

CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE SUMMARY DOCUMENT

INTRODUCTION

This report summarises the responses received, comments made and discussions that were had during the Preferred Options consultation period and gives a brief overview of the range of consultation events that were run. While there is no specific requirement to prepare a statement at this stage of the Core Strategy development, it has nonetheless been prepared in accordance with regulation 30(1) (d) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008, which requires the submission of a DPD to be accompanied by a statement setting out:

- Those bodies consulted;
- How they were consulted;
- A summary of the main issues raised; and
- How representations have been taken into account.

Given the number of written responses received and the breadth of issues covered in the facilitated workshops and public events, this report extracts the key issues, which will guide the drafting of the next version of the Core Strategy prior to its 'Submission' to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

The Preferred Options consultation was the second formal stage of public consultation following on from the 'Issues and Options' consultation in 2009. It was a six-week consultation, which finished on the 2nd July 2010 (although late submissions were accepted and processed), with the consultation document available in hardcopy, to download from the Council's website, or via the Council's consultation portal ([://consult.bassetlaw.gov.uk/portal](http://consult.bassetlaw.gov.uk/portal)). In addition, six public consultation events were held across the District and members of the Planning Policy team attended various Parish Council events and held a number of specific events (e.g. for the development industry) in Worksop Town Hall.

A number of organisations (see Annex B & C for list) were formally notified of the consultation, in line with Regulations. They included:

- **Specific Consultation Bodies:** Statutory bodies involved in service provision and Government Agencies working on particular issues in or adjoining Bassetlaw District;
- **General Consultation Bodies:** A wide variety of local, voluntary and community groups.

In addition, all of those individuals and organisations registered on the Council's LDF consultation database were informed of the consultation by email.

The Council advertised the Preferred Options consultation widely. Posters were distributed to all Parish Councils, local libraries, and community halls/centres, the Council offices in both Retford and Worksop and to the various Council Contact Centres around the District. In addition, notices were put in the local papers (the Worksop Guardian and Retford Times). An article was also sent out to local magazines and parish newsletters and placed in the Council's own newsletter that is posted to every house in the District. A radio interview was also undertaken on local radio station Trax FM aimed at further advertising the consultation and the upcoming events. In addition, the Council's web pages were regularly updated with details of the consultation.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENTS

The six public consultation events provided an opportunity for local residents to comment on all aspects of the document, with members of the Planning Policy Team present to answer questions. There were also copies of the Core Strategy Preferred Options Document, Settlement Boundary Maps and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment available for the public to have a look at or to take away with them. Attendees were able to leave their contact information if they wanted to be kept informed about the further stages of the process (See Annex A for the consultation management plan).

Tuxford

The event was held in the Methodist Church on 12 May and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- The majority of people agreed that Tuxford should receive some future growth.
- There was general agreement that Tuxford maintains a 'key' level of services and facilities and provides a role as a service centre to its surrounding communities (although there was some concern over the range of the current services and facilities), but there were some views about limited retail choice and limited parking.
- There was dissatisfaction at the current state of the town centre environment, especially the current state of the Newcastle Arms Hotel. Many people felt that this should be the focus for regeneration for the town in the coming years.
- the proposed housing numbers were about right, although there were issues surrounding mix, type and density. The concern was that a number of large-scale, high-density developments have altered the character of the town and that any future development should conform to the town's existing character.
- There was some concern that Tuxford would not receive allocated employment growth, given that existing sites were fully occupied.
- (Other than the concern raised by individuals that have land outside them) the revised development boundary was generally agreed.

More general concerns about the wider Tuxford area were expressed over:

- the redundant former factory site in East Markham and how this is likely to be developed in the future.
- the loss of public houses in Askham, Darlton and Laneham and the decreasing level of rural services.

Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold

This event was held in Carlton-in-Lindrick Village Hall on 13 May and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- The majority of people agreed that Carlton and Langold should see some future housing growth.

