

Planning Inspectorate  
Temple Quay House 2  
The Square  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

Our ref: EN010158

20 August 2026

Attn: [REDACTED]  
By email: rosefieldsolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Dear Examining Authority

**Deadline 7 Submissions**  
**Preston Farms Ltd ("PFL") and TCS Biosciences Ltd ("TCS")**

1. We act for PFL and TCS.
2. We provide under cover of this letter PFL/TCS' Deadline 7 submission and have been faithful to the narrow scope set by the ExA for Deadline 7.
3. This includes the main document, the Final Deadline Submission/Evidence, together with:
  - i. Sch 9 DCO adjusted by PFL/TCS
  - ii. Works plans adjusted by PFL/TCS (1) removing solar PV from E23 and access (2) removing solar PV from E23 and shifting access east (labelled Versions 1 & 2)
  - iii. Page 44 of the CTMP adjusted by PFL/TCS shifting Granborough Rd access east
  - iv. Further correspondence from BIVDA dated 20 August 2026
  - v. DHSC Email (referred to in the BIVDA letter) (with presentation pack and mapping)
4. As before, the main document comprises both legal submissions and evidential detail and is prepared by counsel, and by Mr James Preston and Mr Gareth Williams of PFL/TCS, as to the legal submissions and evidential detail respectively.
5. We and our clients are grateful to the ExA for accepting AS-042, though disappointingly the Applicant has still not provided the option agreements of November 2022 and July 2025 or any others and have not responded to AS-042 and now PFL/TCS look to the ExA to demand these of the applicant (reg.17 2010 Rules).
6. Finally, and importantly, we thank PINS for its assistance throughout the examination, for which we and our clients are very grateful.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

**RICHARD BUXTON SOLICITORS**

# Index

|                                                                       | Page(s) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| <b>Section A: PFL/TCS Deadline 7 Submission</b>                       |         |
| 1 PFL/TCS Deadline 7 Submission                                       | 1 - 9   |
| <b>Section B: Material Submitted at Deadline 7 by PFL/TCS</b>         |         |
| 1 Sch9 draft DCO adjusted by PFL/TCS                                  | 10 - 13 |
| 2 Works Plan v1 (Master and Sheet 6) adjusted by PFL/TCS              | 14 - 15 |
| 3 Works Plan v2 (Master and Sheet 6) adjusted by PFL/TCS              | 16 - 17 |
| 4 CTMP Granborough Rd Access adjusted by PFL/TCS                      | 18      |
| 5 BIVDA Letter re PFL/TCS 20.8.26 (appending DHSC Email Item 6 below) | 19 - 20 |
| 6 DHSC Email (with presentation pack and mapping)                     | 21 - 44 |

## Rosefield DCO Application examination

---

### Deadline 7 (final deadline) submissions/evidence of Preston Farms Limited (PFL) and TCS Biosciences Limited (TCS)

---

#### Introduction

1. Preston Farms Limited (“PFL”) and TCS Biosciences Limited (“TCS”) rely on the evidence they have already provided and the submissions they have already made (including the range of supportive evidence provided by the many regulators, professionals and bodies who have been sufficiently concerned by the impact on PFL/TCS that they have weighed in). The latest being their Deadline 6 materials **REP6-108** and their additional submission/request for the option agreements (letter of 13 August 2026 **AS-042**). PFL/TCS also rely on what they have said in the final Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant (“the SoCG”) (the SoCG is included within **REP6-108**, but also at **REP6-031**).
2. This final submission responds to the ExA’s request, set out in the adjusted timetable with its letter of 3 August 2026, for ‘*comments on deadline 6 submissions*’. The ExA set that narrow scope quite deliberately, and PFL/TCS respect that.
3. The focus is on the Applicant’s Deadline 6 submissions. **REP6-071** helpfully pulls matters together, by responding directly to our Deadline 5 materials.
4. Regrettably, and although the Applicant has made some further incremental concessions (all of which are welcome), what stands out is how far short they fall of what statute and guidance requires.
5. As such, at the close of this examination, the Applicant’s failure to trouble to properly understand and assess PFL/TCS at the outset, and apply the mitigation hierarchy accordingly, stands in stark relief, as the root cause of the ills with which PFL/TCS are confronted, and which mean the unique PFL/TCS operation, which is of obvious importance to national and international health (and public safety), faces existential threat. Rather than seek to avoid the Preston Holding when it ought to have done, at the design stage, the Applicant, having failed to understand these interdependent businesses, let alone properly assess them, ploughed on and expanded its land take into the heart of the Holding. What has happened in the course of this examination has been the Applicant finally, grudgingly, waking up to the operations’ importance and sensitivity, but refusing to do the minimum required to avoid unacceptable risk and interference: remove field E23 from solar panelling, avoid access via the Granborough Road, and deliver more widely on necessary mitigation. The Applicant’s Deadline 6 submissions make the failings and the deficiencies clear.
6. The failure to assess and respond accordingly is not simply a matter of a failure of EIA, but a failure of the Applicant’s process as a whole. Applications for DCOs are not meant to proceed in this way, with the result that existing operations of genuine

importance are harmed without proper consideration of their nature and what could be done to avoid harm in the first place. This, sadly, is a paradigm case of an application ill-prepared and ill-executed. It means PFL/TCS write with a burning sense of frustration. If the Applicant had only listened over 2022-2025, we surely would not be where we are.

