPF as set out above.

The applicant has submitted a major application for a residential development for 56 new dwellings and an area of open space. The site is within the development limits of Guisborough but was not allocated for residential development in the adopted LP. It is, therefore, a windfall application.

Policy SD3 sets out that proposals within Development limits will be supported subjecting to meeting other policies in the LP. Policy SD4 confirms that development will be permitted where it meets a number of criteria including (but not limited to) when it *'meets the requirements of the locational policy and accords with other LP policies and designations'*; *'will not result in the unacceptable loss or significant adverse impact on important open spaces or environmental, built or heritage assets which are considered important to the quality of the local environment.'* It goes on to state that all developments must be designed to a high standard setting a further list of criteria which would make it acceptable.

The Local Spatial Policy (LS3) for Guisborough confirms the settlement is in the 'rural communities' tier of the settlement hierarchy (policy SD2) and that the council will aim to *'enhance the role of Guisborough as the principal service centre and promote independent businesses including retail, leisure and tourism sectors, as well as a focus for new housing'* and *'develop new housing if an appropriate scale, with a mix of types and tenures, in suitable rural settlements'*.

The application site consists of an area of land within a central location in the settlement of Guisborough, bounded by housing to all sides. Hutton Beck runs through the centre of the site and the immediate boundary to which can flood; however, the applicant has not proposed any housing in these areas. There are no Public Rights of Way through the site but there are several informal accesses used by local residents for recreational purposes (e.g. dog walking). The site is not however designated as open space in the LP.

Whilst there does appear to be some policy support for the proposals, in that it is effectively 'white land' within the development limits of a sustainable rural settlement, the principal factors most prudent to the determination of the proposal seem to be whether there is a 'need' for the site to be developed and whether the impacts of the proposal are appropriate in that specific location.

Policy H1 of the LP confirms an annual housing requirement of 234 net additional dwellings over the plan



The countryside charity  
North and East Yorkshire

PO Box 189 York YO7 9BL  
[www.cpreney.org.uk](http://www.cpreney.org.uk)  
Tel: 07983 088120  
Email: [info@cpreney.org.uk](mailto:info@cpreney.org.uk)

Branch Chair Mrs Jan Arger

**Authority:** Richmondshire District Council

period to 2032 (3978 in total). It goes on to state that it is expected that most of the requirement will be met through completions on existing sites and land allocations in the LP. The LP does not have a specific Windfall Policy although paragraph 6.31 highlights the fact that *'windfalls tend to exceed stock losses and there is an expectation that this trend will continue though out the plan period'*. The Council's most up to date 'Five Year Housing Supply Assessment' (August 2022) confirms that there is no shortage of supply,

The Council assert they have sufficient supply for well in excess of the entire plan period and certainly in excess of the 5-year requirement. As such, whilst windfall developments can help achieve local planning authority housing requirements, in this case there is no specific 'need' for a proposal of this scale. The 2020 Windfall Allowance Technical Paper assumes circa 45 windfall dwellings per annum (as a minimum), however, given the excessive over-supply demonstrated in the Council's evidence, CPRENEY consider that whilst the site is within the development limits of a sustainable settlement, simply because it could be developed does not mean it should be in all circumstances.

The site itself is one of the few large open spaces left within the settlement which is not developed. Whilst not designated as formal open space, the area is locally valued as was evident by the numerous objection responses on the Council's planning portal pages to the previous application. The site is located to the south west of Guisborough town centre, and is bound to the south and west by existing residential development, Tidkin Lane and St Leonards Road to the south and Trefoil Close and Lucerne Drive to the west. The overall site area is approximately 4.62Ha. The site is centred on the Hutton Beck corridor. Approximately 2.25ha of land is proposed for residential development and 2.4ha of land will remain as open space, thus circa 50% of the site will be developed if approved.

The applicants revised design and access statement sets out the importance of open space provision for the health and wellbeing of residents arguing that the proposed layout will be beneficial as a result of site security and amenity space. However, it is clear that the loss of 2.25Ha of easily accessible land within the development limits of the town would be a huge loss to the existing residents of the adjacent built up areas detrimentally impacting their health and wellbeing. CPRE campaigns, both nationally and locally for the protection of green spaces, whether they are within the limits of urban settlements or within the open countryside. Small, undeveloped patches of land within the urban environment provide millions of appreciative people with a daily dose of nature across the country. However, the North of England has half as many Local Green Space designations as the south of England which means so many places, just like this site, which have real meaning for people, and real value for nature, remain undesignated and vulnerable to development.

