



Oaklands Farm Solar Park

Consultation Report

Appendix 13.1 - Section 42 Copies of Responses and Summary of
Feedback and Regard Had

January 2024

Applicant: Oaklands Farm Solar Ltd

Document Reference: EN010122/APP/5.2

Date: January 2024

Pursuant to: APFP Regulation: 5(2)(q)

Author: Thirty4/7 Communications Ltd

Contents

1. Section 42 - Summary of feedback from consultees and regard had by the Applicant.....	3
--	---

1. Section 42 - Summary of feedback from consultees and regard had by the Applicant

Type	Date	Organisation	Name	Summary of response	Topics included in response	Regard had by the Applicant
Section 43	27.4.22	Amber Valley Borough Council	Simon Gladwin, Executive Director (Operations), Amber Valley Borough Council	Letter confirming that Council has no comments on Project	N/A	Noted.
Section 43	20.4.22	Derby City Council	Paul Clarke, Chief Planning Officer, Communities and Place, Derby City Council	Email thanking for advanced consultation and confirming that Project will have limited to nil impact on the City of Derby – requesting assurance that East Staffordshire Borough Council has been notified.	N/A	Noted. The Applicant confirmed that East Staffordshire Borough Council had been consulted.
Section 43	26.4.22	Derbyshire County Council	Geoff Blissett, Development Control, Transportation Assessment & Studies Officer, Derbyshire County Council	Email requesting drawings of each individual site access point to ensure safe means of access.	- Transport & Access	The Applicant provided relevant drawing and information. Formal consultation response received as part of joint DCC and SDDC response (see line below).
Section 43	06.06.22	Derbyshire County Council and South Derbyshire District Council	Richard Sandbach (DCC) and Jenny Blair (SDDC)	<p>Joint Formal response from DCC and SDDC covering a range of technical comments.</p> <p>The following comments were also noted by members at SDDC and DCC, including from Cllr Stuart Swann (DCC Linton Division Member) and Cllr Amy Wheelton (SDDC Seales Ward Member – <i>who also provided direct feedback dealt with under assessment of section 47 responses within the Consultation Report</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal will lead to the loss of good quality agricultural land. - This agricultural land is valuable and is important nationally to ensure food security. - The scale of the proposal is too large and will have a significant impact on the area, which is considered to be an attractive rural area of South Derbyshire. - The traffic routings proposed are unacceptable, the small roads from the A38 (through Catton and Coton in the Elms) will not be able to cope with the traffic and the large vehicles required. - Concern over loss of biodiversity and trees, and disruption to the earth during construction. <p>Parish Council responses to the consultation were also shared and summarised within this response. Whilst the issues raised within these comments have been incorporated into the table 14.1 within the main body of the Consultation Report, the following points provided in summary by DCC and SDDC, have been incorporated into this table also.</p> <p>Comments summarised from the following Parish Councils: Coton in the Elms Parish Council, Drakelow Parish Council, Lullington Parish Council, Netherseal Parish Council, Overseal Parish Council, Rosliston Parish Council, and Walton on Trent Parish Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding the loss of BMV agricultural land and impact on sustainable food production with the Ukraine war an example of food insecurity. • Alternative power provision site nearby at Drakelow – could this be used instead? • Suggestion of utilising roof spaces of commercial development instead which would not lead to the loss of agricultural land. • Scale of development is too imposing and would have a negative impact on the landscape – it will be larger than the villages of Rosliston, Walton on Trent, Coton in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transport and Access - Heritage - Landscape and Visual - Environmental Health - Noise - Climate Change and Carbon Reduction - Biodiversity - Water resources - Flood Risk - Ground Conditions - Access - Land Use - Glint and Glare - Minerals - Community Benefit - Major Accidents 	<p>The Applicant confirms that feedback provided within the joint LPA response has been considered carefully, and, where appropriate, discussed further with relevant contacts at each authority. Feedback has helped influence the refinement of the final Application in several ways.</p> <p>Members Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consideration of the Proposed Development's impact to agricultural land and food security has been considered and the food production potential of the site has been assessed as part of the EIA process through the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey. Consideration of the site's land use and an assessment of the Agricultural Land Classification can be found in ES Chapter 15, with associated Appendices. - Construction traffic routing has been assessed carefully, and, following the statutory consultation, has been adjusted in response to changes on the local road network (reduced weight limit on the Chetwynd Bridge, and consideration of the delayed Walton bypass). Routes for HGVs have been assessed through traffic surveys to ensure they are suitable to accommodate the proposed activity. A full overview of the construction traffic considerations can be found in ES Chapter 10. - Regarding loss of biodiversity and trees, the proposals will specifically result in a biodiversity net gain of 125% in habitat units, 20% in hedgerow units and 20% in river units, through a comprehensive scheme of landscaping and biodiversity improvements around the Site. This is confirmed in detail in ES Chapter 6 and the Outline LEMP (ES Appendix 5.6). <p>Parish Council Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As noted above, consideration of the site's land use and an assessment of the Agricultural Land Classification can be found in ES Chapter 15, with associated Appendices.

the Elms and Drakelow combined. This would result in urbanisation/industrialisation of a rural area.

- Concern over constant low amplitude noise, and noise during construction.
- Concern over traffic impact at construction phase, especially on narrow lanes with weight restrictions, this could also lead to verge and ditch damage.
- Potential loss of agricultural employment
- Site is too close to another solar farm proposal between Coton and Lullington
- Concerns regarding the impact on wildlife, and the natural migration of wetland birds.
- Potential impact on a medieval archaeological site
- Potential loss of ponds and ditches during the construction
- Solar occupies significant land space, there are environmental questions around the manufacture and later the decommissioning of the panels, as well as questions regarding the efficiency of solar units in the northern hemisphere.
- 4m high hedges will completely alter the landscape and make public rights of way appear like tunnels.
- Restricted transport routes – particularly through Catton and Coton in the Elms
- The emphasis is on national energy security and there is no creative consideration of local benefit. Locally the impact is likely to be overwhelmingly negative. Can consideration be given to giving the community access to green sourced energy?
- Current national policy is relatively silent on the solar power, it would suggest that this proposal is inconsistent with national policy.

Technical comments from the respondents included:

Scope and methodology of the EIA – DCC and SDDC agree with the scope of the EIA topics.

Cumulative Impacts – the assessment of the impact of developments within 5km of the site have been included and should be explored fully through the EIA process. Of particular importance is potential for viewpoints from multiple solar farms in the area (and consideration of glint and glare).

- Cumulative transport issues (such as the construction of the new Walton bypass) should also be considered in detail.

Transport and Access - A key issue is the construction phase traffic and its implications for the local road network.

