

East Midlands Freeport Contributions Supplementary Planning Document Statement of Consultation

Produced pursuant to the Town and County Planning
(Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

May 2026

Contents

Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	4
2. Purpose of the Supplementary Planning Document	5
3. Consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document	7
4. Modifications to the Supplementary Planning Document	9
5. Summary of Responses received to the Supplementary Planning Document	1
Appendix 1: List of consultees and stakeholders consulted	20

Executive Summary

1. This Statement of Consultation sets out a summary of the responses received during the five-week public consultation (23 March 2026 to 27 April 2026) on the emerging East Midlands Freeport (EMF) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
2. The Statement also outlines how the Council has considered the main issues raised and indicates where the SPD has been modified in response to the consultation comments received or due to other relevant matters.
3. The purpose of the SPD is to ensure the coordinated and collaborative delivery and funding of the necessary strategic transport infrastructure required to support development of the three East Midlands Freeport (EMF) sites and that all development coming forward on the EMF sites, or on strategic allocation sites or other major development sites adjacent to or outside the EMF sites which will be unlocked by or significantly benefit from that strategic transport infrastructure (the SPD Sites), contribute towards that strategic transport infrastructure on an equitable and proportionate basis. The evidential work underpinning the SPD, which will be further evolved through an EMF Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) process, as well as assessments accompanying relevant planning or consenting applications, establishes the “in principle” need for pooled contributions (which may include works in kind) from SPD Sites in relation to this strategic transport infrastructure. Further highways modelling work is continuing and will inform an EMF IDP in due course.
4. As set out in this Statement, 32 responses were received to the consultation from a broad range of stakeholders including statutory consultees, neighbouring Councils, landowners, promoters, housing and employment developers, local interest groups, local residents, Parish Councils and Borough and District Councillors.
5. Responses received typically supported the principle of what the SPD is trying to achieve. This notwithstanding, there were concerns raised focussed primarily on the perceived lack of evidence underpinning the SPD and the timing for the preparation of an IDP and how the IDP would be consulted on.
6. This Statement sets out how the representations received have been responded to and in several cases, how the SPD has been amended to address the points raised. Of particular note, the SPD has been amended in the following respects:
 - Text has been added to make it clear that the SPD is not part of the development plan and not development plan policy. From the date of its adoption, the SPD will be a material planning consideration in planning determinations under the Planning Acts (as defined in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) in relation to the SPD Sites (which have been clarified – see below). However, at the date of adoption of the SPD, the EMF IDP will not have been issued for public consultation, published or endorsed by the Local Planning Authorities, and therefore the detail of the Strategic Infrastructure required will not have been established. Until such time as the EMF IDP has been published and endorsed by the Local Planning Authorities, following public consultation, only limited weight should be given to the SPD as a material planning consideration by the Local Planning Authorities,

though the “in principle” need for pooled contributions set out in this SPD (which may include works in kind in accordance with the SPD) in relation to Strategic Infrastructure has been established by the SPD at the date of adoption and carries weight as a material planning consideration in that regard. This is relevant to the local planning authorities’ application of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which provides that in determining planning applications the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where reference is made in the SPD to something being ‘required’ or a ‘requirement’, that something ‘will’, ‘must’ or is ‘expected’ to be provided, then that must be understood in the context of this SPD being material planning consideration and not a development plan document (paragraph 1.17);

- Further clarification has been added in relation to the proposed EMF IDP, including:
 - that the EMF IDP will include estimated costs for identified strategic infrastructure, as well as (where possible) timescales for delivery and the body anticipated expecting to deliver each item (paragraph 1.7);
 - that the EMF IDP will be accompanied by an appropriate evidence base including viability evidence (paragraph 1.10);
 - that the basis on which contributions are sought will be considered as part of the IDP preparation (paragraph 2.9.1(d)); and
 - that the IDP will be the subject of public consultation, following which the IDP is expected to be endorsed by the respective appropriate committee and/or Cabinet of the local planning authorities, prior to it being brought into use for the purposes of the SPD (paragraphs 1.10-1.11.)
- Further clarification has been added around how ‘Other Benefitting Development Sites’ will be determined, including that these are expected to include development sites immediately adjacent to the EMF Sites which form part of or are related to development of an EMF Site. It has also been clarified that ‘Other Benefitting Development Sites’ will also be ‘SPD Sites’ and a key has been added to the plan at Appendix 4 to assist (paragraph 1.4.)
- Text has also been added to explain that the EMF IDP will identify which SPD Sites are intended to contribute towards which items of Strategic Infrastructure, as far as is reasonably practicable at the stage of EMF IDP endorsement by the local planning authorities (paragraph 1.7);
- Text has been added to clarify that it is intended that the substance of this SPD (possibly in a different format, for example a Supplementary Plan where possible) will continue to apply once the adopted local plans cease to have effect and the local planning authorities will work together to achieve that (paragraph 1.20);

- Reference has been added to the East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 DCO application including proposed highway mitigation works to M1 J24 (paragraph 1.21.1(a)(i)(1));
- The description of the proposed development of the Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station Site has been amended and further reference to the Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station Local Development Order has been added (paragraph 1.21.2(a)(i));
- The strategic infrastructure identified in respect of Ratcliffe has been amended to include reference to strategic landscape and visual mitigation measures including to address heritage (paragraph 1.21.2(d)(i)(5));
- The strategic infrastructure needed to deliver the EMIP site has been reviewed and reference to the M1 J24 Improvement Scheme removed, in light of the representations received and an understanding that the EMIP site is unlikely to have a substantial impact on M1 J24 (paragraph 1.21.3(d));
- Other minor amendments have been made to the description of strategic infrastructure for all 3 EMF Sites (paragraphs 1.21.1(d), 1.21.2(d) and 1.21.3(d));
- Further clarification has been added in relation to the application of CIL in Rushcliffe Borough (paragraph 1.22.2);
- It has been clarified that public sector funding may be sought towards the strategic transport infrastructure (paragraph 2.9.1(c));
- Reference to circumstances where roads will be expected to be offered for adoption has been removed (paragraph 2.11);
- Reference has been added to current RICS valuation standards applying to financial viability assessments (paragraph 2.13.3); and
- Minor typos and grammatical errors have been corrected.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document outlines the consultation that was undertaken in the preparation of the East Midlands Freeport (EMF) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 1.2 The Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (“2012 Regulations”) sets out in Regulation 12 that before a planning authority adopt a supplementary planning document, they must prepare a statement (i.e. a statement of consultation) setting out:
 - 1.2.1 The persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the SPD;
 - 1.2.2 A summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
 - 1.2.3 How those issues have been addressed in the SPD.
- 1.3 A statement of consultation was published with the consultation draft of the EMF SPD. This document is an updated version of that statement of consultation and provides a summary of those who were consulted on the consultation draft version of the SPD (at Appendix 1), a list of who responded to that consultation (at Table 1 below) and the main issues arising from the responses received (at Table 2 below). It also outlines how the Council has considered the main issues raised and indicates where the SPD has been modified in response to the consultation comments received or due to other relevant matters. These are summarised below and also set out in Table 2.
- 1.4 The consultation period ran from 23 March to 27 April 2026. As the consultation commenced prior to 25 March 2026, the date on which the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2026 (“2026 Regulations”) came into force, the consultation was therefore undertaken pursuant to the 2012 Regulations.

2. Purpose of the Supplementary Planning Document

- 2.1 EMF was approved by Government in 2023 and provides businesses located within its designated “tax sites” with financial incentives to enable economic growth, stimulate innovation, and to create regional investment and employment opportunities.
- 2.2 The EMF comprises three ‘tax’ sites, respectively falling within three different local authority administrative boundaries:
- East Midlands Airport Gateway and Industrial Cluster (EMAGIC) in North West Leicestershire District, Leicestershire.
 - Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station (Ratcliffe) in Rushcliffe Borough, Nottinghamshire.
 - East Midlands Intermodal Park (EMIP) in South Derbyshire District, Derbyshire.
- 2.3 The Council is working with the EMF and the other Local Planning Authorities and County Authorities within which the EMF sites are located, to prepare and adopt the SPD.
- 2.4 The SPD will ensure the coordinated and collaborative delivery and funding of the necessary strategic transport infrastructure required to support development of the three EMF sites and to ensure that all schemes coming forward on the EMF sites contribute towards that strategic infrastructure on an equitable and proportionate basis.
- 2.5 In addition, the SPD will ensure that strategic allocations in the adopted and emerging Local Plans, together with other development within the local authority areas, which are not within the EMF sites but will be unlocked by or significantly benefit from the strategic transport infrastructure delivered to facilitate development of the EMF sites, make appropriate and proportionate contributions towards that strategic transport infrastructure.
- 2.6 The SPD helps facilitate a mechanism (a framework section 106 agreement) to coordinate the funding and delivery of this strategic transport infrastructure from multiple sites through the planning process, as and when those sites come forward for development. The evidential work underpinning the draft SPD establishes the need for shared infrastructure pooled contributions from multiple sites. Ongoing work is also being carried out in order to inform an EMF Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) in due course which will supplement the SPD and provide greater detail on the strategic infrastructure required and apportionment. The EMF IDP will be the subject of further public consultation, once available.
- 2.7 Subject to adoption, the SPD would form a material planning consideration for the determination of any planning application(s) coming forward on the EMF sites, and/or on other allocated sites or development within those administrative areas which would

also be unlocked by or significantly benefit from the strategic transport infrastructure being delivered to facilitate development of the EMF sites.

3. Consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document

- 3.1 A draft of the SPD was consulted on between 23 March and 27 April 2026.
- 3.2 In accordance with Regulations 12, 13, 35 and 36 of the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the draft SPD and supporting documents (Statement of Consultation and Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment) were made available for inspection during the consultation period at the following locations:
- On the Council’s websites:
 - Rushcliffe Borough Council
<https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/supplementary-planning-documents>
 - South Derbyshire District Council
<https://www.southderbyshire.gov.uk/our-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/east-midlands-freeport-strategic-infrastructure-and-contributions-spd>
 - North West Leicestershire
https://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/supplementary_planning_guidance
 - As hard copies at libraries in Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington and Kegworth and at Rushcliffe Borough Council’s Customer Centre, Belvoir Road, Coalville.
- 3.3 The consultation was facilitated by Rushcliffe Borough Council on behalf of all three Councils. All respondents were able to submit their comments during the consultation period through the following methods:
- By email to localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk
 - By post to Planning Policy, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West Bridgford, NG2 7YG.
- 3.4 Several stakeholders were directly notified as part of the consultation, as set out at Appendix 1.
- 3.5 Table 1 sets out a list of stakeholders, statutory consultees and interested parties who responded to the consultation.

Table 1: List of all responses received

Response received
Historic England
National Highways

Natural England
Derbyshire Wildlife Trust
National Grid Electricity Transmission
Broxtowe Borough Council
Councillors Way, Bilin and Thomas (Leake Ward, Rushcliffe Borough Council)
Normanton on Soar Parish Council
East Leake Parish Council
Kegworth Parish Council
Repton Parish Council
Cllr Sutton (Independent Party NWLDC Councillor / Kegworth Parish Council Councillor)
Uniper
SEGRO
Goodman
Junction 24 Consortium
Barratt Redrow, Clowes Developments and Wilson Enterprises Consortium
Hallam Land
Coaker Trusts
Rula Developments
Parker Strategic Land
Strategic Land Group
Davidsons Developments Ltd
Caesarea Development Holdings (Caesarea) and Harworth Group (Harworth)
The Trustees of Lord Crawshaw 1997 Discretionary Settlement (the Whatton Estate) and Bryan and Colin Jarrom
Road Haulage Association
Protect Diseworth (marked as Resident 5)
Save Aston & Weston Village Environment (SAVE) (marked as Resident 6)
4 x Other Resident Responses [names redacted]

- 3.6 A summary of all responses received, grouped by issue/theme, is provided at Table 2 in Section 5 of this report.

4. Modifications to the Supplementary Planning Document

4.1 In response to the main issues arising from the consultation responses received, a number of modifications have been made to the SPD where this is considered to be appropriate. The modifications are summarised below and are also referred to in Table 2.

4.2 In summary, the principal modifications made to the SPD are:

- Text has been added to make it clear that the SPD is not part of the development plan and not development plan policy. From the date of its adoption, the SPD will be a material planning consideration in planning determinations under the Planning Acts (as defined in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) in relation to the SPD Sites (which have been clarified – see below). However, at the date of adoption of the SPD, the EMF IDP will not have been issued for public consultation, published or endorsed by the Local Planning Authorities, and therefore the detail of the Strategic Infrastructure required will not have been established. Until such time as the EMF IDP has been published and endorsed by the Local Planning Authorities, following public consultation, only limited weight should be given to the SPD as a material planning consideration by the Local Planning Authorities, though the “in principle” need for pooled contributions set out in this SPD (which may include works in kind in accordance with the SPD) in relation to Strategic Infrastructure has been established by the SPD at the date of adoption and carries weight as a material planning consideration in that regard. This is relevant to the local planning authorities’ application of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which provides that in determining planning applications the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where reference is made in the SPD to something being ‘required’ or a ‘requirement’, that something ‘will’, ‘must’ or is ‘expected’ to be provided, then that must be understood in the context of this SPD being material planning consideration and not a development plan document (paragraph 1.17);
- Further clarification has been added in relation to the proposed EMF IDP, including:
 - that the EMF IDP will include estimated costs for identified strategic infrastructure, as well as (where possible) timescales for delivery and the body anticipated expecting to deliver each item (paragraph 1.7);
 - that the EMF IDP will be accompanied by an appropriate evidence base including viability evidence (paragraph 1.10);
 - that the basis on which contributions are sought will be considered as part of the IDP preparation (paragraph 2.9.1(d)); and
 - that the IDP will be the subject of public consultation, following which the IDP is expected to be endorsed by the respective appropriate committee

and/or Cabinet of the local planning authorities, prior to it being brought into use for the purposes of the SPD (paragraphs 1.10-1.11.)

- Further clarification has been added around how 'Other Benefitting Development Sites' will be determined, including that these are expected to include development sites immediately adjacent to the EMF Sites which form part of or are related to development of an EMF Site. It has also been clarified that 'Other Benefitting Development Sites' will also be 'SPD Sites' and a key has been added to the plan at Appendix 4 to assist (paragraph 1.4.)
- Text has also been added to explain that the EMF IDP will identify which SPD Sites are intended to contribute towards which items of Strategic Infrastructure, as far as is reasonably practicable at the stage of EMF IDP endorsement by the local planning authorities (paragraph 1.7);
- Text has been added to clarify that it is intended that the substance of this SPD (possibly in a different format, for example a Supplementary Plan where possible) will continue to apply once the adopted local plans cease to have effect and the local planning authorities will work together to achieve that (paragraph 1.20);
- Reference has been added to the East Midlands Gateway Phase 2 DCO application including proposed highway mitigation works to M1 J24 (paragraph 1.21.1(a)(i)(1));
- The description of the proposed development of the Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station Site has been amended and further reference to the Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station Local Development Order has been added (paragraph 1.21.2(a)(i));
- The strategic infrastructure identified in respect of Ratcliffe has been amended to include reference to strategic landscape and visual mitigation measures including to address heritage (paragraph 1.21.2(d)(i)(5));
- The strategic infrastructure needed to deliver the EMIP site has been reviewed and reference to the M1 J24 Improvement Scheme removed, in light of the representations received and an understanding that the EMIP site is unlikely to have a substantial impact on M1 J24 (paragraph 1.21.3(d));
- Other minor amendments have been made to the description of strategic infrastructure for all 3 EMF Sites (paragraphs 1.21.1(d), 1.21.2(d) and 1.21.3(d));
- Further clarification has been added in relation to the application of CIL in Rushcliffe Borough (paragraph 1.22.2);
- It has been clarified that public sector funding may be sought towards the strategic transport infrastructure (paragraph 2.9.1(c));
- Reference to circumstances where roads will be expected to be offered for adoption has been removed (paragraph 2.11);
- Reference has been added to current RICS valuation standards applying to financial viability assessments (paragraph 2.13.3); and

- Minor typos and grammatical errors have been corrected.

4.3 Alongside the SPD, a Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Assessment document was also issued as part of the consultation. This document has been updated to take into account applicable consultation responses in respect of the SEA, add further explanation to support the conclusions and make it clear that it is a screening opinion in respect of Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Assessment. The comments of statutory consultation bodies have been sought in advance of the respective Cabinet meetings and the conclusions remain unchanged.

5. Summary of Responses received to the Supplementary Planning Document

5.1 Over the course of the five-week public consultation undertaken concurrently across North West Leicestershire District, South Derbyshire District and Rushcliffe Borough, a total of 32 representations were received from a range of stakeholders, statutory consultees and public consultees. Table 2 below provides a summary of the comments received, grouped by theme/topic, against which a response has been provided.

Table 2: Summary of representations received and a response to the comments raised.

No.	Respondents	Section Reference/Topic	Summary of Comments	Response to Comments
Lawfulness and scope of SPD				
1	Broxtowe Borough Council	Background & Policy Context	Highlighted recent changes to planning regulations in relation to SPDs, and the need for updated references within the document (para 1.16).	Noted. Modifications proposed at paragraph 1.20 of the SPD.
2	Cllr Sutton Kegworth Parish Council Resident 3 The Strategic Land Group Protect Diseworth Save Aston & Weston Village Environment	Procedural Approach	Concerns on whether the SPD remains within the lawful scope of a supplementary planning document. SPD should be scaled back to provide guidance on the implementation of existing adopted policies only with any mechanisms that amount to new policy being progressed through the Development Plan Document Process.	The SPD is within the lawful scope of a supplementary planning document. There is no new policy being introduced by the SPD, which has been prepared pursuant to and in order to provide guidance to support adopted local plan policy which is referred to in the SPD. The SPD makes it clear that it is not part of the development plan but will be a material planning consideration for the local planning authorities in making planning determinations, with explanation given as to the weight it will carry until the related IDP is published and endorsed (explained further below and in paragraph 1.17 of the SPD). Also, the strategic transport infrastructure works referred to in the SPD are essentially an evolution

	Davidsons Developments Ltd Hallam Land SEGRO Barratt Redrow, Clowes Developments and Wilson Enterprises Consortium			of those transport works that are already envisaged as part of the relevant local plans.
3	Goodman	EMIP	Support reorder to move EMIP behind EMAGIC and Ratcliffe in the document order to reflect spatial proximity to M1 J24.	SPD amended to reflect request.
4	Davidsons Developments Ltd Hallam Land SEGRO Barratt Redrow, Clowes Developments and Wilson Enterprises Consortium The Strategic Land Group	Procedural Approach	Concerns relating to whether the SPD has an appropriate policy context in all the relevant adopted Local Plans to which it can be properly described as being supplemental. Consider an SPD cannot be supplemental to emerging policies that are yet to be adopted.	Noted. The SPD is clear that it does not form part of the development plan and is intended to be adopted by each local planning authority pursuant to adopted local plan policy not emerging local plan policy. The adopted plan policies to which the SPD relates are set out in the SPD. This includes generic policies relating to development, developer contributions and infrastructure.

