



**NEWARK &
SHERWOOD**
DISTRICT COUNCIL

**STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED FOLLOWING
PUBLICATION OF THE NEWARK & SHERWOOD CORE
STRATEGY DPD**

Summary of Main Issues

July 2010

Contents

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Introduction | page 1 |
| 2 | Summary of Main Issues Raised | |
| | Appendix 1 Notice of Publication Core Strategy | page 11 |
| | Appendix 2 Respondents to Publication Core Strategy | page 12 |

1 Introduction

1.1 The Newark & Sherwood Core Strategy DPD (hereafter referred to as the Publication Core Strategy) for the District was published for a period of public representations on the 20 April 2010. Representations were initially requested to be received by 1st June 2010 and this date was extended to 8th June 2010.

1.2 This statement sets out how many representations were made on the Publication Core Strategy a summary of main issues the representations have raised and has been produced in accordance with regulation 30(e) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

Representation Period

1.3 Council approved the Publication Core Strategy on 31 March 2010. At the beginning of the Representation period the Council placed on deposit at Kelham Hall, the District Council's HQ, the District's Libraries and the Council's website the Publication Core Strategy, the Publication Proposals Map, Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Core Strategy and the Habitats Regulation Assessment. Alongside this the Council provided Representation Forms and guidance note at all these locations – representations could also be made via the Council's Consultation Portal. On the Council's website and at Kelham Hall the evidence base which supports the Publication Core was also made available for review.

1.4 The District Council wrote or emailed all specific consultees providing hard or electronic copies of the Publication Documentation. General Consultees who had previously expressed an interest or made comments on the Core Strategy were also contacted and informed of the representation period. The District Council placed a Public Notice in local newspapers, on our website, at Kelham Hall and in the District's Libraries advertising the period of Representation. A copy of the notice can be found at Appendix 1. Parish and Town Councils and Parish Meetings were also sent a copy of the notice to display in any notice boards they may have.

1.5 Given the nature and purpose of the publication stage, the District Council did not undertake the usual community engagement activities (including road shows, briefing sessions and attendance at meeting) that had been the feature of the earlier consultation stages. That being said the Publication Core Strategy did feature in the local media including an officer interview on BBC Radio Nottingham and articles in local newspapers.

1.6 During the representation period a number of consultees requested an extension to the period, this was because two elements of the evidence base had not been placed on deposit on the website during the initial stages of the period. The Council extended the Representation Period by one week to accommodate these concerns. The period was extended until the 8 June. The Council wrote to correspondents on the matter and updated the Public Notices.

2 Summary of the Main Issues Raised

2.1 General

General Matters

- 2.1.1 During the representation period, the new Government announced its intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies, including that for the East Midlands but has yet to publish interim strategic planning guidance. This affects some of the representations where respondents either considered the Core Strategy sound or unsound depending upon whether it was perceived to be in accord or not in accord with the RSS.
- 2.1.2 The Government Office for the East Midlands [GOEM] stated that Council should examine the Core Strategy in the light of the intention to abolish RSS where reliance is placed on the RSS to support the strategy and the policies.
- 2.1.3 A few respondents, particularly those making representations against the Growth Point and the scale and distribution of housing in the District, considered that the Council should fundamentally recast the strategy [e.g. abandoning the Growth Point and scaling back the housing requirements] after awaiting the promised new interim strategic planning guidance.
- 2.1.4 Many points of support or objection to the Core Strategy revolve around general conformity with the RSS.
- 2.1.5 Some respondents considered that elements of the Core Strategy do not conform to national planning guidance. For example, Nottinghamshire County Council considered that the policies relating to Green Belt are not in accord with the advice set out in PPG2. Others considered that the Core Strategy does not accord with the advice set out in PPS4, PPS7, PPS13 or with other national planning advice documents.
- 2.1.6 These points of perceived accord or divergence from national and regional guidance affected the view of the respondents as to whether they considered elements of the Core Strategy “sound” or “unsound”.
- 2.1.7 Many respondents raised concerns at the perceived lack of clarity of the Core Strategy and the perceived poor evidence base put forward to support the Council’s case. Some, like GOEM, considered the Core Strategy capable of being made more concise, whilst others found the Core Strategy repetitive; others considered that more justification was needed in the main body of the Core Strategy (e.g. from the Appendices) and that there should be more cross-referencing between relevant policies. The Highways Agency and East Midlands Councils were two such respondents who wished to see more justification and supporting evidence for

elements of the Core Strategy. Others considered that the wording in related policies was not the same and that this could lead to interpretation difficulties.