- Issues relating to the 7.5t weight limit on local roads is a concern given the potential for illegitimate access by HGVs (not associated with the project which has legitimate access). Traffic monitoring and marshalling included within the CTMP should contribute to enforcement of environmental weight limits.
- The CTMP contains a comprehensive set of traffic impact mitigations measures. Some elements of the CTMP require further negotiation with the Highway Authority, as will routeing and delivery of AIL deliveries
- Request for further information including swept path analysis of access points to the site to assess suitability or any highway safety concerns.
- The CEMP should clarify whether any safety issues should be considered during operation, although it is noted that vehicle movements at this point will be minimal.
- Highways assessments and safety will be considered in relation to the glint and glare assessment, however this expertise does not exist within the local authority at present.

Heritage – The Authority DCC Officer is satisfied that the PEIR meets the requirements of the NPPF (para 194) in terms of describing the significance of any heritage assets potentially affected by the development. It is evident that this has been suitably assessed in Chapter 7 of the PEIR. There is also agreement with the Core Study Area which is set at 2.5km.

- The officer concurs with the conclusion that any change experienced in the setting of the identified assets during construction will be temporary and short term and therefore no harm should arise as a result of the Proposed Development.
- Given the nature of the proposed development it is agreed that the effects on heritage setting are reversible following the removal of the PV panel arrays and associated above-ground infrastructure. Very generally speaking it is agreed that this level of harm is likely to fall towards the lower end of less than substantial harm.
- However, DCC is less certain over the potential impacts on the setting of Park Farm (GII). While the authority does not disagree that it is likely to fall into the category of less than substantial harm it is not presently clear exactly where within this category it is likely to fall.

- Telecommunications and Utilities

- The Applicant notes the potential for alternative power provision/use of industrial roof space for solar suggestions, however this is beyond the scope of this Application. National policy EN-1 identifies NSIP scale solar as a critical national priority and therefore on that basis demonstrates that the use of appropriate sites for ground mounted solar will be necessary for the UK to meet its carbon reduction targets. This is set out in detail in the Planning Statement (Document 7.1).
- Regarding local visual and landscape impact, this has been dealt with in detail in ES Chapter 5.
- Traffic and transport considerations have been considered carefully, and updates made to the proposed construction routes following the publication of the PEIR for statutory consultation. These assessments are set out in ES Chapter 10.
- Issues relating to employment have been assessed within the Socio-Economics Chapter of the ES (Chapter 12).
- Cumulative considerations have been assessed within ES Chapter 2, and as appropriate, within each individual ES Chapter.
- Noise is not considered to represent a significant impact due to the collocation of the BESS and substation in the centre of the site, away from sensitive receptors, and has been fully assessed within ES Chapter 11.
- Consideration of impact to wildlife, location of ponds and ditches has been set out in ES Chapter 6.
- Heritage issues have been considered and set out within Chapter 7 of the ES.
- Community benefits have been considered carefully and the Applicant is keen to continue dialogue locally to further confirm where there may be opportunities for local schemes and initiatives to benefit from the benefit funding available.
- This application supports, and is supported by, national policy, as set out in the Planning Statement (Document reference 7.1).

Technical comments

Cumulative Impacts – The Applicant notes the LPA comments. Cumulative impacts have been fully assessed and set out within the ES Chapters. Full details of the glint and glare effects can be found in Chapter 14 of the ES and Appendix 14.1 – Solar Photovoltaic Glint and Glare Study. A full overview of the construction traffic considerations can be found in ES Chapter 10.

Transport and Access – The Applicant notes the 7.5t weight limit and has adjusted the proposed construction traffic routing accordingly to account for this (predominantly due to the change in weight limit in the Chetwynd Bridge). These updated construction traffic routes were presented for consideration during the informal targeted consultation and are set out in detail in the ES Chapter 10 and the Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 10.1). The Applicant is committed to ongoing engagement with the Highway Authority for Abnormal Indivisible Load delivery and traffic impact mitigation set out within the CTMP. The final submitted ES Chapter and Outline CTMP (with relevant appendices) contain all detailed information, including swept path analysis for the proposed routes, and the Outline CEMP sets out safety considerations for construction and operation. The Applicant notes the LPA does not have expertise to respond fully to glint and glare in respect of highways safety – the information contained within ES Chapter 14 is comprehensive in addressing any concerns related to this issue.

Heritage – The Applicant notes that the DCC officer is in agreement that the assessment of heritage assets set out within the PEIR is accurate and appropriate. These assessments have been confirmed within the final ES (see Chapter 7 of the ES).

Regarding uncertainty relating to the impact on Park Farm (GII) (and other assets in the northern part of the site), the Applicant has since

- It is considered that due to the broader context of the impacts to the rural setting that some effects (towards the lower end of less than substantial harm) will be experienced on a few identified designations (Church of St Laurence, Walton Hall and Borough Walls Iron Age Hill Fort).
- It is difficult to appreciate exactly the extent of the visibility of the PV arrays and subsequent change based on the photomontages. Suggestion to provide additional visual representation (drone technology or 3D rendered representation).
- Reduction in potential visual impacts could be achieved through consideration of colouring of associated infrastructure – dark grey or black preferably.
- Request for all cables to be placed underground.

Landscape and visual impact – In terms of landscape mitigation planting, we would wish to see, tree belts and buffer zones to certain field boundaries of at least 5m, as well as buffer zones to any PROW that would allow for substantial tree planting and give greater ecological enhancement. There is an opportunity to plant several pocket woodlands within the surrounding area, which would give a greater screening, and longevity, and enhance the impact for wildlife. There is a preference for tree planting rather than hedgerows given the relationship with the National Forest.

- The landscape and visual impact assessment is refreshingly honest and concludes that there would be long-term impacts on the landscape character of the site and its immediate setting as a result of this development proposal.
- To what extent the proposed development could and should provide greater landscape benefit to add to the planning balance, for example through its ability to contribute to the wider aims and objectives of the National Forest.
- Suggest that all boundaries within the site boundary should be replanted/gapped up and not just those that have been highlighted as being the most important for visual mitigation to reinforce and strengthen existing landscape characteristics and perhaps some of the field corners currently identified for species rich grassland could be planted as small woodland copses as an alternative strategy particularly given that existing fields containing the panels will be managed as unimproved grasslands throughout the period of the development.
- Urge that the applicant seeks to secure underground cable connections to negate the need for any additional overhead structures that would introduce more visual clutter to the current scene.

Environmental Health and Noise – No significant concerns in principle raised, with a request to comment more fully at submission stage.

Climate change and Carbon reduction - This proposal would make a huge contribution to carbon emission reduction and would support South Derbyshire's route to carbon neutrality by 2050. It would be a large-scale renewable energy source for South Derbyshire with considerable financial investment. It would be connected to a 40MW battery storage capacity which is classed as large scale and will make the solar farm much more efficient.