The previous application was objected to by the Council's Spatial Policy Team – who are responsible for the Local Plan preparation including monitoring the 5-year housing land supply position and allocating appropriate and sustainable sites for development. As such, whilst this is a separate function within the



Council, their considered opinion should be given considerable weight in the planning balance and determination of the proposal. The response from that team for the previous application set out clearly why the site was not allocated in the Local Plan, despite being put forward:

*'In 2016, representations were submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpey for Newstead Farm to be allocated in the new local plan for 'executive-style' housing. The site was not allocated for the following reasons:*

- 'There are alternative sites in Guisborough which are in more sustainable and less environmentally-sensitive locations and are less physically and environmentally constrained.*
- There are significant physical and environmental constraints and the associated abnormal costs may prohibit the provision of genuine executive housing developed at a particularly low density (perhaps of 10 dwellings per hectare or less, as defined in the emerging plan), which would be similar to the adjacent housing at Stokesley Road and would be most appropriate at this site .*

*It is also the case that Guisborough had a substantial supply of housing commitments towards the start of the current plan period, thereby reducing the need for new allocations'.*

The Spatial Planning Team went on to provide a full planning response setting out which LP policies supported the proposals and which ones the application was contrary to and also setting out a site history which includes a proposal for development being dismissed at appeal and various other schemes, all of which have been refused on very similar grounds relating to the detrimental impact on open space, too high a yield and poor access arrangements. The response concludes that the issues raised by the team in planning policy terms *'outweigh any justification in terms of adding to the housing land supply pipeline or other benefits of the scheme.'*

CPRENEY remain concerned that despite the reduction in units from the previous application, the proposed 56 units is still a considerable yield for the site which far exceeds any previous figures considered by the preparation stage for a previous local plan (and then dropped) and would constitute over-development.

A 2008 application for a development of 65-75 dwellings (across the proposed site and neighbouring site at Newstead Farm) and open space was refused. The current proposal seeks to achieve a similar yield over a reduced site area and a higher site density. As such, CPRENEY see no change in circumstances, especially considering the Council's current housing supply position, that should alter the outcome of this renewed proposal and consider the proposal to be contrary to LP policy H2(e) which requires housing proposals *'to achieve a density appropriate to the proposed housing type and mix which supports wider sustainability objectives'*. The policy is supported by text at paragraph 6.22 which states that there must be an appropriate balance between *'the character of the surrounding area including typical densities, the proposed type of development and housing mix and ensuring proposals are likely to be economically viable...'* This is also supported by the general development principles set out at Policy SD4(j).



The countryside charity  
North and East Yorkshire

PO Box 189 York YO7 9BL  
[www.cpreney.org.uk](http://www.cpreney.org.uk)  
Tel: 07983 088120  
Email: [info@cpreney.org.uk](mailto:info@cpreney.org.uk)

Branch Chair Mrs Jan Arger

**Authority:** Richmondshire District Council

The applicant proposes a new vehicular access be provided from Trefoil Close, running through the centre of the developable area eastwards. CPRENEY are concerned that a future development to the east of the proposed site could then be facilitated leading to further overdevelopment of the overall site. This is also raised as a possible second phase of development in the applicant's own Design and Access Statement and is not something that CPRENEY would support.

In conclusion, CPRENEY cannot support the revised application for 56 new dwellings in this location and therefore wish to maintain their objection at this site.

The Council's current (and future) housing land supply position does not warrant the need for additional windfall development in Guisborough which has already seen a significant proportion of the district's new builds located here. The proposed site is one of the few remaining natural open spaces left within the settlement and CPRENEY consider development in this locally valued open space would not be appropriate at this scale. As such, CPRENEY consider the proposal is contrary to the LP Policies SD4, H2(e) and LS3.

CPRENEY reserve the right to comment further should additional information be submitted in support of the proposals.