- 2.1.8 Two respondents fully supported the Core Strategy considering it to be an excellent document.

Vision and Objectives (Chapter 3)

- 2.1.9 Some respondents considered that there should be new or modified objectives – Lafarge Aggregates wished to see the safeguarding of mineral reserves as an objective and the Coal Authority considered that there should be a new objective relating to the legacy of (past) coal mining activity on land instability issues in the western part of the District. The Environment Agency would wish to see a minor modification to the objectives.
- 2.1.10 There was a measure of support for the area objectives, particularly from those respondents who were promoting development sites in the sub-areas concerned.
- 2.1.11 A general point was made by some respondents that the Growth Point part of the Core Strategy should be either modified or scrapped because of the abolition of Regional Spatial Strategies referred to in paragraph 4. Lincolnshire County Council, whilst not objecting to the Core Strategy, wished to see more justification for the scale of the Growth Point in relation to the other Growth Points at Lincoln and Grantham. The Growth Point issue is also raised later in this report.

Consultation

- 2.1.12 A number of respondents, including CPRE, raise issues relating to how the District Council consulted the public on the Core Strategy mainly in relation to the major development sites around Newark. Some of these respondents argue that the consultation process was not in accord with the Council's own stated policies and procedures on public involvement.

2.2 Spatial Policies (Chapter 4)

- 2.2.1 **Spatial Policies 1 & 2 (Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Distribution of Growth)** have received some criticism in that the former is too descriptive and does not lead to action and that the latter is not in complete accord with RSS and no justification is provided for this lack of accord. The settlement hierarchy is criticised in that village envelopes are not mandated for settlements below the level of Principal Village. One respondent considers that Collingham should be termed a Service Centre as otherwise there are no higher order settlements apart from the Newark Urban Area in the east of the District. Some considered that Southwell should be categorised as a Principal Village rather than a Service Centre. There is however support for Southwell being designated as a Service Centre. Whilst others including Mansfield District Council do not believe that Clipstone should be a Service Centre. The company NSK

and others considered that Fernwood should not form part of the Newark Urban Area as it is not so mentioned in the RSS.

2.2.2 Other respondents consider that other settlements should be defined as Principal Villages or that the category of other villages should be divided into those that are larger and could accommodate sustainable development and those which are smaller and would not meet sustainable development criteria.

2.2.3 Some respondents consider that the overall scale of housing needs to be revised (downwards) and that too much development is being focused on Newark. Specific concerns in this regard were;

- a) the current economic downturn which should require a scaling back of the housing need provision, and
- b) the perception that transport policies were inadequate for the task.

Conversely, a few respondents wished to see the Core Strategy state that the housing requirement was a minimum figure and not a maximum figure.

2.2.4 Other respondents arguing the case for specific housing development sites in settlements either agree with the Strategy or requested that more development be set against a particular settlement e.g. Farnsfield.

2.2.5 Many objections to the two policies also raise issues with Appendix D on which some respondents have fundamental disagreements whilst others consider the Appendix should be revised to address perceived problems of inconsistency with the text in Chapter 4 and still others argue that elements of the Appendix should be in the main body of the Core Strategy.

2.2.6 Some respondents considered that the amount of housing assigned to other villages was too small and would not meet local needs – see Core Policy section.

2.2.7 British Waterways considers that **Spatial Policy 3 (Rural Areas)** is too prescriptive and that features such as marinas in rural areas should be of a scale that is appropriate to the area and the needs of waterway users. Others raised concerns over the criterion relating to public transport and considered the policy to be ruling out otherwise acceptable development in some of the smaller rural settlements and that the term “local services” was not defined. One respondent considered that the policy was not in accord with PPS4.

2.2.8 Nottinghamshire County Council has made objections to parts of **Spatial Policies 4A and 4B Extent of the Green Belt and Green Belt Development** – see paragraph 2.1.5 above and Lafarge Aggregates wished to see mineral extraction included in the list of appropriate developments in Spatial Policy 4B. Others considered that either revision to Green Belt boundaries were required in a settlement e.g. Lowdham and

Rainworth, or were not required as for Blidworth. CPRE considered that Spatial Policy 4A was not in accord with RSS.

