

# **2016 Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan (IDBP):**

## Consultation Representations Summary



**Bassetlaw**  
DISTRICT COUNCIL  
— North Nottinghamshire —

## 1. Scope and Approach to Collating Consultation Representations

This report summarises the representations received in response to consultation on the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan between 17<sup>th</sup> October and 9<sup>th</sup> December 2016. This timeframe constituted a 'Regulation 18'<sup>1</sup> stage of consultation on the emerging Bassetlaw Plan, and looked to test a range of key strategic proposals and development management principles. In summarising the representations received, this document identifies the key issues that need to be considered during the next stage of the Bassetlaw Plan.

A total of 118 representations were received<sup>2</sup> through the consultation process; these are broadly categorised into different respondent types below:

- 35 agents/developers/planning consultants
- 29 individuals
- 22 parish councils or local community groups
- 17 public organisations
- 6 infrastructure providers
- 5 other
- 3 landowners
- 1 elected member

The full set of representations is hosted on the Bassetlaw District Council website. This report documents the results of the thematic coding of the representations. The themes relate to the core elements of the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan, alongside a range of technical or wider issues that were referenced. The themes amounted to:

### Technical

- Structure / Nature of the Document
- Factual / Statistical Errors
- Mapping / Diagram Errors
- Co-Operation / Consultation

### Thematic

- Vision
- Objectives
- Spatial Strategy - Urban/Town
- Spatial Strategy - Functional Clusters
- Spatial Strategy - Development Boundaries
- Spatial Strategy - Criteria Policies
- Spatial Strategy - Wider Rural
- Spatial Strategy - New Village/Settlement
- Housing - Market

---

<sup>1</sup> Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

<sup>2</sup> For a full list of consultees please see Appendix A

- Housing - Affordable/Specialist
- Employment
- Town/Retail Centres
- Heritage
- Natural Environment
- Open Space/Landscape
- Design
- Rural Buildings
- Climate Change
- Infrastructure Provision
- Transport
- Gypsies / Travelers

#### Wider

- Site Specific
- DM Decision/s
- Neighbourhood Plans
- Site Submission
- Sub-Regional Devolution
- Objectively Assessed Housing Need/ 5 Year Housing Land Supply
- Waste/Mineral Extraction

At this stage of consultation, the emphasis was on gathering open responses to the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan in a free-text form. This was in order to allow consultees to tailor their responses appropriately, according to their thoughts and opinions, whilst also allowing for thematic coding. No explicit emphasis was given to outright objection or support to the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan at this stage, although these opinions will inform subsequent consideration.

The number and proportion of coded thematic references are outlined in Table 1 below. In order to achieve this presentation of the data, each representation was awarded a 'score' of one where a technical, thematic or wider reference was made. Representations were only coded once per thematic reference type. This coding approach allows priority themes contained across all 118 representations to be more easily identified and summarised for further consideration.

**Table 1: Number and proportion of technical, thematic and wider references contained within representations to the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan**

SUBJECT	SUBJECT TYPE	NO. OF REPS.	% OF REPS.
Spatial Strategy - Functional Clusters	Thematic	51	43.2
Site Specific	Wider	36	30.5
Spatial Strategy - Development Boundaries	Thematic	27	22.9
Infrastructure Provision	Thematic	26	22.0
Spatial Strategy - Criteria Policies	Thematic	25	21.2
Housing - Market	Thematic	25	21.2
Housing - Affordable/Specialist	Thematic	24	20.3
Neighbourhood Plans	Wider	21	17.8
Transport	Thematic	20	16.9
Site Submission	Wider	19	16.1
Spatial Strategy - Urban/Town	Thematic	18	15.3
Heritage	Thematic	18	15.3
Natural Environment	Thematic	18	15.3
Employment	Thematic	17	14.4