5	Protect Diseworth	Procedural Approach	Unacceptable that those communities within NWLDC will have no voice in decisions relating to the SPD made or influenced by either South Derbyshire CC and Rushcliffe CC who will have neither regard nor responsibility for the wellbeing or best interests of NWLDC residents and which collectively could outvote NWLDC.	<p>The draft SPD has been the subject of comprehensive public consultation, which has been run concurrently across North West Leicestershire District, Rushcliffe Borough and South Derbyshire District.</p> <p>Local stakeholders, including residents, will have the opportunity to comment and make representations in relation to any planning applications on the strategic applications coming forward on the EMF sites when they are submitted and the local planning authorities will consider mitigation and/or compensatory measures at that time.</p>
6	Protect Diseworth Junction 24 Consortium	Procedural Approach	Concern regarding level of promoter involvement/influence over the content and direction of the SPD and concerns around impartiality whether the document can be reasonably regarded impartial expression of planning guidance.	<p>The SPD aims to ensure the coordinated and collaborative delivery and funding of the necessary strategic infrastructure required to support development of the three EMF sites and to ensure that all schemes coming forward on the EMF sites contribute towards that strategic infrastructure on an equitable and proportionate basis.</p> <p>Whilst East Midlands Freeport, given their remit to support the development of the three tax sites, have assisted with the preparation of the draft SPD alongside their appointed consultant team, all work was undertaken alongside discussion and coordination with all three relevant local planning authorities as well as the County Authorities within which the EMF sites are located and the SPD has been promoted by the relevant local planning authorities, not East Midlands Freeport. Such collaborative working is common-place in relation to the production of emerging draft Supplementary Planning Documents in England.</p> <p>Following liaison with the Planning Policy teams at each authority, the draft SPD was presented to the relevant Committees/Cabinets in line with local governance requirements.</p>

				<p>The authority to formally consult, adopt, publish, and give weight to an SPD rests with each local planning authority and Council officers at the three local planning authorities have been clear throughout in this regard.</p> <p>The solicitors independently assisting EMF are an entirely separate part of the firm from that part advising any parties on any Development Consent Order process, with full information barriers in place as is common-place, and there is no conflict of interest arising.</p>
7	Save Aston & Weston Village Environment	Procedural Approach	Concerns regarding the complexity of the consultation material and absence of any public meetings or online events to communicate the SPD. Request that consultation should be re-run.	The consultation on the SPD has been carried out in accordance with statutory procedures and the Councils' own consultation processes. The consultation documents have been available on the Councils' websites and hard copies have also been available to view throughout the 5 week consultation process. This is considered to be an appropriate and robust approach to consultation and has allowed a meaningful period in which consultees have had an effective opportunity to consider and submit representations on the documents.
8	Save Aston & Weston Village Environment	Procedural Approach	Queries regarding other Rushcliffe Borough Council Documents on the consultation page.	The consultation link through Rushcliffe.gov.uk links to the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents page. The Affordable Housing, Design Codes, Developer Contributions, Low Carbon & Sustainable Development, Solar Farms & Wind Energy documents referenced in the SAVE response are currently adopted Rushcliffe Borough Council SPDs further down on the SPD page of the website and for clarity did not form part of this consultation. The consultation was clear that it related to this SPD.
9	Resident 3	Procedural	The SPD reduces transparency, limits public scrutiny and limits the	This SPD helps facilitate a mechanism (a framework section 106 agreement) for securing shared infrastructure pooled contributions

			role of elected local planning authorities in decision making.	<p>through the planning process. The framework section 106 agreement will be developed by the three local planning authorities jointly.</p> <p>If adopted, the SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of any subsequent relevant planning application, subject to the limited weight to be given to the SPD until the related IDP is published and endorsed by the relevant local planning authorities (explained further below and in paragraph 1.17 of the SPD). All planning applications will still be determined by their respective local planning authorities in line with legal governance procedures.</p>
Local Policy / Planning Application Matters				
10	National Highways		Would welcome more clarity on identifying individual development's impacts on the highway network.	Noted. This will be considered at a high level as part of the highway modelling work being undertaken to inform the EMF IDP and at a more detailed level when planning applications come forward.
11	National Highways		Consider that where trigger points for mitigation are identified, the framework section 106 agreement and individual section 106 agreements should make clear that occupation is not permitted until the appropriate SRN mitigation has been constructed and open to traffic.	The SPD already contains reference to the Local Planning Authority using conditions to prevent development and/or occupation of relevant phases of the development in advance of the necessary Strategic Infrastructure being in place.

12	Historic England	Heritage	<p>References to historic environmental contributions could be made more explicit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Heritage is not specifically mentioned for EMIP * Suggest EMAGIC para 1.17.2 amended to read “Strategic landscape and visual mitigation measures including to conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets and their setting.” * Ratcliffe text should make specific reference to conserving and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and their setting as part of required landscape and mitigation measures. 	<p>This SPD is focused on the delivery of strategic highways infrastructure. However, we note that heritage is referred to in relation to EMAGIC and we have agreed that it could also be relevant to Ratcliffe, so have added the same wording there. This will be considered further as part of the IDP preparation.</p> <p>Heritage impacts and any necessary mitigation would also be considered through the planning application process.</p>
13	National Grid	General	<p>SPD represents an opportunity to highlight the presence of NGET assets. Without appropriate acknowledgement of the NGET assets within and adjacent to the site, the SPD risks being less effective. Recommendations for wider area planning for protecting existing NGET assets and enabling future network development.</p>	<p>The SPD is focused on the delivery of strategic transport infrastructure. National Grid assets are beyond the remit of the SPD and will need to be considered by applicants through the necessary licensing and permitting processes.</p>

14	Repton Parish Council	Infrastructure	Need for the document to define the requirement to address the impact of the EMIP workforce travel on the neighbouring settlements and require it to be addressed in the SPD as part of the fundamental infrastructure.	As part of the planning applications for strategic employment sites, including the EMIP site, it is anticipated that Travel Plans will be prepared to set out how workers will travel to work, including via active travel and public transport. This SPD is focussed on the delivery of strategic infrastructure, but travel plans are referenced as a potential site-specific measure that may be included in the section 106 agreement.
15	Normanton on Soar Parish Council East Leake Parish Council	General	SPD should be strengthened to ensure local impacts are fully assessed and mitigated.	The impact of development of the respective strategic sites, including the EMF sites, would be considered on a site-by-site basis during the planning application process in the usual way and mitigation and/or compensatory measures will be considered by the local planning authority at this stage.
16	Normanton on Soar Parish Council East Leake Parish Council	Infrastructure Delivery	SPD lacks sufficient guarantees /should be strengthened to ensure infrastructure will be delivered ahead of development, particularly transport improvements.	The EMF IDP will consider timescales and triggers for the delivery of strategic transport infrastructure. Any site specific infrastructure requirements and related phasing will be considered as part of individual planning applications and the Framework S106/S106 process.
17	Normanton on Soar Parish Council	General	SPD should be strengthened to ensure rural communities are protected from adverse effects.	The impact of development of the respective strategic sites, including the EMF sites, would be considered on a site by site basis during the planning application process in the usual way and mitigation and/or compensatory measures will be considered by the local planning authority at this stage.
18	East Leake Parish Council	General	The SPD prioritises strategic growth over local mitigation, with no clear mechanism to ensure	The SPD recognises that there will be a need for site specific infrastructure, but the focus of the SPD is on ensuring the delivery and funding of strategic transport infrastructure on an equitable and

			affected communities receive proportionate benefits.	proportionate basis. The local impact of development of the respective strategic sites, including the EMF sites, would be considered on a site by site basis during the planning application process together with any mitigation and/or compensatory measures that may be required.
19	Save Aston & Weston Village Environment	Active Travel	Given the Freeport's green aspirations, a robust Transport Strategy should promote rail with a strong focus on rail improvements and potentially electrification.	This is outside of the remit of the SPD. Rail specific requirements will be included within the site specific allocation policies.
20	Junction 24 Consortium Uniper	SPD error	Plan at Appendix 5 is out of date and incorrectly sourced.	Noted. This is not part of the updated SPD.
21	Resident 1	General	Unnecessary development resulting in loss of farmland and risks food security.	These are development management considerations when planning applications come forward. Allocation of the EMF and other strategic sites through the emerging Local Plans are being prepared which will assess the loss of farmland in their Sustainability Appraisals underpinning the Local Plans.
22	Resident 2	General	Expansion of infrastructure will make congestion worse.	Infrastructure expansion will be subject to appropriate testing/consideration through the development management process at the point of an application being submitted.
23	Resident 2	General	Concerns around environmental impact from additional vehicle movements.	Environmental impacts of additional vehicle movements will be subject to appropriate testing/consideration through the development management process, and any applications.