- 2.2.9 **Spatial Policy 5 Delivering Strategic Sites** did not receive major criticism. Some respondents supported the policy whilst others such as the Wildlife Trust wished to see minor changes to the policy. One of the points raised was that more emphasis should be placed in the Policy on the use of brownfield sites (previously used land) and this point was also raised on a number of other Core Strategy policies.
- 2.2.10 **Spatial Policy 6 Infrastructure for Growth** received representations from Nottinghamshire County Council and the Newark Civic Trust; the former commented that the Core Strategy should make it clear that the Southern Link Road (SLR) would have to be built entirely at the developer's expense and this may affect the funding of other services and facilities by new development in the Newark Urban Area. The Civic Trust was concerned that infrastructure improvements may not be in place and in its view this questions the whole Growth Point initiative which should be abandoned (see also paragraphs 2.1.11 and 2.4.3). A number of other respondents also raised similar concerns.
- 2.2.12 The Primary Care Trust was critical that the Core Strategy was largely silent on health and health infrastructure and stated that where new provision was required because of development pressures, it should be fully funded through developer contributions. The Trust considered that this point should be made explicitly in the Core Strategy.
- 2.2.13 One respondent queried whether the transport elements of the Policy could be achieved given that the County Council had not signed up to it whilst some others agreed with the principle of the policy but not with detailed elements.
- 2.2.14 Many of the respondents linked their comments on this policy to Appendix E. Many respondents whilst supporting the policy in general made detailed objections to parts of the policy or Appendix E.
- 2.2.15 Nottinghamshire County Council and other respondents considered that **Spatial Policy 7 (Sustainable Transport)** is not in accord with national government guidance and the relevant RSS policy and that Policy 7 needs to be stronger in securing change in travel behaviour.
- 2.2.16 The Theatre Trust and others supported **Spatial Policy 8 (Protecting and Promoting Leisure and Community Facilities)**.
- 2.2.17 **Spatial Policy 9 (Selecting Appropriate Sites for Allocation)** came in for support and criticism. One respondent considered it did not add anything to the Core Strategy and should be deleted. Others gave general support but wished to see minor wording changes.

2.3 Core Policies (Chapter 5)

- 2.3.1 With regard to **Core Policy 1 Affordable Housing Provision**, one respondent felt that the 30% target for affordable housing was too high, whilst Nottinghamshire County Council considered that more clarity was required on the securing of the aspirations of the latter part of the policy (a point also made by the Council with regard to elements of Core Policy 3) and some respondents considered this part of the Policy to be inflexible and best left to negotiations at the planning application stage. One respondent objected to the affordable housing element of the policy stating that this part was not in accord with national policy. There were a number of respondents supporting the policy.
- 2.3.2 **Core Policy 2 Rural Affordable Housing** also received support and criticism. Critical views were expressed concerning lack of clarity of aspects of the policy e.g. who would be undertaking a Housing Needs Survey.
- 2.3.3 **Core Policy 3 Housing Mix, Type and Density** received few representations. One respondent considered elements of the policy were inappropriate and were best left to negotiations at the planning application stage.
- 2.3.4 **Core Policy 4 Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople – New Pitch Provision** received a number of representations, some objecting to the assessment of pitches required and the location in the Newark area.
- 2.3.5 A respondent representing the travelling community objected to details of **Core Policy 5 Criteria for Considering Sites for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople** which were considered to conflict with national planning policy.
- 2.3.6 **Core Policies 6 & 7 Shaping our Employment Profile and Tourism Development** received support in principle though minor points of concern were raised. Southwell Town Council and others considered that **Core Policy 7** on tourism development was unsound with regard to Southwell.
- 2.3.7 **Core Policy 8 Retail Hierarchy** received general support though Clipstone Park Estates considered that Clipstone should be upgraded to the role of District Centre.
- 2.3.8 **Core Policy 9 Sustainable Design** received general support however the Environment Agency wished to see minor wording changes to the policy and William Davis wished to see the reference to Lifetime homes removed from the policy.
- 2.3.9 Nottinghamshire County Council and GOEM raised concerns that elements of **Core Policy 10 Climate Change** conflicted with the provisions of the relevant RSS policy and with national planning guidance with regard to the lack of mention of the need to maximise energy efficiency as the first stage in reducing carbon dioxide emission from development proposals. The Environment Agency and some other respondents had specific concerns on some of the detailed statements in the Policy.

