

I am writing to formally object to the proposed Rosefield Solar Farm development by EDF. The description of this project as a "solar farm" is deeply misleading. This is not a farm; it is an industrial energy complex proposed across a vast area of productive countryside.

Depending on which figures are used, the development is approximately one-third the size of Inverness. Presenting a project of this scale simply as a green energy initiative while largely ignoring the very real local impacts is disingenuous. The proposal appears driven primarily by corporate profit rather than balanced consideration of environmental, social and community consequences.

I want to be clear that I support the UK transitioning to responsible renewable energy. I am not opposed to development where it is appropriate and properly planned. What I object to is the unnecessary industrialisation of large areas of countryside and productive agricultural land when more suitable locations and solutions exist.

It is also important to note that multiple other solar developments are being pursued around the nearby substation, with several applications already submitted by different companies. The scale of this wider expansion is clearly significant, yet the cumulative impact is not being properly communicated to residents.

This proposal must also be viewed alongside the disruption already affecting the local area, including HS2, the East West Rail project, and the proposed Grendon Super Prison. These developments have already placed enormous strain on the local road network and community infrastructure. The addition of a development of this scale is simply too much for the area to absorb.

---

#### Traffic and Construction Disruption

One of the most immediate concerns is the traffic chaos that construction will inevitably create.

The construction of a development spanning thousands of acres will require large volumes of heavy machinery, equipment and materials. This will result in:

- Significant increases in HGV traffic on rural roads
- Road closures and diversions
- Narrowed lanes and temporary traffic management
- Increased congestion during school run times
- Increased risk to cyclists, walkers and horse riders

Our local roads are narrow country lanes that already struggle with existing traffic levels. They are not designed to accommodate sustained heavy construction traffic over a period of several years.

For residents, daily life will be directly affected. School runs, commuting, access to services and emergency vehicle access could all be compromised. The consultation materials provide little reassurance that these impacts have been properly assessed. I have had three tyre blowouts, a completely cracked alloy and two distorted tyres that have needed replacing from potholes. The council has refused compensation despite photos and obvious neglect on their part. This is and further more years of it is not acceptable, whilst corporate companies make millions.

---

#### Noise and Disturbance

There has been very little information provided about noise levels, both during construction and once the development is operational.

Construction of a development of this scale will inevitably involve:

- Pile driving and ground works
- Constant HGV movements
- Heavy construction machinery
- Potentially extended working hours

For local residents who moved to this rural area for peace and quiet, several years of industrial construction noise will have a significant negative impact on daily life and wellbeing. My partner has mental health challenges and the peace and quiet support this.

Beyond construction, there are also ongoing concerns about operational noise from electrical infrastructure, inverters and substations. Clear information about expected decibel levels during both daytime and nighttime operation has not been provided and I have concerns about the noise in summer evenings when the windows are open. This will no doubt have an impact on house values and an inability to move whilst the works take place.

---

#### Impact on Local Businesses

The proposed siting of infrastructure close to Hogshaw Farm and Wildlife Park is particularly concerning.

This is a valued local business whose entire offering depends on visitors enjoying a peaceful countryside environment. Placing major infrastructure and years of construction activity directly adjacent to a wildlife park is entirely inappropriate and risks causing significant damage to the business.

The visual intrusion, noise and disruption from construction could deter visitors and impact the park's long-term viability.

The consultation documents do not appear to properly acknowledge this risk. I live on this site and have fear around what would happen if the business were to shut.

---

#### Access to Footpaths, Bridleways and Rights of Way and countryside views

The countryside surrounding Hogshaw is widely used by residents for walking, cycling and horse riding. Access to public footpaths, bridleways and rights of way is an important part of the local community's quality of life.

There are serious concerns that the development will result in:

- Temporary or permanent closure of existing paths
- Loss of the rural character of these walking routes
- Increased danger from construction traffic where paths intersect with roads

Many people moved to this area specifically to enjoy the countryside and its network of footpaths. Industrialising the landscape with large-scale solar infrastructure fundamentally alters this experience. I have views across the rolling field from my house. This would overlook the solar farm. Rosefield have made little effort to attend my property, to see the

views and show how they would look to ensure I was not looking out on to a large solar farm.

---

### Safety Concerns – Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)

Another major concern is the proposed Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) located near residential properties.

Large battery storage facilities carry well-documented risks, including the possibility of thermal runaway events and fires. While these incidents are rare, they can be extremely difficult to control and have occurred at battery facilities internationally.

Residents deserve clear answers about:

- The distance between the BESS and residential homes
- Fire prevention and containment measures
- Emergency response procedures
- Potential evacuation zones if an incident occurs

Placing large battery storage facilities close to homes raises legitimate safety concerns that have not yet been adequately addressed.

---

### Burden on Local Residents

Another issue that must be acknowledged is the significant burden placed on local residents to engage with the planning process.

Many of us are now having to write extensive objections to multiple parties, review large volumes of technical documents and try to understand complex planning and energy infrastructure issues. This process is extremely time-consuming and difficult for people without planning expertise.

In reality, many residents simply do not have the time, knowledge or confidence to submit detailed objections. There is a strong perception that large corporations rely on this imbalance - assuming that residents will feel the development is inevitable and that their objections will not make a difference. This is not acceptable. The consultation process should genuinely empower communities to engage, not overwhelm them with technical complexity and need to fill out lots of online forms.

### Key Questions

I've repeatedly asked EDF a number of questions but received no responses. Why is this? Given the scale of this proposal and the limited information provided so far, I would like clear responses to the following questions:

1. Will EDF commission an independent third-party assessment of the impact on local property values, with consideration given to a compensation scheme for those most affected?
2. Why has EDF not considered alternative renewable energy solutions, such as expanding existing wind infrastructure in more suitable locations?
3. Given that solar generation does not need to be directly adjacent to the substation, why has EDF not pursued less visually and socially intrusive locations with cable connections to the grid?
4. Why is the proposed battery storage located close to Hogshaw Farm and Wildlife Park and other residential properties, when alternative locations appear to exist that would have far less impact on residents and local businesses?
5. Why has clear information about construction traffic, noise levels and operational impacts not been provided as part of the consultation?

---

### Conclusion

In its current form, the Rosefield proposal represents a vast industrial development across rural Buckinghamshire that risks causing significant environmental, social and economic damage to the local community.

The consultation process has provided insufficient information, limited time for meaningful engagement and little reassurance that residents' concerns are being genuinely considered.

I strongly urge EDF to reconsider this proposal and explore more appropriate locations and alternative energy solutions that do not industrialise large areas of countryside or place such heavy burdens on local communities.