

I am writing as an interested party to object to the proposed Rosefield Solar Farm in Buckinghamshire. While I support renewable energy generation in principle, this development is inappropriate for the chosen location and would cause significant harm to the landscape, local ecology, heritage assets, and the wellbeing of the surrounding community.

1. Overdevelopment in an Already Impacted Area

The proposed site lies within a part of Buckinghamshire already under sustained pressure from the ongoing construction of HS2. Heavy vehicle movements, construction traffic, and increased workforce travel have placed considerable strain on rural roads and the surrounding environment. Introducing a large, industrial-scale solar compound at this time would intensify these pressures and further degrade the character of the area.

My objection is not to solar panels themselves, but to the industrialisation created by the entire compound — including extensive security fencing, access tracks, inverter stations, substations, and surveillance infrastructure. These elements collectively transform open countryside into a fenced, monitored industrial site. This represents clear overdevelopment and is wholly inappropriate for a rural landscape already experiencing cumulative disruption.

2. Ecological Harm and Habitat Fragmentation

The proposal would cause substantial ecological damage, particularly through habitat loss, fragmentation, and disruption of established wildlife corridors. The site currently supports a mosaic of farmland, hedgerows, and open fields that provide essential movement routes for a range of species.

Key concerns include:

- Perimeter fencing creating a hard barrier that restricts the movement of deer, badgers, foxes, and other mammals
- Displacement of ground-nesting birds, such as skylarks and lapwings, which require uninterrupted open landscapes
- Breaks in hedgerow corridors, which are vital for bats, small mammals, and pollinators
- Soil compaction and hydrological disruption from construction traffic and access tracks
- Loss of foraging habitat for raptors and owls that rely on open fields

The applicant's mitigation proposals do not adequately address the scale of ecological disruption. Once fragmented, these habitats cannot simply be recreated within a fenced industrial compound.

3. Landscape Impact and Visual Intrusion

The fencing, CCTV, and associated infrastructure would introduce an industrial character into what is currently open, rural countryside. This would:

- Diminish the scenic quality of the landscape
- Affect views from public rights of way and nearby properties
- Undermine the tranquillity and rural identity of the area

Solar panels alone may be visually manageable in some contexts, but the combined effect of fencing, surveillance equipment, substations, and access roads creates a far more intrusive footprint than the applicant acknowledges.

4. Impact on Heritage Assets and the Setting of a Grade II Listed Building

I am a resident of a Grade II listed property in Botolph Claydon, a building over 500 years old whose significance is closely tied to its rural setting, open views, and historic landscape context. The *Botolph Claydon Conservation Area Appraisal* (1991) explicitly recognises the importance of these views, stating:

“Both to the north of the pond and to the south of Botolph House are fine views across open countryside. A similarly fine view is afforded in a southerly direction immediately to the west of



My home is directly associated with these protected views. The introduction of a large, security-fenced industrial compound in this landscape would cause substantial harm to the setting of my listed property and to the Conservation Area as a whole. The rural views, tranquillity, and historic context that contribute to its special architectural and historic interest would be eroded.

While property value itself is not a planning matter, the harm to the setting of a listed building and a designated Conservation Area is a material consideration of the highest order under national and local heritage policy. This proposal would diminish the heritage significance of my home and undermine the qualities that justify its listed status.

5. CCTV and Loss of Rural Privacy

The proposed CCTV system is inappropriate for a countryside setting. Even if angled inward, the presence of surveillance infrastructure creates a sense of monitoring that is incompatible with rural life. Residents and visitors reasonably expect privacy and freedom from industrial-style security systems.

The applicant has not provided sufficient reassurance that cameras cannot capture neighbouring land or public rights of way. The introduction of such equipment is unnecessary, intrusive, and out of character with the surrounding landscape.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above — overdevelopment in an already pressured area, significant ecological harm, landscape degradation, unacceptable intrusion on privacy, and demonstrable harm to the setting of a Grade II listed building and the Botolph Claydon Conservation Area — I strongly oppose the Rosefield Solar Farm proposal.

Renewable energy must be delivered in ways that respect and protect the landscapes, ecosystems, and heritage assets it occupies. This proposal fails to do so.

I respectfully request that the Planning Inspectorate rejects this application.

Yours faithfully,
S W FIELD