

# **Mansfield District Council**

## **Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) 2021 (Draft)**

February 2021

**[www.mansfield.gov.uk](http://www.mansfield.gov.uk)**



**Mansfield**  
District Council

# **Consultation Statement December 2021**



# Contents

Section	Page
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Who was consulted?	2
3.0 How was the consultation undertaken?	4
4.0 Who responded?	7
5.0 What was said and what is our response?	9
6.0 Conclusion	56
 Appendix 1 - Pre-consultation engagement with elected members	
- <i>Summary of ideas from councillors (email)</i>	58
- <i>Summary of ideas from councillors – (raised at the workshop)</i>	62
 Appendix 2	
- <i>Letter / email</i>	66
- <i>MDC staff email</i>	68
- <i>Press release</i>	69
- <i>Social media posts</i>	71
- <i>Poster</i>	72

## 1.0 Introduction

### Purpose of this statement

- 1.1 It is important that the council engages with the community throughout the preparation of the Local Plan and other planning policy documents. In doing this we need to ensure we follow the council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and the Regulations<sup>1</sup> governing the development plan process.
- 1.2 In this case we were consulting on an updated draft version of our Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). This consultation took place for six weeks between 11 June 2021 and 26 July 2021.
- 1.3 This statement explains how we consulted and how we have taken the views of consultees into consideration during the preparation of the SCI.

### Statement of Community Involvement

- 1.4 We want to consult the public on planning matters as we believe it helps us to make better informed decisions. The Statement Community Involvement is a document that sets out the consultation activity that we will carry out at various times in the production of the Local Plan and guidance documents, and in the determination of planning applications. It explains how you can get involved and have your say.

### Structure of this Statement

- 1.5 This statement is structured as follows:
  - **Section 2** gives details on who was consulted including the list of specific and general consultation bodies,
  - **Section 3** sets out how the consultation was undertaken,
  - **Section 4** outlines who responded including the chosen response methods,
  - **Section 5** provides a summary of the main issues raised and our response, and
  - **Section 6** provides a conclusion to the consultation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

## 2.0 Who was consulted?

- 2.1 We sent a notification, either electronically or by post, which explained the purpose of the consultation event and invited representations to 2,687 individuals and organisations registered on the local plan database. This included the following specific and general consultation bodies.

### Specific consultation bodies:

Arqiva	Mobile UK
Ashfield District Council	N Power
Bassetlaw District Council	National Grid Property
Bolsover District Council	Natural England
BT Plc	Network Rail
Chesterfield Borough Council	Newark & Sherwood District Council
Clipstone Parish Council	NHS Property Services
Coal Authority	North East Derbyshire District Council
Cuckney Parish Council	Nottingham City Council
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	Nottinghamshire County Council
Department for Transport	Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service
Derbyshire County Council	Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner
E.ON Central Networks	O2 UK Ltd
E.ON Energy Ltd	Perlethorpe-cum-Budby Parish Meeting
East Midlands Councils	Rainworth Parish Council
East Midlands Trains	Rufford Parish Council
Edwinstowe Parish Council	Severn Trent Water Ltd
Environment Agency - Lower Trent Area	Severn Trent Water Ltd. (Mansfield)
Gedling Borough Council	Sherwood Forest Hospitals NHS Trust
Health & Safety Executive	Shirebrook Town Council
Highways England	Vodafone Ltd
Historic England	Warsop Parish Council
Homes and Communities Agency	
Home Builders Federation	
Hutchison 3G UK Ltd	
Mansfield & Ashfield Clinical Commissioning Group	
Mansfield and Ashfield Strategic Partnership	

**General consultation bodies:**

Albert Street Residents Association	Health & Safety Executive
Alzheimers Society	Mansfield 2020 Ltd
Ancient Monuments Society	National Farmers Union
APTCOO	Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre
Ashfield Links Forum	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
British Horse Society	Planning Inspectorate
Citizens Advice Bureau	Royal Society for the Blind (Nottinghamshire)
Country Land and Business Association Ltd	Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
Disability Nottinghamshire	Sport England
Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce	Stagecoach East Midlands
Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Local Enterprise Partnership	Sure Start Meden Valley
Derbyshire County Council	Sure Start Ravensdale
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	The Woodland Trust
Forest Town Community Council	
Groundwork Creswell, Ashfield & Mansfield	

### 3.0 How was the consultation undertaken?

- 3.1 A number of consultation methods were used in the preparation of the SCI to invite people's views and comments on it. The list below sets out the details of the methods of engagement used.

#### **Pre-consultation engagement**

- 3.2 In developing the SCI document there were internal consultations carried out with other departments / teams at the council. This included the development management and technical support teams. The comments made were fed into the document.
- 3.3 Consultation was also carried out with elected members of Mansfield District Council. The results of this are included at Appendix 1 and have informed the final draft of the SCI when appropriate.

#### **Statutory requirements**

- 3.4 There is no statutory requirement to consult on the SCI. However the council undertook the following which would be a statutory requirement of a development plan document:
- ***Consult with specific and general consultation bodies*** - Consultation was undertaken with the specific and general consultation bodies recorded in the local plan database. All organisations were sent a letter either electronically or by post including details about the consultation together with a link to the relevant webpage (<https://mansfield.objective.co.uk/portal/>) where access to the report and online questionnaire was made available. This letter was also emailed / posted to all members of the public on the database, and can be viewed in Appendix 2.

#### **Statement of Community Involvement**

- 3.5 Although this is the document we were consulting on, we made sure that we were in accordance with it, and the council's existing Statement of Community Involvement which was adopted in 2017:
- ***'Statement of Community Involvement 2021 (Draft)'*** - A draft Statement of Community Involvement was produced by the council. It was the key document used during the consultation period to gather the views of individuals and organisations.

- ***Making copies of documentation available for inspection*** - Copies of the document and the questionnaire were made available to view at the following venues:
  - Mansfield District Council - Civic Centre, Chesterfield Road South
  - Clipstone Village Library - First Avenue
  - Forest Town Library - Clipstone Road West
  - Ladybrook Library - Ladybrook Place
  - Mansfield Library - West Gate
  - Mansfield Woodhouse Library - Church Street
  - Rainworth Library - Warsop Lane
  - Market Warsop Library - High Street
- ***Letters*** - Letters were sent either electronically or by post explaining the purpose of the consultation event to 2,687 individuals and organisations registered on the Local Plan database. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix 2.
- ***Website*** - A PDF copy of the document was available to view and download from the council's website. The document was also available on the Local Plan Consultation Portal to allow people to comment online.
- ***Press release*** - A press release was issued by the council on 11 June 2021. This gave details of the consultation period and where copies of the document were available for viewing. A copy is included in Appendix 2.
- ***Drop-in sessions*** – We held four drop-in sessions where members of the public could come along and find out more information. These were as follows:
  - ***1 July 2021 (1pm until 6.30pm)***  
***West Gate (near Primark / WHSmith), Mansfield town centre***
  - ***8 July 2021 (1pm until 6.30pm)***  
***The car park at The Talbot / Co-op, Market Warsop***
  - ***15 July 2021 (1pm until 6.30pm)***  
***Outside the Old Town Hall, Mansfield town centre***
  - ***22 July 2021 (1pm until 6.30pm)***  
***Mansfield Woodhouse Market Place***
- ***Social media (Facebook and Twitter)*** - The council's Facebook page 'Mansfield District Council - My Mansfield' was updated during the consultation period to notify people about the consultation and provide them with links to the




consultation portal. At the start of the consultation period the council had 15,578 followers on Facebook.

Tweets were also sent via the council's Twitter account (@MDC\_News) to help raise awareness of the consultation. Please see Appendix 2 for details. At the start of the consultation period the council had 6,755 followers on Twitter.

## 4.0 Who responded?


- 4.1 From those notified about the consultation on the Statement of Community Involvement, a total of 16 people / organisations responded. Between them they made 17 responses. All 17 responses included general comments on the SCI, and 4 went on to answer all questions.

### Amount of comments per question:




- 4.2 The following breakdown of respondent type shows that the majority of responses were submitted from the general public and statutory organisations. This is shown overleaf.

### Respondent type:



4.3 The majority of comments were submitted via email. The chosen method of response of all the respondents is set out below.

### Response method:



## 5.0 What was said and what was our response?

5.1 A summary of the comments received and our response is set out below.

Organisation details (if applicable)	Comment ref	Officer summary	MDC response to comment	Action
<b>General comments</b>				
Natural England	SCI2021/1	Supportive of meaningful and early engagement of the general community, community organisations and statutory bodies in both shaping policies and the determination of planning applications. Unable to comment on individual SCIs but advice can be found at <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-get-environmental-advice">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-get-environmental-advice</a> . Please send consultations to <a href="mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk">consultations@naturalengland.org.uk</a> .	Noted.	Add email address specified to the local plan database.
N/A	SCI2021/2	Understands the need to update the SCI but concerned that doing so in the name of Covid is detrimental to the community in the long run.  Concerned that "Neighbourhood Forums" have been replaced by "Neighbourhood Councils" as Forest Town Community Council	We need to update our SCI every five years. As well as adding what we will do in circumstances such as the COVID-19 pandemic we also needed to refer to the now adopted Local Plan. The changes made regarding COVID-19 (or similar) will only apply in circumstances such as another lockdown.  Noted. We will refer to 'neighbourhood forums' in the final document.	N/A  Amend all references to 'neighbourhood councils' to

		<p>is a forum and not a council, but is very active and close to the community.</p>		'neighbourhood forums'.
		<p>Table 5: Concerned that this lists 'other' consultees that MAY be contacted and involved "where appropriate" i.e. discretionary rather than compulsory or necessary. It also leaves the method of publication completely at officer's discretion and doesn't give a minimum standard.</p>	<p>We use the term 'may' as not all consultations are appropriate for all consultees. For example a first draft / evidence gathering consultation on infrastructure with key providers will not be suitable for wider consultation. It would be misleading to say that we 'will' consult 'other' consultees. Again, we 'may' use all publication methods listed which is always the aim. However, sometimes our consultation timescales don't align with the publication timescales for 'My Mansfield', and site notices, leaflets / postcards are not always appropriate / cost effective. For example, a consultation on affordable housing guidance would not require site notices as it is not site specific.</p>	N/A
		<p>Also would like to know how verbal comments made at 'informal drop in events' will be recorded. Considers all comments, verbal or documented, should be considered equally.</p>	<p>We cannot register verbal comments made at consultation events. Commenting on a planning matter, whether a policy or a planning application, is a formal process and we need comments to be made in writing to ensure accountability and that they are not misinterpreted. Recording verbal comments may leave officers open to accusations of making up comments, or not recording them</p>	N/A

			correctly. Less formal events, such as Planning for Real workshops, may allow for verbal comments to be recorded.	
		Para 2.19: Asks who decides what is a valid comment? Also concerned that only summaries of representations will be published as does not ensure transparency.	A valid comment is set out in Table 1. We publish comments in full on our consultation portal, however, for brevity our consultation statements contain summaries. For example, the consultation statement for the Local Plan was 563 pages.	N/A
		Para 3.13: Concerned that the 2021 document states that site notices are "SOMETIMES displayed" where the 2017 SCI stated they are "used in MOST CASES". Objectors to planning applications often state the lack of site notices and elected members have, for a long time, been concerned that residents need more information about planning applications in their area.	Site notices are not always displayed as the planning legislation only requires a notification letter or a site notice. For example we would not erect a site notice for a minor development that is far from public view. It was considered that using the term 'most cases' was misleading.	N/A
		Para 3.20: Concerned that this removes the option to make comments by telephone which doesn't help those unable to comment in writing. As per 'informal drop in events', the need to comment in writing calls into question what will happen with verbal comments made?	The 2017 SCI incorrectly stated that comments can be made over the telephone and was misleading. As stated previously, commenting on a planning matter, whether a policy or a planning application, is a formal process and we need comments to be made in writing to ensure accountability. Recording verbal comments may leave officers open to accusations of making up comments, or not recording them correctly.	N/A