- Consideration of mitigation for loss of agricultural land and flood risk considerations should be addressed.
- Request for a Carbon Management Plan and an assessment of any potential the proposed development might have to exacerbate climate change impacts, such as drought, flood risk or overheating due to a reduction in shading and cooling from vegetation loss.

Biodiversity, ecology and trees – given the location, no significant impact on the River Mease SAC or SSSI is anticipated.

- The protection of species rich hedgerows and important trees is welcomed.
- Further comments can be found in the landscape comments relating to the provision of species rich grassland meadows in some locations, consideration here should be given to strengthening or increasing tree cover with the aim of enhancing the local landscape character in the context of the National Forest designation and in light of the extent of grassland that will be retained between and beneath the proposed solar arrays.
- The existing site land use is agricultural, and it is accepted that while the proposed use will take the land out of agricultural production, it will give the land time to rest, effectively in a fallow condition. However, there is concern that construction and eventually decommissioning plant traffic associated particularly with cabling and drainage will contribute to compaction of the soils and damage to soil structure.
- As stated in the comments of the local Councillor, residents have voiced concern that site fencing will restrict the movement of wildlife across and through the site. It is

removed all panels from this part of the site, which significantly reduces the potential for heritage impacts.

The Applicant has provided comprehensive visual representation from multiple viewpoints, which can be reviewed within ES Chapter 5 and supporting appendices.

The colour of the various aspects of the development would not be defined through the DCO application, with details of specific layout and design to be provided to South Derbyshire District Council for approval should Development Consent be granted. The colour used would be appropriately muted to manage landscape and visual effects.

The Applicant confirms that all cables associated with the project will be placed underground, rather than connect via overhead lines.

Landscape and visual impact – The Applicant has considered the feedback provided and has confirmed areas of additional or enhanced planting around the site, having had regard to feedback also provided by the National Forest and Forestry Commission.

Consideration of the visual impact of the Proposed Development has been set out in detail within ES Chapter 5, which confirms the results of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). Confirmation of the updated planting and landscaping can be found in the Outline LEMP (ES Appendix 5.6).

As noted above, the Applicant confirms that all cables associated with the project will be placed underground, rather than connect via overhead lines to reduce visual impact.

Environmental Health and Noise – The Applicant notes that the LPA have no significant issues to raise at PEIR. The ES at Chapter 11 sets out how the Applicant responded to other feedback related to noise and has adjusted the Proposed Development to further reduce the potential for any noise impacts on local receptors. This includes locating the BESS and substation together within the centre of the site away from residential properties.

Climate change and Carbon reduction – The Applicant supports the LPA response that the Proposed Development would make a significant contribution to carbon emission reduction.

Consideration of mitigation to effects in relation to agricultural land (ES Chapter 15) and flood risk (ES Chapter 8) can be found in the respective ES chapters.

Biodiversity, ecology and trees – The Applicant notes the LPA comments regarding no significant impact to River Mease SAC or SSSI, the protection of hedgerows and suggestions in relation to strengthening tree cover in the context of the National Forest designation. These points have been considered and taken into account through the development of the Outline LEMP (ES Appendix 5.6).

Regarding the potential impacts to agricultural land, assessment and relevant mitigation to reduce or avoid any potential impacts to ground conditions has been set out within ES Chapter 9.

Fencing is required, as the LPA confirms, to prevent damage to the solar panels, however comments relating to wildlife and small mammal movements is noted, proposed fencing around the solar arrays will include mammal gaps at the base of the fence to allow dispersal of mammals. ES Chapter 6 sets out a full assessment of local wildlife and biodiversity.

accepted that for security reasons fencing is required and that such fencing will need to prevent access by deer to prevent damage to the PV panels. With this in mind, consideration should be given to the design of the fencing, particularly the ground level panels, to enable the passage of smaller mammals such as badgers, foxes and hedgehogs while maintaining site security.

- Recommendations on specific points from the DCC officer include:
 - The ES submission should ensure all ecological survey work has been undertaken within the appropriate timeframes and lifespans as dictated in best practice guidelines
 - The ES should specify in appropriate detail the likely ecological impacts arising from the fixed cable routes and the mitigation measures required to adhere to relevant statutory legislation and best practice guidelines, in respect of habitats and species.
 - The ES should clearly identify whether ponds are to be affected by the NSIP and further specify any enhancement and mitigation measures, likewise for any drains and watercourses
 - The PIER states that retained veteran/ancient trees will be protected with a 15m buffer. This is an incorrect interpretation of Natural England's standing guidance, which requires 'the buffer zone to be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree'. The ES should ensure that ancient and veteran trees are buffered in accordance with the correct statutory guidance (as correctly noted in the submitted Arboricultural Report, appended to the PIER)
 - The ES should include a biodiversity metric utilising the latest approved Natural England calculator tool (currently Metric 3.1) to suitably measure the biodiversity impact of the NSIP in accordance with current best practice. It is vital that the submitted Metric is directly supported by appropriately annotated plans to ensure that retained, removed, created and enhanced habitats are clearly defined in a transparent manner
 - The outline mitigation measures should be further refined within the proposed CEMP to ensure all habitats are suitably protected during the construction phase in accordance with current best practice. It is recommended that a habitat constraints plan or similar is produced for the CEMP, which clearly defines buffer zones to sensitive features such as ancient/veteran trees, other retained trees, ponds, watercourses, hedgerows and woodlands etc
 - The outline LEMP should be further refined for the ES submission to ensure all habitats are suitably managed to maximise ecological potential over the operational period of the NSIP, in accordance with current best practice
 - The ES should provide separate consideration on likely significant impacts to ground nesting birds, particularly 'Priority Species', arising from the solar installation and the compensation measures which are to be delivered
 - The ES should clarify whether barn owl has been identified as nesting within a Site tree; and if nesting has been identified, mitigation and compensation measures should be prescribed to adhere to statutory legislation and best practice guidelines during construction and operational phases
 - In respect of the Oaklands Farm part of the Site, the ES should consider in more detail the implications of an absence of GCN survey data for off-site ponds and furthermore, the likely significant impacts arising from the construction phase of the solar installation following the precautionary principle. Additional compensation and mitigation measures may be required to suitably control the potential for killing and injuring GCN during the construction phase.
 - The ES should clarify the location and specification of badger access gaps within the perimeter fencing, which should ideally be plotted on an approved site plan

Water Resources, Flood Risk and Ground Conditions – the following comments were made:

- In order to maximise infiltration, a soil management plan should be developed which demonstrates how damage to soil horizons and ground cover will be mitigated and remediated during and after construction and for future decommissioning.
- Query relating to chisel ploughing which will be undertaken on completion of construction works to improve infiltration and counter compaction. How could this be carried out with the solar arrays in place?
- Request that in order to ensure flood risk is not increased during construction, a construction phase surface water management plan should be incorporated.
- The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) indicates that there will be gaps within each array to allow for thermal expansion of the individual panels and that rainwater will be able to fall through these gaps thereby avoiding a concentrated flow onto the ground. Nevertheless, it is likely that the majority of the flow would fall from the bottom of the arrays, particularly

The Applicant notes the additional comments, recommendations and guidance provided on the PEIR by the DCC, which has been considered and, where appropriate, factored into the final ES, through clarifications to content or appendices.