24	Resident 2	General	No reference to where workers will live.	<p>Strategic housing allocations will be included as part of the emerging Local Plans, alongside strategic employment site allocations.</p> <p>As part of the Planning Applications for strategic employment sites, including the EMF sites, it is anticipated that Travel Plans will be prepared to set out how workers will travel to work, including via active travel and public transport.</p>
25	Resident 4	Active Travel	An Active Travel Study should form part of the EMF IDP. SPD is vague about the schemes that will be required for 'active travel' which will make negotiation of contributions for active travel infrastructure difficult.	Active travel requirements would be set at a Local Plan level, with any site specific requirements included in the site specific allocation policies. It is not anticipated that this would be included in the SPD or as part of the EMF IDP.
IDP				
26	Coaker Trusts	Strategic Infrastructure Land	<p>The SPD should recognise that not all contributions will be measured with monetary commitments. There should be recognition of safeguarding land to enable the proposed infrastructure improvement works at Junction 24 to come forward.</p> <p>Para 2.9.3 is unacceptable and strongly opposed. A blanket transferring of land to another authority or body, with no compensation or confirmation of</p>	<p>It is envisaged that there would be land equalisation agreements between landowners which would cover the provision of strategic infrastructure land. This will be assessed and considered as part of the IDP work.</p> <p>To the extent that landowners have not equalised between themselves for necessary strategic infrastructure, the Framework S106 mechanism provides a mechanism to help ensure fair and equitable contributions are made. The reference in the SPD to land transfers to be assumed at nil land value does not mean that there is no compensation or consideration payable to the landowner; rather it means that for planning viability purposes in relation to a Framework S106 mechanism,</p>

			<p>how and when the infrastructure works are to be delivered would not be acceptable. Works in kind principles should be applied.</p>	<p>land will be assumed to be transferred at nil value for the purposes of calculating relevant planning obligation contributions and/or works in kind for strategic infrastructure. The actual land value in relation to any land transfers for strategic infrastructure delivery will remain a matter to be agreed between landowners, subject to a dispute resolution mechanism to be included in a framework S106 Agreement. Paragraph 2.9.4 of the SPD covers the situation where equalisation agreements are not agreed or entered into – the framework section 106 agreement will provide that in this situation the developer shall submit to dispute resolution (arbitration or expert determination) and following determination the equalisation agreement will be entered into. Therefore, there is a mechanism in place to deal with any disputes on equalisation agreements so that these are resolved by an expert or arbitrator and such decision will be binding on the parties to the section 106 agreement.</p> <p>Works in kind in lieu of planning obligations may be provided with the agreement of the relevant local planning authority.</p>
27	<p>Cllr Sutton East Leake Parish Council Kegworth Parish Council Resident 3 The Strategic Land Group Leake Ward Councillors Protect Diseworth Goodman</p>	Procedural Approach	<p>Concerns around proceeding with the SPD without the EMF IDP, full viability evidence and strategic transport modelling being available/agreed.</p> <p>Clarification on subsequent consultations on the EMF IDP/evidence base requested.</p>	<p>This is noted and understood. The draft SPD has been amended to include an explanation of how the SPD is intended to operate in advance of the IDP being published (paragraph 1.17). The EMF IDP and evidence base (including viability evidence and strategic transport modelling) will be the subject of public consultation and the EMF IDP endorsed before it is published and used for the purposes of the SPD.</p> <p>EMF IDP</p> <p>Further highways modelling work currently being undertaken across Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire (commissioned by the EMF), as well as highways evidence separately being prepared by the</p>

	<p>Parker Strategic Land</p> <p>Save Aston & Weston Village Environment</p> <p>National Highways Uniper</p> <p>Davidsons Developments Ltd</p> <p>Hallam Land Junction 24 Consortium</p> <p>Coaker Trusts</p> <p>SEGRO</p> <p>The Whatton Estate & Bryan and Colin Jarrom</p> <p>Barratt Redrow, Clowes Developments and Wilson Enterprises Consortium</p>			<p>respective local planning authorities to inform respective emerging Local Plans, is continuing and will inform an EMF IDP.</p> <p>The EMF IDP methodology is designed to provide an evidence-led Infrastructure Delivery Plan that identifies the transport and highway interventions required to support the development of the EMF Sites, alongside clear cost and programme details. The section of the SPD which sets out what the IDP will cover has been expanded (paragraph 1.7.)</p> <p>Work is underway on the EMF IDP and it is anticipated that a draft EMF IDP will be issued for public consultation in late 2026. This public consultation draft EMF IDP will be accompanied by an appropriate evidence base including viability and further transport evidence – this has been clarified in the SPD. Following that public consultation, the local planning authorities expect to take the IDP to Cabinet for endorsement.</p> <p>The EMF IDP will supplement this SPD and provide greater detail on the strategic transport infrastructure required, costings and programme, which will, in turn, inform the contributions and obligations to be included in the framework S106 agreement.</p> <p>Transport Evidence</p> <p>Substantial transport assessment work and modelling has been carried out to date in relation to the three EMF sites which is considered sufficient to underpin the evidence base for the SPD in relation to each of these sites at this stage, to be further worked on as part of a common EMF IDP pursuant to the SPDs.</p> <p>Viability Evidence</p>
--	---	--	--	---

				Viability work will be undertaken alongside preparation of the EMF IDP which will be used to inform decisions concerning what strategic transport infrastructure is to be included and what levels of contributions or provision are to be sought (or what other funding may be sought).
28	National Highways	EMF IDP	The SPD is not prescriptive about which organisation(s) would lead on the delivery of any required infrastructure and this should be made clear in the EMF IDP and the framework section 106 agreement. These documents should also set out how contribution will be managed and prioritised when funding is pooled.	Noted. The EMF IDP has been amended to make it clear that the EMF IDP will, where possible, seek to identify the body which is anticipated to deliver each item of Strategic Infrastructure. The management and prioritisation of contributions will be dealt with in the framework section 106 agreement.
29	Uniper	Procedural Approach	EMF should work with relevant landowners and developers to produce the EMF IDP. The SPD should clearly set out it will only come into force once the EMF IDP has been consulted upon and adopted.	Noted. The EMF IDP will be consulted on in due course and be accompanied by evidence on a number of areas e.g. transport and highway evidence, viability evidence. The SPD has been updated to confirm the approach (see row below).
30	Uniper Davidsons Developments Ltd Hallam Land Caesarea & Harworth	General	Concerns around an absence of detail around how the SPD might be implemented in practice, which could create significant uncertainty for developers and delay the delivery of infrastructure	Noted. As referred to above, the SPD has been amended to clarify that from the date of its adoption, the SPD is a material planning consideration in planning determinations in relation to the SPD Sites, but, as it is recognised that at the date of adoption of the SPD the EMF IDP has not yet been published or endorsed by the Local Planning Authorities, until such time as the EMF IDP has been published and

	Junction 24 Consortium Coaker Trusts SEGRO The Whatton Estate & Bryan and Colin Jarrom		improvement works (including the J24 Consortium proposal).	endorsed by the Local Planning Authorities, only limited weight shall be given to the SPD as a material planning consideration by the Local Planning Authorities, though the “in principle” need for pooled contributions set out in the SPD (which may include works in kind in accordance with the SPD) in relation to Strategic Infrastructure has been established and should carry weight as a material planning consideration in that regard in the meantime. This should ensure there is no unacceptable degree of uncertainty for developers. The SPD is designed to help facilitate the delivery of strategic infrastructure improvements, not hinder it.
31	Cllr Sutton Kegworth Parish Council	Infrastructure Delivery	Queries around National Highways endorsement of the infrastructure packages at J24 and when their agreement will be obtained.	National Highways have responded to the SPD consultation. As noted in their response, National Highways have been actively engaged in discussions around the development of the EMF and other major sites in proximity to J24 for some time. The full extent of mitigation required however, will only be understood following completion of the transport evidence and progression of the EMF IDP.
32	Road Haulage Association	General	Lack of consideration for the road freight sector, favouring other modes such as rail and air. Unclear to what degree projects included will be built to suit freight operators	Comprehensive modelling and evidence base gathering is taking place to identify the strategic infrastructure requirements. Given the nature of likely development at the EMF sites, considerations around road freight will be a core element of this work.
Framework S106 / Site-Specific S106 Agreements				
33	Uniper Davidsons Developments Ltd Hallam Land		Unclear what ‘Strategic Infrastructure’ is and how this differs from ‘Site Specific Infrastructure’ and ‘site-wide	‘Strategic Infrastructure’ and ‘Site Specific Infrastructure’ are defined in the SPD. The SPD seeks to cover other strategic transport infrastructure, so is not solely focused on M1 J24, although that is clearly a significant part of the strategic infrastructure requirement. ‘Site Specific

			remediation strategies'. The SPD should set out a clearer objective, for example focussing solely on works to increase capacity through M1 J24. Site Specific Infrastructure' and 'site-wide remediation strategies' may be better addressed through separate agreements (as needed) outside the scope of the SPD.	Infrastructure' will be covered in the framework section 106 agreement (see paragraph 2.8 of the SPD for an explanation of how this will work).
34	Cllr Sutton Kegworth Parish Council The Whatton Estate & Bryan and Colin Jarrom Barratt Redrow, Clowes Developments and Wilson Enterprises Consortium	Equalisation	SPD does not adequately address what happens if equalisation agreements cannot be reached. Lack of justification for imposing commercial arrangements onto developers where no existing contract exists.	Paragraph 2.9.4 of the SPD covers the situation where equalisation agreements are not agreed or entered into – the framework section 106 agreement will provide that in this situation the developer shall submit to dispute resolution (arbitration or expert determination) and following determination the equalisation agreement will be entered into. Therefore, there is a mechanism in place to deal with any disputes on equalisation agreements so that these are resolved by an expert or arbitrator and such decision will be binding on the parties to the section 106 agreement.
35	The Strategic Land Group	Exemptions	Concerns around limited exemptions for contributing and absence of justification for why the parameters were selected. Disproportionate and unjustified to require all development above	There is a threshold, as stated in the SPD, below which sites won't be considered. If they are above that threshold then they <i>may</i> need to contribute, in accordance with and subject to CIL regulation 122. The IDP will consider which strategic allocation sites will be expected to contribute towards the strategic transport infrastructure. The IDP will be

