

I continue to strongly object to the proposal on the basis that the large scale nature of the Rosefield installation is not appropriate for a rural area with poor access routes. The site is surrounded by narrow rural roads and is not in any proximity to any motorways or even A roads. I appreciate that the applicant can only work with the land that they have been provided with by the land owner, and that there is a proximity to a substation, however this should not totally counteract the fact that this is not a suitable site for a project of this size.

The access roads proposed are narrow and dangerous at the best of times, especially when you meet HGVs and fast driving construction personnel which we have had to deal with on a daily basis with HS2 and East West Rail. Road closures and diversions have been numerous and the daily mental stress of missing appointments as you are sent on another long winded diversion at short notice will only be exacerbated by this latest proposal. As we know from experience, the traffic managements plans are hard to enforce and the personnel involved have no affinity to the local area. I hope that the examiners have carefully examined and travelled the proposed access route from the A41 via snake lake to the site to see the potential problems.

The site borders a conservation area and contains many listed buildings. The planning rules for the area are extremely strict and there are numerous examples of proposals being rejected for minor works in the area. It seems ridiculous on that basis that this huge proposal can be acceptable against this backdrop when by the applicants own omission there will be a variety of significant adverse effects of varying degrees. We all understand that renewable energy is important, but not at the cost of ruining areas which are currently protected under a conservation area. This is highlighted by the applicant's focus on the avoidance of Claydon House and the surrounding area, however other parts of the site contain many heritage assets and listed building which have been ignored.

The impact on the diverse variety of wildlife: animals, plants, birds and rare species of bats, who currently inhabit the historic woodland, fields and meadows around the site is potentially devastating. Their habitats will be disturbed and/or destroyed and will never be the same again. I refer to Robert Turner's oral submission at the first open floor hearing. He is an on the ground expert in this area and know the habitats extremely well. The applicants assertion of a biodiversity gain is a) fanciful and b) will never replace what has been lost. By the time this loss is realised, it will be too late for many local species. I would also reiterate the BBONT relevant representation at RR-020 which identified considerable concerns which I wholly agree with.

The applicant has also understated the noise and visual impact of the project. The area is particularly quiet and tranquil, especially at night. Even the "acceptable" levels of noise that they cite will be present during construction and operation will have a noticeable effect on local people's quality of life. This should be further investigated to ensure a more meaningful consultation.