7. It is wholly unacceptable that only in the course of the examination has the Applicant come to realise PFL/TCS are “very high sensitivity” (the Applicant’s acknowledged maximum: see **REP6-071**, the Applicant’s specific response to PFL/TCS’ Deadline 5 submissions, at para. 1.2.1), and come to some belated and inadequate mitigation as a result, when this should have been understood and the Proposals evolved accordingly years ago. It adds insult to injury that the Applicant suggests the failure is because PFL/TCS somehow held information back (see **REP6-071** at para. 1.2.2). PFL and TCS beat the Applicant’s door down pre-application in an effort to have the Applicant engage with them and grasp their operations, but it has taken the examination for the penny to start to drop, and with the Applicant digging in on its preferred design. As regards the “assessment gap” discussed generally in previous submissions and evidence, and the particular “assessment gap” table PFL/TCS submitted at Deadline 6, there has been no advance in the Applicant’s assessment of PFL/TCS, so PFL/TCS’ **REP6-108** “assessment gap” analysis stands.
8. Given the Applicant’s Deadline 6 submission, it is clear it will do no more. So we are at the point where PFL/TCS are dependent on the ExA and the Secretary of State to step in and lift the sword of Damocles that is hanging over them.

**Procedurally: the options agreements must be required from the Applicant**

9. Despite **AS-042** the Applicant has not provided the option agreements. It has not even responded to **AS-042**. If, as PFL/TCS increasingly suspect from the Applicant’s failure to disclose, matters are being concealed from the ExA, and ultimately the Secretary of State, then that is a serious matter. Given what Mr James Preston was told in March 2022, and given what the Wintering Bird and Bat Survey reports of 2024 contain by way of drawings labelled 2022, it is important to see whether the November 2022 option agreement includes an option that confirms Mr James Preston’s evidence that in 2022 the ‘parcel 3’ being discussed was very much smaller, and did not include many of the Preston Holding fields the Proposals now take, including E23 (and if that is the case, then the position would be very grave indeed, given what the Applicant has represented to this examination). Similarly, whether what the Applicant says the option agreements say, is actually correct.
10. Procedurally, the ExA must, we respectfully suggest, demand the Applicant provide the option agreements (all the option agreements, but it is those of November 2022 and the July 2025 variation that we definitely know exist, as the Applicant has said they exist). As explained in **REP6-108** and **AS-042**.



11. The ExA has ample power to do so before the close of the examination, under reg 17 of the Rules,<sup>1</sup> and should do so.
12. If not, then the Secretary of State should do so.
13. It cannot be right that the ExA and Secretary of State are denied this essential information and kept in the dark.
14. In particular, the question of whether or not the DCO should be granted must not be taken blind as to whether there is documentation that confirms there was, all along, as Mr James Preston has testified and as the Wintering Bird and Bat Surveys of 2024 thoroughly support through their 2022 drawings' redlines, an option on the table with a much reduced 'parcel 3' that would have avoided the existential impacts PFL/TCS now face.
15. Nor should the decision be taken in the dark as to whether there is substance to the Applicant's claims about what certain provisions of the options say.
16. We consider the position is sufficiently clear cut that requiring the Applicant to provide the option agreements is the only reasonable step to take in discharge of the so-called *Tameside* duty of inquiry that falls on public decision-makers (*Secretary of State for Education v Tameside MBC* [1977] AC 1014, 1065B *per* Lord Diplock and *R (Balajigari) v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2019] EWCA Civ 673, [2019] 1 WLR 4647, at [70]: the duty is one of reasonable inquiry, so the Court will only intervene on *Wednesbury* grounds if the decision-maker's approach falls outside the range of reasonable responses).

### **Substantively**

17. Substantively, in short, either the DCO must be refused, or (and PFL/TCS have made clear throughout that their objection is not to the solar farm *per se*, but to certain aspects that cause unacceptable impacts to their operations) the draft DCO ("dDCO") must be modified so as to:
  - Remove all need for above ground infrastructure on field E23 (Plot 6/13) (i.e. the solar PV presently proposed), by modifying the DCO accordingly. This would be by adjusting the Works plans accordingly, to remove solar PV from Plot 6/13 (see Sheet 6), and also making Plot 6/13 a plot within DCO Schedule 9, only for cable rights (or cable rights and access rights, subject to the issue below). Adjusted Works plans are attached (labelled "Version 1") and an adjusted dDCO Schedule 9 is also attached. See also further below. Note, the Development Description Figures **REP6-050** would also require corresponding adjustment (as would other documents). The Applicant has repeatedly confirmed (by its silence) that it agrees with PFL/TCS that such a modification would be non-material.
  - Require the access to 'parcel 3' to be other than via the Granborough Road, if not for all phases then at least for the operational phase, by modifying the DCO accordingly. This would be by adjusting the draft Construction Traffic Management

---

<sup>1</sup> Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (SI 2010/103).

Plan (**REP5-073**, at page 44) and the OEMP and by adjusting the Works plans accordingly (the access off Granborough Road is shown on Works Plan Sheet 6 by the silage clamp, which is in any event contrary to **REP5-073**, page 44) and by making the fields north and south of the Granborough Road, so Plots 6/12 (also shown as fields SA46-50) and Plot 6/10 (also shown as fields SA35-45), plus the slither of Plot 6/11, plots within DCO Schedule 9 only for cable rights (not also for access rights). Adjusted Works plans are attached for both positions. First, for the position that, respectfully, should be adopted, with no access off the Granborough Road (labelled “Version 1”). The Applicant has, again, repeatedly confirmed (by its silence) that it agrees with PFL/TCS that such a modification would be non-material. If, contrary to PFL/TCS’ position, it is necessary for construction access to be off Granborough Road, then that should be only a more easterly version of what is at **REP5-073** (the CTMP) at page 44, and an alternative adjusted Works plan is attached showing that (labelled “Version 2”), along with an adjusted version of that page 44 of the draft Construction Traffic Management Plan. See also the adjusted dDCO Schedule 9. See also further below. Note, the Development Description Figures **REP6-050** would also require corresponding adjustment (as would other documents).