- 2.3.10 **Core Policy 11 Rural Accessibility** received few representations all supporting the policy. Whilst supporting the policy, the Country Land and Business Association wished to see a greater understanding of getting a better balance between rural job opportunities and rural residents seeking work.
- 2.3.11 Several consultees urged more clarity on **Core Policy 12A Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure** and the Wildlife Trust would wish to see major changes to the policy to reflect the need to protect and enhance the natural environment.
- 2.3.12 **Core Policy 12B Prospective Special Protection Area** received few representations; however Clipstone Estates wanted the policy to go further to specify an alternative development strategy.
- 2.3.13 **Core Policy 13 Landscape Character** received few representations. GOEM considered that the policy needed strengthening.
- 2.3.14 **Core Policy 14 Historic Environment** also received few representations. English Heritage considered part of the policy conflicted with PPS5 and also wished to see minor wording changes elsewhere in the policy.

2.4 Area Policies (Chapter 6)

Newark Area Policies

- 2.4.1 Newark Business Club generally supports the policies for Newark but consider that **NAP1 and NAP3 (Newark Urban Area and Newark Sports Facilities)** should overlap, allowing the principles of growth for the Newark Urban Area to cover those villages connected to Newark by regular public transport services.
- 2.4.2 **NAP1 Newark Urban Area** received many representations some of support and some of objection. Objections mainly focussed on the likely adverse impacts upon the Town Centre resulting from traffic arising from the proposed new urban extensions and the perceived lack of evidence to indicate that such adverse problems would not occur.
- 2.4.3 Many objectors objected to the Growth Point aspects of the Core Strategy either in principle stating that there had been a perceived lack of democratic input in the process, that the historic environment of Newark could not cope with this scale of growth, that unacceptable traffic congestion and other problems would arise in the Town and in particular the Town Centre and that the economic situation in the area would be unlikely to sustain the scale of housing put forward.
- 2.4.4 With regard to the three Strategic Sites, Nottinghamshire County Council reiterated its comments set out in paragraph 2.2.10 concerning the funding of the SLR. Other

respondents either supported the three sites or raised specific objections to detailed wordings in the text.

- 2.4.5 The Highways Agency gave general support to the area policies but wished to see more evidence provided to ensure that the Trunk Road network was not adversely affected by the development proposals and for more clarity in relevant parts of the text in this regard.
- 2.4.6 The commercial NDC Group considered that all three major sites were flawed with regard to employment land issues and proposed an additional urban extension site around South Airfield Farm (which they refer to as NAP2D) to meet the economic development aspects of growth at Newark.
- 2.4.7 With regard to **NAP2A Land South of Newark** Balderton Parish Council raised objections to the scale of the strategic site and requested that the scale of housing should follow the scale of anticipated employment growth rather than the other way round. Other comments raised included lack of consultation with a landowner, strengthening the protection of historic/cultural features, widening the flood risk assessment to include Farndon and concerns that the level of detail in the policy was too great and this would lead to inflexibility that would be best dealt with by either the preparation of an Area Action Plan or at the development control stage when circumstances might well be different from today. Catesby pointed out that flexibility was needed as the precise alignment of the SLR was not yet fixed and there was some concern around the proposed haul road from the A46 prior to the SLR construction commencing.
- 2.4.8 **NAP2B Land East of Newark** received a large number of objections who raised the following matters – lack of consultation with a landowner, traffic and access issues – linkage to Barnby Road and the proposed SLR, landscape/open space concerns, phasing concerns, the over-detailed nature of the policy which would lead to inflexibility (overcome by preparing an Area Action Plan or by leaving certain matters to the development control stage) and the strengthening of ecological issues. One respondent considered the Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the Core Strategy did not provide a justification for NAP2B, as it dealt with a different area. Particular objections were raised to NAP2B where the County Council wished the three accesses to the development from Beacon Hill Road to have some form of interconnection and that the development would adversely affect a notable landscape area, a point of objection also raised by the Newark Civic Trust and others.
- 2.4.9 **NAP2C Land around Fernwood** received a number of representations, mostly of objection relating to the degree of detail in the policy which was considered to lead to inflexibility, drainage and highway issues, and the issue of whether Fernwood was properly part of the Newark Urban Area.
- 2.4.10 **NAP3 Newark Sports Facilities** received support or general support with only minor matters of concern being raised.