- The former Firbeck Colliery Site should be developed for housing as it has been subject to decay and vandalism for over ten years.
- Any new developments within the villages should provide benefit to local services and Langold Country Park.
- Langold Country Park should be better maintained and its facilities improved.
- There were limited employment opportunities in the immediate area and a perception that public transport served only a limited number of destinations.
- The development boundary revisions to both Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold, particularly regarding the inclusion of Firbeck Colliery, were right. The development boundary revisions to both Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold, particularly regarding the inclusion of Firbeck Colliery, were right.
- While the larger Co-op supermarket remained, a few people were concerned about the loss of the smaller Co-op foodstore.

Harworth Bircotes

The event held in the Harworth Methodist Church on 4 June and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- The majority of people agreed that Harworth Bircotes should see growth in the future and that the town has the services, facilities and development opportunities available to support the proposed levels of growth.
- The main concern of local residents was the current state of the town centre, in particular Scrooby Road, with a lack of retail choice and parking. The main issue that was raised at this event was the high number of take-aways on Scrooby Road and the general retail offer.
- Housing figures for Harworth were generally supported, although housing tenures, mix and density were reoccurring issues. The main concerns of residents are that there is not enough housing that is affordable for young people and, consequently, people have to move out of the area. One resident expressed a concern over the lack of housing for the elderly.
- It was generally supported that Harworth Bircotes should see more employment growth as the area has seen a decline in employment land due to the closure of the Colliery. There were very mixed views about whether it would be beneficial for the town for the Colliery to re-open.
- There was general agreement that much of the Harworth Colliery site should be redeveloped to increase the quality and types of housing in the town.
- There was general agreement with the revised development boundaries, although some local residents would like to see Droversdale Wood excluded.

Retford

The event was held in Retford Town Hall on 8 June and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- That Retford has already seen a large proportion of growth over the past few years, particularly towards the northeast of the town, and that no-more is required. There were suggestions that further employment areas should be

allocated to encourage investment and employment opportunities, although it was recognised that some current allocations have not been taken up.

- There was concern that large housing developments would occur on the former school sites and it was noted that the former King Edward School on London Road was suffering from vandalism and decay.
- There were a number of concerns surrounding the town centre, particularly with a perceived poor retail provision and perceived under usage of the market square's buildings. It was agreed that more should be done to include the Chesterfield Canal and River Idle in any redevelopment plans. There was praise that the Market Square is seeing regeneration, which will encourage investment.
- That there are a number of significant sites that could be redeveloped to enhance the existing town centre. The Chesterfield Canal, Market Square and Wharf Road areas were identified as 'key' sites for regeneration opportunities.

Worksop

The event was held in the BCVS offices on 27 May and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- As the largest settlement within the District, Worksop should accommodate the largest percentage of housing growth. A number of participants suggested that future housing growth should be located to the west of the town. It was also suggested that there should be further housing within the town centre to encourage diversity and attract people and investment to the town centre. In addition, it was agreed that Worksop should see further employment designations to encourage further investment and jobs into the town. It was also recommended that the Council do more to encourage small enterprises into live/work units in the town centre.
- There was a concern at the lack of facilities and retail choice within the town centre. It was also recognised that there was a large percentage of vacant retail units, which are discouraging investment into the town. It was suggested that the environment within the town centre is poor and needs investment to reverse the current decline. The markets stalls need to be improved as the majority of these are damaged.
- There was significant scope for regeneration in Worksop. Respondents identified numerous sites that should be taken forward for regeneration purposes. A number of these were within the town centre, along the Chesterfield Canal and Victoria Square/Canal Road areas of the town.

Misterton

The event was held in the Misterton Centre on 2 June and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- The majority of people agreed with that Misterton should only see limited housing development in the future. The main concerns of local residents were that any new development that does take place would need to be of a high quality of design. The design of existing housing, particularly the three-storey

development on Fox Covert Lane, was also a main concern for residents. The issue of affordable housing was also raised, as residents would like to see more housing of this type in the area.