- Cut down the overly broad rights conferred by DCO Schedule 9 as regards the Preston Holding. See the adjusted dDCO Schedule 9 attached (and see further below).

18. As for the rest, the Applicant’s proposed last-minute mitigation continues to fall short of what is needed, and what PFL/TCS have sought. But PFL/TCS know that it is not the ExA or Secretary of State’s role to redraft the minutiae of mitigation for the Applicant, the Applicant having come so far but no further. The choice, rather, is one that either sees the DCO refused, or the DCO modified (non-materially).

19. So, brief comments only.

*Applicant’s continued claims of no evidence of quantifiable risk/interference*

20. We wondered whether the Applicant might, at last, provide some evidence to counter the evidence we have provided.

21. The Applicant has not.

22. It continues to assert, as if assertion makes true, that there is no evidence of quantifiable risk to health or public safety. See PFL/TCS’ previous submissions and evidence: (a) overwhelming evidence has been provided; (b) EN-1 4.1.7/4.2.15 does not, in any event, make ‘quantifiable risk’ the test.

23. In fact, the SoCG sees the Applicant *agree* (see 2.1-2.3) that (i) we are one of only two UK suppliers of donor animal blood for diagnostics and the only one in England and Wales; (ii) our products are essential; (iii) they are subject to short shelf life and cannot be frozen (and similar points). The Applicant also acknowledges, in its confused text at SoCG point 2.4, that *‘It is not clear what replacement supply would be in place’*. Indeed (and the Applicant’s vague gesture towards European suppliers that could step

in, of which the Applicant plainly has no knowledge, has already been thoroughly debunked by PFL/TCS).

24. If the Proposals go ahead in their present form, and the adverse effects PFL/TCS fear and anticipate come to pass, then PFL/TCS will need to advise the Department of Health and Social Care's National Supply Disruption Response team. We know they fully endorse UKHSA's representation to the examination to date of 22 June 2026 (**REP4-101**), and expect the ExA to give that significant weight, and that they are closely monitoring situation (see the email of 29 July 2026 from National Supply Disruption Response, which ought to have been included in the Deadline 6 materials, and is included now, along with the (suitably redacted) presentation pack referred to).
25. The examination already has the UKHSA's potent representation of 22 June 2026 **REP4-101**.

### E23

26. Still the Applicant refuses to give this up. Why? Clearly not because it is necessary to meet the project's objectives.
27. Rather, the Applicant's 'justification' for ripping the heart out of the Preston Holding is that no proposed MW of generation can be given up. That cannot stand against EN-1 4.1.7/4.2.15 and it cannot stand against a credible application of the mitigation hierarchy, the s.104(7) balance and the compulsory acquisition guidance.
28. The same applies to the Applicant's refusal to provide movement routes around E23 that would allow PFL to bring livestock across it north/south and east/west, as PFL needs to do (and will doubly need to do if the Proposals proceed). The Applicant's suggestion that PFL instead use Granborough Road is wholly unrealistic and yet another reminder that the Applicant simply pays lipservice to PFL's nature and sensitivity. PFL presently uses Granborough Road for one very carefully managed crossing to/from the donation centre. The existing crossing is a short, direct crossing with clear visibility, undertaken at quiet times and carefully managed by experienced staff under established internal procedures, as previously explained.
29. It is with great disappointment that PFL/TCS note their fears for the Applicant's adjusted proposals for 'movement' links through E23, explained at para.76 of their main document to **REP6-108**, have come to pass. By the latest Design Commitments, **REP6-013**, the Applicant has now taken a step backwards, and is proposing simply two east-west corridors across E23. That would not allow PFL to move livestock north and south, which is what it also needs to do (as well as east and west). PFL has explained at Deadline 5 and Deadline 6 why it could not use fields adjacent to E23 for those movements. PFL has discussed movement requirements concerning E23 repeatedly with the Applicant, and has provided it with maps showing the bare minimum (the "capsule" design included at **REP6-108**, that was inadvertently omitted from the PFL/TCS Deadline 5 materials). The Applicant simply refuses to listen.
30. It is a shoal of red herrings for the Applicant to claim the obvious problem of it taking E23 for solar PV is answered by the Claydon Estate's ability to force PFL off that land.

It is the Applicant that wants E23 and the Applicant that is ultimately the controlling hand here. The additional MW that E23 could provide cannot possibly justify what the loss of that pivotal field will do to PFL's ability to operate. One sixth of horse donor blood production hinges on E23. In light of the Applicant's intransigence, PFL/TCS respectfully submit that E23 must be removed from the DCO for all but below ground connection.

31. Necessary modifications to the Works plans and to the draft DCO are attached.
32. Note, the Development Description Figures **REP6-050** would also require corresponding adjustment (as would other documents).