SUBJECT	SUBJECT TYPE	NO. OF REPS.	% OF REPS.
<b>Spatial Strategy - New Village/Settlement</b>	Thematic	15	<b>12.7</b>
<b>Vision</b>	Thematic	14	<b>11.9</b>
<b>Objectives</b>	Thematic	13	<b>11.0</b>
<b>Spatial Strategy - Wider Rural</b>	Thematic	11	<b>9.3</b>
<b>Design</b>	Thematic	11	<b>9.3</b>
<b>Sub-Regional Devolution</b>	Wider	11	<b>9.3</b>
<b>Climate Change</b>	Thematic	10	<b>8.5</b>
<b>Open Space/Landscape</b>	Thematic	8	<b>6.8</b>
<b>Objectively Assessed Housing Need/ 5 Year Housing Land Supply</b>	Wider	8	<b>6.8</b>
<b>Rural Buildings</b>	Thematic	7	<b>5.9</b>
<b>DM Decision/s</b>	Wider	7	<b>5.9</b>
<b>Co-Operation / Consultation</b>	Technical	6	<b>5.1</b>
<b>Gypsies / Travellers</b>	Thematic	6	<b>5.1</b>
<b>Structure / Nature of the Document</b>	Technical	5	<b>4.2</b>
<b>Waste/Mineral Extraction</b>	Wider	5	<b>4.2</b>

SUBJECT	SUBJECT TYPE	NO. OF REPS.	% OF REPS.
Town/Retail Centres	Thematic	4	3.4
Factual / Statistical Errors	Technical	1	0.8
Mapping / Diagram Errors	Technical	1	0.8

## 2. Thematic Summary

A collective summary of the issues raised and observations made in relation to each of the thematic areas is detailed below. The themes are ranked highest to lowest according to the proportion of representations which referenced them. The issues associated with each theme are presented in a format that is intended to assist the development of the next drafting stage of the Bassetlaw Plan, whilst still reflecting the original representations made. Some of the more detailed technical comments relating to the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan document are not included as these will be addressed separately.

It is important to stress that there is inevitable overlap in the coding of responses, as some issues address several themes. As such the thematic summaries below may include elements of repetition.

### 1. Spatial Strategy – Functional Clusters

#### Issues to Consider:

- Consider combining relevant settlements to create a 'North West Functional Cluster'
- Look to merge Costhorpe into Carlton-in-Lindrick within the 'Carlton & Langold Functional Cluster'
- Explore again, and test the functional connectivity between Blyth and Harworth & Bircotes, specifically remove the connection between the two areas
- Explore again and test the functional relationship between Grove, Stokeham and Retford within the 'Retford & Villages Functional Cluster'
- Look to identify Mattersey Thorpe and Misson within the 'Everton & Mattersey Functional Cluster'
- Look to relate Styrrup with Harworth & Bircotes due to geographic proximity
- Look to relate the 'South West Functional Cluster' to Shireoaks
- Consider again the role of Mission within the Functional Cluster methodology
- Consider the proposed 20% development cap in relation to the existing scale of rural settlements and the cumulative impact considering the scale of recent development
- Explore flexibility in the 20% development cap, specifically where this could be exceeded with local support or any wider triggers
- Provide a clear baseline from which any development cap will be calculated, consider back dating this to account for the recent upturn in rural planning permissions
- Suggested reducing the cap on individual developments to around 5% of the existing settlement given the potential for proportionately large rural development proposals
- Look to provide a definition of a reasonable settlement gap between Functional Cluster settlements
- Consider the role of smaller hamlets within Functional Clusters and assess any 'missed' settlements
- Relate any windfall allowance in the housing trajectory to Functional Clusters
- Consider and refine the 'Trent Corridor Functional Cluster' and assure equitable access to services
- Explore the potential for a village character Supplementary Planning Document to assist in the decision making across rural areas

## Observations:

- Functional Clusters do not represent realistic flows of people, for example in relation to jobs and services, where settlements may be able to operate more autonomously or alongside Bassetlaw's three largest towns (e.g. Blyth)
- Functional Clusters, where an individual settlement does not grow by 20%, may result in unfair levels of development in related areas
- Functional Clusters appear to represent a move to merging rural settlements and there is not enough to protect settlement integrity
- Cap does not appear to take into account extant permissions, sites under construction or any Neighbourhood Plan allocations
- Cap appears to override any Neighbourhood Plan allocations and policies
- Cap appears arbitrary and conflicts the need to plan positively for growth
- Role of employment growth in relation to Functional Clusters

## 2. Site Specific/Site Submission

### Issues to Consider:

- Site submissions outlined for consideration as a part of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan. Some are re-submissions of sites originally submitted through the 2015/16 Land Availability Assessment (LAA) process.  
**NOTE: Any additional sites have, wherever appropriate, been added to the LAA process for wider consideration. The LAA will help inform the site allocation process in turn**
- Site specific concerns and issues, many of which fall outside the direct scope of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan

## 3. Infrastructure Provision

### Issues to Consider:

- Assess the potential for cycling and walking infrastructure improvements across the District
- Consider the role of any CIL monies in relation to funding cycling and walking infrastructure projects and any wider improvements to the historic environment
- Consider more reference to waste water and SuDs (in the light of projected increasing rainfall levels) schemes alongside the need for an accompanying Water Cycle Study
- Consider evidence on SuDs capacity and specific reference to SuDs schemes in emerging design policies
- Look at methods, including through viability assessments, to secure a balance of highways, utilities, education and public transport contributions through planning policy to help assure adequate delivery
- Consider how to develop more pro-active working arrangements with Nottinghamshire County Council and wider infrastructure delivery partners through the emerging Bassetlaw Plan



### **Observations:**

- Growth proposals do not account for possible impacts on transport, utilities and social infrastructure
- Not enough policy support for local infrastructure provision for young persons (e.g. play facilities)
- CIL monies do not offer benefit to many local residents, particularly in rural areas
- Concern over the growth of Worksop in relation to impact on the A57
- Growth proposals do not appear to account for internal/cross-boundary highway impacts and possible strain on the existing road network
- No reference given to the two drainage boards in Bassetlaw, the Trent Valley Drainage Board and the Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board

## **4. Spatial Strategy – Criteria Policies**

### **Issues to consider**

- Consider the proposed 20% development cap in relation to the existing scale of rural settlements and the cumulative impact considering the scale of recent development
- Explore flexibility in the 20% development cap, specifically where this could be exceeded with local support or any wider triggers
- Provide a clear baseline from which any development cap will be calculated, consider back dating this to account for the recent upturn in rural planning permissions
- Suggested reducing the cap on individual developments to around 5% of the existing settlement given the potential for proportionately large rural development proposals
- Provide a definition of a reasonable settlement gap between Functional Cluster settlements
- Look to enhance coverage of environmental and landscape characteristics in the criteria
- Explore a differing range of development caps that are directly related to the scale of existing rural settlements

### **Observations:**

- Criteria do not offer enough protection against rural settlement coalescence in the proposed absence of development boundaries
- Not clear that all the proposed criteria need to be met when considering development proposals
- Cap does not appear to take into account extant permissions, sites under construction or any Neighbourhood Plan allocations
- Cap appears to override any Neighbourhood Plan allocations and policies
- Cap appears arbitrary and conflicts the need to plan positively for growth
- Criteria are too restrictive and will restrict appropriate rural development

## 5. Housing – Market

### Issues to consider:

- Update the OAHN figure in line with the most recent population projections, updated SHMAA and the emerging government standard OAHN calculation
- Establish a clear baseline year for the proposed housing target and consider if/how any shortfall is transferred over
- Consider how Neighbourhood Plans operate alongside, or could contribute to, the OAHN target with localised housing need targets
- Continue to consider the potential impacts of the 2017 Planning White Paper on market housing delivery
- Look at a range of housing land allocations to accommodate differing scales of development and provide a degree of market choice in delivery
- Consider how market housing viability is assessed as a part of planning policy delivery
- Look to consider any housing target as a 'minimum' baseline figure
- Consider whether a contingency or buffer needs to be accounted for alongside the OAHN figure
- Look at energy efficiency standards in relation to market housing delivery
- Look to explicitly relate employment projections to housing targets
- Look to re-assess the proposed windfall allowance

### Observations:

- Not clear how the OAHN figure was arrived at or from what baseline it will operate
- No distribution of housing numbers across the Functional Clusters
- Viability evidence relating to housing delivery should be made more transparent as policy asks seem to be abandoned at application stage
- Market housing appears delivery focuses on larger properties with little smaller housing/bungalow provision
- The proposed housing target of 435 per annum underestimates economic growth aspirations and the high level of need for affordable housing
- The 2013 SHMA is considered to be out of date

## 6. Housing - Affordable and Specialist

### Issues to consider:

- Consider opportunities for 100% affordable housing schemes where appropriate in areas of particular need
- Address the demand/need for smaller housing and bungalows, particularly in rural areas, in light of a generally aging population
- Continue to explore the relationship between the proportionately high levels of affordable housing need against the OAHN figure for market housing, recognising that affordable housing need is addressed through wider means than the delivery of new dwellings