- There are concerns regarding the lack of retail offer in Misterton. The main issue that was echoed throughout the event was the concern over the Co-op being the only convenience shop in the area and the fact that it is regarded as being too expensive.
- There was general agreement with the amendments to the development boundaries.
- There was a perception that bus services are poor although they run on an hourly basis.
- The majority of residents also expressed a concern about poor drainage in the village.

OTHER CONSULTATION EVENTS

Community Planning Day: Worksop Town Hall

A community planning event was undertaken in conjunction with the District Council's public open day. The event ran from 11-6pm on 14 July 2010 and was designed to further provide information regarding the Local Development Framework and the recent Preferred Options consultation. Key messages were that:

- Worksop has a large percentage of social housing and that the local housing market has been suffering due to the lack of new market housing within the town. The proposed housing target figure for Worksop was generally supported, but there were concerns over the potential allocation of some sites (most notably Kilton Golf Course).
- The number of empty units the increase in 'low-end' shops were seen as a concern. It was felt that more should be done to protect local businesses and attract more national chain stores (although many recognised that the proximity of Meadowhall made this unlikely).
- A number of people commented favourably on the recent regeneration that is currently underway in the Canch. There was concern over the level of security within the park and some felt that further CCTV is needed.

A further public open day is scheduled for Retford later in the year which Planning Policy will be attending.

Engagement with the Gypsy Liaison Officer

The County's Gypsy Liaison Officer was re-consulted for the Preferred Options Consultation period to allow further input and responded favourably.

Engagement with Bassetlaw Community Voluntary Service (BCVS)

A letter detailing the Preferred Options consultation and explaining the current stages of the Local Development Framework was sent to a wide range of organisations affiliated with the BCVS. Meetings with individual groups were also offered and a consultation event was held in the BCVS offices.

Engagement with the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP)

Planning Policy Officers attended further meetings with the LSP at Board and Executive level, as well as with individual LSP sub-groups and received a favourable response to the Preferred Options. The groups were made aware of the Preferred Options consultation period and urged to comment on the consultation document. The LSP will continue to be a 'key' consultee partner throughout the remaining LDF process.

Engagement with the District's Rural Officer

As Bassetlaw has a large rural community, the Council felt that it was important to continue to liaise with the District's Rural Officer regarding the LDF processes. In addition, the Rural Officer attended a number of our consultation events to assist with any rural development and/or rural issues. These issues included the protection of local services, school provision, community facilities and public transport. Policies seeking to protect and encourage local facilities were strongly supported.

Engagement with the Development Industry/Planning Agents

Planning Officers ran an event specifically for developers and agents on 1 June. Key issues were whether the proposed removal of the RSS would delay progress and where the Council was with its infrastructure work. There was discussion of the site allocation process and a request that, in relation to Harworth specifically, greater flexibility be introduced over when and how greenfield sites might come forward. There was also discussion of rural exception sites and a request that the Energy Opportunities Map be clarified for the Publication Stage.

Engagement with Parish Councils

Planning Policy Officers have attended numerous Parish Council meetings and events from October 2009 and all the way through, and beyond, the Preferred Options consultation in late May 2010. These have been visits to specific Council meetings, village events (in Elkesley and Tuxford), events arranged for groupings of Councils and attendance at the North East Bassetlaw Forum. Brief notes of the formal consultation sessions arranged for Parishes are given below:

Carlton, Langold and Tuxford Parishes (Carlton Village Hall) 24 May

Key areas of discussion included: affordable housing (how it is defined and how it will be addressed in rural areas); infrastructure delivery (are local services full); housing density (too high in some areas); site allocations (how parishes can be involved); and housing numbers (believed to be too high).