			<p>the thresholds to contribute. SPD scope should be limited to strategic allocations directly unlocked by the EMF. Council should be able to identify what types of development this would apply to and in what geographical locations.</p>	<p>the subject of public consultation so representations can be made in relation to that when it is issued for consultation.</p> <p>The SPD makes it clear that other development sites (defined as 'Other Benefitting Development Sites' in the SPD) will only be expected to contribute towards the strategic transport infrastructure identified where it is unlocked by or significantly benefits from that infrastructure. This will be considered by the Local Planning Authorities when the IDP is prepared and also on a case by case basis as planning applications come forward. Such sites are expected to include any development site immediately adjacent to the EMF Sites where such a development site forms part of or is related to development of an EMF Site. Any section 106 obligation must satisfy statutory tests set out in Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 in any event to ensure it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p>
36	Leake Ward Councillors, Rushcliffe Borough Council	Site Specific Infrastructure	<p>Concerns regarding omissions for site specific infrastructure needed to deliver the Ratcliffe on Soar site.</p>	<p>The EMF IDP currently being prepared will set out requirements for strategic highways infrastructure and the associated costs. Other site specific infrastructure would be considered further at planning application stage, or would be set out in the site specific allocation policy in the emerging Local Plan. Site specific infrastructure is envisaged to be included in any framework section 106 agreement and this is explained in the SPD (see paragraph 2.8 of the SPD).</p>
37	Parker Strategic Land	CIL	<p>Important that there is no overlap or double counting between S106 obligations and CIL charges towards the 'strategic</p>	<p>As set out in paragraph 2.9.8 of the SPD, the framework section 106 agreement shall include a provision that if CIL were to be introduced which applied to any of the SPD Sites, the framework section 106 Agreement would be adjusted so that there would be no increased</p>

			infrastructure’ where CIL is in place/may come in to operation in the future.	financial burden on landowners or developers of land within the allocation site as a result. The current position in relation to CIL is summarised at paragraph 1.21 of the SPD.
	Barratt Redrow, Clowes Developments and Wilson Enterprises Consortium	Procedural Approach	Risk that the approach to s106 contributions proposed to be taken is via a tariff; if this is the case it should be taken forward via the Community Infrastructure Levy and not s106 contributions.	The approach is a framework section 106 agreement and not a tariff, as explained in the SPD.
Sites which may need to contribute to infrastructure				
38	Broxtowe Borough Council	Appendix 4	Suggest adding a key to the map in Appendix 4 to understand when the SPD may apply to development outside of the designated Freeport sites.	The criteria as to where contributions may be sought is set out in paragraph 1.4 of the SPD and could comprise any development parcel within any of the EMF Sites, Other Benefitting Strategic Allocation Sites or Other Benefitting Development Sites within the relevant local authority areas. A key has been added to Appendix 4 to clarify the area relevant for the purposes of ‘Other Benefitting Development Sites’.
39	Cllr Sutton Kegworth Parish Council Resident 3 The Strategic Land Group Leake Ward Councillors Protect Diseworth	Other Benefitting Development	Queries/concerns regarding the thresholds and study area used in the SPD and identification of “Other Benefitting Development” and Strategic Allocation Sites. Concerns as to how the assessment of whether sites should contribute will be applied consistently and transparently, and how contribution requests will	There is a threshold, as stated in the SPD, below which sites won’t be considered. If they are above that threshold then they <i>may</i> need to contribute, in accordance with and subject to CIL regulation 122, which does not need to be specifically referred to since it applies as a matter of law. Further clarificatory text has been added to the SPD, which explains that it applies to ‘SPD Sites’ defined as the EMF Sites, the Other Benefitting Strategic Allocation Sites and Other Benefitting Development Sites (all as defined.) Other Benefitting Strategic Allocation Sites and Other Benefitting Development Sites will be sites which will be unlocked by or significantly benefit from the strategic infrastructure. The identification of SPD Sites will be progressed through the EMF IDP (so far as is

	Rula Developments Limited Parker Strategic Land Davidsons Developments Ltd Hallam Land Caesarea & Harworth SEGRO The Whatton Estate & Bryan and Colin Jarrom National Highways		meet the tests under Regulation 122 of the CIL regulations.	reasonably practicable at that stage) which will be the subject of public consultation. It has also been clarified that Other Benefitting Development Sites are expected to include any development site immediately adjacent to the EMF Sites where such a development site forms part of or is related to development of an EMF Site (paragraph 1.4 of the SPD). The SPD provides a mechanism (a framework section 106 agreement) for achieving a consistent approach towards the contributions which will be sought from SPD Sites towards the delivery and funding of necessary strategy transport infrastructure. This framework section 106 agreement will be developed by the three local planning authorities jointly and used as a base template document for all section 106 agreements being negotiated by the local planning authorities in relation to relevant development as and when planning permission is sought for that development. This will ensure the approach taken by the three Local Planning Authorities is consistent and transparent.
40	Leake Ward Councillors, Rushcliffe Borough Council	Site Specific Infrastructure	Ratcliffe on Soar site is not entirely within freeport area and there should be equivalent contributions from those areas outside.	The SPD has been amended to make it clear that Other Benefitting Development Sites are expected to include any development site immediately adjacent to the EMF Sites where such a development site forms part of or is related to development of an EMF Site and will therefore be expected to contribute.
SEA				
41	Cllr Sutton Kegworth Parish Council	Strategic Environmental Assessment	Clarification as to whether SEA screening has been undertaken and, if so, the screening conclusion and its basis. If screening has not	The SEA and HRA document published with the consultation draft SPD has been updated to take into account applicable consultation responses in respect of the SEA, add further explanation to support the conclusions and make it clear that it is a screening opinion in respect of Strategic

	Protect Diseworth		<p>been undertaken, it should be carried out before the consultation proceeds further.</p> <p>Concern on reliance on historic assessments without re-evaluating cumulative impacts.</p>	<p>Environmental Assessment and Habitats Assessment. The comments of statutory consultation bodies have been sought in advance of the respective Cabinet meetings and the conclusions remain unchanged.</p>
Environmental / BNG / Green Infrastructure				
42	Natural England	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Net Gain	<p>Strategic Green Infrastructure should be coordinated throughout the large developments within the surrounding area, together with BNG sites to provide connected habitats for the maximum benefit for nature recovery and access for people to nature.</p>	<p>Strategic green infrastructure is outside of the remit of the SPD, which is focused on the delivery of strategic transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Local Nature Recovery Strategies in effect across Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Leicestershire set out the priorities for BNG provision and habitat enhancements across the strategic sites, including the EMF sites, coming forward in the respective Local Plans. This will help to coordinate Strategic Green Infrastructure and does not need to be duplicated in the SPD.</p> <p>It is also anticipated that each respective emerging Local Plan will also have its own Green Infrastructure policy.</p>
43	Derbyshire Wildlife Trust	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Net Gain	<p>Government requirements on NSIP are due to be published November 2026. A clear biodiversity strategy should be developed that could underpin the ongoing EMF development and ensure meaningful gains that deliver locally and for the respective Local Nature Recovery Strategies. The strategy could help</p>	<p>Green infrastructure and Biodiversity Net Gate is outside of the remit of the SPD, which is focused on the delivery of strategic highways infrastructure.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Local Nature Recovery Strategies in effect across Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Leicestershire set out the priorities for BNG provision and habitat enhancements across the strategic sites,</p>

			build partnerships to enhance biodiversity locally.	including the EMF sites, coming forward in the respective Local Plans. This will help to coordinate Strategic Green Infrastructure. It is also anticipated that each respective emerging Local Plan will also have its own Green Infrastructure policy.
Other SPD representations				
44	Uniper	General	Response makes 17 recommendations for amends to the SPD which are not all covered here individually.	We have updated the SPD where appropriate in response to these comments.