### Access to Parcel 3

33. There has been a slight change here from the Applicant's Deadline 5 position, but as ever it is limited and grudging. The Applicant now says that for the operational stage it will only use the access off the Granborough Road into Plot 6/12 (specifically, what is known as field SA46) for HGVs (see **REP6-071** para.3.3.2). There can be no justification for this insistence on continuing to expose the livestock to stress and contamination risk. Given such movements will be rare, the claimed 'safety case' against the alternative Winslow Road route cannot outweigh the risk to the PFL/TCS operation.
34. If, contrary to PFL/TCS' case, there is to be a Granborough Road access, for construction or operation, then it must be moved as far eastwards in field SA46 as possible. The Applicant was to speak to Buckinghamshire Council regarding visibility splays (PFL/TCS know the road very well and are convinced visibility would not prevent a movement eastwards). There is still no explanation from the Applicant of its vague references to 'environmental' or 'ecological' constraint regarding the brook: the Works plans show separation from the brook already, and that is surely sufficient (the Applicant does not suggest the brook has any particular designated status of relevance).
35. Once again, the need for the ExA and the Secretary of State to do what the Applicant ought to have done, and prohibit access via Granborough Road, and at the very least prohibit operational access, is, respectfully, clear.
36. Necessary modifications to the Works plans and to the draft DCO are attached. The modifications to the Works plans show, first, PFL/TCS' primary position, with no access off the Granborough Road (labelled "Version 1)", and, second, PFL/TCS' secondary position, with access off the Granborough Road but moved to the east (still with ample separation from the brook) (labelled "Version 2").
37. Note, the Development Description Figures **REP6-050** would also require corresponding adjustment (as would other documents).

### Cable runs and access/connection rights

38. The Applicant explains it has reduced two cable runs to one following technical review (see **REP6-071** para.3.6.7 and the updated Figure 3.7 at **REP6-050**). That is a start,

and welcome, however see below regarding the Applicant clinging to its overbroad access/connection rights.

#### Replacement land

39. PFL is of course grateful for anything, given the position the Applicant has placed PFL and TCS in. But that supplicant gratitude must not be allowed to obscure the reality: PFL is losing the heart of the Holding, and the 'replacement' is land out on a limb, with a difficult access, much of which is too far away from a donation centre or housing to be used for grazing, and which PFL will itself have to pay to fence internally, level for access (the land is materially lower than the Preston Holding) and provide with water. At a cost estimated in the region of a hundred thousand pounds.

40. Again, this underlines the need for the removal of E23 from the above ground scheme.

#### Temporary land

41. It is correct this land, far away, over a fast road, is not suitable for grazing. PFL could use it for food production, if given sufficient time to ready it (as PFL has already explained to the Applicant). However, it appears the Applicant is willing to offer it only for grazing, as a means to get the livestock away from its proposed operations.

#### BESS

42. There has been no relevant change since Deadline 5.

#### Biosecurity

43. There has been no relevant change since Deadline 5.

#### Applicant's decision not to amend Schedule 9 (so the broadly cast access/cable/connection rights stand)

44. Remarkably, despite expressly stating at CAH2 that it would address this obvious issue, and despite the ExA itself noting the need to cut down the rights sought in its 15 July 2026 schedule of changes to the dDCO, the Applicant has decided to do nothing (see **REP6-071** at para 3.6.1 onwards). It wants to be able to have unlimited access across fields that PFL will be occupying with its livestock, to go anywhere it wishes, and it wants that not only for the plots where 'access' rights are expressly sought, but even where only 'connection' rights are sought. This is contemptuous of PFL/TCS: rather than cut down what is required to the absolute minimum, the Applicant pursues its usual maximalist approach, designed for its convenience.

45. PFL/TCS do not understand why access rights are required over Plot 6/10, at all, or over Plot 7/5, at all (neither have been remotely explained let alone justified, and the ExA will note that no access track or similar is shown), or over Plot 6/12 (and the slither Plot 6/11) either at all, or (if PFL/TCS' position there should be no access at all is not accepted) to any extent beyond the easterly access track in field SA46. An adjusted version of DCO Schedule 9 is attached, with track changes shown. The changes do two things: (a) they cut down the overly broad wording of the provisions regarding 'cable rights' and 'substation connection rights'; and (b) they appropriately adjust the

rights over these Plots 6/10, 6/11, 6/12 and 7/5 (along with further alternative wording against Plot 6/12 in the event the PFL/TCS primary position is not accepted).

46. Note, it may be that the Works Plans and Development Description Figures **REP6-050** would also require corresponding adjustment (as might other documents).

#### Screening

47. There has been some concession here, as regards early planting, which is welcome (see **REP6-071** at paras. 3.5.11-3.5.12). But this plainly does not reduce the risks to PFL/TCS' operations to an acceptable level, let alone avoid them.

#### Noise fencing

48. There has been some concession here as regards the construction phase (temporary noise barriering and the use of rotary piling, ground conditions permitting, when livestock is in adjacent fields, see Commitment 327 in **REP6-053** and the CEMP at 2.10.3 and 2.11.3 **REP6-058**), which is welcome. But this plainly does not reduce the risks to PFL/TCS' operations to an acceptable level, let alone avoid them.

#### Standback regarding the mitigation concessions recently made

49. Ultimately all are welcome, but ultimately all fall short. Which is predictable, given they are late-in-the-day efforts, rather than an appropriate application of the mitigation hierarchy and the other strands of statute, policy, and guidance that should have meant PFL/TCS would not be left in this desperate position. They confirm that if unacceptable risk to PFL/TCS operations is to be avoided, then field E23 must not have solar PV, and the Granborough Road access must either be removed altogether, or at most pushed as far eastwards as possible and used for construction access only.

#### Update regarding tenancy negotiations

50. PFL confirm that negotiations continue productively and they have every reason to believe that both a short term and a long term FBT will soon be in place regarding Sion Hill Farm. Discussions are also ongoing regarding assignment of the Botolph Farm AHA tenancy from Lynda Preston to James Preston. No documentation has yet been provided regarding the latter, let alone agreed (or even close to agreement).
51. Regarding the letter from the Claydon Estate that the Application has attached at Deadline 6, this is very odd. The Claydon Estate told the Prestons, in clear terms, more than once, that if E23 was not needed for above ground infrastructure for the Proposals after all, then it could form part of the long term Sion Hill Farm replacement FBT. But the Estate have now written a letter to support the Applicant that is to the contrary (the letter of 12 August 2026 attached to **REP6-071**). It is clear where the drive for the process is coming from.