		<p>Para 3.23 states comments "may be displayed or summarised" where as in the 2017 version it stated "will be published in full" and your address as stated in 2021 version "may be displayed" rather than the 2017 version "will be displayed".</p> <p>Concerned that the 2021 SCI replaces "WILL" with "MAY" in many places within the document. It relies far too much on officer's discretion, is wrong, and leaves the community unsure of what will happen.</p>	<p>We currently do not publish neighbour / community comments on planning applications on our website but summaries do appear in the officer reports. However, many other councils do publish comments in full, alongside the address of the consultee. We wanted to future proof the SCI in case the decision is made to publish this information in the future.</p> <p>The use of 'will' in the 2017 version was misleading. As mentioned previously, we have used the word 'may' instead of 'will' throughout the document in order that we do not mislead the public or give false expectations. Officers are professionals and should be trusted to use their judgement when making arrangements for consultations. We will always meet the consultation requirements of planning legislation (which would represent the minimum standard). Most activities listed in the SCI are over and above this.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
N/A	SCI2021/3	<p>Consultee made a number of suggestions to improve the area. Unfortunately these are not relevant for this consultation which seeks to improve how we consult with the public. Suggestions included:</p> <p>A) better access to electric vehicle charging infrastructure and disabled/family friendly sized parking bays;</p> <p>B) take account of air pollution;</p>	<p>Policies in the adopted local plan deal with these issues. Specifically:</p> <p>A) policies P5, RT4, RT5, and IN10;</p> <p>B) policies NE3 and P2;</p> <p>C) policy P5; and</p> <p>D) policies IN2, IN4 and NE2.</p>	N/A

		<p>C) future planning applications should be compatible with the net zero pledge of emissions;</p> <p>D) future planning applications should include green spaces for wildlife/public/private use.</p>		
N/A	SCI2021/4	<p>Comments that email notifications exclude those without access to IT. Questions why the events weren't advertised beforehand, such as with the council tax notification. Considers that this is just a box ticking exercise.</p>	<p>We write to all people / organisations on our database that do not have email addresses. These are people who have expressed an interest in being contacted regarding planning policy matters. We also put out press releases which are picked up by the local newspaper, and put posters up at the Civic Centre and all district libraries (where the document is available to view). We couldn't advertise the consultation beforehand as we couldn't prejudge the decision making process. We try to time our consultations with publication of other council news (such as My Mansfield) in order to reach a wider audience, but this was not possible this time. This is not a box ticking exercise. The council is genuinely interested in how we can consult you better on planning matters.</p>	N/A
Old Meeting House Unitarian Chapel	SCI2021/5	<p>Comments that the MDC website is complex and would benefit from illustrations and signposting. Also comments that community boards could be used to help inform passers-by.</p>	<p>The website used by the council currently does not allow for illustrations to be added but this comment will be passed to the relevant team. In addition we will be streamlining our planning web pages in the near future to make them more user friendly. In relation to the use of community boards, these are owned by Nottinghamshire County Council for the display of their material.</p>	<p>Pass website comment onto relevant team at MDC.</p>



			Planning is a district matter and it may cause confusion about who to contact to make comments etc. Additionally, they tend to be locked and we would require access and permission to display posters / notices.	
Nottinghamshire County Council	SCI2021/6	No comments.	Noted	N/A
Severn Trent Water Ltd	SCI2021/7	No comments.	Noted	N/A
Forest Town Community Council Planning Sub-Committee	SCI2021/8	<p><b>Introduction:</b> The Forest Town Community Council (FTCC) is recognised by MDC as the Tenants &amp; Residents Association for the whole of Forest Town, Mansfield. The Planning Sub-Committee makes submissions on behalf of the Community Council and has on many occasions engaged with MDC on planning matters. It includes people with local knowledge and with extensive experience and understanding of the planning system and the practice of other local authorities across the country with respect to the handling of planning applications.</p> <p><b>Comments on how the consultation is being conducted:</b> Considers that a tracked changes version of the draft SCI or a summary / rationale of changes would have been helpful for consultees to identify what has been modified, removed, added or moved elsewhere in the document.</p>	<p><b>Introduction:</b> Noted.</p> <p><b>Comments on how the consultation is being conducted:</b> This is not something that the council usually provides. However software is available to anyone wanting to draw this comparison themselves.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>

		<p>Considers that an inaccurate rationale was given to the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee (Place) and gave the impression that there were no significant changes beyond those responding to Covid and to petition procedures. Considers there has been a number of material changes.</p>	<p>Other changes made to the document were to simplify the text, correct errors and ensure that any misleading text was removed / replaced.</p>	N/A
		<p>Considers that the SCI should not be signed off without going back to OSC and that a second round of consultation should be undertaken with a comprehensive list of changes and rationale being provided.</p>	<p>The SCI will be going back to OSC Place prior to being signed off by the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Growth. Requesting additional consultation is within the power of the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Growth, however a further round of public consultation (six weeks) is not considered to be a good use of resources.</p>	N/A
		<p>Considers that this consultation is not good enough and that it doesn't meet the requirements of 'formal' consultation as set out in the 2017 SCI, or paragraph 1.13 of the draft SCI ('What you can expect from us'). There is no procedure or explanation of how comments will be used, no clarity regarding whether or not this SCI consultation will give rise to a Consultation Statement, and no clarity regarding Elected Members' powers to accept or reject Officer's recommendations, e.g. as part of the work of the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee (Place).</p>	<p>The consultation carried out on the draft SCI met all the requirements of the 2017 and 2021 (draft) SCIs. 'What you can expect from us' on pages 2 and 3 of the 2021 draft SCI states how we will ensure responses to the consultation are available on our website. The 'providing feedback' section on page 15 explains how comments will be considered and that the council's response will be provided. It is not the role of the SCI to explain the decision making processes of the council; this can be found in the council's constitution.</p>	N/A

		<p>Considers that as COVID-19 restrictions are now being lifted, the review of the SCI is not as urgent and more time could be taken to consider historic and current suggestions and allow for informed consultation. Considers the 2017 SCI to be superior and that specific GDPR or COVID related changes should be in an addendum as per NCC's approach.</p> <p><b>The SCI should take on board Member's suggestions to support greater community involvement:</b> Considers that the changes in the draft SCI are not consistent with the process agreed by Full Council in November 2018. There is no evidence of the assessment of existing consultation arrangements, or of how the draft SCI has been informed by the members' workshop session and the review of what other Nottinghamshire authorities do.</p> <p>Considers that failure to amend the SCI as called for by members increases rather than decreases the gap between the council and its community. Officers assured that the suggestions would be taken on board, in the OSC Place meeting in February 2021, yet no changes were made. It was stated that the SCI had not been drafted to take into account all</p>	<p>Due to the ongoing possibility of further COVID-19 related lockdowns it is considered important to get the 2021 SCI adopted as soon as possible. The previous suggestions have been considered alongside this process and will be contained (where appropriate) within the final version of the document that officers will recommend for adoption. There is a requirement to update the SCI every five years. It is not considered that an addendum would meet this requirement as we would still need an updated SCI by 2022.</p> <p><b>The SCI should take on board Member's suggestions to support greater community involvement:</b> This work has been prepared and will form part of the consultation statement.</p> <p>The suggestions by members have been considered alongside this process and will be contained (where appropriate) within the final version of the document that officers will recommend for adoption.</p>	<p>N/A, although we will move text that relates to COVID-19 restrictions into an appendix rather than having the information within the main document.</p> <p>Include within consultation statement.</p> <p>Include within consultation statement.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>of the comments that came out of the workshop primarily due to COVID-19 and social distancing requirements. But these will be taken into consideration as part of any review as we begin to open up again. Considers that the justification for failing to take these suggestions into account no longer holds, and the time is now right for the Council's review.</p> <p><b>Relevant documents should always be made available on the Planning Portal:</b> Questions why paragraph 1.13 of the Draft SCI states that “responses to consultation are available on our website” but paragraph 3.23 states that comments on planning applications "may" (rather than 'will') be available and notes that they might be summarised. Considers this to be a backwards step compared to paragraph 9.20 of the extant SCI which states: "All comments made on a planning application will be acknowledged and displayed or summarised on our website."</p> <p>FTCC asks for paragraphs 1.13 and 3.23 to be amended to make explicit that the Council will publish in full (with redactions for personal</p>	<p><b>Relevant documents should always be made available on the Planning Portal:</b> Paragraph 1.13 refers to both planning functions within the council - planning policy and development management. Both teams make responses available on our website, either in a consultation statement (policy) or a committee report / officer report (development management). This does not state that the responses are provided in full. The council does not currently publish comments from members of the public on planning applications, but summaries of the key issues raised can be found in the committee / officer report. Paragraph 3.23 reflects this and also gives flexibility should the council decide to publish comments in full in the future.</p> <p>The Planning Advisory Service (PAS) in their 'Planning and GPDR' guidance of June 2021 state:</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	--	---	--	-----------------------

		<p>data as necessary) responses to planning application consultations and correspondence between MDC and developers. Considers that this would move Mansfield closer to common practice at many planning authorities across the country and to FTCC's historic request as part of the 2017 SCI consultation. This referred to amending the MDC website to allow residents to see all planning application consultation submissions and correspondence between the applicant and planners, and to track Section 106 agreements and Environmental Statement screening and scoping consultations. Considers that sufficient time has passed for this to be considered by the Development Services Manager, as stated in the MDC response. Considers that if this is not done, the SCI should explain how people can request this information as part of exercising their rights under the Freedom of Information Act and/or the Environmental Information Regulations. Also considers that if this cannot be done for budgetary reasons during the 2021 business year then a commitment should be made that once funds are available then this information will be routinely provided via the council's Planning Portal.</p> <p><b>The ability of people to make representations using the telephone should be maintained:</b> Requests that the SCI retains the right for</p>	<p>“In the absence of a regulatory requirement [to publish data] it is for LPAs to assess whether publication is “more than just useful, and more than just standard practice. It must be a targeted and proportionate way of achieving a specific purpose”.</p> <p>As the purpose of collecting and processing the data (the consultation responses - which may contain personal and special category data) is to inform the decision maker, it is not considered necessary for this to be made publicly available and therefore the decision has been made not to publish this information. There is information regarding the Freedom of Information Act and the Environmental Information Regulations on our website.</p> <p><b>The ability of people to make representations using the telephone should be maintained:</b> The 2017 incorrectly stated that comments</p>	N/A
--	--	---	---	-----

		<p>members of the community to get involved in planning matters via the telephone as stated in the 2017 SCI. Considers that by removing the right of the community to make objections over the telephone would exacerbate the digital divide. No justification was given in the SCI for the permanent removal of this existing right. As stated by Councillor Wright in the February 2021 OSC Place meeting, this contradicts the need to take reasonable steps to ensure that sections of the community that do not have access to the internet are involved.</p> <p><b>The frequency of site notices should be maintained or expanded:</b> Requests that the SCI retains or expands the current level of site notices enshrined in the extant 2017 SCI rather than reducing the commitment to using such notices as proposed in paragraph 3.13 of the draft SCI, which is a major change.</p> <p>As highlighted by an elected member at the February 2021 OSC Place meeting, site notices are central to making community members aware of planning proposals, particularly as the level of readership of local newspapers has significantly declined. Their existence helps elected members to demonstrate that reasonable steps have been taken by the council to inform the community of planning</p>	<p>can be made over the telephone and was misleading. Commenting on a planning matter, whether a policy or a planning application, is a formal process and we need comments to be made in writing to ensure accountability and that they are not misinterpreted. Recording verbal comments may leave officers open to accusations of making up comments, or not recording them correctly. Less formal events, such as Planning for Real, may allow for verbal comments to be recorded.</p> <p><b>The frequency of site notices should be maintained or expanded:</b> Site notices are not always displayed as the planning legislation only requires a notification letter or a site notice. For example we would not erect a site notice for a minor development that is far from public view. It was considered that using the term 'most cases' was misleading.</p> <p>The council meets all regulations regarding the advertisement of planning applications, including the use of site notices. We do not intend to reduce the amount of circumstances where a site notice would be displayed, we have just made the text within the draft SCI reflect our advertisement processes more accurately in order to ensure it is not misleading. A number of councillors help to</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	--	--	--	-----------------------