Appendix 1: List of consultees and stakeholders consulted

Rushcliffe Borough Council

Active Notts	Barton Willmore
Active Travel England	Barwood Development Securities Limited
Aerodynamics Dry Leasing Ltd	Barwood Homes
Aitchison Raffety Ltd	Barwood Land
Aldergate Properties Ltd	Bassetlaw District Council
Alexandra Blue Ltd	Bellway Homes
Alverton & Kilvington Parish Meeting	Bidwells
Alverton and Kilvington Parish Council	Bingham Town Council
Amber Valley Borough Council	Bleasby Parish Council
Andrew Granger & Co	Bloor Homes
Andrew Hiorns Town Planning Limited	BNP Paribas Real Estate
Angelorange Ltd	Bottesford Parish Council
Arc Partnership	Boyer Planning
Arcstone Ltd	Bradair Aviation Consultancy Ltd
Arquiva	Bradmore Parish Council
Ashfield District Council	Braemore Group
Aslockton Parish Council	British Gas
Aspbury Planning Ltd	British Gypsum
Astill Planning Consultants Ltd	British Horse Society
Avison Young	Broughton and Dalby Parish Council
AXIS	Broxtowe Borough Council
Barkestone, Plungar and Redmile Parish Council	BT Openreach
Barratt David Wilson Homes	Bulcote Parish Council
Barratt David Wilson Homes and Averill Land Limited	Bunny Parish Council
Barratt Homes	Burton Joyce Parish Council

Barratt Redrow	Burton on the Wolds, Cotes and Prestwold Parish Council
Barton in Fabis Parish Council	Cadent Gas
Camelot Pictures Ltd	Davidsons Developments Ltd
Cameron Homes	Deeley Homes
Canal & River Trust	Defence Infrastructure Organisation
Car Colston Parish Meeting	Define Planning and Design Ltd
CarneySweeney	Derby City Council
Carter Jonas	Derbyshire County Council
Caythorpe Parish Council	DevPlan
CBP Architects	DIO Operations
Cerda Planning	DLP Planning Ltd
Ceylon Tea Growers Association Limited	DLUHC
CFS Flight Training Ltd	DPP UK Ltd
Change.org	Duchy of Cornwall
Charnwood Borough Council	East Bridgford Parish Council
Charter Point	East Bridgford St Peter's Cofe Academy
Chave Planning	East Leake Academy
Chris Wade Aviation Ltd	East Leake Parish Council
Churchill Living and Mccarthy Stone Retirement Lifestyles	East Midlands Ambulance Service
Civil Aviation Authority	East Midlands Building Consultancy
Clark Architectural Services	East Midlands Combined County Authority
Clawson, Hose and Harby Parish Council	East Midlands Freeport Ltd.
Clipston Parish Meeting	East Midlands Railway
Colston Bassett Parish Council	Edwalton Municipal Golf and Social Club

Colwick Parish Council	EE
Compass North Aviation	Elston Parish Council
Copperfield Ltd	Elton-on-the-Hill Parish Meeting
Cora Homes Ltd	Emery Planning
Costock Parish Council	Endurance Estates
Cotgrave Town Council	Environment Agency
Country Land and Business Association	Erewash Borough Council
Countryside Properties	Evolve Planning & Design
CPRE	FH Farms Ltd
Creagh Concrete	Fisher German LLP
Crofts Development Ltd	Flawborough Parish Meeting
Cropwell Bishop Parish Council	Flintham Parish Council
Cropwell Bishop Primary School	Forestry Commission
Cropwell Butler Parish Council	Frazer Halls Associates
Crown Estate	Freeths LLP
Crown Estates Commissioners	Friends of Sharphill Wood
CT Planning	G Longley Planning & Property Services
Cushman & Wakefield	Garden History Society
DAQS Ltd	Gascoines Group Limited
David Lock Associates	Gedling & Sherwood CC
David Wilson Home East Midlands	Gedling Borough Council
General Aviation Awareness Council	Integrated Care Board
Girlguiding Nottinghamshire	Jelson Homes
Gladman Developments Ltd	JG Woodhouse & Sons
Gleeson Homes	Jigsaw Homes

Gotham Parish Council	Jigsaw Planning Limited
Grace Machin Planning & Property	JMS Planning & Development
Granby cum Sutton Parish Council	John A Wells Limited
Grantham Canal Society	John Church Planning Consultancy Ltd
Green 4 Planning	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd
Gunthorpe Parish Council	Kase Aero Ltd
GVA	Kegworth Parish Council
Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments	Keyworth Conservation Area Advisory Group
Hallam Land Management Limited	Keyworth Labour Group
Harris Lamb Limited	Keyworth Parish Council
Harris Land Management	Kingston on Soar Parish Council
Harworth Group	Kinoulton Parish Council
Hathern Parish Council	Kittyhawk Aerodrome
Havenwood Construction Limited	Kneeton Parish Meeting
Hawksmoor	Knightwood Developments Limited
Hawksworth Parish Meeting	Lambert Smith Hampton
Hayhoe Marine Services	Landstack
Health and Safety Executive	Langar cum Barnstone Parish Council
Heaton Planinng	Langridge Homes Ltd
Heaton Planning	Leaders Romans Group
Hickling Parish Council	Leicester City Council
Historic England	Leicestershire County Council
Hollins Strategic Land	Leicestershire Police and Crime Commissioner
Holme Pierrepont And Gamston Parish Council	Leith Planning
Home Builders Federation	Pleydell Smithyman Ltd

Homes England	Lidl GB Ltd
Hortons' Estate Limited	Lightsource BP
Hoton Parish Council	Lockington and Hemington Parish Council
Hoveringham Parish Council	Lone Star Land
HTA Design LLP	Lone Star Land Ltd
IBA Planning Ltd	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish
Iceni Projects	Lucy White Planning
ID Planning	M1 Agency
IDC & Associates	Mansfield District Council
IM Land Limited	Marine Management Organisation
Infraland	Marrons Planning
Inland Waterways Association	Mather Jamie Ltd
Innes England	McCarthy Stone
Inovo Consulting	Meadow School of Riding
Inspired Villages	Melton Borough Council
Midlands Engine	OSVAID
Midlands Land Portfolio Limited	Owthorpe Parish Meeting
Mike Downes Planning Consultant	Oxalis Planning
Ministry of Defence Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding	Paget Estate
Mobile Operators Association	Parker Strategic Land Limited
National Air Traffic Services Ltd	Pegasus Group
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	Pell Frischmann
National Grid Electricity Distribution Plc	Penland Estates
National Grid Electricity Transmission	Persimmon Homes
National Highways	Peter Tyers Associates

Natural England	Peveril Securities Limited & Omnivale Pension Scheme
neighbourhood-planning.co.uk	Planning & Design Group Limited
Nottingham Express Transit	Planning Issues
Network Rail	Planning Potential
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Planning Prospects Ltd
Newton Nottingham LLP	Plumtree Parish Council
Newton Parish Council	PMC Land and Planning Limited
Nexus Planning	Positive Homes Ltd
NHS England	Profectus Town Planning
NHS Nottm & Notts ICB	Q+A Planning Ltd
NHS Property Services	Quiet Tiger Aviation
nineteen47	Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council
Normanton on Soar Parish Council	Radcliffe-on-Trent Residents Assoc
Normanton-on-Soar Parish Council	Railfuture
Normanton-on-the-Wolds Parish Council	Rapleys LLP
North West Leicestershire District Council	Ratcliffe Marina
Northern Trust Land Ltd	Ratcliffe on Soar Parish Meeting
Notcutts Ltd	Ratcliffe-on-Soar Parish Meeting
Nottingham City Council	Redrow Homes East Midlands Ltd
Nottingham City Transport	Regatta Way Sports Club
Nottingham Credit Union	Regen
Nottingham Green Party	Rempstone Parish Council
Nottingham Students' Partnership	Rentplus UK
Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers	RES
Nottinghamshire CPRE	rg+p Ltd.

Nottinghamshire County Council	Richard Ling & Associates
Nottinghamshire Police	Richborough Commercial
Nottinghamshire Ramblers	Richborough Estates Ltd
Nottinghamshire Sports Properties	Ridge and Partners LLP
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Royal Mail
Orchestra Land	Ruddington Parish Council
Orston Parish Council	Rula Developments Ltd
Office of Rail and Road	Rural Insight Land & Development
Rural Solutions	Syerston Parish Meeting
Rushcliffe Green Party	TASCforce
Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group	Taylor Wimpey
Rushcliffe School	Taylormade Group
Samworth Farms Limited	Terra
Savills UK Ltd	Tetlow King Planning
Sawley Parish Council	The Coal Authority / The Mining Remediation Authority
Saxondale Parish Meeting	The Cranmer Group of Parishes
Scarrington Parish Meeting	The Crown Estate
Screveton Parish Meeting	The Gardens Trust
Sequence Ltd	The General Aviation Awareness Council
Seven Homes	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Severn Trent	The Planning Bureau
Sharphill Action Group	The Planning Inspectorate
Sharphill Management Services	The University of Nottingham
Shelford Parish Council	The Victoria Centre Partnership