2.4.11 **NAP4 Newark Southern Link Road** received a number of objections in principle by those opposed to the Growth Point. The Highways Agency was concerned at the details of the junctions to the A46 and A1 Trunk Roads stating that the costs of works would be borne by the developer, a point echoed by Nottinghamshire County Council with regard to the funding for the SLR itself.

Southwell Area Policies

2.4.12 **SoAP1 Role and Setting of Southwell** was supported by a number of consultees others including the National Trust wished to see stronger safeguards for the protection of the setting of Southwell.

2.4.13 Nottingham Trent University supported **SoAP2 Brackenhurst Campus – Nottingham Trent University** along with other representations received, were either opposed to the policy or wished to see stronger safeguards for the protection of the setting of Southwell.

Sherwood Area Policies

2.4.14 **ShAP1 Sherwood Forest and Sherwood Forest Regional Park** was generally supported with minor wording changes suggested e.g. to give more emphasis to ecological matters. The Country Land and Business Association considered ShAP1 should not just be about increasing recreation and tourism in the area.

2.4.15 **ShAP2 Role of Ollerton & Boughton** a number of representations suggested more attention should be paid to issues in Ollerton Conservation Area or minor amendments were proposed.

Mansfield Fringe Area Policy

2.4.16 Respondents supported **MFA01 Mansfield Fringe** with some voicing concerns at wildlife/ecology interests needing to be strengthened and specific reference to the need for the potential for brownfield development to be tested before greenfield sites were taken.

2.5 Appendices, Maps and Figures

Appendices

2.5.1 Many respondents referred to all the Appendices and in particular Appendices D and E and such references are in the main body of the report. Some pointed to different terminology within the Appendices to relevant parts of the main document whilst others considered that elements of Appendix D in particular should be in the main part of the document to provide the necessary evidence base for the policy.

Maps and Figures

2.5.2 Various respondents requested changes to the various maps/figures arising from the representations made particularly with regard to the development sites around Newark. GOEM made several detailed suggestions for modifications to these parts of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 Notice of Publication Core Strategy

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment)
Regulations 2008 (Regulations 27 & 28)

Notice of Publication of:

- * **Newark and Sherwood Publication Core Strategy DPD**
- * **Newark and Sherwood Publication Proposals Map**
- * **Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Publication Core Strategy DPD**

Subject Matter: This Publication Core Strategy sets out the District Council's spatial policy framework for delivering the development and change needed to realise the District Council's vision for the District up to 2026. It has been published for a period of public representation before Submission to the Secretary of State.

Area Covered: Whole of the Newark and Sherwood District

Publication Period: 20 April until 1 June 2010

Representations: Representations can be made via the Council's consultation portal or on representation forms available online and in the same locations as the documents and guidance notes.

Copies of the documents and guidance on how to make a representation are made available for inspection by Newark & Sherwood District Council at:

- * District Council Offices at Kelham Hall (during normal office hours);
- * Local Libraries in Newark and Sherwood District;
- * On the Council's web site
www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/planningpolicy

Representations not submitted via the Council's consultation portal should be sent to:

**Planning Policy, Planning Services, Newark & Sherwood District Council,
Kelham Hall, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 5QX.**

