

## Written response regarding proposal for Rosefield solar farm development

I am a Botolph Claydon resident and moved here 8 years ago from London because of the peaceful pastoral location. While I support the use of clean energy sources such as solar, I believe they should be installed on rooftops and on industrial sites, not in open agricultural countryside and not at the scale that is proposed for Rosefield. I therefore do not support this application.

Residents amenity will be adversely affected by disruption caused by construction traffic, noise and vibration. Our local roads and lanes are narrow with surfaces already badly damaged by HGV traffic and significant contractor staff personal commuting traffic from HS2 and EW rail. There are very few paved areas. I am concerned by risks to walkers, cyclists and riders from the traffic and from road damage.

I am also expecting significant adverse effects on the views from my house and garden (impacted by planned solar panels and the BESS) and on my ability to use a range of local rights of way to take regular exercise and walk my dogs. Some of these effects will be permanent. During Covid, in particular, I realised the huge beneficial effect of being able to have local walks in order to de-stress and preserve my mental health.

The effect this project is having on villagers is out of all proportion especially when you take into account the removal of long standing farm tenancies disrupting long term relationships with the land and the village community.

I am also very worried about the existential threat to local businesses such as TCS-Biosciences, Preston Farms and Hogshaw Farm and Wildlife Park that will be severely impacted by the proposal. These three organisations employ more than 100 local people. TCS is a critical NHS supplier and works hand in hand with Preston Farms. Hogshaw Wildlife Park is a significant tourist attraction. The proposed siting of the solar panels and their perimeter fence will be immediately adjacent to the wildlife park; the proposed layout will make it much harder for Preston Farm's 400 horses and 3000 sheep to be moved safely between different grazing fields, and some of the current grazing fields will be permanently lost due to the Rosefield development.

I do not understand why Rosefield needs to include a BESS (with its associated fire risk) since there is already planning permission for Statera to build a 500MW BESS adjacent to the East Claydon National Grid substation. (NESO seems to agree here with only having allocated a Gate 1 connection to the BESS element). And given that the National Grid plans to replace their existing substation I do not understand why Rosefield needs a substation of its own in an adjacent site at all. And given that the National Grid cannot offer a connection date for Rosefield until well after 2030 (via and gate 2 connection) I don't see the Rosefield proposal can contribute in any way to the 2030 clean energy target for the country. I believe these to be critical factors as to why this proposal should be rejected.

Botolph and East Claydon have suffered for some years from the impact of construction of the waste disposal site, HS2 and EW rail developments. As well as the replacement National Grid substation, there is already planning permission for the Statera BESS and Tuckey Farm solar development close to East Claydon. If Rosefield were to go ahead we would have industrial developments surrounding our villages. This would damage our cultural heritage irreversibly (Botolph Claydon alone has 17 listed properties) and change this area from a peaceful pastoral location to a brownfield industrial site.

This proposal in my mind is purely opportunistic based on the availability of a compliant landowner and not on a proper assessment of needs and suitability as required by law.

I strongly urge that this project is rejected.