		<p>proposals. Considers that failure to use site notices could mean that Planning Applications Committee are not confident that the community has been given a fair chance to share their concerns about a planning application prior to its determination.</p> <p><b>Forest Town Community Council should be included in all consultations:</b> Considers that the expectation that Forest Town Community Council will be involved in consultations should be maintained and strengthened rather than diminished through the use of the word 'may' rather than 'will' in Table 5 (Target Groups). This leaves too much room for doubt as to whether or not FTCC would be consulted. Judgements made about the appropriateness of consultation should not be taken by an officer of the council but by FTCC themselves. Considers that the current proposals could be seen as a backwards step when compared to the extant SCI.</p> <p><b>Residents should be given hard copy notification of Local Plan consultations and other consultations relating to planning documents:</b> Considers that as all members of the community are affected by the Local Plan and associated planning documents, the district council should ensure, as a minimum requirement, that all Local Plan and planning document consultations are accompanied by</p>	<p>advertise planning applications by sharing details with their ward members via newsletters or social media. This is something that any councillor is able to do.</p> <p><b>Forest Town Community Council should be included in all consultations:</b> We use the term 'may' as not all consultations are appropriate for all consultees. For example a first draft / evidence gathering consultation on infrastructure with key providers will not be suitable for wider consultation. It would be misleading to say that we 'will' consult 'other' consultees.</p> <p><b>Residents should be given hard copy notification of Local Plan consultations and other consultations relating to planning documents:</b> The planning policy team consult on multiple documents most years. The council does not have the resources to notify each household each time. (The cheapest option is to have an A5 flyer printed and delivered to every household with 'junk mail'</p>	<p>N/A, although we will amend Table 5 to split statutory consultees from 'other' target groups in order to make this distinction clearer.</p> <p>Continue advertising the local plan database within each publication of My Mansfield.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>written notification posted through the door of each residence as not all of these people have their details registered on MDC's 'Local Plan Consultation Portal'. Suggests that such hard copy notification should provide guidance in plain English about how the consultation could impact upon them and provide details on electronic and non-electronic means for residents to read the relevant documents and communicate their views and where to get assistance if required. This suggestion would require changes to Table 4, Table 5 and paragraph 1.13 under 'ease of access to information'.</p> <p><b>Issues raised at informal drop-in events should be formally recorded:</b> Considers that members of the public would reasonably assume that verbal comments made at a drop-in session will be taken on board as part of the process, particularly 'hard to reach' members of the community who do not make written submissions. Considers that comments should be recorded and how they've been considered should be included in the consultation statement to avoid poor decisions being made that are not informed by local knowledge. Suggests that clear signage should be erected</p>	<p>and costs around £7,000.) We have the consultation portal for this reason so that people who are interested and want to receive notifications can do so. The majority of consultees have email addresses which helps to reduce our costs and is also quicker and more environmentally friendly. When possible we utilise the My Mansfield publication (which goes to every household) to advertise consultations, however our consultation timescales don't always align with the publication timescales. We do however have a planning policy / local plan update within each My Mansfield publication where we recommend that people sign up to our consultation portal to keep informed. They can do this themselves online, or contact officers.</p> <p><b>Issues raised at informal drop-in events should be formally recorded:</b> We cannot register verbal comments made at consultation events. As stated previously, commenting on a planning matter, whether a policy or a planning application, is a formal process and we need comments to be made in writing to ensure accountability and that they are not misinterpreted. Recording verbal comments may leave officers open to accusations of making up comments, or not recording them correctly. Less formal events,</p>	N/A
--	--	--	---	-----



		<p>to inform the community that they will need to make written representations as verbal comments will not be considered as a formal representation.</p> <p><b>Ensure that full consultation responses are made available on the website, not just summaries:</b> Considers paragraphs 1.13 and 2.19 of the draft SCI are confusing as 1.13 states that "responses to consultation are available on our website" and 2.19 refers to summaries being provided and states that issues may be grouped together. Considers that this summarisation process can lead to a distortion of comments made by consultees and result in important points being lost, removed from their context, and/or poorly expressed. Considers that it should be made explicit that the full comments will always be made available even where summaries are provided.</p> <p><b>The council should correct errors in documents made subject to consultation and inform consultees of any corrections made in addendum and/or track changes format:</b></p>	<p>such as Planning for Real, may allow for comments to be recorded.</p> <p><b>Ensure that full consultation responses are made available on the website, not just summaries:</b> Paragraph 1.13 refers to both planning functions within the council - planning policy and development management. Both teams make responses available on our website, either in a consultation statement (policy) or a committee report / officer report (development management). This does not state that the responses are provided in full. In relation to planning policy, we do publish comments in full on our consultation portal, however, for brevity our consultation statements contain summaries. For example, the consultation statement for the Local Plan was 563 pages. On occasions when we receive a high level of response, the issues that are raised by many people are grouped together and responded to collectively. This is considered to be a practical and reasonable method of processing this amount of data.</p> <p><b>The Council should correct errors in documents made subject to consultation and inform consultees of any corrections made in addendum and/or track changes format:</b> We</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	--	---	---	-----------------------

		<p>Considers that the SCI should include a commitment for MDC officers to promptly correct errors that are brought to their attention so that consultees can be informed in time to take them into account before the consultation closes, or the consultation period be extended if necessary.</p> <p><b>Mansfield's SCI should reflect a commitment on behalf of MDC Officers to exhibit parity of esteem with the Local Community:</b> Considers that MDC should set out the expectation that officers will be reasonable and respectful towards members of the community (Table 1).</p> <p><b>List of invalid planning reasons for objecting to a development should not be misleading:</b> Considers that the list of what cannot be considered a planning reason for objecting to a development proposal contained in Table 1 of the draft SCI includes a number of inaccuracies and would be better for this list to be removed rather than for it to be inaccurate. Inaccuracies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "disagreeing with the need for the development" - The question of whether or not a proposed development is 'needed' can be a material planning consideration in many circumstances, and could even be determinative in some cases.</li> </ul>	<p>will look into any errors that are brought to our attention and may make amendments if necessary.</p> <p><b>Mansfield's SCI should reflect a commitment on behalf of MDC Officers to exhibit parity of esteem with the Local Community:</b> Noted. We can add this to the 'What you can expect from us' section (paragraph 1.13).</p> <p><b>List of invalid planning reasons for objecting to a development should not be misleading:</b> We set out some examples of valid planning reasons in Table 1 of the draft SCI in order to assist people form their comments, however this list does not cover everything, and as you can see below there is no definitive list. The National Planning Practice Guidance states the following in Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 21b-008-20140306.          "What is a material planning consideration? A material planning consideration is one which is relevant to making the planning decision in question (e.g. whether to grant or refuse an application for planning permission). The scope of what can constitute a material consideration is very wide and so the courts</p>	<p>Add sentence to 'What you can expect from us' (paragraph 1.13).</p> <p>Make changes to Table 1 as detailed in MDC response to comment.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "matters covered by other legislation" - It is not clear what the 'legislation' is to which there would be 'other legislation'. Furthermore, in many instances matters which are covered by other legislation are still material planning considerations.</li> <li>• "loss of views over land" - This is true for views from private land, but not for the loss of views from public footpaths or harm to the setting of a heritage asset for example.</li> </ul>	<p>often do not indicate what cannot be a material consideration. However, in general they have taken the view that planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of a neighbouring property or loss of private rights to light could not be material considerations".</p> <p>In relation to the inaccuracies suggested, we will ensure this list is made clearer by amending them to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "disagreeing with the need for the development if an objectively assessed need has been demonstrated and agreed". (For example, the need for us to provide sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople was demonstrated as part of the Local Plan examination in public and agreed by the planning inspector. When we consulted on potential sites, comments received which stated that we don't need to / shouldn't have to provide sites were not a material consideration.)</li> <li>• "matters covered by legislation other than planning legislation". (For example, when boundary issues / disputes are raised which would be addressed under party wall legislation.)</li> <li>• "loss of private views over land".</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

Highways England	SCI2021/9	Noted that Highways England is listed in Table 5 as a statutory consultee on planning documents, and will be engaged with where relevant on development management issues. Would encourage relevant statutory consultees to be engaged by developers at an early stage in pre-application consultations. Advise that applicants should be guided to the following guidance document at the earliest possible opportunity: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/461023/N150227_-_Highways_England_Planning_Document_FIN-AL-lo.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/461023/N150227_-_Highways_England_Planning_Document_FIN-AL-lo.pdf</a>	Noted. Reference to engagement with relevant statutory consultees at an early stage to be added to the 'pre-application stage' section of the SCI. A link to the guidance note can also be added.	Add text to 'pre-application stage' section of the SCI.  Add an appendix that signposts applicants to guidance from statutory consultees.
N/A	SCI2021/10	Considers that the portal is not the appropriate place to question the content of the draft SCI and make suggestions, so submitted them by letter. Questions the need to reveal consultees' names on the portal as this may deter people from commenting. Comments that clicking on a name links through to the consultee's past consultation comments. Comments that information on the portal doesn't make it clear that a person's name will be displayed (only that it may).	The consultation portal has been used by the council to consult on planning documents for a number of years. People can comment directly using online comment forms, or they can write emails or letters which are then input by council staff. It has a 'who said what' function which allows all comments to be visible to aid transparency. As such, historic comments which have been made on previous consultations can also be viewed. The portal is externally hosted by a global company (Objective Online) and is used by many local planning authorities in the UK. Whilst we can control what information (name, answers town/city) is visible to the public, we are not able to change the text that states that this 'may' be displayed. Objective has a privacy	N/A

		<p>Paragraph 1.9 - does not feel heard by MDC Planning due to responses received in relation to previous complaints made, and considers that the views of elected members are not considered either due to changes they suggested to this document not being made before the consultation on it. Considers that improvements to the consultation process are needed to show that MDC values, listens to and considers the opinions of its customer base.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.10 - Considers that MDC need to communicate with the wider community and measure that they are reaching the target audience.</p> <p>Considers that notification should be sent to every household in the district as not all have access to the internet, can access the libraries, or read the Chad. This should be in the form of letter, leaflets, magazine etc. Asks (question 1) if MDC have further considered a 2019 suggestion to have a more strategic process to</p>	<p>statement on the webpage header. However, the decision has now been made not to publish individual names on our consultation portal.</p> <p>All comments and complaints made are considered by the relevant officer. However it is not always possible to act upon every suggestion made. The suggestions on the SCI by members have been considered alongside this process and will be contained (where appropriate) within the final version of the document that officers will recommend for adoption. Noted.</p> <p>We ask people information about themselves when they sign up to our portal, however not everybody provides this information which means that monitoring this would not give an accurate indication of the make-up of our audience.</p> <p>The planning policy team consult on multiple documents most years. The council does not have the resources to notify each household each time. (The cheapest option is to have an A5 flyer printed and delivered to every household with 'junk mail' and costs around £7,000.) We have the consultation portal for</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>Ask consultees to check / update their details on the next consultation notification letter / email we send.</p> <p>Continue advertising the local plan database within each publication of My Mansfield.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>contact the whole community about consultations?</p> <p>Paragraph 1.12 - Asks how MDC decides what a valid comment is, on this and future consultations.</p>	<p>this reason so that people who are interested and want to receive notifications can do so. The majority of consultees have email addresses which helps to reduce our costs and is also quicker and more environmentally friendly. When possible we utilise the My Mansfield publication (which goes to every household) to advertise consultations, however our consultation timescales don't always align with the publication timescales. We do however have a planning policy / local plan update within each My Mansfield publication where we recommend that people sign up to our consultation portal to keep informed. They can do this themselves online, or contact officers.</p> <p>We have set out some examples of valid planning reasons in Table 1 of the draft SCI, however this list does not cover everything, and as you can see below there is no definitive list. The National Planning Practice Guidance states the following in Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 21b-008-20140306.</p> <p>“What is a material planning consideration? A material planning consideration is one which is relevant to making the planning decision in question (e.g. whether to grant or refuse an application for planning permission). The scope of what can constitute a material consideration is very wide and so the courts often do not indicate what cannot be a</p>	N/A
--	--	---	---	-----