Or planningpolicy@nsdc.info

Appendix 2 Respondents to Publication Core Strategy

| Representor | On behalf of |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Andrew Martin Associates | NSK Europe Ltd |
| Andrew Martin Associates | Wheeldon Bros Ltd |
| Anthony Aspbury Associates Ltd | Knightswood Developments Ltd |
| Anthony Aspbury Associates Ltd | |
| Balderton Parish Council | |
| David Wilson Homes | |
| Bray, G | |
| British Waterways (East Midlands Office) | |
| Brown, Charles, Mr | |
| Campaign to Protect Rural England | |
| Catesby Property Group | Barton Willmore Planning |
| CgMs Consulting | Hempsall, P |
| CgMs Consulting | Wildgoose Construction |
| CgMs Consulting | Elliott |
| Clarke, Mr Douglas | |
| Cobb, D | |
| Coddington Parish Council | |
| Collingham Parish Council | |
| Country Land and Business Association | |
| Day, Mr Peter (No Growth Point Campaign) | |
| Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group | |
| DLA Town Planning Ltd | Kenilworth Estates |
| Dodson, Mr John | |
| East Midlands Councils | |
| English Heritage | |
| Environment Agency | |
| Farndon Parish Council | |
| Farnsfield Parish Council | |
| Friends Families and Travellers Planning | |
| Framptons | Severn Trent Water |
| Freethcartwright LLP | Dolan, G |
| Freethcartwright LLP | Kirklington Road Landowners |
| Gazeley UK Ltd | |
| Gedling Borough Council | |
| Government Office for the East Midlands | |
| Granger, Margaret (No Growth Point Campaign) | |
| Hagan, Mr Douglas (Farndon Residents Environment Group) | |
| Harris Lamb | Nottingham Trent University |
| Harris, Councillor Peter | |
| Hawes, Mr Michael (No Growth Point Campaign) | |
| Hempsall, Mr P | |

| Representor | On behalf of |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Highways Agency | |
| Holmes, Mr Philip | |
| Ian Baseley Associates | Bowring, SR |
| Ian Baseley Associates | Thomas, Mr Richard |
| Indigo Planning Limited | |
| John Church Planning Consultancy Ltd | |
| John Martin & Associates | Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd |
| Kay, Mr Des | |
| Kessler, Mr Holger | |
| King, Philip & Jennie | |
| Laurence Jones Associates | |
| Leech-Smith, Andrea (Farndon Residents Environment Group) | |
| Lichfield Planning | NDC Group |
| Lincolnshire County Council | |
| Mallinder, Mr D | |
| Mansfield District Council | |
| Marshall, Mr Joel | |
| McCarthy, Mr Jez (Farndon Residents Environment Group) | |
| McCarthy, SC | |
| McGrath, Mr James | Butler, Mr Tim |
| Mike Sibthorpe Planning | Gathercole, Miss |
| Mike Sibthorpe Planning | Rose Family |
| Molloson, Mrs M | |
| Musgrove, Mr J | |
| Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners | Bourne Leisure Leisure Limited |
| National Farmers Union | |
| National Grid | |
| National Trust- East Midlands Regional Office | |
| Network Rail | |
| Newark Area Internal Drainage Board | |
| Newark Business Club- Action Group | |
| Newark Church of England Churches | |
| Newark Civic Trust | |
| Newark Town Council | |
| Newzies, Mr Anthony (Farndon Residents Environment Group) | |
| Northern Trust Co Ltd | |
| Nottinghamshire County Council | |
| Nottinghamshire County Teaching Primary Care Trust | |
| Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust | |
| Parker, Mr Graham | |
| Payne, Mr Richard | |
| Pegasus Planning | Brownhills Motorhomes Ltd |

| Representor | On behalf of |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Pegasus Planning | Clipstone Park Estates Limited |
| Pinder, R | |
| Revill, DJ (No Growth Point Campaign) | |
| Revill, S (No Growth Point Campaign) | |
| Robertshaw, Mr Kevin (No Growth Point Campaign) | |
| Royal Society for the Protection of Birds | |
| RPS | Harworth Estates |
| RPS | Veolia Environmental Services |
| Savills | |
| Savills | |
| Savills | Oxton Farm and Estate Trust |
| Savills | Taylor, Robert & Michael |
| Savills | Diocese of Southwell and Nottingham |
| Savills | Trinity College Cambridge |
| Smith Stuart Reynolds | William Davis Ltd |
| Smith, Councillor Brian | |
| Smith, CL | |
| Smiths Gore | The Thoresby Estate |
| Southwell Town Council | |
| Sport England | |
| Steedman Planning Ltd | Starkey, Bt John |
| Stephenson, Joan (No Growth Point Campaign) | |
| Steven Abbott Associates LLP | Noble Foods Ltd |
| The Coal Authority | |
| The Theatres Trust | |
| Thomas, Giles & Elizabeth | |
| Thoresby Estate Office | |
| Traffic Reduction in Ollerton | |
| Truelove Property & Construction | |
| Walker Morris Solicitors | Gascoines Group Limited |
| Warren, Mr Spencer | Lafarge Aggregates Ltd |
| Winthorpe with Langford Parish Council | |