Hodsock, Shireoaks, Rhodesia and Harworth (Worksop Town Hall) 25 May

Key areas of discussion included: the methodology for drawing up Development Boundaries; the reason for Shireoaks and Rhodesia being part of Worksop; how the elderly population will be catered for in terms of housing supply; infrastructure delivery (whether local services utilities providers on board; whether local schools are full); whether the Core Strategy will allocate sites for wind farms; whether colliery tips been looked at as possible places for renewable energy production; whether there are likely to be any legislative changes to the planning system that may change the way the LDF is developed; whether the site allocations document will allocate land for Gypsies and Travelling Show people.

Cuckney, North Leverton, North and South Wheatley, Sturton-le-Steeple, Dunham, Rampton, Nether Langwith, Gringley on the Hill, Elkesley, East Markham (Worksop Town Hall) 1 June

Key areas of discussion included: how some Parish Councils can make objective responses when most Councillors have an interest in the outcome of the Core Strategy; affordable housing (how need would be assessed and how it would be delivered in rural areas); whether more can be done to prevent windfarm developments and whether there should be greater clarity over where they can and can't be located; how the new development boundaries have been drawn up; whether the Core Strategy can protect local services (and strong support for it doing so); how derelict and replacement buildings outside development boundaries can be addressed; how new development might impact on flooding and how drainage infrastructure can cope.

Bothamsall, West Stockwith, Gamston, East Drayton, Clayworth, Markham Clinton (Retford Town Hall) 3 June

Key areas of discussion included: whether there was likely to be commercial development at Markham Moor (no support for this); how new development might impact on flooding; how rural affordable housing will be delivered; how rural businesses can expand; whether the Core Strategy will allocate sites for wind farms; whether there are likely to be any legislative changes to the planning system that may change the way the LDF is developed; how Parish Councils can better engaged with the process and make representations on planning applications; how greenfield development in the middle of nowhere would be treated.

Everton, Beckingham and Saundby, Blyth, Mattersey, Ranskill, Walkeringham, Claborough (Beckingham Village Hall) 7 June

Key areas of discussion included: how some Parish Councils can make objective responses when most Councillors have an interest in the outcome of the Core Strategy; whether the Core Strategy can protect local services; affordable housing (how it would be delivered, especially in rural areas, and how it can be prioritised for local people); how the size of new allocations will be determined (housing allocations should only be of a size proportionate to the existing settlement); renewable energy (strong resistance to wind farms); how local services and utilities can cope with new houses (education and drainage were particular issues).

RESPONSES TO THE PREFERRED OPTIONS DOCUMENT

The Preferred Options Consultation document received over 500 comments from 200 respondents. A summary is provided below.

Views on the vision

The majority of people agreed with the vision and we only received a few comments regarding its context. It was suggested, however, that the vision needed to strengthen the service role for Tuxford. In addition, the vision includes climate change and design policy in the same paragraph, which is seen as confusing and suggests they are linked issues.

Views on the Strategic Objectives for Bassetlaw

There was general support for the Strategic Objectives identified within the Consultation Document. It was suggested, however, that a further objective should be included, aimed at safeguarding natural resources from inappropriate development which would reflect the policy in the County's mineral plan. In addition, the restoration of mineral sites should be included in SO8.

A respondent noted that none of the Strategic Objectives references transport and it was suggested that there should be reference to the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment in Objectives 5 and 8.

Views on the Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy

There were only a few comments relating to aspects of the development strategy. It was suggested that Dunham was removed from the rural service centre category due to issues of flooding. It was also suggested that Retford and Harworth Bircotes should be combined into a 'town' category within the hierarchy, with Local Service Centres relabelled as Large Villages and the Rural Service Centres as villages and no mention of other villages, resulting in a four-tier hierarchy rather than the six tiers currently proposed.

There were numerous comments regarding the proposed housing numbers in the Core Strategy, although these were concerned with, in many cases very minor, adjustments up or down depending on the settlement(s) in which the respondent had an interest, rather than fundamental concerns about the quantum of housing proposed or the general approach to its distribution.

