



OAKLANDS FARM SOLAR PARK

Applicant: Oaklands Farm Solar Ltd

Environmental Statement

Appendix 6.1 – Consultation Responses

January 2024

Document Ref: EN010122/APP/6.1/Appx 6.1

Revision: -

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Application: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 - 5(2)(a)

Oaklands Farm Solar Park - Environmental Statement Volume 3

Appendix 6.1 - Ecology Consultation Responses



Final report
Prepared by LUC
January 2024

Appendix 6.1: Consultation Responses

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
Scoping Consultation		
Planning Inspectorate September 2021	PINS would expect the proposals relating to the management of land and vegetation under and around the solar PV modules to be described in the ES. Proposals for maintaining vegetation around the Public Right of Way (PRoW) within the application site, including any potential to enhance biodiversity should also be described. Details should be included of any proposal to divert the PRoW which runs through the site.	This has been addressed in Appendix 5.6: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan . There are no PRoW diversions required.
	Advised that where documents are intended to remain confidential that the Applicant should provide these as separate documents with their confidential nature clearly indicated in the title and watermarked on each page.	Actioned as directed. The only confidential document in the ES is Appendix 6.7: Badger Survey.
	Agrees with the scoping out of dormouse from further assessment.	Noted
	The extent of the study area should be clearly defined in the ES and the assessments should reflect the extent of the Proposed Development site. The extent of the study area should be agreed with relevant consultees, where possible.	This Chapter details the proposed study area applied for each ecological feature. These have been defined in line with best practice guidance and reflect the extent and distribution of potential effects.

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	<p>Advised the ES should include within its assessment, European sites within 20km where bats are a qualifying feature and those European sites which are hydrologically linked to the Proposed Development site.</p>	<p>LUC have prepared a draft Report to Inform HRA, (Appendix 6.2: Report to Inform HRA) which considered the potential for Adverse Effect on Integrity to European Sites.</p> <p>No ecological connectivity was identified between the habitats affected and any European sites designated for bats and impacts were scoped out of the assessment.</p> <p>Impacts scoped into the assessment of Likely Significant Effect were limited to those associated with the River Mease SAC.</p>
	<p>Advised the ES should include details of any fish surveys (including eels) and aquatic invertebrates or it should be demonstrated that the need for such surveys can be ruled out.</p>	<p>Fish and aquatic invertebrates are scoped out of this assessment on the basis that there is no potential for significant effects to occur to these species due to the low suitability of watercourses within and adjacent to this Site for these species and the provision of embedded avoidance and mitigation measures, which provide certainty that any effects to these watercourses will be avoided.</p>
	<p>Advised the ES should confirm whether any European Protected Species licenses and/or mitigation licenses for other protected species licenses would be required and consider the relevant dates in which licensed activities can occur.</p>	<p>Noted. The ES Chapter outlines the requirements for European protected species licenses and/or mitigation licenses for other protected species. Design considerations have sought to protect and retain features used by protected species from the outset and as such will ensure that no badger</p>

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
		setts are lost as part of the Proposed Development.
	Noted the ES makes no reference to veteran trees. The ES should identify the locations of any veteran trees which may be affected by the Proposed Development. Likewise, the ES should identify the location of trees or groups of trees on the Site and explain how the Proposed Development will affect them.	Design considerations have ensured the protection and retention of all ancient and veteran trees from the outset. Locations of these trees are presented in the Arboricultural Survey Report (see Appendix 6.14: Arboricultural Survey Report). The ES considers the impact of the Proposed Development on trees within and adjacent to the site.
	Advised the ES should take into account the objectives of this regeneration project and the potential impact it may have on the ability of the National Forest to achieve its objectives.	A design and consultation meeting was held between the National Forest working group and the Project Design team on 23 rd September 2021 to understand opportunities for supporting their objectives. It was agreed to seek to maximise opportunities for increased connectivity between woodland blocks. The Proposed Development design has sought to complement and support the objectives of this project by increasing the extent, distribution and connectivity of key linear movement corridors including through provision of scrub, tree and woodland planting and enhancement.
Derbyshire County	Recommended engagement with the Derbyshire Wildlife Trust to allow them the opportunity to assess the ES	Further consultation will be undertaken with Derbyshire Wildlife Trusts, following submission of the ES.