Water Resources, Flood Risk and Ground Conditions – The Applicant notes the comments made with regard to ground conditions and can confirm a full consideration of the noted points has been set out within the ES at Chapter 9.

An outline Soils Management Plan is included as an appendix to the Outline CEMP (ES Appendix 4.3).

Regarding flood risk, a full assessment of the Proposed Development and its potential impacts and required mitigation can be found in ES Chapter 8. Appendix 8.1 of the ES includes a Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy. Recommendations and comments made by the LPA have been considered and incorporated within the information supplied in the ES Chapter.

Public Rights of Way – The Applicant notes the comments of the PRO Officer. Care has been taken to consider rights of way and routes through the site. Where feasible, improvements have been proposed (such as the provision of the permissive path). Landscaping and planting has also taken these routes into consideration, as can be seen on the Outline LEMP (ES Appendix 5.6).

Land Use and Planning – Consideration of the Proposed Development's impact to agricultural land and food security has been considered and the food production potential of the site has been assessed as part of the EIA process through the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey. Consideration of the site's land use and an assessment of the Agricultural Land Classification can be found in ES Chapter 15, with associated Appendices.

Glint and Glare - The Applicant notes the LPA does not have expertise to respond fully to glint and glare – the information contained within ES Chapter 14 is comprehensive in addressing any concerns related to this issue.

Major Accidents and Disasters and Telecommunications and Utilities – The Applicant notes these comments.

Minerals – The Applicant agrees with the LPA assessment with regard to minerals and that as the Proposed Development can be reversed, this does not permanently sterilise the access to sand and gravel underlying part of the site.

Community Benefit – The Applicant notes the LPA comments on community benefit and is pleased to confirm its approach to this issue. Following the statutory consultation and further engagement with relevant stakeholders, the Applicant has confirmed its commitment to an annual community benefit contribution of around £55,000 for the life of the project (40 years) to be distributed to local causes via a local community fund. The total amount across the lifetime of the project would be in the region of £2m. There are also opportunities for direct ecological benefits and Biodiversity Net Gain through improvements such as Hedgerow planting & improved management, Improving grasslands and wildflowers, Decreased use of fertiliser and herbicide, Improved soil condition. Socio-economic benefits then include improving links between existing paths and right of ways, local contracting opportunities - fencing, civil works, testing and

- when individual panels are in an expanded condition. Request for measures to be incorporated to mitigate against potential erosion of the ground underneath the lower edges of the arrays. Any surface water drainage system should be sustainable and with multiple benefits.
- Ordinary watercourses within the site should be modelled to ensure infrastructure is kept outside areas of risk.
 - As requested by the Environment Agency, there should be a minimum 8m easement between the top of any watercourse bank and any infrastructure.
 - Any watercourse crossings, or changes to existing crossings, may need Land Drainage Consent from the LLFA and should be designed so as to not impede drainage.
 - The drawings of the battery storage and transformer details in appendices of the FRA do not appear to show the gravel bases referred to in the assessment text.

Public Rights of Way – The DCC officer noted that the site is crossed by a limited Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network which has been accommodated within the site layout. While the user experience of the landscape will undoubtedly be impacted by the proposal, including by the noise associated with the solar park plant and battery storage facility, those sections of the PRoW are not extensive and scope exists for the screening of the more significant views, without creating a sense of enclosure. Further, additional permissive routes are proposed with and through the solar park creating greater potential for circular routes in the locality.

Land Use and Planning – The SDDC officer noted the mix of agricultural land across the proposed site and requested that the Applicant utilises land that does not lead to the loss of Grade 2 and Grade 3 land (albeit on a semi-permanent basis). The Proposed Development will be assessed in line with the SDDC adopted Local Plan (Part 1 and Part 2).

Glint and Glare - While glint and glare issues potentially affecting local residents, air traffic, highway and rights of way users have been considered and expert evidence provided to confirm that glint and glare are not identified as significant, with the exception of a limited number of residential receptors, for whom mitigation is identified, it should be noted that this authority does not have the in-house expertise to assess the data included in the PEIR appendices.

Major Accidents and Disasters and Telecommunications and Utilities - DCC agrees that adherence to applicable industrial and regulatory standards in the specification, design and use of plant and equipment proposed to be installed at, and used in the construction of, the proposal will greatly reduce the potential for adverse impact on telecommunications systems, utilities or lead to an increased risk of major accidents and disasters. It is therefore accepted that, in the absence of contradictory information, that these issues are scoped out of the ES.

Minerals - Part of this site to the northeast of Walton on Trent is indicated to be underlain by resources of sand and gravel and is therefore covered by the Mineral Consultation Area (MCA), as defined in the Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan. The MCA ensures that minerals of economic importance are safeguarded and are, therefore, taken into account in the assessment of applications for non-mineral development to avoid their needless sterilisation. It is considered in this case that the nature of a solar park development means it could be removed relatively easily (unlike built development with foundations etc), and it is unlikely therefore that it would lead to the permanent sterilisation of the sand and gravel resource i.e. the sand and gravel would still be readily available should the development be removed. Also, the area has never been promoted by mineral operators, and is not identified as being required for sand and gravel extraction in the period for the emerging Minerals Local Plan, which will cover the period to 2038. As a result, on balance, DCC would not have any objections to this proposal in terms of its impact on the sand and gravel resource.

Community Benefit - The NPPF indicates that where new developments raise concerns regarding their likely harm to the environment, particularly important heritage assets, this likely harm should be balanced against any public benefits that may be generated by the development proposals. In this respect, it is noted that in Paragraph 12.134 of the PEIR, reference is made to the applicant's proposals to administer an annual community benefit fund, which is welcomed and supported by the County Council. Further details should be provided in the applicant's DCO ES submission, particularly regarding the scale of funding and how such a fund is likely to be administered in consultation with local community groups. Early dialogue with such groups could establish a list of potential projects that could be funded, should the scheme be granted consent. It is noted that paragraph 12.136 of the PEIR also indicates that the proposed development could provide a valuable educational resource for the

commissioning and knock on effects for local businesses and payment of business rates.

General – The Applicant notes the LPA comment relating to a preference to utilising industrial roof space for solar, however this is not within the scope of this Application. National policy EN-1 identifies NSIP scale solar as a critical national priority and therefore on that basis demonstrates that the use of appropriate sites for ground mounted solar will be necessary for the UK to meet its carbon reduction targets. This is set out in detail in the Planning Statement (Document 7.1).