			<p>material consideration. However, in general they have taken the view that planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of a neighbouring property or loss of private rights to light could not be material considerations.”</p>	
		Asks (question 2) what improvements have been made to the process for determining valid and inadmissible comments.	<p>We generally report all comments made, but only respond to the valid planning issues that are raised. Inadmissible comments are those containing hateful or offensive language. This is down to officer discretion and will be flagged up and agreed with another officer.</p>	N/A
		Asks (question 3) which MDC considers costs more, an IT upgrade, staff time or MDC’s reputation.	<p>The planning team work to deliver community consultation using online engagement software that has been built for this purpose.</p>	N/A
		Asks (question 4) if there is an intention to install anti-profanity software in the next financial year.	<p>The consultation portal is externally hosted. We are able to reject comments that we consider to be inadmissible so there is no requirement for anti-profanity software to be installed.</p>	N/A
		Paragraph 1.13 - asks (question 5) if all MDC staff have full access to the portal and all consultation documents and if they will correct and update both the portal and the website in real time rather than leave their website uncorrected.	<p>Only staff in the planning policy team have access to the consultation portal. We will look into any errors that are brought to our attention and may make amendments if necessary, as soon as practically possible.</p>	N/A

		<p>Paragraph 1.14 - asks (question 6) whether petitions sent in under different rules previously will still count when consultation on the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople DPD resumes.</p> <p>Agrees with MDC that communication should be civil, but asks (question 7) if MDC can amend the SCI to reflect that 'be reasonable and respectful' applies to both their staff and members of the community.</p> <p>Asks (question 8) in relation to the provision of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites whether or not MDC will refrain from mitigating visual impact, as surrounding sites with screening would go against Government guidelines to avoid isolating the site from the rest of the community.</p> <p>Agrees that comments should not be made based on ethnicity, but considers that comments based on fact and evidence should not be dismissed by MDC as racist.</p> <p>Concerned that MDC states in one of its own documents that a particular ethnic group did not wish to reside close to members of the same group due to internal issues, and asks (question 9) why this statement can be made by some but not others.</p>	<p>The petitions sent in previously have been considered. Paragraph 1.14 / Table 1 will apply to future consultations following the adoption of the 2021 SCI.</p> <p>Noted. We can add this to the 'What you can expect from us' section (paragraph 1.13).</p> <p>This is not relevant to the SCI. Some screening may be necessary to soften the visual impact, as with other developments, but it should not be used to 'hide' the site.</p> <p>Noted. We are not aware of any occasion where an evidence based comment has dismissed as being racist.</p> <p>This relates specifically to the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople DPD and is not relevant to the SCI.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>Add to 'What you can expect from us' (paragraph 1.13).</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	--	---	--	---



		<p>Paragraph 1.15 - concerned that MDC not encouraging the use of petitions during times such as a national lockdown would remove a valuable tool. Asks (question 10) for MDC to confirm if this only relates to the consultation on the draft SCI.</p>	<p>This advice would apply to all future consultations that take place during times of lockdown. The draft SCI has been written to be future proof as best it can and although we are currently out of lockdown and slowly returning to normal, there is always a possibility that a new COVID-19 variant could emerge. We are not 'banning' petitions, just advising that online petitions would be safer to use in such circumstances.</p>	N/A
		<p>Paragraph 1.16 - asks (question 11) whether or not the 2021 SCI will become obsolete when the national lockdown rules end, and would it not be better to have one SCI document that covers both eventualities that can be reviewed in its entirety every five years.</p>	<p>The SCI will not become obsolete at the end of lockdown as, like has been suggested, it covers both eventualities. Its next review would be in 2026/27.</p>	N/A
		<p>Paragraph 1.24 - asks (question 12) whether or not the Planning Portal is MDC owned.</p>	<p>MDC do not own the Planning Portal. It is a joint venture between the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) and TerraQuest Ltd. The Planning Portal is a website that was established by UK Government in 2002 to allow planning applications in England and Wales to be processed electronically. It later added guidance and information content, interactive guides, an application service for Building Regulations approval and the ability to purchase site location plans. Please note that</p>	<p>Amend web address for the Planning Portal in paragraph 1.24.</p>

			<p>the web address in the draft SCI is incorrect. This will be corrected (to <a href="http://www.planningportal.co.uk">www.planningportal.co.uk</a>) in the final version. We also refer to a consultation portal in the SCI. This is privately owned and hosted by Objective Online.</p>	
		<p>Concerned that people may be put off from using the MDC portal as it states “your name may be displayed, your answers may be displayed, your town/city will not be shown”. Revealing the consultee’s name also appears to link to other consultation comments. Concerned as was advised prior to registering for access to the portal for the GTTSP consultation 2019, that individual names would not be made public on the portal when making a submission. Asks (question 13) why MDC has changed its policy.</p>	<p>As stated previously, the portal is externally hosted by a global company (Objective Online) and is used by many local planning authorities in the UK. Whilst we can control what information (name, answers town/city) is visible to the public, we are not able to change the text that states that this ‘may’ be displayed. Objective has a privacy statement on the webpage header. In addition the MDC privacy statement is on the MDC website. However, the decision has now been made not to publish individual names on our consultation portal.</p>	N/A
		<p>Paragraph 2.5 - raises issues regarding consultant led work on the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople DPD.</p>	<p>Not relevant to this SCI consultation.</p>	N/A
		<p>Paragraph 2.11 - considers it helpful that information is published but that errors (when pointed out to MDC) should be corrected in real time and not left. Provides further information regarding the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople DPD. (Not relevant to this SCI consultation). Asks (question 14)</p>	<p>This is not relevant to the SCI and has been dealt with via the complaints procedure.</p>	N/A

		<p>what new training staff have had to prevent errors in future.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.16 / Table 4:</p> <p>In relation to 'What the council will do / collect evidence to input and support production of document' - Suggests that out of date information such as photographs are not used as they are not a true representation. Suggests that we only use relevant detailed text, diagrams and pictures.</p> <p>In relation to 'Opportunity for involvement / Provide details of any sites' considers that site suggestions are generally ignored or given an unqualified response. (Makes reference to sites suggested for the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople DPD) and asks (question 15) if there is any valid reason why councillors suggestions for GTTSP sites have not been reviewed and reported on.)</p> <p>In relation to 'What the council will do / ...engagement with appropriate stakeholders such as Nottinghamshire County Council...' Raises concern that MDC do not take account of land owners responses as do not discount sites that the land owner advises are not available or deliverable.</p>	<p>We use the most up to date and relevant information available to us, and photographs represent a point in time. Preparing a planning document takes many months and site assessments tend to be done towards the start.</p> <p>This relates to the GTTSP consultation and is not relevant to the SCI.</p> <p>Again, this relates to the GTTSP consultation and is not relevant to the SCI.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	--	---	---	----------------------------------

		<p>In relation to 'What the Council will do / Consider all issues and any alternatives which may come forward'. Asks (question 16) what has changed to convince the public these consultations are not just tick-box exercises, have MDC reconsidered their previous dismissive actions (re site suggestions).</p> <p>In relation to the SPD column, asks (question 17) whether the question marks mean that the document is only produced as and when required.</p> <p>Table 5: Examples of consultation methods that may be used</p> <p>Concerned that 'walk in' events have no format, and can leave people bewildered as to what to expect. Suggests that MDC have someone to engage directly with the public to explain the format of the event to those attending.</p> <p>Concerned that any comments made at these events would have no substance as they are not logged at present and asks (question 18) how comments at walk in events will be recorded and whether or not verbal comments be noted in order to get a true representation of public sentiment.</p>	<p>The planning policy team produces a consultation statement for each consultation it carries out which shows what comments / key issues have been received and gives a response. This shows how the comments have informed the process.</p> <p>That is correct.</p> <p>We do try to greet everyone who comes to our events however in very busy periods this can be difficult to manage. For the GTTSP events we had support from our community safety team who carried out this role, and also managed the sign in process so we could monitor how many people had visited us.</p> <p>We cannot register verbal comments made at consultation events as commenting on a planning matter, whether a policy or a planning application, is a formal process and we need comments to be made in writing to ensure accountability and that they are not misinterpreted. Recording verbal comments may leave officers open to accusations of</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>Make this clearer.</p> <p>Ensure people are greeted at future drop in sessions.</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>Asks (question 19) whether or not MDC chase responses from certain organisations that they are required to consult. 'Did not respond' has been seen in some documents but have MDC considered that some positions may no longer exist within certain organisations.</p> <p>In relation to "We will also try to engage 'hard to reach' or 'easy to overlook' groups..." Asks (question 20) if MDC can advise how this will be done and whom this refers to specifically, and (question 21) whether councillors will be shown evidence of this process before passing and signing off the SCI draft Feb 2021.</p> <p>Comments that it will be interesting to see if MDC publish organisation details alongside their comments. Considers it to be vital for all to see what is being said, and by whom (where GDPR allows), as certain comments can carry more weight when you see who it's from.</p>	<p>making up comments, or not recording them correctly. Less formal events, such as Planning for Real, may allow for comments to be recorded.</p> <p>We chase responses when there is a duty to cooperate. We also investigate email bounce backs and letter returns to find an alternative contact where this is possible.</p> <p>We hold contact details for a number of organisations and charities that work with / represent some of the harder to reach people in our community. Use of social media to advertise our consultations is important as such a diverse range of people use this, including a lot of harder to reach people such as young adults. To give a couple of examples, in the past we have given presentations to school children and also the Deaf Society.</p> <p>We will publish this information.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>Details of organisations consulted provided within consultation statement.</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>Asks (question 22) whether MDC have set any guidelines about document content and how summarising statements can impact on what was actually submitted by a member/group from the community.</p>	<p>We take care to summarise content accurately and briefly. On occasions when we receive a high level of response, the issues that are raised by many people are grouped together and responded to collectively. This is considered to be a practical and reasonable method of processing this amount of data.</p>	N/A
		<p>Paragraph 2.19 - asks who at MDC decides what is and isn't a valid comment (any specific level of staff) and in the absence of controlled guidelines what is the criteria. Considers that in the absence of anti-profanity software, the public should be allowed to see examples of why any submission is deemed by MDC not valid (inadmissible), e.g. the original submission is produced showing redactions.</p>	<p>We set out some examples of valid planning reasons in Table 1 of the draft SCI in order to assist people form their comments, however this list does not cover everything, and as you can see below there is no definitive list. The National Planning Practice Guidance states the following in Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 21b-008-20140306.</p> <p>"What is a material planning consideration? A material planning consideration is one which is relevant to making the planning decision in question (e.g. whether to grant or refuse an application for planning permission). The scope of what can constitute a material consideration is very wide and so the courts often do not indicate what cannot be a material consideration. However, in general they have taken the view that planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of a neighbouring property or loss of private rights to light could not be material considerations."</p>	N/A

			<p>A qualified planning officer will make a judgement about whether an issue is a material planning consideration or not, and in cases where it is unclear this will be discussed with another planning officer. It would not be appropriate to highlight submissions to the public which contain prejudicial content, even if the offending word is redacted. Our role is to address planning issues, not to publicly name and shame people who have reacted to proposals in this way.</p>	
		<p>Paragraph 2.21 - in relation to "...summarised and passed to the Inspector..." Concerned that the summarising of comments on the GTTSP DPD was not adequate to ensure transparency as it excluded and broke up important comments/information/proposals. Considers that MDC should change the current summary compilation strategy to ensure the clear meaning is not lost. Asks (question 24) what new criteria (guidelines/improvements) are in place for when MDC decide what goes in a summary document from this point onward, and (question 25) who oversees this process to ensure all key, valid information/proposal has not been left out.</p>	<p>As set out previously, we take care to summarise content accurately and briefly. On occasions when we receive a high level of response, the issues that are raised by many people are grouped together and responded to collectively. This is considered to be a practical and reasonable method of processing this amount of data. A qualified planning officer will summarise the key points and make a judgement about whether an issue is a material planning consideration or not. In cases where it is unclear this will be discussed with another planning officer.</p>	N/A
		<p>Paragraph 2.34 - suggests that MDC should advise if Duty to Cooperate has been carried out prior to consultation in order to prevent time being wasted by looking at sites outside</p>	<p>Duty to cooperate is an ongoing process with our nearby local planning authorities and other prescribed bodies. We produce Duty to Cooperate statements as part of the evidence</p>	N/A