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
Council (DCC) 20 th September 2021	Ecology Chapter and the approach to the assessment and mitigation of ecological impacts.	
	DCC considers it to be essential to consult with the National Forest Company given the Proposed Development is located within the National Forest Area.	LUC have consulted with the National Forest Company in relation to the Proposed Development and sought to include design measures which complement the objectives of the project, including increasing native scrub and woodland connectivity across the Site.
	DCC's key concern on the scope of the Ecology Chapter is the approach to assessing the impacts of the Proposed Development on the River Mease Special Area of Conservation. They support SDDC comments and advise a level 1 HRA (Screening Assessment) should be undertaken as soon as practicable during the pre-application stage. No substantive screening work has been undertaken to date and in the absence of properly considering the potential of the SAC to be affected by the Proposed Development there is a risk that issues that should be within the scope of the EIA could be inadequately considered.	LUC has prepared a draft Report to Inform HRA (Appendix 6.2: Report to Inform HRA) to provide sufficient evidence for the Competent Authority to assess the Proposed Development under the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
Drakelow Parish 25 th August 2021	Do not agree with the scoping out of an assessment of the effects on dormouse because no records of dormouse have been provided by the Derbyshire Biological Records Office. A survey should be undertaken to determine this and the results reported in the ES.	The Scoping Report has provided reasoned justification for scoping out of this species. The primary reason for scoping out of Dormouse is due to the low suitability, limited extent and poor connectivity of the habitats affected and the retention and protection of woodland and

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
		hedgerow habitats. This has been supported and agreed by The Planning Inspectorate.
Environment Agency 20 th September 2021	Advised the whole site needs to be assessed as part of the NSIP application to ensure all aspects of the ecological impact are understood. Appendix C only appears to assess the lower half of the Scoping Report site and appear to use a different cable route identified in Figure 1.1	This Chapter takes into consideration impacts of the Proposed Development in relation to the Site.
	Noted the Applicant intends to consult with the local planning authority to discuss biodiversity net gain. EA would encourage biodiversity net gain to be implemented through the site.	The ES Chapter is supported by a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Appendix 6.12).
Forestry Commission 16 th September 2021	Noted the Proposed Development is located close to Rosliston Forestry Centre and the application site sites within the area of the National Forest. FC are surprised that the impact on the National Forest and its objectives have not been included in the Scoping Report and would encourage the Applicant to do so as soon as possible	LUC have consulted with National Forest Company in relation to the Proposed Development and sought to include design measures which complement the objectives of the project, including increasing native scrub and woodland connectivity across the Site.
	Noted they would expect any trees onsite to be retained or compensated and for the Applicant to protect all veteran trees onsite. Therefore, identification of these trees to enable a retention or likely compensation process needs to be scoped in.	Design considerations have sought to protect and retain trees, including veteran trees from the outset. A plan of trees and hedgerow that will be retained and removed is provided in Appendix 6.14: Arboricultural Survey Report .

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
		The ES has considered the impact of Proposed Development on trees within and adjacent to the site.
Natural England 20 th September 2021	Advised that the potential impact of the proposal upon features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for habitat creation/enhancement should be included within this assessment in accordance with appropriate guidance on such matters.	Noted. The ES considers the potential impacts on statutory and non-statutory designated sites, habitats and protected and notable species, supported by appropriate baseline survey. This is shown in Appendices 6.2-6.15.. The ES Chapter is supported by a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Appendix 6.12).
	Advised the ES should thoroughly assess the potential for the proposal to affect designated sites. European sites. Should a Likely Significant Effect on a European/Internationally designated site be identified or be uncertain, the local planning authority may need to prepare an Appropriate Assessment, in addition to consideration of impacts through the EIA process.	LUC has prepared a Report to Inform Habitat Regulations Assessment (Appendix 6.2) to demonstrate consideration of this designated site in relation to Proposed Development.
	Advised the ES should include an assessment of the likely impacts on the local wildlife, protected species and geodiversity interests of such sites. The assessment should include proposals for mitigation of any impacts and if appropriate, compensation measures.	The ES Chapter has assessed the impact on statutory and non-statutory designated sites, habitats and protected and notable species.