- Clarify the role of the private rental sector in relation to addressing affordable housing need
- Consider the distribution of affordable housing units within large residential development schemes
- Look to address the distinct need for supported living or elderly accommodation
- Consider bespoke site allocations for supported living or elderly accommodation factoring specific site requirements
- Analyse the (2012) *Housing in Later Life: Planning Ahead for Specialist Housing for Older People* and associated toolkit.
- Consider specific policy areas on elderly, specialist and sheltered accommodation

**Observations:**

- Not enough is done to address the need for affordable and specialist housing
- The majority of new housing should be 100% affordable in nature
- The need for affordable housing is not fully recognised or incorporated into the OHAN figure

## 7. Neighbourhood Plans

**Issues to consider:**

- Consider how to better incorporate and account for Neighbourhood Plans in the Bassetlaw Plan process
- Consider the role of rural settlement criteria policies in relation to Neighbourhood Plans
- Look at assure clarity over Neighbourhood Plan allocations and how they would contribute to any development cap
- Consider how Neighbourhood Plans may be impacted by newly adopted strategic policies and how this may be resolved through Neighbourhood Plan reviews to assure general conformity
- Look at structured, positive ways of continuing to engage with Neighbourhood Plan groups
- Consider how Neighbourhood Plans may be able to plan for local housing needs and how this may relate to any development cap
- Look for Neighbourhood Plan opportunities to allocate land and provide detail on local settlement character

**Observations:**

- Not enough support is given to Neighbourhood Plans
- The proposed policies appear to contradict or override local aspiration
- The emerging Bassetlaw Plan will disrupt the production and adoption of Neighbourhood Plans

## 8. Transport

**Issues to consider:**

- Consider how bus and rail services can be better integrated, particularly in relation to Worksop and Retford train stations

- Explore the under-provision of rural bus services and the proposed growth across the Functional Clusters settlements
- Explore methods to increase cycling network provision across Bassetlaw
- Assess the potential of any CIL Regulation 123 list to help boost public and sustainable transport delivery
- Consider a range of methods to support rural public transport access, perhaps through wider infrastructure work
- Look to reference Bassetlaw's position within the 'Airport Corridor' as a part of the SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan

**Observations:**

- The impact of proposed development has not been considered in relation to transport provision/highways impact
- The current proposals will encourage the use of private vehicles

## 9. Spatial Strategy - Urban/Town

**Issues to consider:**

- Consider further the formal relationship between urban land allocations and the proposed level of growth across the Functional Clusters of rural settlement
- Consider the possibility of specialist land allocations (such as for elderly or specialist housing) across the three towns as the most sustainable locations for relevant growth
- Continue to assess the highway impacts of proposed growth around the three towns
- Look for more opportunities to positively enhance town centres and recognise their role as 'hubs' for growth

**Observations:**

- Harworth & Bircotes is growing too quickly, particularly the 'Harworth South' development which represents a significant encroachment into greenfield land and will increase traffic impacts
- Shireoaks and Rhodesia should remain as independent settlements and not be linked to Worksop
- The lack of proposed site allocations makes comment difficult
- Traffic impacts related to proposed growth in Retford will be severe

## 10. Heritage

**Issues to consider:**

- Consider methods to better integrate heritage into the Functional Cluster criteria policies
- Look to emphasise the importance and protection of the Chesterfield Canal, Clumber Park, Sherwood Forest and Creswell Crags as important local heritage assets
- Assess the role of any future CIL monies in relation to enhancing the historic environment
- Look to reference 'conservation' alongside the enhancement of heritage assets

**Observations:**

- Growth proposals across rural Bassetlaw will have detrimental heritage impacts
- Locally designated heritage assets should continue to play an important role of development decisions

**11. Natural Environment****Issues to consider:**

- Consider the loss of any agricultural land as a part of any site allocations where appropriate
- Under Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy areas consider inserting reference to the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, particularly sections 40 and 41.
- Consider referring to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Guidance and Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace standards in relation to open space policies
- Explore the addition of specific text to the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople policy, specifically that 'the site would not lead to the loss, or adverse impact on landscape character and value, heritage assets and their settings, nature conservation or biodiversity sites'
- Consider existing or emerging evidence around 'natural capital assets' including protected land, soil, species, (ground/surface) freshwater, air quality, mineral protections and sub-soils
- Consider the need for an updated Landscape Character Assessment
- Explore references to National Nature Reserves, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas in relation to the Sherwood Forest area

