

Rosefield Solar Farm

Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Open Floor Hearing 1 (OFH1)

EN010158/APP/8.6
Deadline 1
March 2026
Rosefield Energyfarm Ltd

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Examination
Procedure) Rules 2010



Table of Contents

- Table of Contents 1**
- 1. Written Summary of Applicant’s Oral Submissions at Open Floor Hearing 1 (OFH1) 2**
 - 1.1. Introduction2**
 - 1.2. Written summary of the Applicant’s oral submissions at OFH1 on Tuesday 24 February 2026.....2**

1. Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Open Floor Hearing 1 (OFH1)

1.1. Introduction

1.1.1. This written summary has been prepared on behalf of Rosefield Energyfarm Limited ('the Applicant') to summarise the oral submissions made by the Applicant at Open Floor Hearing 1 ('OFH1') held on 24 February 2026 in relation to the Development Consent Order ('DCO') Application for the construction, operation (including maintenance), and decommissioning of Rosefield Solar Farm (hereafter referred to as the 'Proposed Development').

1.1.2. This note does not purport to summarise the oral submissions of other parties, and summaries of submissions made by other parties are only included where necessary to give context to the Applicant's submissions, or where the Applicant agreed with the submission(s) made and so made no further submissions (this is noted within the document where relevant). This note does not address procedural or administrative items.

1.2. Written summary of the Applicant's oral submissions at OFH1 on Tuesday 24 February 2026

1.2.1. OFH1 was held at 13:30 on 24 February 2026 as a blended event at Horwood House, Mursley Road, Little Horwood, Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire, MK17 0PH and by virtual means using Microsoft Teams.

1.2.2. Ms Amy Stirling, Senior Associate at Pinsent Masons LLP, appeared on behalf of the Applicant. Ms Stirling thanked everyone for their time in attending the hearing. She recognised that the public's right to be heard and to have an opportunity to express concerns is an important part of the process. She noted that the Applicant had submitted a detailed response to all relevant representations submitted (see **Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006]**) and noted that interested parties have an opportunity to comment on the Applicant's response for Deadline 1.

1.2.3. Ms Stirling observed that some of the representations made were relevant to public policy. She stated that Government policy is very clear that there is an established need for solar farms at the Development Consent Order (DCO) scale. This is confirmed by National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 at paragraphs 3.28 and 3.29, which states that all applications for renewable energy schemes covered by the policy (which includes solar), should be assessed on the basis that the Government has already

demonstrated that there is a need for the infrastructure, and that substantial weight should be given to that need.

- 1.2.4. Notwithstanding, Ms Stirling confirmed that the Applicant had complied with the mitigation hierarchy by seeking to avoid and mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Development in delivering the national and urgent need for renewable infrastructure. She noted that this unfortunately resulted in localised impacts, which had been assessed and mitigation proposed as reported and assessed within the Applicant's Environmental Statement. Ms Stirling confirmed that the **Planning Statement [EN010158/APP/5.7.3]** concluded that the benefits of the Proposed Development outweighed the localised impacts. Ms Stirling then turned to address the comments made by members of the public.
- 1.2.5. Ms Stirling responded to Mr Turner, who appeared on behalf of Greg Smith MP, who made comments about the impacts to agricultural land. Ms Stirling confirmed that minimising impacts on agricultural land played a key role in the Applicant's site selection, noting that there was only just over 1.5% Best and Most Versatile Land within the Order Limits. She observed that this was an extremely low percentage for solar DCO schemes as set out in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [EN010158/APP/6.2]** [[APP-055](#)].
- 1.2.6. In response to concerns raised about construction traffic management, Ms Stirling confirmed that the Applicant is obliged to comply with its **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010158/APP/7.5.2]** which would ultimately be subject to the approval of Buckinghamshire Council as the local planning authority.
- 1.2.7. In response to comments made about BESS safety, Ms Stirling confirmed that the BESS had been assessed and effects were found to be not significant. She confirmed that the Applicant was committed to complying with the **Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010158/APP/7.9.2]** which would ultimately be subject to the approval of Buckinghamshire Council as the local planning authority.
- 1.2.8. In response to Mr Turner's concerns about biodiversity, Ms Stirling confirmed that the Applicant was obliging itself to deliver a biodiversity net gain (**BNG**) of a minimum of 40% area-based habitat units, 17% hedgerow units and 10% watercourse units as secured by Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [EN010158/APP/3.1.3]**. She observed that this went above and beyond the current Government policy for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (**NSIPs**) of at least 10% BNG, which affirmed the Applicant's commitment to delivering BNG.
- 1.2.9. Lastly, Ms Stirling responded to comments raised about alternative renewable energy technologies, she confirmed that the Applicant had considered alternatives technologies – including wind – and that its

analysis of the alternatives considered can be found at Section 4.5 of **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered** [EN010158/APP/6.1] [[APP-047](#)].



rosefieldsolarfarm.co.uk