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	<p>The ES should assess the impact of all phases of the proposal on protected species (including, for example, great crested newts, reptiles, birds, water voles, badgers and bats). Natural England does not hold comprehensive information regarding the locations of species protected by law but advises on the procedures and legislation relevant to such species. Records of protected species should be sought from appropriate local biological record centres, nature conservation organisations, groups and individuals; and consideration should be given to the wider context of the site for example in terms of habitat linkages and protected species populations in the wider area, to assist in the impact assessment.</p>	<p>The ES has assessed the impact on protected species during the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Appropriate ecological baseline surveys have been carried out for protected and notable species as detailed in Appendices 6.2-6.10.</p> <p>Biological Records have been obtained from Derbyshire Biological Records Centre.</p>
	<p>Advised the ES should thoroughly assess the impact of the proposals on habitats and/or species listed as 'Habitats and Species of Principal Importance' within the England Biodiversity List, published under the requirements of S41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006.</p>	<p>The ES Chapter has assessed impacts on 'Habitats and Species of Principal Importance'.</p> <p>Design considerations have achieved the protection and retention of key ecological corridors, including woodland, hedgerow, trees and watercourses, through sensitive design from the outset.</p> <p>Appropriate consideration of climate change has been provided.</p>
	<p>The England Biodiversity Strategy published by Defra establishes principles for the consideration of biodiversity and the effects of climate change. The ES should reflect these principles and identify how the Proposed</p>	<p>Design considerations have achieved the protection, retention and enhancement of key ecological corridors, including woodland,</p>

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	<p>Development's effects on the natural environment will be influenced by climate change, and how ecological networks will be maintained.</p> <p>Advised the NPPF requires that the planning system should contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment 'by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures' (NPPF Para 174), and should be demonstrated through the ES.</p>	<p>hedgerow, trees and watercourses, from the outset.</p> <p>In line with the draft National Planning Statement, whilst there is no specific requirement for this Proposed Development to achieve a minimum Biodiversity Net Gain score, there is a requirement to provide demonstrable gain. In NPS EN-1 (November 2023, designated in January 2024), it is detailed that development "<i>Energy NSIP proposals, whether onshore or offshore, should seek opportunities to contribute to and enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity, and the wider environment where possible (para 4.6.6).</i>" The Proposed Development will seek to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain where possible using the Natural England Defra Metric 3.1.</p> <p>Design considerations have sought to protect, retain and enhance ecological corridors, including woodland, hedgerow, trees and watercourses, from the outset.</p>
Rosliston Parish Council (RPC)	Noted that nature reserves owned by Staffordshire and Derbyshire Wildlife Trusts are within 5km of the site and therefore consider they should be added to the consultees in addition to the National Forest Company as Rosliston	Appropriate consultation with stakeholders, including National Forest Company, Staffordshire and Derbyshire Wildlife Trusts, has been undertaken to inform the ES.

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
<p>17th September 2021</p> <p>Walton-on-Trent Parish Council (WTPC)</p> <p>16th September 2021</p>	<p>Forestry Centre is within close proximity to the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>LUC has taken into consideration the geographic location and the ecological features of these sites to understand the potential impact of the Proposed Development as part of the impact assessment of non-statutory designated sites. This has been considered within the Ecology Chapter.</p>
<p>South Derbyshire District Council</p> <p>7th September 2021</p>	<p>The EIA can only properly take account of the vulnerabilities or the Conservation Objectives of the SAC if some early assessment under the Habitat Regulations takes place to inform the scope of the EIA. In order to properly co-ordinate the EIA and HRA requirements a level 1 HRA (Screening assessment) should be undertaken as soon as practicable during the pre-application stage. An early understanding of the potential ways in which development could affect the SAC can then inform the evidence or assessment that needs collecting or preparing as part of the EIA.</p> <p>Welcomes the commitment of the Applicant to consult the Authority on proposals to deliver a Biodiversity Net Gain within the site. Given the site's current land use and its scale and having regard to the proposed use clearly there is very significant potential to deliver a significant net gain, both</p>	<p>LUC has prepared a Report to Inform HRA (see Appendix 6.2) to provide evidence to enable the competent authority to assess the Proposed Development under the requirements of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.</p> <p>The ES has included a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, which has been provided in Appendix 6.12 and a separate River Condition Assessment provided in Appendix 6.13.</p> <p>The Proposed Development have sought to maximise the opportunity for Biodiversity Net</p>

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	through specific habitat creation and improvement and changes to long-term land management.	Gain by retaining valuable habitats and focusing development in areas of lower ecological value, whilst recognising and promoting opportunities for habitat creation and management as part of the project.
PEIR Consultation		
Derbyshire County Council (DCC) and South Derbyshire District Council (SDDC) 6 th June 2022	The DDC officer notes that residents have voiced concern that site fencing will restrict the movement of wildlife across and through the site. It is 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.	Mammal gaps will be provided in the fencing at specific locations. Indicative locations are shown as detailed in Figure 6.3 . This will allow the movement of small mammals, including badger and hedgehog to disperse through the site.
	The SDDC officer states that the ES submission should ensure all ecological survey work has been undertaken within the appropriate timeframes and lifespans as dictated in best practice guidelines.	Surveys have been completed within the appropriate timings of surveys. Details of these surveys are presented in Appendix 6.3-6.13 . An updated site walkover was undertaken in March 2023, which confirmed the land use and site conditions largely remain unchanged since the previous surveys and that the findings of the surveys remain valid. This is presented in Appendix 6.5: Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report .