**Observations:**

- Proposed growth will negatively impact on the natural environment

**12. Employment****Issues to consider:**

- Consider how Sheffield City Region economic aspiration can be balanced against the existing and forecast strength sectors of Bassetlaw
- Consider how employment forecasts and aspiration relate to the OAHN figure
- Look to propose employment building design standards and refine related criteria policies
- Consider employment forecasts in relation to sub-regional aspiration and any major neighbouring authority employment sites
- Look at 'catchment areas' in relation to any proposed employment land allocations
- Look to agree an employment forecast baseline

**Observations:**

- Approach relies too heavily on distribution and warehousing, these sectors are not aspirational and require large amounts of land

- Having no upper limit on employment growth will open up the potential for too much growth and may not be a sound approach
- Approach will do little to encourage higher skilled employment opportunities
- Current employment development proposals, such as at Harworth & Bircotes, are too large and will have a detrimental environmental impact
- Surrounding areas such as Doncaster provide too much completion in the distribution and warehousing sector

### 13. Spatial Strategy - New Village/Settlement

#### Issues to consider:

- Continue to consider and screen possible locations for any new settlement
- Assess how any new settlement may relate to the Functional Clusters of rural settlement

#### Observations:

- Any new settlement needs to enable the delivery of local services
- Any new settlement will need to be guided by environmentally sustainable principles
- Lack of proposed locations makes detailed comment difficult
- Assure clarity that any new settlement would belong in Wider Rural Bassetlaw
- Substantial residential growth would be more sustainable when associated with an existing town

### 14. Vision/Objectives

- General support for the of the vision and objectives of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan, look to continue to refine as the Bassetlaw Plan emerges

### 15. Spatial Strategy - Wider Rural

#### Issues to consider:

- Consider a local connection and character criteria policy across settlements in Wider Rural Bassetlaw
- Modify relevant policy to account for the changing nature of the national rural planning approach
- Explore the potential for a village character Supplementary Planning Document to assist in the decision making across rural areas

#### Observations:

- Need greater recognition of changes to agricultural permitted development rights contained in the 2015 amends to the GPDO
- Clarity is needed over the scope of development in Wider Rural Bassetlaw where Neighbourhood Plans are in operation or are being prepared
- The extent of Wider Rural Bassetlaw needs more definition

## 16. Design

### Issues to consider:

- Consider the permeability of residential development schemes in relation to pedestrian, cycle and public transport access
- Look to relate health ambitions with design policies
- Consider economic development design policies to minimise the visual impact of any new storage or warehouse type developments

### Observations:

- Consideration of settlement character and impact on the wider landscape need to be fundamental to the design of rural development

## 17. Sub-Regional Devolution

### Issues to consider:

- Continue to consider the role of Sheffield City Region economic aspiration in relation to housing and employment targets
- Consider the role of Bassetlaw's tourism offer in the sub-regional context
- Consider where or if Bassetlaw sits as a part of an 'airport corridor' linked to Doncaster Airport

### Observations:

- Sheffield City Region may override local planning powers in the future and disrupt the Neighbourhood Planning process
- There is a chance Bassetlaw and Worksop will lose their identity and be seen as an extension of Sheffield

## 18. Climate Change

### Issues to consider:

- Consider how new build dwellings and employment developments can be more energy efficient through planning policy
- Consider how SuDS capacity may change in light of climate change
- General need to retain an emphasis of positively addressing climate change through planning policies and the Sustainability Appraisal process

## 19. Open Space/Landscape

### Issues to consider:

- Consider Landscape Character Assessments in relation to the review/removal of any development boundaries and emphasise landscape impact more in any Functional Cluster policy criteria
- Look for any emerging/additional opportunities to protect and enhance the natural environment through the emerging Bassetlaw Plan alongside promoting biodiversity networks
- Look at the need for an updated Landscape Character Assessment

## 20. Objectively Assessed Housing Need/5 Year Housing Land Supply

### Issues to consider:

- Consider how the OAHN figure relates to economic aspiration and the level of employment
- Continue to review the OAHN figure based on emerging government guidance, particularly relating to the 2017 White Paper
- Consider any implications of the most recent population projections and any latest SHMAA
- Consider attaching the caveat of a 'minimum' housing target