Views on Core Strategy policies

Views on Policy CS1 Worksop

There was general agreement with this policy, but there were a number of suggested alterations:

- The policy should consider the town centre conservation area and numerous listed buildings when considering future development sites.
- An even greater percentage of new housing development should be directed to Worksop.
- There was concern that the policy fails to provide sufficient clarity over the need (or not) for urban extensions in Worksop.
- It was suggested that the River Ryton should be mentioned within Policy CS1 and the growth of the Priory Centre should be used as a catalyst to spur development along the Canal.
- A few respondents suggested that further clarification is needed on whether the development of a single dwelling would trigger the requirement for a contribution to affordable housing as the phrase 'net addition', may imply application to redevelopment of housing sites only.

Views on Policy CS2 Retford

There was general agreement with this policy, but there were a number of suggested alterations:

- The proposed housing numbers should be more than those for Harworth and redistributed accordingly.
- The proposed percentage of employment land for Retford is too low, particularly given the recent loss of two large employment sites in the town.
- The River Idle and Retford Beck should be included within the policy as they offer positive development opportunities.
- The policy should clarify what the retail centre is for the purposes of national retail policy and the application of the sequential approach to locating retail development.

Views on Policy CS3 Harworth Bircotes

There was general agreement with this policy, notably that the Colliery site was a priority regeneration site and the town a focus for regeneration, but there were a number of suggested alterations:

- There should be greater flexibility about when greenfield housing sites will be released if the Colliery site does not come forward fast enough.
- Some felt the housing percentage was too high based on past completions in the area and should be redistributed across the District.
- Such a large percentage of growth will have an affect on the surrounding landscape of Harworth and care should be taken when allocating development sites.

Views on Policy CS4 Tuxford

There was general agreement with this policy, including support for future growth in Tuxford, but there were a number of issues raised:

- A number of respondents highlighted the need for affordable housing in Tuxford and stated that the current high density housing developments are impacting the existing character of the town.
- It was suggested that Tuxford should see more employment growth, due to its strategic location and the fact that employment sites around the town are full.
- Concern was raised over the quality and choice of retail offer in the town and respondents agree that there are numerous regeneration opportunities.

Views on Policy CS5 Carlton and Langold

There was general agreement with this policy, particularly the explicit support for Firbeck Colliery redevelopment and improvements to Langold Country Park. There was a suggestion that the proposed housing figure for Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold is too low and that future development should contribute to the improvement of the current poor state of the buildings and public realm in Langold's retail area.

Views on Policy CS6 Misterton

There was strong agreement with this policy from local residents, particularly that Misterton should not see any major growth due to the past rates of development in the village. It was noted, however, that restrictions on release of greenfield sites coming forward should not be tied to delivery in specifically named settlements.

There were a number of comments that raised concern over recent developments in Misterton. It was noted that development has been of poor design and high density that has conflicted with local character. In addition, the substantial new development has been in an area with few employment opportunities. Other issues included the current drainage and flood risk to the settlement and that any further development would need to consider these factors.

Views on Policy CS7 Rural Service Centres

There was general agreement with this policy, including support for some rural development (explicitly from Blyth, East Markham and Everton), notably for affordable housing or to deliver local services and facilities, but there were a number of issues raised:

- It was suggested that Nether Langwith should be elevated to a Local Service Centre due to the settlement's close proximity to Langwith.
- Issues regarding drainage, flood risk and local transport were raised as concerns in relation to a number of potential development villages.

Views on Policy CS8 All Other Settlements

There was general agreement with this policy, including support for the policy's scope to accommodate community facilities, but there were issues raised:

Some respondents felt that there should be scope for some limited growth in other settlements. It was noted that this policy does not provide for any infill development

within the built up areas of these settlements. In addition, local transport issues and the lack of affordable housing have also been highlighted as a concern.

Development Management Policies

While there were different views about the precise content of each policy, no views were expressed to suggest that any of the policies were unnecessary or fundamentally unsound.