Regarding the potential for collaboration with relevant local stakeholders for educational purposes, the Applicant would be pleased to consider a dialogue on this point in due course.

				<p>local area in consultation with the local community, to establish how best to provide such educational materials on site. Examples of good practice are referred to including the use of interpretation boards, explaining solar energy and the work going on onsite, which could be placed at strategic locations such as along PRow; and that visits could also be arranged for local schools / community groups. These proposals are also welcomed and supported by the County Council and again, it is expected that further details should be provided by the applicant in its DCO ES submission.</p> <p>General - There is a general feeling that while solar energy is supported to tackle climate change, large warehouses (especially new ones) should be utilised as a priority, instead of agricultural land. Rosliston Forestry Centre, which is adjacent to the proposal to the east, have asked whether there would be scope to incorporate solar power energy in their education sessions and possibly work with the company to enable that to happen. If biodiversity measures were found to be exemplar, they would be keen to share expertise in this area also.</p>		
Section 42	09.06.22	Cadent Gas	Carys Hale, Fisher German / Gemma Hayes, Cadent Gas	<p>Response setting out Cadent Gas guidance/ consideration for actions in proximity to medium pressure mains pipeline and associated equipment.</p> <p>Cadent has existing easements for this pipeline which prevents the erection of buildings/ structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials within the easement strip.</p>	- Other issues	Noted. The Applicant acknowledges the points made within the consultation response and has liaised closely with Cadent to ensure that existing operation of the pipeline remains uninterrupted. Protective provisions with Cadent Gas Limited are being negotiated.
Section 42	09.06.22	Local Resident - Shirley Dumigan	Shirley Dumigan, Director, Transport & Infrastructure Planning	<p>Comments on traffic and PRow - construction route diversions.</p> <p>Respondent noted that she did not receive a formal notification about the consultation and queried the level of local advertisement.</p> <p>Consultee notes that the proposals are suggesting to divert a number of PROWs including the Cross Britain Way and this includes pushing walkers onto the Rosliston Road running from Rosliston to Walton and another onto Burton Road, suggesting that this is acceptable as it is done on Catton Lane. Consultee notes that there is a significant difference from Catton Lane where the footpath runs along the road in terms of level of traffic, speeds, visibility and space for walkers to use the road at this location to the routes suggested. Families walk each route and the respondent does not believe that providing temporary signage warning drivers of pedestrians in the road is an appropriate safety measure to allow users to use these roads safely.</p> <p>Rosliston and Burton Roads are fast roads with a lot higher levels of traffic than Catton Lane. The only way to access the Forestry centre and garden centre from Rosliston village is via footpaths through the centre and nobody would risk walking on the narrow roads or Burton Road. This mitigation is unsafe and dangerous and not a suitable option even for a temporary period.</p> <p>Respondent queried details on length of time diversions would be in place. Requested information related to visitors numbers to the Forestry Centre and walkers on the PRow?</p> <p>The Forestry Centre is a tourism attraction and this doesn't appear to have been taken into account in the road surveys undertaken.</p> <p>Queried whether a Road Safety audit has been completed.</p> <p>Queried where the proposed signage would go.</p> <p>Respondent stated that she did not feel that the proposed mitigation approach was appropriate or safe. Recommended alternative temporary routes are identified that avoid local road network.</p>	<p>- Transport & Access</p> <p>- Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that not a formal consultee under section 42 – as a local resident and professional in the Transport & Infrastructure Planning industry, the comments and feedback provided should be considered in line with other technical consultees.</p> <p>The Applicant notes comments related to consultation notification. Whilst the respondent was within the newsletter mailing radius and would therefore have received a newsletter in line with the SoCC, for the reasons noted above, she would not have received a formal notification. A full overview of local consultation activity undertaken can be found in Consultation Report Chapter 18.</p> <p>The Applicant notes concerns raised about PRow diversions onto Rosliston Road and onto Burton Road. The Applicant has considered this point in detail and has undertaken several assessments of local road safety (see ES Chapter 10 – Transport & Access).</p> <p>The Applicant has consulted with the Rosliston Forestry Centre, including on public rights of way alignment and potential diversions. Appropriate mitigation has been set out in the ES Chapter 12 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation). A Recreation Questionnaire also sought feedback on local use of the site, which informed the final design and consideration of mitigation.</p> <p>Consultation with local authority (DCC) highways officers have confirmed appropriateness of proposed mitigation during construction, subject to specific application to the authority for each temporary PRow diversion.</p> <p>Following consultation, a permissive path was confirmed through the site (outline LEMP (ES Appendix 5.6))</p>
Section 43	06.06.22	Derbyshire County Council Place Department	Vicky Killeen, Rights of Way Assistant	<p>Comments relating to specific footpaths, access and safety around the site.</p> <p>Consultee confirmed that Drakelow Public Footpath No. 5 and Walton Upon Trent Public Footpath No. 9 run through the proposed application site. Request to pay due regard to the following, throughout the planning process, and throughout any subsequent works: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The footpaths must remain open, unobstructed and on their legal alignments. • There should be no disturbance to the path surfaces without prior authorisation from the Rights of Way Section. • Consideration should be given to the safety of members of the public using the paths during any works. A temporary closure of paths will be permitted on application to DCC where the path(s) remain unaffected on completion of the development. 	<p>- Transport & Access</p> <p>- Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that the noted footpaths are considered within the assessment and mitigation proposed for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Agreement that the Proposed Development will not alter the accessibility or legal alignment of the footpaths.</p> <p>The Applicant will seek authorisation from the Rights of Way Section should disturbance to path surfaces be required during construction or operation of the Proposed Development.</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no encroachment of the paths, and no fencing should be installed without consulting the Rights of Way Section. • Any detailed future plans for consideration, should include proposed widths allowed for the footpaths to run along, and any proposed landscaping, including hedgerows. The Rights of Way Section would welcome the opportunity to discuss any such proposals at an early stage. 		<p>Where temporary impacts are identified on footpaths during construction phase, suitable mitigation will be set in place, with diversions if required. The Applicant will seek temporary closure of paths through an application to DCC, should it be required.</p> <p>A set back has been incorporated from all public rights of way to ensure no encroachment from the solar farm.</p> <p>Consideration of visual impact from receptors include public rights of way. This has been considered through the visual assessment work undertaken (Chapter 5 of the ES).</p> <p>The Landscape Strategy Plan produced at PEIR consultation has been incorporated into the outline LEMP (ES Appendix 5.6) and updated in alignment with consultee comments, and to confirm inclusion of additional permissive path.</p>
Section 42	26.05.22	Environment Agency	Mr Joseph Drewry, Planning specialist	<p>No significant objections, but comments to take on board by the Applicant including the need for Environmental Permit.</p> <p>The EA has no fluvial flood risk objections however request the Applicant consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adherence to best practice for (cable route) crossing watercourses at 90 degrees to the flow of water. - Minimum 8m distance for easement of cable duct and solar panels from water courses. <p>The EA has no objections in relation to biodiversity however request the Applicant consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request for a management plan to manage any wildflower meadow planting and permitted grazing/cutting schedule to allow species to fully establish - Water storage in this area would add significantly to the biodiversity value of the site – suggestion of linear wetlands through ditches directed to attenuate water - Recommendation for inclusion of bird boxes. - Expectation to see mitigation and enhancement measures included in a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. <p>Regarding groundwater and contaminated land, the EA noted the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant should note that in accordance with Government policy 'where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner'. - Encourage alignment with EA guidance on groundwater protection. - Notes a potential requirement for an Environmental Permit. <p>The EA has no objections in relation to environment management, however request the Applicant consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During construction there is a risk that sediments will enter the watercourse via the overland drainage, especially during wet weather and could result in a pollution. Only clean water is allowed to enter watercourses. Should sediment enter the Pessall Brook this could impact on the River Mease. - Mitigation measures need to be identified and considered to ensure sediment does not enter the tributary of the Mease or the River Trent especially during wet weather. The plans do include a plan to introduce hedgerows and wildflower meadows around the panels which should help act as mitigation against silt and other sediment entering the watercourse however these would need to be maintained. - The suggestions of the fisheries, recreation, and biodiversity team to introduce water storage areas to decrease flood risk would also mitigate sediment loss from the site. - Our only other comment would be around any washing and toilet facility on site. Ideally these would be connected to the Severn Trent Water Ltd sewage system for disposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water resource and flood risk - Ecology - Project description/Site selection and design strategy - Agriculture and land use 	<p>The Applicant notes responses from the EA and will align future development activity with ES guidance and national policy requirements.</p> <p>Consideration of flood risk points can be found in ES Chapter 8. The Applicant confirms adherence with minimum offset from water courses for the cable route and solar panels.</p> <p>Consideration of biodiversity and environment management comments can be found in ES Chapter 6, and the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 4.3) and the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.4).</p> <p>Consideration of groundwater and contaminated land can be found in ES chapter 8 and ES Chapter 9. The Applicant confirms adherence with EA guidance and national policy.</p>
Section 43	20.4.22	Erewash Borough Council	Steve Birkinshaw, Head of Planning and Regeneration, Erewash Borough Council	<p>Email thanking for consultation and confirming that proposal will have no environmental effects on Erewash Borough Council and confirming that they do not intend to respond to further engagement</p>	N/A	Noted.