#### Conclusion

52. The close of the examination is days away, but it is still not too late for the Applicant to relent and change course. However, PFL/TCS hold out little hope it will do so.
53. PFL/TCS respectfully rely upon the ExA and the Secretary of State to put matters right.

**Preston Farms Ltd and TCS Biosciences Ltd**

**Authored by: [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as to evidential matters,  
and**

**[REDACTED] 39 Essex Chambers, as to legal matters**

**20 August 2026**

# Rosefield Solar Farm

Draft Development Consent Order: Sch 9  
(Preston Farms Ltd and TCS Biosciences Ltd tracked  
change version of Schedule 9Clean)

EN010158/APP/3.1.9  
Revision 09  
Deadline 6  
August 2026  
Rosefield Energyfarm Limited



P Regulation 5(2)(b)  
Planning Act 2008  
Structure Planning  
Applications: Prescribed Forms  
(Procedure) Regulations 2009



## LAND IN WHICH ONLY NEW RIGHTS ETC. MAY BE ACQUIRED

**Interpretation****1. In this Schedule—**

“access rights” means rights over land to—

- (a) alter, improve, form, maintain, retain, use (with or without vehicles, plant and machinery), remove, reinstate means of access to the authorised development including visibility splays and road widening or improvements and to remove impediments (including vegetation) to such access; and
- (b) pass and repass on foot, with or without vehicles, plant and machinery (including rights to lay and use any temporary surface) for all purposes in connection with the authorised development;

“cable rights” means rights over land to—

- (a) install, use, support, protect, inspect, alter, remove, replace, retain, renew, improve and maintain electrical underground cables, earthing cables, optical fibre cables, data cables, telecommunications cables and other services, works associated with such cables including bays, ducts, protection and safety measures and equipment, and other apparatus and structures;
- (b) remain, pass and repass on foot, with or without vehicles, plant and machinery (including rights to lay and use any temporary surface or form a temporary compound) for all purposes in connection with sub-paragraph (a) immediately above the authorised development; and
- (c) restrict and remove the erection of buildings or structures, restrict the altering of ground levels, restrict and remove vegetation and restrict the planting of trees or carrying out operations or actions (including but not limited to blasting and piling) which may obstruct, interrupt or interfere with the exercise of the rights or damage the authorised development;

“public right of way rights” means rights over land to—

- (a) alter, improve, form, maintain, retain, use, reinstate public rights of way; and
- (b) pass and repass on foot, without vehicles, for all purposes in connection with the use of the public rights of way;

“substation connection rights” means rights over land to—

- (a) install, use, support, protect, inspect, alter, remove, replace, retain, renew, improve and maintain electrical cables, earthing cables, optical fibre cables, data cables, telecommunications cables and other services, works associated with such cables including bays, ducts, protection and safety measures and equipment, and other apparatus and structures and to connect such cables and services to the National Grid East Claydon Substation;
- (b) install, use, support, protect, inspect, alter, remove, replace, retain, renew, improve and maintain watercourses, public sewers and drains and drainage apparatus and equipment;
- (c) remain, pass and repass on foot, with or without vehicles, plant and machinery (including rights to lay and use any temporary surface or form a temporary compound) for all purposes in connection with sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) immediately above the National Grid East Claydon Substation works;
- (d) restrict and remove the erection of buildings or structures, restrict the altering of ground levels, restrict and remove the planting of trees or carrying out operations or actions (including but not limited to blasting and piling) which may obstruct, interrupt or interfere with the exercise of the rights or damage the authorised development; and


- (e) install, use, support, protect, inspect, alter, remove, replace, retain, renew, improve and maintain soft landscaping and biodiversity measures; and

“vegetation maintenance rights” means rights over land to install, use, support, protect, inspect, alter, remove, replace, retain, renew, improve and maintain vegetation and restrict or prevent the removal of vegetation for the purposes of the authorised development and in connection with the authorised development.

| <i>(1)</i><br><i>Plot reference number shown on the Land Plans</i> | <i>(2)</i><br><i>Purposes for which rights over land may be required and restrictive covenants imposed</i>                                                                                                                                |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1/4                                                                | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 1/6                                                                | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 1/9                                                                | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 1/12                                                               | Cable rights, access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 1/14                                                               | Access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 1/15                                                               | Access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 2/2                                                                | Access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 2/3                                                                | Access rights, vegetation maintenance rights                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 2/4                                                                | Access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 2/7                                                                | Access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 3/1                                                                | Access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 3/3                                                                | Access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 3/4                                                                | Access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 3/6                                                                | Access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 3/9                                                                | Cable rights, access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 3/10                                                               | Cable rights, access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 3/11                                                               | Cable rights, access rights                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 3/13                                                               | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 3/14                                                               | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 3/15                                                               | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 3/16                                                               | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 3/17                                                               | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 3/18                                                               | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 4/1                                                                | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 4/2                                                                | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 4/3                                                                | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 4/6                                                                | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 6/3                                                                | Access Rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 6/4                                                                | Cable rights, highway works rights                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 6/5                                                                | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 6/6                                                                | Access rights, cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 6/7                                                                | Cable rights                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 6/10                                                               | Cable rights, <del>access rights</del>                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 6/11                                                               | Cable rights, <del>access rights</del>                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 6/12                                                               | Cable rights, <del>access rights</del> [or, alternatively: <u>‘cable rights, access rights limited to access via the access shown on Sheet 6 of the Work Plans as adjusted by Preston Farms Ltd and TCS Biosciences Ltd, Version 2’</u> ] |
| <u>6/13</u>                                                        | <u>Cable rights [or, alternatively: ‘cable rights, access rights limited to access via the access shown on Sheet 6 of the Work Plans as adjusted by Preston Farms Ltd and TCS Biosciences Ltd, Version 2’]</u>                            |
| 7/1                                                                | Substation connection rights                                                                                                                                                                                                              |

|     |                                                         |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 7/2 | Substation connection rights                            |
| 7/4 | Substation connection rights                            |
| 7/5 | <del>Access rights</del> , Substation connection rights |
| 7/7 | Substation connection rights                            |
| 7/8 | Substation connection rights                            |

