

Subject: Formal Objection – Rosefield Solar Development Proposal

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed Rosefield Solar development.

While I recognise the importance of renewable energy and the transition to lower-carbon power generation, I believe this proposal is poorly located and insufficiently considerate of the cumulative impacts already affecting this area.

My key concerns are outlined below.

1. Loss of productive agricultural land

The proposed site is currently productive farmland. At a time when the UK already imports a significant proportion of its food, the permanent removal of viable agricultural land for energy generation is difficult to justify. Given the availability of brownfield sites and extensive unused commercial and industrial roof space suitable for solar installations, prioritising high-quality farmland appears to be the wrong approach.

2. Cumulative impact of major infrastructure projects

This area has already experienced significant disruption due to the construction of both East West Rail and HS2. The local road network is under considerable strain as a result.

While I expect your proposal will reference designated construction routes, these do not account for the additional traffic generated by workers, contractors, and associated activity. At certain times, a substantial proportion of passing traffic already appears linked to HS2 or East West Rail works.

As a resident of a rural road with no dedicated footpaths, my family and others rely on the road itself for cycling, horse riding and walking. Additional construction traffic will further reduce safety and usability. With HS2 construction likely to continue for several years, it is difficult to understand how the cumulative impact of yet another large-scale development can be considered acceptable given the existing pressure on local infrastructure.

3. Condition of local roads

The condition of local roads has deteriorated significantly during the ongoing infrastructure works. I have personally incurred costs of approximately £1,000 due to damage caused by potholes resulting from heavy construction traffic. This illustrates the real and tangible impact that large construction projects can have on local residents.

Introducing another major development that relies on the same road network raises serious concerns about further deterioration and the associated costs and safety risks for residents.

4. Limited operational lifespan

The proposed operational lifespan of approximately 40 years raises questions about the long-term suitability of the development. Decisions affecting the character and use of rural land should be made with a genuinely long-term perspective. A development with such a comparatively short lifespan risks leaving a lasting impact without delivering enduring benefits.

5. Lack of meaningful community benefit

The proposal currently appears to offer little tangible benefit to the local community. Large-scale developments of this nature should include meaningful local enhancements such as improved footpaths, bridleways, or accessible nature areas.

Given the scale of disruption during construction and eventual decommissioning, it is reasonable to expect clear and lasting community value in return.

6. Wider energy policy considerations

While expanding renewable generation is important, national discussions increasingly recognise that energy consumption and efficiency are equally significant challenges. Developments such as this should therefore be carefully balanced against land use priorities and local impact.

7. Landscape impact

Finally, the proposed site currently represents open rural landscape. The visual impact of covering such land with large-scale solar infrastructure should not be underestimated.

For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposal in its current form and urge the project team to reconsider both the location and overall approach. I hope that genuine engagement with the local community will take place before any further progress is made.

Yours faithfully,

Robert Talbot

Resident, [REDACTED]

Middle Claydon