

To whom it may concern,

I am writing express my concerns, disappointment and key issues that lead me to conclude that the solar development on the Claydon Estate AKA Rosefield Solar Farm should not be given approval for planning.

In no specific order of importance or weighting:

1. The chosen location uses over 1650 acres of productive agricultural farm land. Whilst this has been given a grading of 3B on the ALC ratings, this land has been used for growing crops for most of the past 50 years. Not grassland, not forage and not grazing. This land has grown food for UK consumers to consume and therefore it remains key to our food security strategy.
2. Some of the land that has been selected is on slopes - it was clearly set out in the initial governments plans that land on slopes should not be used.
3. Some of the land that has been selected runs adjacent to ancient woodlands that are habitats for animals and rare bats.
4. The area selected includes land on public pathways and will completely change the way of life for many people that use these walks for recreation and health.
5. The local road network is already at capacity and many of the local roads are barely useable - the 'build' stage of the project will put further pressure on already damaged roads and an infrastructure at capacity.
6. There was an agreed cut-off date 28th August 2025 for all energy projects to be registered with NESO. To register they needed qualify on 3 conditions. (i) Agreed route to a sub-station, (ii) agreed plug in contract with sub-station and (iii) agreed arrangements with land owner. Its is clear that Rosefield did not have all the land finalised and agreed with Claydon Estate as there is some confusion over land that the new sub-station was also claiming to have rights over. This fundmanentally means that the Rosefield project was not in a position where they could register their project and therefore it should not be considered.
7. The argument put forward for "NEED" is simply not satisfactory as it has been confirmed that the 'energy area' that Rosefield sits within already has enough projects either built, registered or in the planning process to achieve the governments targets for net zero goals.
8. The accompanying BESS that sits alongside Rosefield has not been allocated a gate 2 status meaning that it does not have a timing pathway for an agreement to plug in to the new sub-station. Rosefield have only ever presented that the solar works together with a storage facility.
9. The farmer that farmed much of the land was served notice and was forced off the land that his family had farmed since the end of WWII. Rosefield claim that he surrendered it but it is clear that an offer was put to him that he had no choice but to accept.
10. Solar energy on agricultural land is fundamentally wrong. It is inefficient and unproductive. It is not a good use of land and we should not be supporting this strategy.