Views on Policy DM1 Farm Diversification and Agricultural/Forestry Buildings

There was mixed support for this policy, with one respondent feeling that it should not prevent schemes designed to be larger than the original farming enterprise industry. The view was also expressed that the, potentially negative, landscape implications of farm diversification should be appreciated.

Views on Policy DM2 Development in the Countryside

It was suggested that this policy should allow for consideration to be given to the wider landscape impacts of development. It was welcomed that this policy emphasises the need to diversify the local economy and there was support for part D of the policy as many rural businesses do require a rural location and this should not be restricted.

Views on Policy DM3 Conversion of Rural Buildings

There were views that a 12-month marketing period for non-domestic rural buildings, before permission for other uses is given, is too long and should be amended.

Views on Policy DM4 Design

There was general agreement that design is an important issue and should be a significant consideration when planning for new developments. Suggested amendments included the need to recognise that a site could be in an area in need of improvement; that Historic Landscape Characterisation should be used within policy in conjunction with the Council's Landscape Character Assessment; that 'major development' needs defining; and that the policy should also set out requirements for major development proposals to be supported by a detailed transport assessment. A number of respondents suggested that a Supplementary Planning Document for design needs to be produced to provide further detail on this issue.

Views on Policy DM5 Housing Mix and Density

The key views on this policy were that the Council needs to be aware that an amendment has been made to paragraph 47 of PPS 3, which has removed the blanket minimum density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare. There were split views on whether the policy should reference density targets at all, ranging from the recommendation that local character should directly inform the density of any

scheme put forward to ensure it is not out of character with its neighbouring housing areas to the need for a clear statement on expected density levels.

Views on Policy DM6 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People

The only views on this policy were that greater flexibility should be given for traveller sites in Rural Service Centres, in line with the approach taken for housing, and that local landscape and nature conservation designations should not in themselves be used to refuse planning permission for sites. There was also a request for greater flexibility in terms of the wording of where transit sites might be located, with 'ready access' to the strategic road network.

Views on Policy DM7 Protecting Employment Land

This policy was generally supported. The recognition that not all employment sites are likely to be suitable for employment into the future was welcomed. It was suggested that the policy was overly restrictive, however, in relation to PPS4's sequential test and that the policy should be amended to allow the loss of employment land on the basis of absence of need or inappropriateness of allowing a use to continue, or in situations where employment uses are not viable.

Views on Policy DM8 Conservation and Built Heritage

There were no significant issues with this policy. There was a view that heritage issues might be better highlighted in place specific policies and that a more proactive strategy that relates to the wider matters than those addressed in the development management policy would be preferred. In addition, a recommended amendment to this policy is the title, which should be changed, to conform to national policy, to 'conservation and the historic environment'

Views on Policy DM9 Green Infrastructure; Biodiversity; Open Space and Sports Facilities

It was noted that sites such as Clumber Park are important areas in providing green infrastructure and this should be recognised further within the Core Strategy. In addition, the protection of open spaces should be a priority in the Core Strategy, particularly in areas where a large percentage of growth is likely to occur. There was also a recommendation to include biodiversity as a separate issue and not incorporate it into either green infrastructure or open spaces. The Chesterfield Canal should be included as a key link in the regeneration of Worksop and providing new green infrastructure.

Views on Policy DM 10 Renewable Energy

While there was support for the Council's approach in not trying to run in advance of Government policy, this policy received the most negative comments (although most of these were copies of a standard letter). These were more concerned with the specific issue of windfarms than they were with the overall thrust of the policy, with the view that greater specificity about how windfarm applications should be assessed

is required. There were mixed views about whether policy should specifically allocate windfarm sites. In contrast, there was agreement that more should be done to provide renewable energy within the District, particularly from new developments.

Views on Policy DM11 Developer Contributions

There was general agreement with this policy, although it was noted that since the Preferred Options document was released the CIL regulations had come into force and thus the explanatory text was incorrect. It was stated that the Council needed to be cautious in how it seeks such contributions, given the current uncertainty around CIL and that the Council follow this policy up with a Supplementary Planning Document. A further amendment is that public art should be included in the bulleted list of contributions and that transport mitigation measures should be included.