Section 42	03.5.22	ESP Utilities Group Ltd	Plant Protection Team, ESP Utilities Group Ltd	Confirmation that ESP has no gas or electricity apparatus in the site vicinity	N/A	Noted.
Section 42	23.5.22	Forestry Commission East and West Midlands Area	Corinne Meakins, Local Partnership Advisor, Forestry Commission East and West Midlands Area	<p>Confirmation of ongoing engagement and recommendations on how to incorporate Forestry Commission policy into Project. Encouraged consultation with Forestry Centre Rosliston.</p> <p>The Forestry Commission considers that as this application is set within the area of the National Forest that it should strive to deliver on the attempt to afforest as much as possible of the area and we refer you to the National Forest Guide for Developers and Planners.</p> <p>With the Rosliston forest centre being adjacent to the site on the western side, it would be a prime opportunity to expand the forested area or at least buffer it, however we defer to the views of the National Forest in this matter. The larger the forest area the greater the resilience to climate change and pests and disease.</p> <p>Given that biodiversity net gain and tree planting targets are national ambitions any development needs to consider how it will support these and we hope to see some clear aims with this in mind.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ecology - Socio-economics, tourism and recreation - Landscape and visual 	<p>The Applicant notes comments related to the request for additional tree planting. This has been incorporated into the proposals. Additional planting has been identified and included within the final Proposed Development plans – shown in detail in the outline LEMP (ES Appendix 5.6)).</p> <p>Consultation and engagement with the National Forest has taken place to consider opportunities for joint working and input to the Proposed Development. These discussions have resulted in several amendments to the Landscape Strategy Plan to find opportunities to improve access to the Cross Britain Way and increase planting of relevant trees through the site.</p> <p>Consideration of biodiversity net gain and tree planting is set out in ES Chapter 6 and shown in the Landscape Strategy Plan.</p>
Section 42	06.06.22	Historic England	Tim Allen, Development Advice Team Leader (North)	<p>Refers to the expert advice of Derbyshire County Council's archaeological officers with regard to the assessment of on-site impacts through staged investigation by geophysical survey and target trial trenching etc.</p> <p>The impacts of cable routes as well as panel fixing and substation construction should be assessed, minimised and mitigated with a view to the effective management of risk.</p> <p>At 7.42 of the PEIR the initial assessment of the importance of the Rynield Street as of at least local importance is preliminary and may be revealed to be higher as part of the Roman Road as a whole and / or in its immediate Roman and Post – Roman landscape and archaeological context, opportunities to better reveal and safeguard its significance should be embraced.</p> <p>Remains of the Drakelow Park pale should be regarded in the context of the park as whole including its GII Gate Piers 1158871, the GII listed Stable block and cottages 1096454, GII Sunken Garden 1334614 and GII Garden Wall 1311251. Whilst the survival at Drakelow of this elite landscape is fragmentary (as is well described at 7.48) it should still be considered holistically, if remains of the former park pale can be traced archaeologically then their significance as part of a greater whole deserves to be better revealed.</p> <p>Ridge and furrow earthworks form a key element of historic character of the English midlands. Survivals should be positively conserved through the planning process where possible, both as historic landscape setting to designated assets and as assets in their own right.</p>	- Historic Environment	<p>The Applicant notes the comments shared by the respondent.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the specific historic features identified within the response have been considered carefully and addressed within the ES Chapter 7, and ES Appendix 7.1 – Historic Environment Assessment.</p>
Section 42	26.05.22	Health and safety Executive - HSE	Allan Benson (CEMHD4 NSIP Consultation Team)	<p>The respondent noted that the proposed DCO application boundary for the Proposed Development is not within any consultation zones of major accident hazard sites or major hazard pipelines.</p> <p>HSC would be required to store or use any of the Named Hazardous Substances or Categories of Substances at or above the controlled quantities.</p> <p>At present there is a limited consideration of risk assessments arising from the developments vulnerability to major accidents. We would advise this is considered further in line with Advice Note 11 Annex on the Planning Inspectorate's website - Annex G – The Health and Safety Executive taking account of the following: "it may be beneficial for applicants to undertake a risk assessment as early as possible to satisfy themselves that their design and operation will meet the requirements of relevant health and safety legislation as design of the Proposed Development progresses."</p>	- Other issues (inc Major Accidents and Risk)	The Applicant notes comments from the HSE with regard to risk assessment. Consideration of this issue has been set out within ES Chapter 16, including an Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.6).
Section 44	26.4.22	Lloyds Bank	Jayne Cresswell, Case Handler, Lloyds Bank	Notice of returning correspondence as unable to locate securities referred to (response to landowner letter)	N/A	The Applicant provided additional information to assist with clarification of specific site area for the proposed Development. No further response was received.