		<p>of the district that have already been excluded. Asks (question 26) whether this has already been considered and implemented as suggested previously.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2 - notes that things do not always go to plan in internal departmental communication and that the community are affected by decisions. Example relates to two sites looked at by the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople DPD. Asks (question 27) what has been put in place to prevent any further occurrences of this type of issue.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.7 - asks (question 28) what is MDC's definition of 'early stage', what is the time-scale/period (years - months - weeks)? Considers that the reference 'early stage' is too open ended, and suggest that if no actual period can be stated, reference to 'early stage' should be removed to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 - concerned that the draft document states that site notices are sometimes displayed, whereas the 2017 SCI says that they are used in most cases, particularly as objectors to planning applications often cite a lack of site notices</p>	<p>base for a planning document when it goes to examination. This details all the discussions that have taken place throughout the preparation of the document.</p> <p>It is not clear what point is being made here. This comment doesn't appear to be relevant to the SCI.</p> <p>In this context, 'early stage' relates to the period before a planning application is submitted (the pre-application stage). Developers who carry out public consultation before submitting their planning application are able to take account of the local community's views and amend their plans accordingly before they submit their application to the council. This can help improve the design of schemes and reduce the amount of objections received.</p> <p>A link to the government's statutory publicity requirements is provided at paragraph 3.16. It is clear from this that by providing letters and, in some cases, site notices (when we are only required to do one or the other), we go above the minimum requirement for advertising a</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------



		<p>being displayed and elected members are concerned that residents need more information about planning applications in their area. This is another example of unclear terms being used by MDC (sometimes, early stages, usually, if necessary, reasonably possible, practicable). Asks (question 29) whether, as this is still a draft, MDC will consider a more definitive approach so residents are clearly informed. Suggests that a table is used to show what notifications / advertisements will be carried out for major developments down to minor developments, as well as a definition of what is a major / minor development. This would allow everyone to clearly understand what to expect.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.19 - concerned that the public were advised that they couldn't object to GTTSP sites by saying "we don't want a GTTSP site" as it is not a valid planning reason, but MDC allowed the reverse, e.g. "this is a good site, there's lots of space". Particularly concerned as comments were made by people who were not directly affected. Considers that this should be classed as a non-valid reason too. Asks (question 30) for MDC to justify what valid reason allows a member of the public from a completely different area of the district to be able to support a site and MDC class this as a valid comment. (The person</p>	<p>planning application. It is also clear from this table that a site notice is not a statutory requirement for the majority of applications that we process (which are minor, householder applications). The approach we have taken in paragraphs 3.12 and 3.13 allows flexibility. We will actively write to neighbouring properties, but may also add a site notice where we believe it is necessary. The 2017 SCI was misleading when it said that we use site notices 'in most cases'; it would have been more accurate to say 'for most application types'.</p> <p>Anyone can comment on any planning application / consultation. This comment mostly relates to the GTTSP consultation and isn't relevant to the SCI. Just commenting "we don't want a GTTSP site near us" is not a valid planning reason.</p>	N/A
--	--	--	---	-----

		<p>submitting may not even have an interest, like many social media commentators.)</p> <p>General - concerned that the draft SCI has removed many references to "will", and has replaced with "may". Considers that this removes the element of obligation and relies far too much on an MDC Officer's discretion. States that there is still time to review and change the wording, rather than leave the community unsure of what will happen, or may happen.</p>	<p>We have used the word 'may' instead of 'will' throughout the document in order that we do not mislead the public or give false expectations. Officers are professionals and should be trusted to use their judgement when making arrangements for consultations. We will always meet the consultation requirements of planning legislation (which would represent the minimum standard). Most activities listed in the SCI are over and above this.</p>	N/A
N/A	SCI2021/11	<p>Asks how MDC will provide accessible information to all members of the community as account needs to be taken of those residents that do not use the internet, those who are reticent to attend events and those who have disabilities / are vulnerable. Suggests providing copies of the policy and comment form on request, posting information and telephone consultations.</p>	<p>As stated in the draft SCI, MDC will use a variety of consultation methods. This allows people to access our consultation documents in the easiest way for them. People are able to register on our consultation database (or ask us to sign them up) for either email or postal notifications when we consult on a document. There are regular planning updates in the residents' magazine 'My Mansfield' where we recommend people sign up to get these notifications if they are interested in planning matters. As stated in the SCI, other methods we may use to notify people are through the council's website, press releases which get picked up by The Chad, social media, My Mansfield, site notices, and leaflets / postcards / posters. When we write to consultees we explain what the document is</p>	N/A

		<p>about and also where they can obtain a copy. We encourage digital engagement where possible, but also provide hard copies (to view) and questionnaires at the Civic Centre and all libraries in the district. We can also provide copies on request as stated in the draft SCI, but will charge for this in order to cover our printing and postage costs. We do not carry out telephone consultations as we need people's comments in writing. However we do take phone calls to answer any questions people may have in order to help them understand what is being consulted on and make informed comments.</p> <p>In planning we can only consider valid planning reason (or material planning considerations) when making decisions. We have set out some examples of valid planning reasons in Table 1 of the draft SCI, however this list does not cover everything, and as you can see below there is no definitive list. The National Planning Practice Guidance states the following in Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 21b-008-20140306.</p> <p>"What is a material planning consideration? A material planning consideration is one which is relevant to making the planning decision in question (e.g. whether to grant or refuse an application for planning permission). The scope of what can constitute a material consideration is very wide and so the courts</p>	<p>Considers that everyone's views should be valid, unless it amounts to a criminal offence or is intended to incite hate, under the principles of free speech. Questions what is a valid comment and who judges this. Asks for clear guidelines and considered the list in the draft SCI to be vague and inadequate. Considers that there is too much room for MDC subjectivity and that only the offensive word should be redacted.</p>	N/A
--	--	--	---	-----

			<p>often do not indicate what cannot be a material consideration. However, in general they have taken the view that planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of a neighbouring property or loss of private rights to light could not be material considerations.”</p> <p>In relation to hateful or offensive language, this is down to officer discretion and will be flagged up and agreed with another officer.</p>	
		<p>Questions what are normal circumstances in relation to the provision of hard copies of planning policy documents to Warsop Parish Council and statutory bodies. States that this doesn't serve the needs of people who rarely or who are unable to leave home.</p>	<p>'Normal circumstances' refers to when COVID-19 restrictions (or any other such restrictions) are lifted. As mentioned above, we can send hard copies out to people on request.</p>	N/A
		<p>Suggests that 'try to engage', 'may', 'where appropriate' and 'will try' (table 5) are weak and that terms such as 'intend to' or 'we will ensure that' are stronger. Considers that examples other than social media should be stated when trying to engage hard to reach groups. Questions why comments made on social media will not be considered by the council as they are a good indication of community feeling. Considers that views expressed at a public meeting / informal event</p>	<p>We use these terms in order to ensure the document is flexible. For example a first draft / evidence gathering consultation on infrastructure with key providers will not be suitable for wider consultation. It would be misleading to say that we 'will' consult 'other' consultees. Again, we 'may' use all publication methods listed - which is always the aim. However, sometimes our consultation timescales don't align with the publication timescales for 'My Mansfield', and site notices, leaflets / postcards are not always</p>	N/A

		<p>should be recorded without the need to use another method of consultation.</p> <p>Questions whether or not the term 'consulting and involving' (paragraph 1.11) infers that consultation is not the only way residents will be involved in decision making. Questions what influence the results of the consultation have in the decision making.</p>	<p>appropriate / cost effective. For example, a consultation on affordable housing guidance would not require site notices as it is not site specific. We use social media as a way to try and engage harder to reach groups as such a diverse range of people use it. We also have various community organisations on our local plan database who we send notifications to. In relation to social media and verbal comments made at consultation events; it is not appropriate for us to accept these. Commenting on a planning matter, whether a policy or a planning application, is a formal process and we need comments to be made in writing to ensure accountability. Recording verbal comments, or accepting comments from what could be spoof social media accounts may leave officers open to accusations of making up comments, or not recording them correctly.</p> <p>As well as commenting on planning matters, residents can also attend and speak at Planning Applications Committee, and at the discretion of a planning inspector, at planning inquiries and examinations in public. If valid planning reasons are raised, consultation responses can ultimately result in a planning application being refused, or amendments being made to a planning policy document.</p>	N/A
--	--	--	---	-----

		Questions the relevance of the Unreasonable Behaviour Policy, and what is meant by 'if necessary'.	The council has an Unreasonable Behaviour Policy to manage behaviour that is aggressive, rude or abusive, or which places unreasonable demands on our staff. If this behaviour is displayed then it may become necessary for the council to apply the policy.	N/A
		Questions what offensive statements regarding a person's reputation within their trade, profession or business (footnote 2) has got to do with members of the community.	It is not appropriate for members of the community to make personal comments about officers, councillors, the Executive Mayor, and / or any consultants that may have provided services to the council. This is offensive and may affect their professional reputation.	N/A
		Suggests that we amend paragraph 2.12 to say we 'will' provide documents in alternative formats, rather than we 'can'.	We have used this phrase on many consultation documents, as per council policy.	N/A
		Considers that endeavouring to use non-digital consultation methods where possible is not a good enough commitment, particularly as there are target groups that must be consulted.	This statement from Table 5 refers to us having to rely on digital methods of consultation more heavily in times such as the COVID-19 pandemic. If there are further restrictions on face to face contact then this would be necessary if we needed to carry out a public consultation during such times. As stated we would try to use non-digital methods too when possible, such as contacting everyone on our database who has registered an interest in planning matters by email or letter and issuing a press release to be picked up by The Chad. All target groups	N/A

		<p>Considers that there needs to be a mechanism for MDC to correct any errors in the consultation statement (paragraph 2.19) so that decisions are not made on wrong information.</p> <p>Considers that the section on neighbourhood plans is not representative of real life and refers to problems that the Forest Town Community Council had in the past due to lack of support from MDC.</p> <p>Considers that the use of 'usually' in paragraph 3.12 sounds weak and questions what it means and when it wouldn't happen. States that the vast majority of residents adjoining the former Sherwood Hall playing fields were unaware of the 2019 Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople consultation until contacted by volunteers.</p>	<p>that must be consulted (statutory consultees) are organisations that can be reasonably expected to have access to the internet.</p> <p>People can let us know if they spot any errors and we will look into it and correct if appropriate.</p> <p>Forest Town Community Council was unable to become a neighbourhood forum (for the purposes of neighbourhood planning) in the past due to not being fully representative of the area at the time. The council have provided support to Warsop Parish Council who have been working on a neighbourhood plan for a number of years.</p> <p>In most cases immediate neighbours to a site for which a planning application has been submitted are notified by letter. This may not happen for more remote sites where there are no neighbouring properties close by. Residents adjoining the former Sherwood Hall School playing fields were not notified in this way as the consultation on the Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople DPD was not a planning application. We were consulting on potential site options. We notified the community in accordance with</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	--	--	---	----------------------------------

		Considers paragraph 3.22 to be a clear, positive statement, but that it contradicts earlier statements in the draft regarding validity of comments. Questions what happens when honest, plain speaking affects the sensitivity of MDC officers.	the 2017 SCI and met all the requirements of the planning regulations.  As above, the validity of a comment is in reference to whether or not it raises material planning considerations. We read all comments received but only report on and address the material planning considerations (valid planning reasons) that have been raised. As stated in Table 1, comments containing language that is considered to be offensive, racist, discriminatory or threatening in any way will be disregarded.	N/A
The Coal Authority	SCI2021/12	No comments.	Noted.	N/A
N/A	SCI2021/13	Concerned that not all of the community has time to read through the whole document, and compare to the previous document (if they are aware of that) to be able to see what changes have been made. Considers that there may have been a better way of presenting the document for consultation as finding the changes to the SCI is not simple. A user friendly addendum that highlighted the changes could have been provided as was done by Nottinghamshire County Council in 2020.  Concerned that consultees' names have been revealed on the portal as was advised prior to registering for the GTTSP consultation in 2019 that individual names would not be made public when making a submission. Also	Noted. We considered that presenting a complete document, as it would appear when adopted, was the clearest way of presenting the information.  The decision was made during the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople DPD consultation to remove comments from public view, so depending on when you signed up, that would be why you would have been told	N/A  N/A