Views on Policy DM12 Flood Risk, Sewerage and Drainage

There was general agreement with this policy, although the view was expressed that development can be successful in flood zones 2, 3a and 3b if designed to overcome a flood threat. There were some views that East Drayton, Eaton, Dunham and Normanton-on-Trent should be included in Part B, as requiring drainage assessments for planning applications.

Views on Policy DM13 Local Parking Standards

It was suggested that this policy should be expanded to address issues of sustainable transport more widely and to provide clear linkages with the Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan.

Further comments

It was requested that the Core Strategy address the ground stability issues that are associated with the District's coal mining legacy and which still affect certain localities.

Settlement Boundary Representations

Submissions made regarding the revised Development Boundaries have not been included within this consultation response document. All respondents have been written to under separate cover explaining the outcome of their submission. If you require any further detail on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact the Planning Policy Team on 01909 535150.

Annex A: Consultation Plan

Date	Event	Time		Parishes invited
12 May	Public	Afternoon	Tuxford Methodist Church	
13 May	Public	Afternoon	Carlton-in-Lindrick Village Hall	
20 May	Members	Evening	Ceres Suite	
24 May	Parish Council	Evening	Carlton-in-Lindrick Village Hall	Carlton-in-Lindrick Langold Misterton and Tuxford
25 May	Parish Council	Evening	Venetian Room	Worksop, Retford, Shireoaks, Rhodesia and Harworth Bircotes
27 May	Public	Afternoon	BCVS Booked	
1 June	Parish Council	Evening	Ceres Suite	Clarborough & Hayton, Cuckney, Dunham, East Markham, Elkesley, Gamston, Nether Langwith, North Leverton, North & South Wheatley, Sturton le Steeple and Rampton
2 June	Public	Afternoon	Misterton Centre	
2 June	Developers	Afternoon	Ceres Suite	
3 June	Parish Council	Evening	Ballroom, Retford Town Hall	All other Settlements
4 June	Public	Afternoon	Harworth Methodist Church	
7 June	Parish Council	Evening	Beckingham Recreation Room	Beckingham, Lound , Blyth, Everton, Gringley on the hill, Mattersey, Misson, Ranskill, Sutton and Walkeringham
8 June	Public	Afternoon	Market Hall, Retford Town Hall	

Annex B: List of Consultees and Interest Groups

Relevant consultation bodies (under part one of the Town and Country Planning Amendments Regulations 2008) and others with whom Bassetlaw District Council will consult during the formulation of Development Plan Documents include:

- Government Office for the East Midlands
- East Midlands Development Agency
- Yorkshire Forward
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Derbyshire County Council
- Lincolnshire County Council
- East Midlands Regional Assembly
- Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
- Rotherham Borough Council
- Bolsover District Council
- West Lindsey District Council
- Newark and Sherwood District Council
- North Lincolnshire Council
- Mansfield District Council
- All Parish Councils in Bassetlaw
- Sheffield City Region
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- Nottinghamshire Police
- English Heritage
- Bassetlaw Primary Care Trust
- Utility Companies

Annex C: Other Interested Groups

There are numerous local and national interest groups, which under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 are classified as 'General Consultation Bodies'. These groups will be informed of draft publications and encouraged to meet planning officers to discuss their contents. Their involvement is vital, as they will have an interest in, and useful knowledge of, a variety of local planning related issues. The list below illustrates the types of interest groups with whom the Council will seek to engage.

- Wildlife/Environmental Groups
- Heritage Groups
- Sports Groups
- Development Industry Representatives
- Planning Agents
- Countryside Groups
- Cycling and Rambling Groups
- Local Area Forums
- Civic Societies
- Local Schools and Colleges
- Local Chambers of Trade
- Archeology Groups
- Transport Groups
- Regeneration Groups
- Housing Associations
- Local Community Groups