Section 42	27.5.22	National Grid (NGET)	Anne Holdsworth (DCO Liaison Officer, Land Rights and Acquisitions)	<p>Due to the proximity of some of our assets, NGET wishes to express its interest in further consultation while the impact on its assets is still being assessed.</p> <p>Where the Applicant intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with or work within close proximity to any of NGET's apparatus and land, this will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights.</p>	- Other issues	The Applicant notes comments made by NGET and has worked closely with NGET during the design process including engagement to confirm relationship of the Proposed Development with NGET assets and interests. Protective provisions with National Grid Electricity Transmission plc are being negotiated.
Section 42	06.5.22	National Highways	Steve Freek, Assistant Spatial Planner	<p>Following review of Chapter 7 of the PEIR: Transport and Access, National Highways provided the following advice with respect to the assessment of traffic impacts on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) to support any forthcoming application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would advise that the assessment of the development should be carried out and reported as described in the Department for Transport 'Guidance on Transport Assessment (GTA)' and in accordance with Circular 02/2013. We note that a construction traffic management plan (CTMP) shall be provided, which we support and would advise be submitted for review and advice in advance of the DCO application. Details regarding site operation and decommissioning from a traffic impact perspective should also be provided for review. Although a plan has been provided showing the access routes which shall be recommended during construction, for longer distance journeys, it is not clear which junctions on the SRN shall be impacted. It appears that for traffic routeing from the south on the A38, the A38 / A513 junction at Alrewas will be used; from traffic routeing from the north on the A38, the Branston junction south of Burton on Trent will be used. This should be clarified, along with routeing choices for those travelling from elsewhere. Further to the above point on identifying the SRN locations which shall be impacted, the likely distribution proportions (during the most intensive construction period) should be detailed to understand the scale of traffic impacts and potential need for assessment. 	- Transport & Access	<p>The Applicant notes the feedback provided and confirms alignment with the advice provided in term of presenting information.</p> <p>The Outline CTMP, alongside details regarding site operation and decommissioning from a traffic impact perspective, can be found in ES Chapter 10 – Appendix 10.1 (Outline CTMP) and Appendix 10.6 (Construction Movements and Resource Plan).</p> <p>Additional information relating to access routes during construction (including information on which junctions on the SRN would be impacted) was shared and consulted upon during the Additional Targeted information consultation in Spring 2023.</p>
Section 43	01.06.22	North West Leicestershire District Council	Adam Mellor, Principal Planning Officer, Planning and Development, North West Leicestershire District	<p>The only real impact to the District would be the potential for limited distance glimpsed views to be established from those settlements in the north-western part of the District (e.g. Chilcote and Albert Village). The Zone of Theoretical Visibility plans (attached) suggest that such visibility would be at the lower end of the 'Theoretical Visibility' scale with it being noted that the text within Chapter 5 Landscape and Visual of the Oaklands Farm Solar Park Preliminary Environmental Information Report (April 2022) indicates that significant effects are unlikely to occur at a distance of over 5 kilometres from the application site boundary (which is the case in this instance).</p> <p>At this stage, officers cannot foresee any other planning issues affecting the District given the separation distance but full consideration would need to be given to any potential traffic implications on the road network through North West Leicestershire should such impacts arise.</p> <p>This response has not been formally reported to the District Council's Members. In these circumstances the comments made are those of an officer of the Council and would not prejudice any future response by the District Council in respect of this proposed development.</p>	- Transport & Access - Landscape and visual	<p>The Applicant notes this response and confirms that it is not likely that landscape and visual impacts would cause an impact on areas within North West Leicestershire District. Full consideration of these issues is contained within ES Chapter 5.</p> <p>Whilst at PEIR consultation no specific traffic issues were identified for the roads within North West Leicestershire District, following updates to the Proposed Development post consultation (updated transport routes), additional information was shared with the authority to seek input and feedback. Full details of the updated traffic routes, incorporating further feedback from the authority can be viewed in ES Chapter 10.</p>
Section 42	20.4.22	BT Openreach	Infrastructure Solutions, Open Reach	Confirmation of registration on systems with a reference of 875170 - local Repayments engineer to contact within 30 working days	N/A	The applicant has offered to agree protective provisions with BT Openreach although it is noted that BT Openreach is protected by the standard protective provisions for the protection of operators of electronic communications code networks at Part 6 of Schedule 10 of the draft DCO. The Applicant is happy to enter discussions with BT Openreach for bespoke protective provisions.
Section 43	04.5.22	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Nigel Hancock, Head of Planning and Building Control, and Andrew West, Development Management Officer, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Confirmation that Rotherham MBC have reviewed information and owing to location and little impact of development, do not wish to make any representations	N/A	Noted.