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The ES fully considers the ecological impacts of the proposed cable route.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The ES Chapter and Appendix 6.10: Great Crested Newt (GCN) Survey appropriately considers the impacts of the Proposed Development in relation to GCN.</p> <p>The Proposed Development will not result in the loss of any ponds and will be focused in areas of arable and improved grassland, which has limited value for GCN.</p>
	<p>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).</p>	<p>The ES Chapter has been updated to provide the correct reference to Natural England's Standing Advice document.</p>
	<p>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</p>	<p>The ES includes a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment using Defra Metric 3.1 in Appendix 6.12 and a separate River Condition Assessment, which is provided in Appendix 6.13.</p>

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	<p>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.</p>	
	<p>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</p>	<p>This has been taken into account within the CEMP.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>An outline LEMP is provided in Appendix 5.6, which provides an appropriate level of detail at this stage. A detailed LEMP will be provided following planning consent to provide further details on the delivery of ecological enhancements and management.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The ES Chapter has been updated to provide specific consideration of the impacts of the Proposed Development on ground nesting birds.</p>
	<p>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</p>	<p>No nesting habitat for barn owl will be lost as part of the Proposed Development. It is predicted that the Proposed Development will provide benefit to</p>

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	<p>prescribed to adhere to statutory legislation and best practice guidelines during construction and operational phases.</p>	<p>this species by providing increases in the availability of taller, tussocky grassland habitat within the Site boundary of increased suitability for this species to forage. In addition, barn owl boxes will be provided in suitable locations within the Site.</p> <p>Barn owl has been considered as part of this ES Chapter and in supporting Appendix 6.9.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The ES chapter has been updated to provide further information in relation to impacts to GCN during the construction phase.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Mammal gaps will be provided in the fencing at specific locations. Indicative locations are shown as detailed in Figure 6.3. This will allow the movement of small mammals, including badger and hedgehog to disperse through the site.</p>
<p>South Derbyshire</p>	<p>Additional comments were received from the SBBC Biodiversity Officer:</p>	<p>The ES Chapter has included additional provision of information on protected and notable species, including barn owl, GCN and skylark. It has been</p>

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
<p>District Council (Additional comments from the Biodiversity Officer). 27th June 2022</p>	<p>The officer acknowledged that additional information will be provided at the formal EIA stage in respect of barn owl, GCN and skylark.</p> <p>In respect to veteran/ ancient trees, the officer notes that Natural England/ Forestry Commission guidance specifically states 'for ancient or veteran trees (including those on the woodland boundary), the buffer zone should be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree'.</p> <p>In relation to Tables 6.6 and 16.1, the officer states that the PEIR has incorrectly interpreted the NE/FC standing advice for ancient and veteran tree buffers which should be directly proportional to the stem diameter of each tree (measured at 1.5m from ground level). For example, a veteran or ancient tree of 2m in stem diameter would require a buffer zone of 30m. Furthermore, the BS 5837 15m RPA upper threshold limit cannot be utilised as a generic buffer for veteran and ancient trees. The officer also notes that the submitted arboricultural report has correctly interpreted the NE/FC standing guidance.</p> <p>In regards to the Badger Survey Report, the officer states that 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.</p>	<p>updated to provide the correct reference to Natural England's Standing Advice document.</p> <p>Mammal gaps will be provided in the fencing in specific locations as detailed in Figure 6.3. This will allow the movement of small mammals, including badger and hedgehog to disperse through the site.</p>
<p>The Environment Agency</p>	<p>Biodiversity</p> <p>Note that if crops are to be replaced by wildflower meadows, a management plan must be agreed which should include when and where any grazing is permitted, as well as an</p>	<p>An outline LEMP has been provided at Appendix 5.6, which provides high-level detail on the ecological enhancements and management. Further detail will be provided as part of a</p>

