Submission ID: S6025311D

I am writing to object to the Rosefield Solar development proposal and to formally request that the Planning Inspectorate undertakes site visits to properties bordering and overlooking the development site, including my own. While I acknowledge that the scheme has been revised and reduced from its original extent, the proposal continues to result in unacceptable harm, and the process to date has been characterised by a complete failure of communication and engagement with affected residents, particularly those occupying Grade II listed properties within the Botolph Claydon Conservation Area.

I reside at [redacted] Botolph Claydon, Buckingham, a Grade II listed property situated within the Botolph Claydon Conservation Area. My home directly borders the development site and has clear views to the south.

Although the amended layout no longer immediately surrounds my property to the south and west, the current proposal still includes solar development on a ridge line approximately 600 metres due south of my home. This would introduce conspicuous built infrastructure into what is currently an open and elevated landscape, resulting in a change to the existing topography and skyline when viewed from my property and the conservation area.

The Botolph Claydon Conservation Area Assessment (1991) clearly identifies the importance of these views, stating:

“Both to the north of the pond and to the south of Botolph House are fine views across open countryside. A similarly fine view is afforded in a southerly direction immediately to the west of [redacted].”

The current proposal would undermine this identified view, replacing open countryside with development visible along the ridge line. This represents harm to:

- The setting of a Grade II listed building
- The character and appearance of the conservation area
- The appreciation of the landscape as open countryside, as expressly recognised in adopted conservation documentation

This continuing harm highlights the importance of undertaking site visits with properties bordering and overlooking the development site. At no stage has the developer undertaken site visits or direct engagement with me, or with other neighbouring residents, to understand the visual impact of the proposal from listed buildings and conserved viewpoints.

The complete absence of communication—no correspondence, no consultation meetings, and no site based engagement—is wholly inappropriate for a development of this scale and sensitivity. Scaling back a proposal does not negate the need for meaningful consultation, nor does it remove the requirement to properly assess heritage and landscape impacts.

I therefore respectfully request that the Planning Inspectorate organises site visits in the near future to as many of the properties bordering and overlooking the development as possible, including Grade II listed dwellings within the conservation area. Such visits would allow the Inspectorate to properly appreciate the visual, landscape, and heritage impacts of the proposal as experienced from affected properties, and would help ensure a fully informed and balanced assessment of the application.

Reagards

Mr Field