Version 1 - E23 No Solar with no access



**LEGEND:**

- Order Limits
- Areas outside the Order Limits
- Work No. 1  
Ground-mounted solar PV Generating Station  
(Up to 3.5m)
- Work No. 1  
Ground-mounted solar PV Generating Station  
(Up to 4.5m, Assumed for 'Good Areas')
- Work No. 2A  
Rosefield Substation Compound
- Work No. 2B  
Abnormal Involuble Load Corridor
- Work No. 3A  
Satellite Collector Compound
- Work No. 3B  
Satellite Collector Compound Transformer
- Work No. 4  
Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)
- Work No. 5  
Main Collector Compound
- Work No. 6  
Grid Connection Cabling Corridor
- Work No. 7  
Interconnecting Cabling Corridor (N)
- Work No. 8A  
Primary Temporary Construction and Demarcation Compound
- Work No. 8B  
Secondary Temporary Construction and Demarcation Compound
- Work No. 9  
Highway Works
- Work No. 10A  
Green and Blue Infrastructure
- Work No. 10B  
Internal access to mitigation areas only

- NOTES:**
1. Ordnance Survey (OS) MasterMap data adopted as the drawing base map.
  2. The location of features shown are indicative only. Exact locations to be confirmed on site.
  3. Additional features may be present on site that have not been identified on the OS MasterMap data.
  4. The Works Plans show the spatial extent of the authorised development, which are described in Schedule 1 (Authorised Development) to the draft Development Consent Order. The Works Plans should be read in conjunction with the draft Development Consent Order and other plans and documents to be verified by it.
  4. The Works Plans are drawn to OS MasterMap data and Land Registry boundaries. In some locations the Land Registry boundaries differ from the OS MasterMap data which results in Limits of Deviation and/or the Order Limits not aligning with the line work shown on the base map.
  5. The Works Plans show some works taking place in combination with each other on the same area of land. Within the combined Limits of Deviation for those works the Applicant seeks authorisation for any combination of those Work Nos. shown within that Limit of Deviation (including an inset).
  6. Where the Order Limits overlap with works, it is assumed that the spatial extent of works extends to the outer edge of the Order Limits.
  7. The legend is to be read alongside Schedule 1 (Authorised Development) to the draft Development Consent Order.

Rosefield Solar Farm

DOCUMENT:

DRAWING TITLE:  
**WORKS PLANS  
KEY PLAN**

PIR REFERENCE NUMBER:  
EN01058APP2.3.7


REVISION:  
**07**

DATE: DRAWN: SCALE:  
1:15,000 @ A1





Version 1 E23 No solar with no access



**LEGEND:**

- Order Limits
- Areas outside the Order Limits
- Work No. 1: Ground-mounted Solar PV Generating Station (Up to 3.5m)
- Work No. 1: Ground-mounted Solar PV Generating Station (Up to 4.5m, Accounting for Flood Avoidance)
- Work No. 2A: Rosefield Substation Compound
- Work No. 2B: Abnormal Individual Load Corridor
- Work No. 3A: Satellite Collector Compound
- Work No. 3B: Satellite Collector Compound Transformer
- Work No. 4: Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)
- Work No. 5: Main Collector Compound
- Work No. 6: Grid Connection Cabling Corridor
- Work No. 7: Interconnecting Cabling Corridor (x)
- Work No. 8A: Primary Temporary Construction and Decommissioning Compound
- Work No. 8B: Secondary Temporary Construction and Decommissioning Compound
- Work No. 9: Highway Works
- Work No. 10A: Green and Blue Infrastructure
- Work No. 10B: Internal access to mitigation areas only

**NOTES:**

1. Refer to key plan for notes.

**KEY PLAN:**

**DOCUMENT:**

**DRAWING TITLE:**  
WORKS PLANS  
SHEET 6 OF 8


**PIN REFERENCE NUMBER:** EN01058APP3.7

**REVISION:**

**DATE:** **DRAWN:** **SCALE:** 1:2,500 at A1

**SCALE BAR:**

Version 2 - E23 No Solar with access moved east



LEGEND:

- Order Limits
- Areas outside the Order Limits
- Work No. 1  
Ground-mounted solar PV Generating Station  
(Up to 3.5m)
- Work No. 1  
Ground-mounted solar PV Generating Station  
(Up to 4.5m. Assuming for 7000 Acres)
- Work No. 2A  
Rosefield Substation Compound
- Work No. 2B  
Abnormal Involuble Load Corridor
- Work No. 3A  
Satellite Collector Compound Transformer
- Work No. 3B  
Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)
- Work No. 4  
Main Collector Compound
- Work No. 5  
Grid Connection Cabling Corridor
- Work No. 6  
Interconnecting Cabling Corridor (N)
- Work No. 6A  
Primary Temporary Construction and Demounting Compound
- Work No. 6B  
Secondary Temporary Construction and Demounting Compound
- Work No. 9  
Highway Works
- Work No. 10A  
Green and Blue Infrastructure
- Work No. 10B  
Internal access to irrigation areas only

NOTES:

1. Ordnance Survey (OS) MasterMap data adopted as the drawing base map.
2. The location of features shown are indicative only. Exact locations to be confirmed on site.
3. Additional features may be present on site that have not been identified on the OS MasterMap data.
4. The Works Plans show the spatial extent of the authorised development, which are described in Schedule 1 (Authorised Development) to the draft Development Consent Order. The Works Plans should be read in conjunction with the draft Development Consent Order and other plans and documents to be verified by it.
4. The Works Plans are drawn to OS MasterMap data and Land Registry boundaries. In some locations the Land Registry boundaries differ from the OS MasterMap data which results in Limits of Deviation and/or the Order Limits not aligning with the line work shown on the base map.
5. The Works Plans show some works taking place in combination with each other on the same area of land. Within the combined Limits of Deviation for those works the Applicant seeks authorisation for any combination of those Work Nos. shown within that Limit of Deviation (including an inset).
6. Where the Order Limits overlap with works, it is assumed that the spatial extent of works extends to the outer edge of the Order Limits.
7. The legend is to be read alongside Schedule 1 (Authorised Development) to the draft Development Consent Order.

Rosefield Solar Farm

DOCUMENT:

DRAWING TITLE:  
WORKS PLANS  
KEY PLAN

PIR REFERENCE NUMBER: EN01058APP2.3.7


REVISION: 07

DATE: DRAWN: SCALE: 1:15,000 @ A1

SCALE BAR:



# Version 2 E23 No solar with access moved east



**LEGEND:**

- Order Limits
- Areas outside the Order Limits
- Work No. 1: Ground-mounted Solar PV Generating Station (Up to 3.5m)
- Work No. 1: Ground-mounted Solar PV Generating Station (Up to 4.5m, Accounting for Flood Avoidance)
- Work No. 2A: Rosefield Substation Compound
- Work No. 2B: Abnormal Individual Load Corridor
- Work No. 3A: Satellite Collector Compound
- Work No. 3B: Satellite Collector Compound Transformer
- Work No. 4: Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)
- Work No. 5: Main Collector Compound
- Work No. 6: Grid Connection Cabling Corridor
- Work No. 7: Interconnecting Cabling Corridor (IC)
- Work No. 8A: Primary Temporary Construction and Decommissioning Compound
- Work No. 8B: Secondary Temporary Construction and Decommissioning Compound
- Work No. 9: Highway Works
- Work No. 10A: Green and Blue Infrastructure
- Work No. 10B: Internal access to mitigation areas only

**NOTES:**

1. Refer to key plan for notes.

**KEY PLAN:**

Rosefield Solar Farm

**DOCUMENT:**

**DRAWING TITLE:**

WORKS PLANS  
SHEET 6 OF 8

PIN REFERENCE NUMBER:  
EN01058APP3.7

REVISION:

DATE:

DRAWN:


SCALE:  
1:2,500 @ A1

SCALE BAR:



0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Copyright 2025 Rosefield Energy Farm Limited (11618221). No part of this drawing be reproduced without prior permission of Rosefield Energy Farm Limited.

This drawing may contain Ordnance Survey material by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of His Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2024. All rights reserved. Reference number 1000010473  
OS Open data / © Natural England / © DEIRA / © DECC / © English Heritage. Aerial Photography - ISRL DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, USDA FSA, USGS, AEX, Geomapping, AerialGrid, IGN, JCT, Jvintops, the CB User Community



- NOTES:**
1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN METERS UNLESS STATED OTHERWISE.
  2. ALL WORKS TO BE EXECUTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DMRB, THE MANUAL OF CONTRACT DOCUMENTS FOR HIGHWAYS WORKS, DESIGN MANUAL FOR ROADS AND BRIDGES, AND TRAFFIC SIGNS MANUAL.
  3. ALL WORKS TO BE CARRIED OUT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF THE STATUTORY AUTHORITIES AND CONSTRUCTION DESIGN MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS.
  4. ANY DISCREPANCIES TO BE REPORTED TO THE ENGINEER IMMEDIATELY SO THAT CLARIFICATION CAN BE SOUGHT PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF WORKS.
  5. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL EXISTING SERVICES AND DRAINAGE CONNECTIONS PRIOR TO COMMENCING WORKS.
- LEGEND:**
- PROPOSED ROAD CONSTRUCTION
  - JUNCTION VISIBILITY SPAY
  - INDICATIVE ACCESS TRACK



PFL / TCS edit with access an track moved further east

| App                                                                                                           | Date | Description | Dm | Chk | App         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------------|----|-----|-------------|
| Rosefield Solar Farm                                                                                          |      |             |    |     |             |
| DOCUMENT:                                                                                                     |      |             |    |     |             |
| TITLE:<br>APPLICATION DRAWINGS FOR APPROVAL REGULATION 5(2)(K)<br>SUBSTATION<br>PROPOSED SITE ACCESS JUNCTION |      |             |    |     |             |
| PINS REFERENCE NUMBER:<br>EN010158/APP/7.5                                                                    |      |             |    |     |             |
| FIGURE SK004                                                                                                  |      |             |    |     |             |
| SCALE : AS SHOWN @ A1<br>0 1km                                                                                |      |             |    |     | REV:<br>P02 |



Lead panel for the Examining Authority  
Planning Inspectorate  
c/o QUADIENT  
69 Buckingham Avenue  
Slough  
SL1 4PN

20th August 2026

Dear [REDACTED]


**EN010158/APP/8.32 – Rosefield Solar Farm – TCS Biosciences/ Preston Farms Clarification of BIVDA evidence**

I write briefly to clarify three points arising from BIVDA's letter of 11 August 2026.