		<p>concerned as this may deter people from commenting as they might not want their details on display. Questions why there is a need to display the consultees' names. Consultees should be allowed to remain anonymous, but have their comments published, if they wish. Displaying a reference number (unique to the consultee) could be done instead to evidence that it is a real person / organisation taking part. Comments that information on the portal doesn't make it clear that a person's name will be displayed (only that it may). Comments that clicking on a name links through to the consultee's past consultation comments. It's not clear if these are all of the user's comments or just relevant ones.</p>	<p>this in relation to your comments on that document. We changed our usual approach on that occasion due to a number of consultees making what we considered to be racist / prejudicial comments which unfortunately made it onto the website. In order to not single anybody out, or to miss any, we removed all comments. The consultation portal has been used by the council to consult on planning documents for a number of years. People can comment directly using online comment forms, or they can write emails or letters which are then input by council staff. It has a 'who said what' function which allows all comments to be visible to aid transparency. As such, historic comments which have been made on previous consultations can also be viewed until the system archives them. However, the decision has now been made not to publish individual names on our consultation portal. We could use a unique identification number instead, however in terms of the GDPR this is still personal information. The portal is externally hosted by a global company (Objective Online) and is used by many local planning authorities in the UK. Whilst we can control what information (name, answers town/city) is visible to the public, we are not able to change the text that states that this 'may' be displayed. Objective has a privacy statement on the webpage header. In addition the MDC</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

			privacy notice is on the MDC website. We use 'may' in the general text for consistency, and also in case anybody submits an inadmissible comment that we wouldn't want to publish.	
N/A	SCI2021/14	Considers that the draft SCI does not give the community any more say in planning matters and does not make access, understanding or contact any easier. Considers that developers have control and communities are an afterthought.	Planning is a complicated process and the draft SCI has attempted to explain when and how communities are able to get involved in order that more people feel confident and able to do so. Developers have more expertise with planning and get involved regularly, but this does not mean that we do not value feedback from communities or that they are an afterthought.	N/A
N/A	SCI2021/15	Concerned that consultation is a box ticking exercise.	The Statement of Community Involvement is a document that we are required to produce, however that does not mean that the council are not committed to consulting the public on planning matters and involving you in local decision making. This helps to ensure, as far as possible, that our decisions properly reflect and respond to the needs of our district and communities.	N/A
N/A	SCI2021/16	<p>Fully agree with the findings and recommendations of FTCC Planning Sub-committee.</p> <p>How the Consultation is being conducted: No-one involved in the process has been provided with a list of proposed changes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This is not something that the council usually provides. However software is available to anyone wanting to draw this comparison to the 2017 version themselves.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>

		<p>The SCI should listen to Member's suggestions to support greater community involvement: the Council should encourage public participation as we 'begin to open up again'.</p>	<p>The suggestions by members have been considered alongside this process and will be contained (where appropriate) within the final version of the document that officers will recommend for adoption. We do encourage public participation, this is what the document aims to do.</p>	N/A
		<p>Telephone representations should be maintained: the importance of the ability of local citizens to make representations over the telephone was highlighted at the OSC meeting on 23.2.21</p>	<p>The 2017 SCI incorrectly stated that comments can be made over the telephone and was misleading. Commenting on a planning matter, whether a policy or a planning application, is a formal process and we need comments to be made in writing to ensure accountability and that they are not misinterpreted. Recording verbal comments may leave officers open to accusations of making up comments, or not recording them correctly.</p>	N/A
		<p>Site notices to be maintained/expanded: Many residents rely on site notices to be aware of development proposals. Without site notices, people who have a legitimate interest in a planning application, could have no notice of the planning applications.</p>	<p>The council meets all regulations regarding the advertisement of planning applications, including the use of site notices. We do not intend to reduce the amount of circumstances where a site notice would be displayed, we have just made the text within the draft SCI reflect our advertisement processes more accurately in order to ensure it is not misleading.</p>	N/A

		<p>FTCC should be included in all consultations: FTCC should always be contacted and involved where appropriate.</p>	<p>Not all consultations are appropriate for all consultees. For example a first draft / evidence gathering consultation on infrastructure with key providers will not be suitable for wider consultation.</p>	<p>N/A, although we will amend Table 5 to split statutory consultees from 'other' target groups in order to make this distinction clearer.</p>
		<p>Hard copy of Local Plan notifications: A minimum requirement that all Local Plan &amp; planning consultations are given in writing and be notified by post.</p>	<p>The planning policy team consult on multiple documents most years. The council does not have the resources to notify each household each time. (The cheapest option is to have an A5 flyer printed and delivered to every household with 'junk mail' and costs around £7,000.) We have the consultation portal for this reason so that people who are interested and want to receive notifications can do so. The majority of consultees have email addresses which helps to reduce our costs and is also quicker and more environmentally friendly. When possible we utilise the My Mansfield publication (which goes to every household) to advertise consultations, however our consultation timescales don't always align with the publication timescales. We do however have a planning policy / local plan update within each My Mansfield publication where we recommend that people sign up to our consultation portal to keep</p>	<p>N/A</p>

		<p>All comments raised at drop-in sessions should be recorded and be included in SCI reports. Clear signage should be displayed if this is not the case.</p> <p>Full comments, not just summaries, should be made available on the website.</p> <p>Mansfield's SCI should reflect parity of esteem with the Local Community: MDC be</p>	<p>informed. They can do this themselves online, or contact officers.</p> <p>We cannot register verbal comments made at consultation events. As stated previously, commenting on a planning matter, whether a policy or a planning application, is a formal process and we need comments to be made in writing to ensure accountability and that they are not misinterpreted. Recording verbal comments may leave officers open to accusations of making up comments, or not recording them correctly. We could provide signage to this effect in the future. Less formal events such as Planning for Real may allow for comments to be recorded.</p> <p>The SCI refers to both planning functions within the council - planning policy and development management. Both teams make summarised responses available on our website, either in a consultation statement (policy) or a committee report / officer report (development management). In relation to planning policy, we also publish comments in full on our consultation portal, however, for brevity our consultation statements contain summaries. For example, the consultation statement for the Local Plan was 563 pages.</p> <p>Noted. We can add this to the 'What you can expect from us' section (paragraph 1.13).</p>	<p>Consider providing signage at consultation events to indicate that comments must be made in writing.</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Add text to 'What you can expect</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>reasonable and respectful towards members of the community.</p> <p>The list of planning reasons for objecting to a development should not be misleading</p>	<p>We set out some examples of valid planning reasons in Table 1 of the draft SCI in order to assist people form their comments, however this list does not cover everything, and as you can see below there is no definitive list. The National Planning Practice Guidance states the following in Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 21b-008-20140306.</p> <p>“What is a material planning consideration? A material planning consideration is one which is relevant to making the planning decision in question (e.g. whether to grant or refuse an application for planning permission). The scope of what can constitute a material consideration is very wide and so the courts often do not indicate what cannot be a material consideration. However, in general they have taken the view that planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of a neighbouring property or loss of private rights to light could not be material considerations.”</p> <p>In relation to the inaccuracies suggested by FTCC, we will ensure this list is made clearer by amending them to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "disagreeing with the need for the development if an objectively assessed</li> </ul>	<p>from us’ (paragraph 1.13).</p> <p>Amend Table 1.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>need has been demonstrated and agreed". (For example, the need for us to provide sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople was demonstrated as part of the Local Plan examination in public and agreed by the planning inspector. When we consulted on potential sites, comments received which stated that we don't need to / shouldn't have to provide sites were not a material consideration.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "matters covered by legislation other than planning legislation". (For example, when boundary issues / disputes are raised which would be addressed under party wall legislation.)</li> <li>• "loss of private views over land".</li> </ul>	
Historic England	SCI2021/17	Contents of the SCI are noted. Inclusion of Historic England as a statutory consultee is welcomed. No further comments.	Noted.	N/A
<b>Question 1 – Are there any other ways you would like to be consulted on the Local Plan?</b>				
N/A	SCI2021/2	No	Noted.	N/A
N/A	SCI2021/13	Considers that many of the community are unaware of the SCI consultation. Suggests that notification should be sent to every household in the district as not all have access to the internet, can access the libraries, or read the Chad. This should be in the form of letter, leaflets, within magazines etc. A regular 'Consultation Schedule' could be placed in 'My Mansfield' for example.	The planning policy team consult on multiple documents most years. The council does not have the resources to notify each household each time. (The cheapest option is to have an A5 flyer printed and delivered to every household with 'junk mail' and costs around £7,000.) We have the consultation portal for this reason so that people who are interested and want to receive notifications can do so.	N/A

			<p>The majority of consultees have email addresses which helps to reduce our costs and is also quicker and more environmentally friendly. When possible we utilise the My Mansfield publication (which goes to every household) to advertise consultations, however our consultation timescales don't always align with the publication timescales. We do however have a planning policy / local plan update within each My Mansfield publication where we recommend that people sign up to our consultation portal to keep informed. They can do this themselves online, or contact officers. Whilst not a consultation schedule as such, the council's Local Development Scheme<sup>2</sup> gives an indication of when planning documents are likely to be available for consultation.</p>	
		Asks whether or not MDC has any freepost or Freephone options for consultation feedback, similar to those used by Nottinghamshire County Council.	MDC do not currently offer freepost or Freephone options.	N/A
N/A	SCI2021/14	Considers that communities should be directly consulted on large developments, including issues around parking, need and accessibility, and their comments weighted. Documents are difficult to access and understand.	<p>Direct consultation on development proposals is not the council's role, however we do encourage developers to carry out public consultation on major development proposals before they submit a planning application in order to help inform their plans.</p> <p>Unfortunately planning is complicated which</p>	N/A

<sup>2</sup> Available at <https://www.mansfield.gov.uk> (search LDS)



			is why we produce an SCI to help point communities in the right direction. The planning team can be contacted to answer queries about developments if required.	
N/A	SCI2021/15	Suggests greater advertising of major developments. Active engagement with communities rather than notifying immediate neighbours and erecting site notices.	Active engagement on development proposals is not the council's role, however we do encourage developers to carry out public consultation on major development proposals before they submit a planning application in order to help inform their plans.	N/A
<b>Question 2 – Is the SCI clear about how you can comment on development proposals and enforcement issues, or get further information?</b>				
N/A	SCI2021/2	Yes, but matters raised need addressing.	Noted.	Changes to the SCI as a result of this consultation will be detailed in the consultation statement.
N/A	SCI2021/13	Considers that the document is not user friendly for the whole community as the links to electronic documents / websites are meaningless for those without access. Regarding enforcement, suggests a summary and a re-iteration of contact details.	Noted. This will be included in the final draft.	Include a summary of enforcement and contact details at paragraph 3.35.
N/A	SCI2021/14	Considers that it is no easier to comment. Not everyone can access documents online, or get them easily. People are not notified when an application goes to committee, or when changes are made.	Appointments can be made to view planning applications in the council offices, (as well as planning policy documents that we consult on). This will be made clearer in the SCI. Anyone who comments on an application is notified when it goes to Planning Applications Committee (however not all applications are determined in this way as some decisions are	Make it clearer that planning applications (via the PCs in reception) and planning policy documents can be viewed at the

			delegated to officers and / or the Chair of the committee). Interested persons are also able to track applications on our website to keep up to date with any amendments etc.	Civic Centre by appointment.
N/A	SCI2021/15	Considers the SCI to be clear to a degree but questions what access adjustments are available for people with disabilities. Comments that the portal is not overly user friendly.	The council's website and portal meet accessibility standards <sup>3</sup> . We can also provide documents in alternative formats upon request. The portal is also used by many other council's across the country and has been developed to be as user friendly as possible.	N/A

---

<sup>3</sup> Please see: <https://www.mansfield.gov.uk/-/footer-links/accessibility-1/1> (please type into browser) and <https://mansfield.objective.co.uk/common/accessibility.jsp>

## 6.0 Conclusion

6.1 This consultation focused on how Mansfield District Council consults the community on planning matters. There was not a huge response to the consultation but the comments we received were on the whole very detailed. There was a mix of respondents representing statutory organisations, central and local government, the general public and local interest groups.