Shelton Parish Meeting	The Woodland Trust
Sherwood Conservatives	Theatres Trust
Shouler and Son	Theta Squared Aviation
Sibthorpe Parish Meeting	Thomas Heap
South Notts Association for Visually Impaired Group	Thoroton & District Branch - Newark Conservative Association
Spawforths	Thoroton Parish Meeting
Sport England	Three
St James' Church NOS	Thrumpton Parish Meeting
Stagfield Group	Tithby and Wiverton Parish Meeting
Stainton Planning	Tollerton Against Backdoor Urbanisation
Stanford on Soar Parish Council	Tollerton Parish Council
Stanford-on-Soar Parish Council	tor&co
Stantec UK	Trebor Developments LLP
Stanton on the Wolds Parish Council	Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board
Stanton-on-the-Wolds Parish Council	Trustees of Hammond Farm
Stathern Parish Council	Turley
Staunton Parish Meeting	T/as Hawk Helicopters
Stoke Bardolph Parish Council	Uniper UK Limited
Strata	Unite Notts Retired Members Branch
Strawson Group Investments Ltd	Unite the Union
Strutt and Parker	Upper Broughton Parish Council
Sustainable Transport Nottingham	Upper Saxondale
Sutton Bonington Local Residents Committee	Vale Planning Consultants
Sutton Bonington Parish Council	Vistry Homes Ltd
Swift Aero Maintenance	West Bridgford LAF Traffic and Transport Group

Swords Aviation	West Bridgford Local Area Forum
West Leake Parish Council	West Bridgford Hockey Club
West Leake Parish Meeting	Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
Western Power Distribution	Wood PLC
Whatton in the Vale Parish Council	Woodall Homes Ltd
Whitefields Farm	Woodland Trust
Widmerpool Parish Council	WSP
William Davis Homes	www.GeoGreenPower.com
Willoughby on the Wolds Parish Council	Wymeswold Parish Council
W Westerman Ltd	Wysall And Thorpe-in-the-Glebe Parish Council
Via East Midlands	Zesta Planning Ltd
Wellesbourne Matters	Over 1,500 private consultees, other businesses and other organisations

North West Leicestershire District Council

Clerk to Calke Parish Meeting
Clerk to Ulverscroft Parish Meeting
Carter Jonas
Savills
Planware Ltd
Leicester Centre for Integrated Living
Ashby de la Zouch Endowed Schools Foundation
VIP - Volunteering Partnerships
Moira Furnace Trustees
Ashby Canal Trust
Friends of Ashby Bath Grounds

Citizen's Watch
Design Council
Campaign for Real Ale Ltd
Guide Association UK
RSPB
CPRE (Leicestershire)
Roberts Coaches
dglg planning
Mono Consultants (represents all Comms Companies)
Stephenson College
Loughborough Council of Faiths
Action Deafness
Age UK
The Garden History Society
MOSAIC (user-led disability group)
Twentieth Century Society
Creative Leicestershire
Garden History Society
Council for British Archaeology
CPRE
The Georgian Group
Leicester Council of Faiths
Moira Replan
Marlene Reid Centre (Community Action)
The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings & The Victorian Society

VISTA
Ibstock in Bloom
Sustrans
Trent Barton
St David's Vicarage
Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust
National Trust
Press for Change
MENCAP
National Forest Charitable Trust
Leicestershire County Council
Woodland Trust
Friends of Thringstone
Ancient Monuments Society
Coalville Brownies, Guides and Rainbows
Packington Nook Residents Association
Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council
NFU East Midlands Region
St David's Church
Castle Donington Community Appraisal Group
People's Forum
Inland Waterways Association
Theatres Trust
CAMRA
Harlow Brothers Ltd

Greenhill Community Church
Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant
The Loughborough Gospel Halls Trust
Leicestershire Local Access Forum
Ibstock Brick Ltd
Castle Rock High School
Home Builders Federation
Trent Barton
Everything is Somewhere Ltd
Friends of Ashby Bath Grounds
Castle Donington Parish Council
Packington Parish Council
Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Parish Council
Breedon on the Hill Parish Council
Natural England
Historic England
Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust
Environment Agency
Canal and River Trust
Sport England East Midlands Region
East Midlands Airport
Health and Safety Executive
NHS Property Services Ltd
Homes England
East Midlands Chamber

Severn Trent
Sport England
The Coal Authority
The National Forest Company
Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Natural England
Leicestershire Fire and Rescue
Marine Management Organisation
Network Rail Property
Department for Education
Highways England
Clerk to Sawley Parish Council
Clerk to Breaston Parish Council
Clerk to Weston on Trent Parish Council
Clerk to Bagworth and Thornton Parish Council
Clerk to Hathern Parish Council
Clerk to Overseal Parish Council
Clerk to Shakerstone Parish Council
Clerk to Woodhouse Parish Council
Clerk to Shepshed Town Council
Clerk to Stanton under Bardon Parish Council
Clerk to Markfield Parish Council
Clerk to Ticknall Parish Council
Clerk to Hartshorne Parish Council
Clerk to Ratcliffe on Soar Parish Meeting

Clerk to Shardlow and Great Wilne Parish Council
Clerk to Melbourne Parish Council
Clerk to Nailstone Parish Council
Clerk to Netherseal Parish Council
Clerk to Newton Regis, Seckington and No Man's Heath Parish Council
Clerk to Clifton Campville Parish Council
Clerk to Kingston on Soar Parish Council
Chilcote Parish Meeting
Clerk to Thrumpton Parish Council
Clerk to Smisby Parish Council
Clerk to Aston on Trent Parish Council
Clerk to Twycross Parish Council
Clerk to Woodville Parish Council
Stetton en le Field Parish Meeting
Clerk to Coton-in-the-Elms Parish Council
Clerk to Sutton Bonnington Parish Council
Blaby District Council
Broxtowe Borough Council
Charnwood Borough Council
Derby City Council
Derby City Council
Derbyshire County Council
Erewash Borough Council
Erewash Borough Council
Harborough District Council

Leicester City Council
Leicestershire County Council
Lichfield District Council
Melton Borough Council
North Warwickshire Borough Council
Nottingham City Council
Nottinghamshire County Council
Oadby and Wigston Borough Council
Rugby Borough Council
Rushcliffe District Council
South Derbyshire District Council
Staffordshire County Council
Warwickshire County Council
Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board
Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Integrated Care Board
CCG/NHS
Taylor Wimpey
Cadent
National Grid
Leicestershire County Council
GraceMachin Planning&Property
Oxalis Planning Ltd
Savills
BNP Paribas

Tetlow King Planning
Inspire Planning
GVA
Vale Planning Consultants
Pegasus Group
Redrow Homes Limited
Duckworth Planning and Design
Fisher German LLP
Heatons
Iceni
The Coach House
Copesticks Ltd.
Andrew Large Surveyors
Persimmon Homes North Midlands
M and M Lettings
Measham Parish Council
MPC
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd
Harworth
David Wilson Homes East Midlands
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd
Fox Bennett
Muller Property Group
Willder.com
SF Planning Ltd

Savills
Chave Planning
Sansom Clarke Ltd
nineteen47
Savills
Apusprojects
DLP Planning Ltd
GVA
Howkins and Harrison
Savills
rg+p Ltd.
Appleby Magna Parish Council
Jelson
Kingswood Homes
Andrew Large Surveyors
Harworth Group
Brackley Property Developments Ltd
Planning and Design Group (UK) Limited
Astill Planning Consultants Ltd.
Walton & Co (Planning Lawyers) Limited
Andrew granger & Co Ltd
Barton Willmore
Future Energy Performance
Sirius Planning
Leicestershire Police

Federation of Small Businesses
planinfo
Walsingham Planning (Representing Whitbread)
ID Planning
Barratt and David Wilson Homes North Midlands
Trebor Developments
Lichfields
Turley
DWD Property and Planning
Fisher German LLP
Hodgetts Estates
Forest Holidays
Clarendon Land and Development
Miller Homes
Intro Crowd
Richborough
Nineteen47
Delta Planning
King West
Mather Jamie
Mulberry Land
Avison Young on behalf of National Gas Transmission
FP McCann
Berrys
Bloors

Gladman Development
Planning Potential
Barwood Land
Gladman Development
Longhurst Group
Cornwall Buildings
Marble Property Services Ltd
Appleby Environment
David Granger Architectural Design Limited
Barton Willmore
DevPlan
Stantec
Avison Young
R3Design Developments Ltd
Rosconn Group
Planning Prospects Ltd
Spawforths
Boyer Planning
Cerda Planning Ltd
Hollins Strategic Land
National Grid
Hallam Land Management
Class Q Ltd
RG-P
Harris Lamb

Gladman Developments Ltd
KC Planning and Development
Hallam Land Management
Taylor Wimpey
RG+P
Breedon Northern
Pegasus Group
Barwood Homes
Planning Prospects Ltd
Carter Jonas
JJM Planning
Housing 21
Wonderful Homes Limited
NHS Property Services Ltd
Lucy White Planning
Sports Facilities Development Officer Active Together (formerly Leicester Shire & Rutland Sport)
Habinteg Housing Association
Alec MacGregor Associates
Burnett Planning
CT Planning
Adams Hendry Consulting
Evolve Planning & Design
Pegasus Group
Avison Young
WSP

Evolve Planning & Design
Copperfield L & P Ltd
Thomas Taylor Planning
Metacre Ltd
Savills Uk Ltd
Turley
JLL
Define Planning and Design Ltd
Brown & Co.
Hodgetts Estates
Gladman Developments Ltd
Carney Sweeney
William Davis
James Martin Consultancy
Oxalis Planning Limited
Mather Jamie
I Gray Consulting
Knights
Marrons Planning
Define Planning and Design Ltd
WSP
Chief Executive, Diocesan Secretary and Cathedral Administrator, Diocese of Leicester
Williams Homes
Midlands Connect
Trammell Crow

