

I strongly object to the proposed Rosefield Solar Farm development.

The scale, industrial nature, and cumulative burden of this scheme would cause severe and irreversible damage to the rural character, natural environment, and wellbeing of our community. These harms are disproportionate and cannot be justified.

#### Noise Impacts from Construction and Operation

The likely noise impacts have been significantly understated. My home lies approximately 1 km from E22 in Parcel 3, the main collector compound. This site sits alongside E20 and E11, which include the substation and associated infrastructure, leaving very little separation between major operational areas and residential properties.

This is currently an area of exceptional tranquillity. Extended construction activity followed by permanent operational noise would fundamentally and permanently alter the peaceful character of the landscape.

#### Cumulative Burden on the Community

Our area is already under intense pressure from multiple major infrastructure schemes, including High Speed 2, East West Rail, and the Grendon Underwood Prison. The recently approved Statera BESS facility lies immediately adjacent to the proposed site.

In addition, the proposed East Claydon Power Station must be considered in any meaningful cumulative assessment. Key haul routes for Rosefield overlap with traffic from these projects, compounding congestion, access difficulties, and road safety risks.

Simultaneous construction phases are highly likely. Local roads are narrow, poorly maintained and failing. The additional heavy traffic would cause severe disruption to residents, local businesses, and the village school, placing unacceptable strain on daily life.

#### Visual Intrusion and Landscape Harm

The sheer scale of the proposal is excessive for the landscape. Due to the area's natural topography, the development would be widely visible from the village and from numerous public rights of way.

The industrialisation of this area is alarming. Views from the locally significant Mushroom Tree — a landmark dating back to 1912 — would be dominated by Parcels 2 and 3. Views toward Bernwood Farm and Hogshaw would be impacted by extensive solar arrays and battery storage units. Similarly, other heritage assets in East Claydon and Botolph Claydon would suffer further harm through the cumulative erosion of their rural setting.

#### Harm to Health, Recreation, and Wellbeing

The surrounding countryside is central to community life and is widely used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders, and visitors. Footpaths and bridleways such as Splash Lane, the route to Runts Wood, are essential for exercise, mental wellbeing, and access to nature.

Many of these valued routes would be directly affected. Industrial fencing, lighting, noise, and the visual dominance of solar infrastructure would significantly reduce opportunities to enjoy peaceful recreation and the restorative benefits of the natural environment.

#### Impacts on Wildlife and Ecology

Having lived here for over 40 years, I have seen firsthand the richness and diversity of local wildlife. Evidence presented at the February 24th hearing by Mr Turner highlighted the presence of varied and, in some cases, rare species that rely on these habitats.

These ecosystems should be protected and strengthened, not fragmented by large-scale industrial development.

The Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust has also raised serious concerns, stating that "more needs to be done to understand the interaction between these new technologies and the ecology they are ultimately designed to protect." This warning should carry significant weight.

#### Battery Storage Safety Risks

The proposed concentration of large-scale battery storage remains a serious concern. Although repositioned from the original design, clustering substantial battery infrastructure in one location presents clear fire safety and environmental risks.

With the nearby Statera battery facility only, the cumulative risk profile increases further, raising justified concerns about emergency response capability and potential environmental contamination.

#### Conclusion

I support renewable energy and the need to reduce carbon emissions.

However, climate action must not come at the expense of the very landscapes, ecosystems, and communities it aims to protect.

This proposal would bring heavy industrial development into a rural area that is already under pressure from major infrastructure projects.

The environmental damage, visual impact, added strain on the community, safety concerns, and loss of wellbeing would be serious and long-lasting.

This development is simply the wrong project in the wrong place, and it should be refused.