6.2 We have made the following changes to the SCI as a result of the consultation, and the pre-consultation engagement carried out with elected members of Mansfield District Council:

- set out that officers will be reasonable and respectful towards members of the community (paragraph 1.13);
- made changes to Table 1 to clarify some of the examples of what are not material planning considerations;
- replaced text from paragraph 1.15, old 1.16 and throughout the document with an appendix to contain all changes that we will make to our consultation processes in extraordinary circumstances, such as a pandemic, rather than having the information within the main document (Appendix B);
- made it clearer that planning applications (via the PC terminals in the reception area) and planning policy documents can be viewed at the Civic Centre by appointment (new paragraphs 1.16 and 3.20);
- amended the web address for the Planning Portal in new paragraph 1.23;
- added a key to Table 4 to make it clearer;
- added distribution of information to community groups, shops etc. to Table 5;
- added signing people up to our local plan consultation portal at consultation events to Table 5;
- amended Table 5 to split statutory consultees and other target groups in order to make this distinction clearer;
- amended all references to 'neighbourhood councils' to 'neighbourhood forums' (Table 7);
- added text to 'pre-application stage' section of the SCI to encourage early engagement with statutory consultees (new paragraphs 3.6 and 3.9);
- added an appendix to signpost applicants to standing advice from statutory consultees (Appendix D);
- added text paragraph 3.12 regarding use of more eye catching site notices, with QR codes;
- added new paragraph 3.14 regarding contacting councillors;
- added new paragraph 3.15 regarding use of social media to advertise planning applications and,

- included a summary of enforcement and contact details at new paragraph 3.37 onwards.

6.3 We have also:

- passed feedback on the website onto relevant team at MDC;
- set up a weekly Facebook and Twitter post to advertise the weekly list of planning applications;
- trialled more eye catching site notices;
- added QR codes to our site notices and posters;
- arranged for a message to be displayed on the digital screen in the Civic Centre to promote viewing planning applications online;
- explore other methods to increase awareness of the Local Plan (such as an online exhibition platform – however this is dependent on budget availability);
- contacted all of the district's county councillors following their election in May 2021 to advise them that they can sign up to receive the weekly list and,
- made other minor amendments / clarifications to the document.

6.4 And will:

- continue advertising the local plan consultation portal within each publication of My Mansfield;
- encourage consultees to check / update their details on the next consultation notification letter / email we send;
- ensure people are greeted at future drop in sessions where possible;
- consider providing signage at consultation events to indicate that comments must be made in writing;
- use site notices at all relevant Regulation 18 consultations;
- include local site names (also known as....) when describing land in consultation material;
- continue to meet with relevant ward councillors regarding any new allocations and provide them with information leaflets / notices;
- continue to use the council's Facebook page and Twitter feed when consultations are due to take place (this gives us access to approximately 15,600 Facebook followers and 6,800 Twitter followers).

6.3 The document is due to be adopted in January 2022. Following this, the document will be followed in all consultations on planning matters.

## Appendix 1

### - Summary of planning consultation ideas from councillors (email)

Idea	Planning applications or planning policies?	Officer response	Potential costs	Action
A way to measure the value for money of advertising in newspapers needs to be found – people are reading newspapers less and less	Both	<p>We are required by law to publicise the following types of planning applications in a local newspaper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>major development submitted with an environmental statement;</li> <li>development affecting a public right of way (to which Part 3 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 applies);</li> <li>applications involving a departure from the development plan;</li> <li>major development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 or more dwellings or where the site is 0.5 ha or more; and</li> <li>for all other uses, floor space of 1000 sq. m or more or site area of 1 ha or more;</li> </ul> </li> <li>applications which would affect the setting of a listed building or affect the character or appearance of a conservation area;</li> <li>applications to vary or discharge conditions attached to listed building consent or involving exterior works to a listed building; and</li> <li>applications for Listed Building Consent where works to the exterior of the building are proposed</li> </ul> <p>We no longer pay to advertise planning policy documents (such as the local plan and supplementary planning documents etc) in the local newspaper due to cost. It is also no longer a requirement of the regulations. Instead press releases are written which are often picked up on and reported by the newspaper anyway.</p>	<p>This is a legal requirement and covered by the planning application fees / existing budgets</p> <p>This was costing in the region of £450 per advert.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
Use social media	Both	Social media is already used when consulting on planning policies.	Officer time	None

		<p>There is potential for a link to the weekly list to be added to social media, or for posts to be added about any major applications we receive.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate to receive comments about applications via social media as these need to be made through existing channels in order to be registered. Such posts should contain details on how to comment.</p>	Use of social media is free	A weekly Facebook and Twitter post to advertise the weekly list has been trialled by the PR team and will continue.
Publish the weekly list on the MDC website	Planning applications	This is already done <sup>4</sup>	N/A	None
Increase amount of site notices, especially in areas where they are likely to get removed	Both	<p>Site notices are located in visible areas around the relevant application / proposal sites. Officers use their judgement and put an appropriate amount of notices around each site. If these notices get removed it is likely that this will happen regardless of how many are put up in the first place. Site notices can look visually detrimental when they are left up on the lamp posts; if more were to be erected this would get worse.</p> <p>We have a statutory duty to put a site notice up for certain developments. The legislation states that if the LPA has put the notice up and it is removed then the LPA is treated as having complied with the requirements if they have taken reasonable steps for protection of the notice, which is done by lamination.</p>	<p>Additional printing / laminating costs</p> <p>Officer time</p>	None
Use A3 site notices	Both	This is unnecessary as all the required information fits onto A4. It may be that we can redesign the notices to make them more eye-catching although care would be needed to ensure they are not visually detrimental to the streetscene.	Additional printing / laminating costs	We have been trialling more eye-catching site notices
Monitor site notices and replace if removed	Both	Officers do not have capacity to visit sites multiple times to check on site notices.	Officer time	None

<sup>4</sup> See <https://planning.mansfield.gov.uk/online-applications/search.do?action=weeklyList> (please type into browser)

		As above, the LPA has complied with the legal requirement if they have taken reasonable steps for protection of the notice, which is done by lamination.		
Email weekly list to all county councillors as well as district councillors	Planning applications	The weekly list is available on our website for anyone who wishes to view it, or county councillors can request to be added to our circulation list.	N/A	None
Make use of NCC's public notice boards across the district. Officers and members to obtain keys from NCC and refresh information	Both	These noticeboards are for the display of county council material. Planning is a district matter and it may cause confusion about who to contact to make comments etc.	N/A	None
Contact schools to ask them to email parents and post on their websites	Both	School circulation lists are for a specific purpose and it would be inappropriate to use them to advertise planning information.  Schools may wish to advertise planning matters that they consider will affect them but this should be their own decision.	N/A	None
Use notice board outside of the Civic Centre and an area within the mall	Both	The Local Plan documents have all been placed in the mall (legal requirement) but generally the council policy is that this area should be kept clear of notices and posters. We could look into making use of the electronic displays to advertise the planning applications received on the current weekly list.	Officer time	Investigate whether the link to the weekly list could be advertised.
Approach local shops, charity shops, hairdressers, doctors surgeries, dentists, large retailers, public houses, community centres / groups, churches and the	Both	The planning policy team have previously approached community groups to ask if they would disseminate local plan consultation material amongst their members and there was some take up, particularly those with social media, websites or newsletters. However with the constant nature of planning application submissions it is likely to be too onerous a task for them (and the other outlets suggested) to do this every week.	Printing / postage costs	Add distribution of information to community groups to the planning policy section of the SCI.

football club to see if they will display the information				
Make use of Notts Watch (Neighbourhood Watch) email circulation list	Both	This circulation list is for a specific purpose and it would be inappropriate to use it to advertise planning information.	N/A	None
Use the Police Alert system	Both	This alert system is for a specific purpose and it would be inappropriate to use it to advertise planning information.	N/A	None
Work with NHS, police, NCC education all of whom can apply for s106 funding.	Both	We already consult these organisations on local plan issues and on relevant planning applications.  It would be inappropriate for them to advertise the proposals themselves.	N/A	None
Residents unaware when consultation was happening on the Local Plan	Planning policies	The consultation that was carried out was over and above that required by the regulations and the council's current Statement of Community Involvement. Information was posted to every household on various occasions throughout the preparation of the plan (through the use of publications My Mansfield and the Mayor's newsletter, as well as a dedicated Local Plan Summary document).  This process is an opportunity to find out what else can be done to increase awareness.	N/A	Explore other methods to increase awareness of the Local Plan
Site notices are not put up in a wide enough area	Both	We have to draw the line somewhere and as stated above, officers use their judgement as to where the most appropriate locations for site notices are.  For planning applications, the legislation requires that site notices are displayed in at least one place on or near the land to which the application relates. For applications that affect wider catchment areas these usually require a press advert. These are used to inform the wider area.  For planning policy, it is not a legal requirement to use site notices to	N/A	None



		identify future development sites, however we have included this within the SCI.		
--	--	--	--	--

– Summary of planning consultation ideas from councillors – raised at the workshop

<b><u>Consultations on Planning Applications</u></b>		
<b>Issues / what needs to be done better</b>	<b>Ideas to address issue</b>	<b>Officer response / any implications to ideas</b>
<b>Site Notices</b>		
Residents don't know about planning applications despite the site notices.	Site notices need to be bigger, more eye-catching and colourful. Need to be clear and concise with larger text font used.	Officers are currently trialling printing the notices on coloured paper. This started in April 2021. A size increase is unnecessary as all the required information fits onto A4.
Site notices are being taken down/falling off. Issue with lamination.	Officers to monitor/check site notices are still in position. Review laminating process. Can brackets for site notices be used?	Officers do not have capacity to visit sites multiple times to check on site notices.  The legislation states that if the LPA has put the notice up and it is removed then the LPA is treated as having complied with the requirements if they have taken reasonable steps for protection of the notice, which is done by lamination. Brackets would be costly and not be feasible for such use.
Not easy to link to and comment on the relevant planning application.	If possible, place 'QR Codes' on site notices so residents can be directed to the relevant webpage via their smartphones.	Since March 2021 site notices have included a QR code that directs users to the application search page where they can add the planning reference and view the details of the application.
Site notices for important/major planning applications should be located in locations where people are likely to notice them (e.g. in hairdressers, pubs, supermarkets, nearby noticeboards etc.).	Send multiple copies of site notices (for major applications) to relevant elected members who can subsequently distribute them to maximise awareness.	This proposal is not deemed viable as it would lead to additional printing and laminating costs, and reduction in officer time. Also, site notices can look visually detrimental when they are left up on the lamp posts; if more were to be erected this would get worse.  Elected members may use other methods available to them to raise awareness of certain applications, such as newsletters or social media.

<b>Letters to affected neighbours</b>		
Residents who live in close proximity to applications are not receiving formal correspondence about important applications.	Widen the area the letters are sent to so as to include the surrounding area (e.g. whole street).	Officers feel this would lead to inconsistency and open up a further debate about where to draw the further line.
<b>Weekly list</b>		
Nottinghamshire county councillors do not get the weekly list.	Relevant county councillors sent the weekly list automatically.	Anyone can request to be added to the circulation list. New county councillors were contacted to advise them of this after the election in May 2021.
Elected members shouldn't have to sign up to receive the weekly list.	Elected members sent the weekly list automatically.	This is already in operation.
<b>MDC website / planning applications webpage</b>		
Needs to be more user friendly.	Review webpage and remove any unnecessary jargon.	Such a review has recently been undertaken but unfortunately some of the terminology is inescapable.
Users have difficulties registering on the website.	'Video/ Idiots Guide' to be produced which provides a step by step illustration of the process.	A guide and training for members has previously been undertaken which could be refreshed. A video has been made which could be uploaded to the website if required.
Difficulties understanding changes to planning applications. Even if an elected member has registered an interest in a planning application, and there is update, it is still hard to understand what the specific document change is.	Ensure the updated document is highlighted.	Officers fully acknowledge this issue which is difficult to rectify. The date of the specific file is helpful but a call to the case officer is advised.
'Simple Search' function is not prominent.	Raise awareness of the search function by making it more prominent on the webpage.	The search function is one of the main buttons highlighted on the webpage.
<b>Time constraints</b>		
Insufficient time to allow for consultation.	Extend the 21 day statutory timescale	This is not possible with statutory timescales.
Timescales for applications do not always allow for Warsop Parish Council to be fully consulted.	Extend the 21 day statutory timescale. Parish Clerk to be contacted directly.	As above. The parish clerk already receives the weekly list in order for the parish council to decide which applications to comment on.
<b>Advertising/social media</b>		
Utilise social media better.	Put major applications/weekly list on the Mansfield Facebook Page and Twitter feed.	Agreed. Between March and July 2021 the council's Facebook page and Twitter feed advertised the link to the weekly list every Monday, as a trial. This will be continued.