Barratt Development East
Carney Sweeney
Strata
National Highways (Midlands)
Richborough
Boaz Real Estate
Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd.
CBRE Ltd
Clerk of Osgathorpe Parish Council
Mather Jamie
Protect Diseworth
Carter Jonas
Stantec
Barwood Land
Director - Stone Planning Services
Chair of the Melbourne Civic Society
Stantec
Caddick Group
Chairperson, Willesley Environment Protection Association (WEPA)
Country Land and Business Association (CLA)
ELG Planning
WSP
Firstplan
Mather Jamie
Walton Homes

Rural Solutions
CBRE Ltd
Caddick Group
David Wilson Homes East Midlands
HA Law
National Highways (Midlands)
East Midlands Freeport
Alexander Bruce Estates
Leicestershire Local Access Forum
DHL International (UK) Ltd
Strategic Land Group
CBRE
C. Green Planning
Savills
Pegasus Group
Satplan
Turley
Nurton Developments
Define Planning & Design Ltd
Stantec UK Ltd
TWB Town Planning Consultants
Marrons
Gladman Developments Ltd
Stantec UK Ltd
Charley Heritage Group

Coleorton Heritage Group
Crowne Estate
NFU Midlands
The National Forest Company
Sustrans (East Midlands)
Active Travel England
Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust
Friends of Thringstone
The Scout Association
Hugglescote Heritage Society
Whitwick Historical Group
Equality & Human Rights Commission
Coalville Heritage
Savills
Ashby Civic Society
Environment Agency
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Clerk to Castle Gresley Parish Council
Clerk to Austrey Parish Council
Clerk to Draycott and Church Wilne Parish Council
Clerk to Newton Regis, Seckington & No Man's Heath Parish Council
Campaigne for Real Ale (CAMRA)
Marble Homes Ltd
Planning and Design Group
Stoford Properties Ltd

Twentieth Century Society
Oxalis Planning
Allison Homes
Maplevale Planning
Twenty5
Taylor Wimpey
William Davis
Four Counties Architecture
Persimmon Homes
Carter Jonas
Four Counties Architecture
Leicester City Council
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council
Spawforths
Oxalis Planning
Redrow
Pick Everard
Sport England
South Derbyshire District Council
Marrons
Define Planning and Design
Kier
Stantec
Andrew Large Surveyors
Ashby Town Council

National Highways
Mather Jamie
The Coal Authority
Packington Nook Residents Association
Derbyshire County Council
Fisher German
PM Group
Castle Donington Parish Council
Ibstock Parish Council
Kegworth Parish Council
Packington Parish Council
Whitwick Parish Council
Leicester Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board
Clowes Developments
Firstplan

South Derbyshire District Council

1Mini	2012 Partnership Homes Ltd
Ainscough Strategic Land	ALPAC
ALYeomans	Amber Valley Bourough Council
Amy Taylor Affinity Learning Partnership	Ancient Monuments Society
Andrew Large Surveyors Ltd	Aspbury Planning
Astill Consultants	Aston on Trent Parish Council

Avison Young	Avril Record
AYeomans	B & Y C Gambini
Bagshaws	Bailey-English Studio
Barratt Homes	Barrow Upon Trent Parish Council
Barton Willmore	Bellway Homes
Bi Design	Bloor Homes
Bolsover District Council	Boyer Planning
Brackley Property Developments	Bretby Parish Council
Burnaston Parish Council	Burnett Planning
Bus Link	Caddick Land
Cameron Homes	Canal and River Trust
Carden Group	Carney Sweeney
Carter Jonas	Cass Associates
Castle Gresley Parish Council	Catesby Estates
Cauldwell Parish Meeting	CBRE Ltd
Centrica	Cerda Planning
Chave Planning	Chesterfield Borough Council
Church Broughton Parish Council	Church Gresley Infant & Nursery School
Church Broughton Primary School	Churchill Living

Citizens Advice Mid Mercia	Civic Aviation Authority
Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Copesticks
Coton in the Elms Parish Council	Council For British Archaeology
CPRE	Crime Prevention Design Advisor
CT Planning	Cushman & Wakefield
Dalbury Lees Parish Council	David Wilsom Homes (East Midlands)
Davidsons Developments Ltd	Dean Lewis Estates
Define Planning & Design	Deloitte
Department for Transport	Derby Airfield
Derby City Council	Derby Sandiacre Canal Trust
Derby & Derbyshire CCG	Derby Canal
Derbyshire Association of Local Councils	Derbyshire County Council
Derbyshire Swift Conservation Project	Derbyshire Wildlife Trust
Derbyshire Association of Local Councils	Derbyshire Dales District Council
Derbyshire Fire and Rescue	Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
Derbyshire Heathcare NHS Foundation Trust	Derwent Valley Trust
Design30	Diocese of Derby
DKA Commercial Ltd	DLP Consultants
DPDS consulting	Drakelow Parish Council

DTH Services Ltd	E.ON UK Ltd
East Midlands Airport	East Midlands Combined County Authority
East Staffordshire Borough Council	East Midlands Homes
Egginton Parish Council	Egginton Airfield
ELG Planning	Elvaston Parish Council
Emery Planning	Environment Agency
Erewash Borough Council	Etwall Parish Council
Etwall Preschool	Etwall Cricket Club
Evolve Planning and Design	Findern Parish Council
Fisher German	Forestry Commission
Foston & Scropton Parish Council	Framptons Planning
Freeths	Futures Housing Group
Gainsborough Property	Gibson Technology
Gladman	Goodman UK Ltd
Green 4 Developments	GRL Planning
Hallam Land	Harris Lamb
Harrow Estates	Hartshorne Parish Council
Hartshorne Residents Association	Harworth Group

Hatton Parish Council	Hawksmoor Property Services
HBF	Heaton Planning
High Peak Borough Council	Highways England
Hilton Parish Council	Historic England
Howard Sharp & Partners LLP	Indigo Planning
Ingleby Parish Meeting	Innova Renewables Developments Ltd
IVC Brunel Healthcare	JF Planning
JMI Planning	JTA Accountants
JVH Planning	Kings Newton Residents Association
Kingsmere Holdings	Land Allocation Ltd
Land Project UK (LPUK)	Land & Planning Consultants
Landmark Planning	Lathams
Lichfield District Council	Lichfields
Lightsource bp	Linton Parish Council
Linton Primary School	Lion Planning
Lucy White Planning	Lullington Parish Meeting
MAG East Midlands Airport	Marrons Planning
Marston on Dove Parish Meeting	Martin Hubbard and Associates
Mather Jamie	Mcarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles

Melbourne Civic Society	Melbourne Parish Council
Melbourne Infant School	Midland Land Portfolio
Midland Heart	Midland Rural Housing
Midland Searches	Miller Homes
Mining Remediation Authority	National Forest Company
National Grid	National Highways
National Trust	National Grid
Natural England	Netherseal Parish Council
Network Rail	Newton Solney Parish Council
Newton Park Residents	NHS Derby and Derbyshire Integrated Care Board
NHS Property Services	Nightingale Land
Nineteen47	North West Leicestershire District Council
Northern Trust	North East Derbyshire District Council
NT Land	Overseal Parish Council
Oxalis Planning	P&DG
Parker Strategic Land	Pearlsfield Planning
Pegasus Group	Persimmon Homes
Peveiril Homes Ltd	Places for People

Planning & Design Practice Ltd	Planning Issues
Planning Prospects	Planware Ltd
Police & Crime Commissioner Derbyshire	Posford
Providence Land Ltd	R & M Property Group Ltd
Radbourne Parish Meeting	Ramblers Association
Rapleys Planning	Redrow Homes Ltd
Redrow	Repton Parish Council
Repton School	Repton Village Society
rg-p	Richborough Estates Ltd
Rosliston Parish Council	Roger Bullivant Ltd
RPS Group	Rula Developments Ltd
Rural Solutions	Sale & Davys Church of England Primary School
Salloway	SAVE
Savills	Severn Trent Water
Shardlow and Great Wilne Parish Council	Shardlow Heritage Centre
Smisby Parish Council	South Staffs Water
Sport England	SSA Planning
St James's Property Management	St Modwen Homes

St Philips	Stantec
Stanton By Bridge Parish Meeting	Stenson Fields Parish Council
Stone Planning Services	Strategic Land Group
Strata	Walk Wheel Cycle Trust
Sutton on the Hill Parish Meeting	Swifts Local Network
Tarmac Trading Ltd	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Tensi Properties Ltd	Tetlow King Planning
The Derby and Derbyshire Local Access Forum	The Planning Bureau Ltd
Theatres Trust	The Sirius Group
Ticknall Parish Council	Trenport Investments Limited
Trent and Dove Housing Association	Trusley Parish Meeting
Turley	Town Planning Consultants Ltd
Twyford and Stenson Parish Meeting	Vista Planning
Vodafone & O2 Mobile	Wain Estates
Walsingham Planning	Walton on Trent Parish Council
Western Power	Weston-on-Trent Parish Council
Wheelton Bros Ltd	William Davis Homes
Willington Parish Council	Wilson Bowden

Woodland Trust	Woodville Parish Council
Woolf Bond Planning	WSP
Over 1,000 private consultees.	