Section 42	28.4.22	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent Water	Setting out conditions and precautions to be taken when working adjacent to Severn Trent Water apparatus including required offset distances to Severn Trent Water apparatus and construction works. Tree planting restrictions were also provided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ecology - Other issues - Water resources and flood risk - Project Description 	<p>The Applicant notes the advice provided and will adhere to restrictions set out during construction. Where appropriate, construction advice has been incorporated into the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (ES Appendix 4.3).</p> <p>Due to the limited interaction with Severn Trent Water's apparatus, the Applicant does not consider it necessary to enter into protective provisions with Severn Trent Water. In any event Severn Trent Water is protected by the standard protective provisions for the protection of electricity, gas, water and sewerage undertakers at Part 1 of Schedule 10 of the draft DCO. The Applicant is happy to enter discussions with Severn Trent Water for bespoke protective provisions.</p>
Section 43	06.06.22	Staffordshire County Council	James Chadwick, Principal Planning Policy Officer	It is recognised that we have been in liaison with you ahead of this statutory consultation and the consultation documents pick up the issues/concerns we have raised previously in relation to construction traffic being routed to the northern part of the site through Burton. We would welcome further dialogue with you as the scheme progresses to shape the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and to keep you updated on progress with the Walton bypass. We acknowledge that you cannot, at this stage, commit to a route that does not exist however the CTMP at paragraph 3.15 is somewhat dismissive on the potential use of the Walton bypass. Traffic data on potential use of the bypass is available from the Transport Assessment/s associated with the Drakelow Park development and we would therefore welcome a technical assessment of the route is undertaken.	- Transport & Access	<p>The Applicant notes the advice provided.</p> <p>Consideration of the potential for the Walton Bypass not to be complete in time for construction has been shared and discussed with the authority in further detail. Additional information relating to access routes during construction was shared and consulted upon during the Additional Targeted information consultation in Spring 2023. Further and ongoing dialogue with the authority has taken place to help shape the Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 10.1).</p> <p>Consideration of all transport related matters, including information relating to all surveys and assessment undertaken in this respect are detailed in Chapter 10 of the ES – with a Traffic Survey Analysis contained in ES Appendix 10.5.</p>
Section 43	26.4.22	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	Emma Curle, Chief Planning Officer, Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	Letter confirming that Council has no comments on Project	N/A	Noted
Section 42	13.5.22	The Coal Authority	Melanie Lindsley Development Team Leader (Planning)	Confirmation that the site identified for the solar farm does not fall within the defined Development High Risk Area and is located instead within the defined Development Low Risk Area. On this basis the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the proposal.	N/A	Noted.
Section 42	01.06.22	The National Forest Company	Eilish Gardner, Green Infrastructure & Planning Officer	<p>Guidance and feedback on Proposed Landscape Strategy, and National Forest Way. The respondent acknowledges the need to generate solar energy to meet net zero targets, however wish to ensure the interests of the National Forest is protected and enhanced as a result of this proposal.</p> <p>In the non-technical summary, it is not explicit that the site is within the National Forest, and paragraph 1.103 incorrectly refers to the National Forest as a tourism attraction close to the site. The National Forest is not a tourism attraction close to the site but a designation that covers 200 square miles which includes the entire site. Request that this is addressed prior to submitting the Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>The NFC considers that Paragraph 146 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should be acknowledged in the PEIR. Although Local Plan Policy INF8 and the National Forest Strategy are quoted, the NFC does not consider that they are explored in detail, resulting in a landscape strategy that is generic and not specific to the National Forest.</p> <p>Feedback related to the Landscape Strategy included a request for additional tree planting around the solar farm – Including how the design of the solar farm would not inhibit future tree planting and forest habitat connectivity (both north-south and east-west) in the future.</p> <p>Due to the nature and scale of this development, the NFC considers that to adequately assess the proposal, full landscaping details should be provided at the submission stage, as opposed to being dealt with by a condition of consent. The NFC also considers the approved landscaping scheme, or elements of it, must be provided in a phased arrangement prior to the completion of the development, ideally in accordance with details approved as part of the application (as opposed to by a condition of consent). The NFC considers that it would be</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape and visual - Ecology - Socio Economics, Tourism and Recreation 	<p>The Applicant is grateful for the feedback provided and confirms further dialogue with the National Forest has taken place to discuss points raised in further detail.</p> <p>Consideration of this feedback has helped shape the final proposed Landscape Strategy, which was further shared for consultation at Additional Targeted Consultation stage in Spring 2023. The outline LEMP is provided as ES Appendix 5.6 and dealt with in detail in ES Chapter 5.</p>

				<p>wholly inappropriate to wait until the completion of a development of this size, scale and impact for commencement of the approved landscaping scheme.</p> <p>Pleased that the National Forest Way is identified in the PEIR, however request that additional work could be incorporated to widen a green corridor along the route. Suggestion for the inclusion of information panels to inform walkers of the need for renewable energy and information about how the solar farm works to support the fight against climate change.</p>		
Section 42	30.5.22	UK Health Security Agency and OHID	Carol Richards, NSIP Admin Team, UK Health Security Agency	<p>Thank you for your consultation regarding the above development.</p> <p>The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposals and Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) at this stage of the Nationally Significant Infrastructure. Views from the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities (OHID) have also been included within the feedback provided.</p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) notes that some Public Rights of Way (PRoW) would require temporary diversion for a few days to enable on site access tracks to be laid (Para 12.107). It also notes (para 12.126) that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SD16/5/1 could be diverted via the track past Spring Farm Cottage, onto Burton Road running south towards the Forestry Centre at which point the original route of SD16/5/1 ends: and • the Cross Britain Way could be diverted along SD48/2/1 and SD48/1/1 in Walton-on-Trent, then along Rosliston Road until it meets SD38/26/1 where it would meet up with its original route into Rosliston. <p>Proposed mitigation is via the Construction Transport Management Plan (CTMP), which requires the installation of signage as these roads have no pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>The report does not however assess the risk from road traffic injuries based the frequency of use of these PRoW and the nature and number of vehicles using these roads and whether any accident clusters occur along this route.</p> <p>The report does not also consider the option to temporarily divert the PRoW a short distance on site for the few days required to construct the on site access tracks.</p> <p>The ES should assess the risk of the temporary diversions of the PRoW along local roads and also consider the alternative of short diversions on site whilst internal access tracks are laid on site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transport and Access - Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation - Agriculture and Land Use 	<p>The Applicant notes the feedback provided by the UKHSA in relation to road safety considerations as a result of temporary pedestrian diversions during the construction period.</p> <p>The Applicant notes concerns raised about PROW diversions onto Rosliston Road and onto Burton Road. The Applicant has considered this point in detail and has undertaken several assessments of local road safety (see ES Chapter 10 – Transport & Access).</p> <p>These comments have been considered further and an Outline CTMP has been produced for consideration as part of the DCO submission. (ES Chapter 10.1).</p> <p>The Outline CTMP considers the effects and proposes appropriate mitigation for these temporary pedestrian diversions.</p> <p>Consultation with local authority (DCC) highways officers have confirmed appropriateness of proposed mitigation during construction, subject to specific application to the authority for each temporary PROW diversion.</p> <p>Where temporary impacts are identified on footpaths during construction phase, suitable mitigation will be set in place, with diversions if required. The Applicant will seek temporary closure of paths through an application to DCC, should it be required.</p> <p>Following consultation, a permissive path was confirmed through the site, with the intention of improving pedestrian access through the proposed site between Rosliston and Walton-on-Trent (outline LEMP (ES Appendix 5.6)</p>
Section 42	06.06.22	Western Power Distribution (now National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) plc)	Neil Bromwich, Partner, Osbourne Clark LLP (on behalf of Western Power Distribution)	<p>WPD requested the inclusion of protective provisions within the DCO to protect its assets. It also requested that the Applicant enter into an Asset Protection Agreement and enter into further dialogue to discuss the Proposed Development in further detail.</p>	N/A	<p>Noted. The Applicant will undertake ongoing engagement with the respondent to discuss the Proposed Development's relationship to WPD assets and interests within the area.</p> <p>Protective provisions with National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) plc are being negotiated.</p>