<b><u>Consultations on Planning Policies</u></b>		
<b>Issues/ what needs to be done better</b>	<b>Ideas to address issue</b>	<b>Officer response/ any implications to ideas</b>
<b>Lack of awareness of the Local Plan (and relevant site specific allocations)</b>		
Public unaware of the Local Plan and/or how to comment on various consultation documents. There is an assumption that everyone uses the internet.	Signpost consultations at GP surgeries and supermarkets. Display a poster which directs people to the documentation online or where they can view a hard copy (libraries, town hall etc.).	Officers have previously attempted this and will continue to attempt to advertise consultations. Private companies are not obliged to assist.
No site notices are posted for planning policy site allocations.	Site notices should be posted for planning policy site allocations.	Officers happy to continue this at the Reg 18 / draft stage of plan making having done for this for recent Local Plan consultations. It is not appropriate at Reg 19 / publication stage.
Public are not familiar with the terms used to describe some of the allocations.	Names of site allocations to reflect local names of specific sites. Contact local members to help with this.	Officers will be mindful of this but need to provide a location which is understandable for all. During consultation if we are aware of local names these can be added in brackets "(also known as ....)".
Elected members are happy to 'spread the word' about allocations affecting their ward. However they aren't always informed about implications to their ward or provided with helpful documentation to pass on.	Organise meetings with ward members regarding any new allocations. Provide information leaflets/notices to relevant ward members.	Officers happy to continue this. Elected members (with an allocation in their ward) were contacted ahead of committee report publication and meeting arranged. Summary leaflets were also provided.
<b>Meetings/consultation events</b>		
People who attended planning policy events haven't been kept informed about future development on the specific issue.	Form to be handed out at consultation events to record contact details of the attendees so they can be added to the consultation database (if they wish).	Agreed. Anyone who provided written comments at or after the events was added to our consultation database but we will now give people the chance to sign up even if they do not wish to provide comments.
Location and time of the day of consultation events are not always convenient for people to attend.	Provide differing meeting opportunities to increase participation. The Turner Hall would be a good venue to use.	Agreed. Officers have attempted arranging different locations and times previously, and have used Turner Hall on numerous occasions. Officers have researched the use of a 'virtual exhibition room' which, depending on

		budget availability, can be hosted online (externally) and means that people can access the exhibition content 24 hours a day at a time that suits them.
<b>Understanding planning policy documentation/ making representations</b>		
Some of the planning policy documentation produced is very detailed and lengthy. This makes it very hard to understand the content meaning important information is often overlooked.	Important documents to be translated into a separate plain English version which extracts the key information but removes unnecessary jargon/acronyms.	Summary documents have been produced previously. However plain English is not always possible due to certain regulations / terms. Glossaries are often included as appendices to the planning policy documents.
Difficulties making representations using Objective portal as it's not easy to locate and use if you're not familiar with it. "It's horrible and it is not mobile friendly".	Make the portal weblink more prominent and improve/ raise awareness of 'Video/Site Tour' showing a step by step illustration of how to make representations.	The portal is now accessible on smartphones and includes a site tour video. Consultation letters / emails currently include the portal weblink, individuals' usernames and a link to use if they have forgotten their passwords. The weblink is also advertised on the bottom of planning policy team members' emails.
<b>Advertising/ social media</b>		
Utilise social media better. Posts on Mansfield Facebook page regarding the Local Plan have not been updated.	Provide regular planning policy updates to the Mansfield Facebook page/Twitter feed. Links to the Facebook page and Twitter feed to be placed on the council homepage.	Officers will use the council's Facebook page and Twitter feed when consultations are due to take place. This gives us access to approximately 15,600 Facebook followers and 6,800 Twitter followers.
Public unaware that planning policy updates are in My Mansfield. People don't realise My Mansfield is from the council.	Consider branding and raising the profile of planning policy updates within the documentation.	This has been raised with the marketing and communications team.
Lack of advertisements in the Mansfield Chad.	More press releases. Create specific articles to be advertised within the Mansfield Chad.	Press releases are published at the start of planning policy consultations which is deemed sufficient. Extra press releases can be published throughout a consultation period if required.
<b>Successes - Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Consultation</b>		
Not sure how it could have been improved! Attendees seemed to gain understanding and an important perspective of this important policy area.	Consider using the event as a model which can be replicated for other such contentious consultations in the future.	Noted.

## Appendix 2

- Letter / email (1,073 letters and 1,614 emails sent)

# Mansfield District Council



Mansfield  
District Council


**Contact:** [REDACTED]  
**Your ref:**  
**Our ref:** SCI 2021  
**Direct line:** [REDACTED]  
**Email:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 9 June 2021

Dear

**Re: Mansfield District Council Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)**


Mansfield District Council are required by legislation to produce a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and update it every five years. This document sets out how we will consult you on planning matters, such as new planning policies and planning applications that might affect you. We have recently updated our SCI and would like to know what you think about the draft version.

You can make comments on the draft SCI from 11 June to 26 July 2021. All comments received will be used to inform the final document which, upon adoption by Mansfield District Council, will be applied each time we consult on planning matters.



You can view the document and comment online by visiting our consultation portal:  
[https://mansfield-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/sci\\_2021/draft\\_sci\\_2021](https://mansfield-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/sci_2021/draft_sci_2021)  
or by scanning the QR code on the left with the camera on your smartphone.

Your username is:




If you have forgotten your password please use this link or QR code for a new one:  
<https://mansfield-consult.objective.co.uk/common/forgottenPassword.jsp>

You can also view a copy of the document at the Civic Centre (by appointment only, please call 01623 463463) and at each county library in the district during the consultation period. Please check opening times, ensure you follow all social distancing guidelines in place and remember Hands, Face, Space and Fresh Air to help keep Mansfield safe.

We will be holding the following drop in sessions where you can come along and find out more:

**1 July 2021** (1pm until 6.30pm)  
West Gate (near Primark / WHSmith), Mansfield town centre

**Andy Abrahams** – Elected Mayor      **Hayley Barsby** – Chief Executive Officer  
Civic Centre, Chesterfield Road South, Mansfield, NG19 7BH  
 [www.mansfield.gov.uk](http://www.mansfield.gov.uk)    **T** 01623 463463    **E** [mdc@mansfield.gov.uk](mailto:mdc@mansfield.gov.uk)    **f** MyMansfieldUK    **t** @MDC\_News

**8 July 2021** (1pm until 6.30pm)  
The car park at The Talbot / Co-op, Market Warsop

**15 July 2021** (1pm until 6.30pm)  
Outside the Old Town Hall, Mansfield town centre

All events will be held outside in a gazebo. Hand sanitiser will be available and face masks should be worn.

Comments should preferably be sent electronically via the consultation portal or by email to [lp@mansfield.gov.uk](mailto:lp@mansfield.gov.uk). Any comments sent by post should be addressed to the Planning Policy Team Leader at the address below and reach the council no later than 26 July 2021. Please note that any comments you make may be made publicly available.

You have received this letter because you are listed on Mansfield District Council's Local Plan database. We'd be grateful if you could let us know your email address so that we can reduce our paper usage. Please contact us at [lp@mansfield.gov.uk](mailto:lp@mansfield.gov.uk) or on 01623 463182 for further information, or to be removed from our records.


Yours Faithfully



Planning Policy Team Leader  
Mansfield District Council

A further email was sent out on 28/06/2021 to advertise a fourth consultation event that was arranged. This was for 22 July at Mansfield Woodhouse Market Place.

- MDC staff email





## Mansfield residents encouraged to have their say on planning document

Residents are encouraged to provide feedback on a document which sets out how Mansfield District Council will consult on planning matters, such as new policies and planning applications.

The draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) explains:

- Why you should get involved in planning decisions
- How your involvement makes a difference
- What you can expect from the council
- What the council expects from you
- How you can still get involved during the COVID-19 pandemic
- When opportunities to comment will arise
- How you can best make comments
- What the council does with the comments received
- Where to go for independent support and information

The consultation period runs from Friday 11 June 2021 until Monday 26 July 2021.

You can view the document and comment online by visiting [our consultation portal \(opens in new window\)](#).

You can also view a copy of the document at the Civic Centre (by appointment only, please call 01623 463463) and at every county library in the district during the consultation period. Please check opening times, ensure you follow all social distancing guidelines in place and remember Hands, Face, Space and Fresh Air to help keep Mansfield safe.

The council is holding the following drop-in sessions where you can find out more:

**Thursday 1 July 2021** (1pm until 6.30pm)

West Gate (by Primark / WHSmith), Mansfield town centre

**Thursday 8 July 2021** (1pm until 6.30pm)

The car park at The Talbot / Co-op, Market Warsop

**Thursday 15 July 2021** (1pm until 6.30pm)

Outside the Old Town Hall, Mansfield town centre

All events will be held outside in a gazebo. Hand sanitiser will be available and face masks should be worn.

Comments should preferably be sent electronically via the consultation portal or by email to [lp@mansfield.gov.uk](mailto:lp@mansfield.gov.uk). Any comments sent by post should reach the council no later than 26 July 2021. Please note that any comments you make may be made publicly available.

If you prefer to write, send your comments to:

Planning Policy Team Leader

Mansfield District Council

Civic Centre

Chesterfield Road South

Mansfield

NG19 7BH

Your comments will be used to produce the final document which, upon adoption, will be applied each time the council consults on planning matters.

The council is required by legislation to produce a SCI every five years. The current SCI was adopted in 2017 but has been amended to update the status of the Mansfield District Council Local Plan which is now adopted, and to add what consultation methods may be used in circumstances such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

---


**Published:** June 11th 2021

## - Social media posts

### • Facebook



Examples of some of our Facebook posts. The table shows how many people saw each post.



### • Twitter



Examples of some of our tweets on Twitter



Mansfield  
District Council

## Mansfield District Council

# Do you want to be more involved in decisions made about planning and development?

The draft **Statement of Community Involvement** explains how Mansfield District Council will consult you on planning matters, and we'd like your views.

Have any questions or want to know more?  
Come and see us!

**1 July 2021** (1pm until 6.30pm)  
West Gate (by Primark / WHSmith), Mansfield town centre

**8 July 2021** (1pm until 6.30pm)  
The car park at The Talbot / Co-op, Market Warsop

**15 July 2021** (1pm until 6.30pm)  
Outside the Old Town Hall, Mansfield town centre

**22 July 2021** (1pm until 6.30pm)  
Mansfield Woodhouse Market Place

All events will be held outside in a gazebo. Hand sanitiser will be available and face masks should be worn.



Mansfield District Council

Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)  
2021 (Draft)

February 2021

[www.mansfield.gov.uk](http://www.mansfield.gov.uk)



Available online at:  
[https://mansfield-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/sci\\_2021/draft\\_sci\\_2021](https://mansfield-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/sci_2021/draft_sci_2021)



**by 26 July 2021**

Please send your comments to:  
**Planning Policy Team, Mansfield District Council,  
Civic Centre, Chesterfield Road South, Mansfield, NG19 7BH**

 [www.mansfield.gov.uk](http://www.mansfield.gov.uk)

 [MyMansfieldUK](https://www.facebook.com/MyMansfieldUK)

 [@MDC\\_News](https://twitter.com/MDC_News)