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
26 th May 2022	<p>annual cut and removal of wildflowers in August to allow species to fully establish.</p> <p>Environment Management</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>detailed LEMP following consent of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>The CEMP (Appendix 4.3) includes all necessary mitigation to manage sediment run off on site. The LEMP (Appendix 5.6) ensures the suitable management of proposed and existing planting.</p>
<p>Forestry Commission East and West Midlands Area</p> <p>23rd May 2022</p>	<p>FC considers that as the Proposed Development is set within the areas of the area of the National Forest then it should strive to deliver on the attempt to afforest as much as possible of the area. Given the Rosliston Forest Centre is adjacent to the Site on the western side, it would present a prime opportunity to expand the forested area or at least provide a buffer to it. However, they defer to the views of the National Forest on this matter.</p> <p>The Proposed Development should consider how it will support biodiversity net gain and tree planting targets, given these are national ambitions.</p>	<p>LUC have consulted with the National Forest and have included consideration of the tree planting targets as part of the design of the Proposed Development. Further detail is presented in the outline LEMP (Appendix 5.6), which has been prepared.</p> <p>The ES includes a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, which is supported by Defra Metric 3.1 and is provided in Appendix 6.12 and River Condition Assessment, which is provided in Appendix 6.13. This is further supported by the preparation of an outline LEMP (Appendix 5.6), which takes into consideration the delivery and management of ecological enhancements,</p>

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
		including those relating to the tree planting targets.
The National Forest Company 1 st June 2022	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. To make the landscape strategy more locally relevant further consideration of the Site's location within the National Forest should be incorporated along with detailed explanations of how the proposals can contribute to the creation of the National Forest and not hinder its Proposed Development.	The LEMP (Appendix 5.6) has been updated to include reference to the National Forest Strategy. Reference should be made to the updated version of the Landscape Strategy, which has been updated following further discussions with NFC.
	The Government-endorsed aim of the National Forest is to increase forest cover to 33% (from an original 6%) so extensive further tree planting is anticipated across the Forest including around the Proposed Development. This should be taken into account in the PEIR with consideration given to how the design of the Proposed Development can ensure that there is no detriment to future forest habitat connectivity. The Strategy should consider how development of this scale will not form a barrier to habitat connectivity both north-south and east-west.	The Proposed Development has made provision for tree planting in areas, which promote and strengthen habitat connectivity with the Site and wider area.
	The NFC does not consider that the landscape strategy has achieved increased connectivity between existing woodland blocks. At this preliminary stage of design, the NFC considers that there may also be the opportunity for	Reference should be made to the updated version of the Landscape Strategy, which has

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	woodland planting in the 'land available for grid cable route and site access'.	been updated following further discussions with NFC.
	The NFC notes that the creation of National Forest woodland does not feature in the objectives and design approach of the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. This should be included.	The Outline LEMP has been updated to include as much planting as possible
Derbyshire Wildlife Trust and Staffordshire Wildlife Trust	No response received	Derbyshire Wildlife Trust and Staffordshire Wildlife Trust were included in all stages of consultation for the Proposed Development but no responses have been received.
Targeted Consultation		
Derbyshire County Council 24 th March 2023	No additional comments in relation to biodiversity, ecology and trees have been received. The comments on the PEIR dated 6 June 2022 remain relevant.	N/A
National Forest Company (NFC) A meeting was held with	NFC maintain that the landscape strategy should include significantly more woodland, with their preference for larger blocks of woodland as opposed to a number of smaller areas as has been shown. Additionally, they consider that more habitat connectivity should be achieved.	The Proposed Development has maximised opportunities to deliver tree planting, including woodland, scrub and hedgerow creation and enhancement in areas, which promote and strengthen habitat connectivity with the Site and wider area, whilst ensuring that the Proposed

Consultee and Date	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
<p>NFC on 17/04/23. Written response received 20/04/23</p>	<p>While their preference is for woodland, we discussed that an element of parkland style planting could be appropriate, particularly to the south of panels.</p> <p>NFC are pleased to note the retention of existing landscape features, however they consider that opportunities to connect these features as opposed to being isolated and/or surrounded with panels, should be taken. They are supportive of a permissive path and the ability to connect to surrounding footpath routes. NFC were advised at the meeting that opportunities to increase planting around this route were under consideration.</p> <p>Upon receipt of the revised landscaping strategy, the NFC will annotate the areas where we consider it important that connectivity is improved.</p>	<p>Development meets the requirements and needs of the solar farm proposals.</p> <p>The updated landscape strategy is presented in Appendix 5.6: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, which has been updated following further discussions with NFC.</p>