### Observations:

- The proposed 435 dwellings per annum housing target is too low
- The OAHN figure for affordable housing does not take into full account the level of need

## 21. Rural Buildings

### Issues to consider:

- Look to explore local connections policy criteria in relation to Wider Rural Bassetlaw and assess the use of criteria to manage development proposals in these areas
- Consider the implications of changing/emerging government advice on rural planning and specifically agricultural building GPDO rights

## 22. Gypsies / Travellers

### Issues to consider:

- Explore the addition of specific text to the Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople policy, specifically that 'the site would not lead to the loss, or adverse impact on landscape character and value, heritage assets and their settings, nature conservation or biodiversity sites'
- Assure the 'Gypsy, Travellers & Traveling Showpeople' chapter is properly referenced in all future Bassetlaw Plan documents
- Look to include reference to flood risk within the Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople policy area

## 23. Waste/Mineral Extraction

### Issues to consider:



- Consider how recognition can be given to fracking, as an area of community interest, and mineral extraction whilst recognising these are functions of Nottinghamshire County Council

## **24. Town/Retail Centres**

### **Issues to consider:**

- Consider how policy approaches can do more to enhance town centre regeneration opportunities
- Consider how to help address town centre vacancy rates in Worksop

## Appendix 1: Full List of consultees who responded to the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan public consultation

- Anglian Water Services Ltd
- Architectural Technologist Lts
- Barton Willmore on behalf of R E Howard and Sons
- Bawtry Town Council
- Beckingham cum Saundby Parish Council
- BiLFINGER GVA
- Blyth Awareness Community Group
- Blyth Parish Council
- Bolsover District Council
- Canal and Rivers Trust
- Carlton in Lindrick Parish Council
- CBRE Ltd on behalf of Worksop College
- Central Bassetlaw Forum
- Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Uniper
- Cushman and Wakefield on behalf of EON
- Derbyshire County Council
- DHA Group on behalf of Laing O'Rourke
- DLP Consultants
- Doncaster Council
- DWPS Chartered Surveyors
- East Markham Parish Council
- Education Funding Agency
- Elmton with Creswell Parish Council
- Environment Agency
- Everton Parish Council
- Felsham PD on behalf of INEOS Upstream Ltd
- Fisher German LLP on behalf Mr David Thorlby
- Fisher German LLP on behalf Mr David Thorlby
- Fisher German LLP on behalf Mr M Horrocks
- Fisher German LLP on behalf of CA Strawson Farms Ltd
- Fisher German LLP on behalf of Mr and Mrs Witney
- Fisher German LLP on behalf of Mr P Hinds Rampton
- Fisher German LLP on behalf of The Hospital of the Holy and Undivided Trinity
- Gladman Developments Ltd
- GR 1 Planning
- Headon, Upton, Grove and Stokeham Neighbourhood Planning Group
- Headon, Upton, Grove and Stokeham, as well as the Neighbourhood Planning team
- Headon, Upton, Stokeham and Grove Parish Council/s
- Highways England
- Historic England

- Home Building Federation
- IBA Planning
- John Martin & Associates
- JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd
- Linden Homes
- Lowland Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Local Nature Partnership
- Mansfield District Council
- Mattersey Parish Council
- Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
- National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
- National Grid
- National Trust
- Natural England
- National Farmers Union
- NLP Planning on behalf of SP Scholey
- North and South Wheatley Parish Council
- North Leverton Parish Council
- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
- Notts County Council
- Oxalis Planning on behalf of Merryvale Developments
- PB Planning on behalf of Barratt Homes
- Pegasus Group
- Pegasus Group on behalf of Edward Fisher
- Planning and Design Group
- Pritchard Associates
- Retford Civic Society
- Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
- Sandhills Community Vision Plan
- Savills
- Severn Trent Water
- Shireoaks Parish Council
- South Leverton Parish Council
- Strutt & Parker LLP on behalf of Foljambe Estate
- Sturton Le Steeple Parish Council
- Sustrans
- Sutton-cum-Lound Parish Council
- Sutton-cum-Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
- The Coal Authority
- The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd
- The Priory Shopping Centre
- Town Planning on behalf of client base
- W S Barnes LLP
- Walkeringham Parish Council

- Water Management Consortium
- West Lindsey District Council
- WYG on behalf of Chaterpoint Group
- WYG on behalf of William Davis Limited