- For the avoidance of doubt, I have been aware of Preston Farms' tenancy position since December 2025. It has therefore been known to me throughout all of BIVDA's discussions and correspondence concerning Rosefield Solar Farm, including when I wrote BIVDA's letter of 11 August 2026. The final paragraph of that letter expressly refers to the tenancy position and the potential resulting loss of two-thirds of horse blood production and one-third of sheep blood production. Those figures illustrate the potential scale of the supply risk arising from the tenancy position, but as previously described, BIVDA's concern is not limited to that precise outcome. Assuming the tenancy position is resolved, I understand the solar farm will still be taking land (a field called E23) with the potential to cause the loss of one-sixth of horse blood production. I discussed the potential supply consequences directly with Mr Griffiths for the Applicant at the hearing at which I spoke. My response in that discussion was that, if there were a material impact on donor animal blood supply, DHSC and UKHSA would become directly involved in resolving the situation. A loss of one-sixth of horse blood production would be highly material.
- Second, the reference in BIVDA's letter to correspondence dated 26 July from the Department of Health and Social Care's National Supply Disruption Response was an error. The intended reference was to the email of 29 July 2026 from National Supply Disruption Response, concerning the potential supply risk. A copy of that email is attached. It had been intended to accompany BIVDA's 11 August letter but was inadvertently omitted.
- Third, I am aware that both the UK Health Security Agency and DHSC's National Supply Disruption Response continue to monitor the supply risks associated with this situation. DHSC, BIVDA and UKHSA monitor and manage supply risks and this supply risk forms part of those requirements. I also understand that National Supply Disruption Response has reiterated that the UKHSA representation of 22 June 2026 is of key importance to the planning consideration of this matter.

BIVDA's position remains that the continuity and resilience of the UK supply of donor animal blood is an important matter for the diagnostics sector and healthcare system, and that the risks identified in our letter of 11 August should be appropriately taken into account.

Yours sincerely,



Chief Executive, BIVDA

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 29 July 2026 1:54 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Rosefield Solar Farm - URGENT

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

[REDACTED]

Thank you for sending through the presentation pack and mapping details following our meeting to discuss this issue.

I am writing in my capacity as Deputy Director of National Supply Disruption Response in the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC). I understand that a Development Consent Order is currently being prepared which, if agreed as currently proposed, could adversely impact the ability of TCS Biosciences Limited to maintain supply of animal blood, primarily from horses and sheep, to produce blood-enriched agar, which is used in diagnostic microbiology across the UK.

The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA), as an executive agency of DHSC, acts on behalf of the Secretary of State for Health and Social care as a statutory consultee in responding to Nationally Significant Investment Projects. UKHSA in this role have exercised their statutory duties and health protection functions to respond to the planning inspectorate stressing the criticality of supply of blood agar to the UK's public health system, medical and life sciences sectors, the significant national importance of maintaining a robust, UK-based production capability. This includes outlining concerns about any aspects of the proposed development, during its development or construction and operational phases, that has the potential to disrupt or adversely impacts the ability of Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited to provide blood agar.

From a supply chain resilience perspective, potential issues affecting the ongoing supply or quality of donor animal blood could present a concern which UKHSA have identified in their formal response. Additionally, as UKHSA have responded as a statutory consultee it is expected that the planning inspector will afford their response significant weight when making a recommendation.

Please keep us updated on any key developments regarding this matter.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
Deputy Director, National Supply Disruption Response  
Department of Health and Social Care  
E: [REDACTED]  
T: [REDACTED]

This e-mail and any attachments is intended only for the attention of the addressee(s). Its unauthorised use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, please destroy all copies and inform the sender by return e-mail. Any views expressed in this message are not necessarily those of the Department of Health and Social Care. Please note: Incoming and outgoing email messages are routinely monitored for compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications.

---

**PFL/TCS presentation pack ref. email dated 29.7.26 from Deputy Director, National  
Supply Disruption Response**

---

# TCS Biosciences Ltd



## Welcomes



&



Commercial in confidence



# Attendees

|              |                            |           |
|--------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| • [REDACTED] | Managing Director          | TCS / PFL |
| • [REDACTED] | Finance Director           | TCS / PFL |
| • [REDACTED] | HR & Legal Director        | TCS       |
| • [REDACTED] | Director                   | TCS       |
| • [REDACTED] | Sales & Marketing Director | TCS       |
| • [REDACTED] | Key Account Manager        | TCS       |
| • [REDACTED] | Operations Manager         | TCS       |
| • [REDACTED] | Farm Manager               | PFL       |

Commercial in confidence

# Re-Cap

- TCS was founded in 1965 with a single objective:

Supply UK Microbiologists with a consistent, sterile and fresh source of animal blood products for use as a diagnostic tool, primarily in Blood Agar Plates

- 60 Years later TCS and PFL remain the largest donor animal blood provider in the UK and Europe
- Shipping, on average, over [REDACTED] per week of donor blood products to customers in the UK, Europe and Middle East

Commercial in confidence

# Re-Cap

- Primary customers
  - Pre-Poured Media Manufacturers:




- Direct supply to:



Commercial in confidence

# Re-Cap



Source: BIVDA - Protecting the Lifeblood of UK Diagnostic Microbiology



Based on customer and market knowledge, TCS' conservative estimate is that 60 to 70% of these plates contain animal blood collected by PFL and supplied to market by TCS

Commercial in confidence

# Business Continuity:

- Business continuity is important:
  - Defibrinated Whole Donor Animal Blood has a short shelf-life, 4 weeks from the date of collection
  - Depending on dehydrated culture media used, shelf-life plates is 8 to 12 weeks
  - Stock piling of meaningful contingency stock is therefore not possible
  - TCS and PFL are businesses providing continuous year-round supply

Commercial in confidence

# Business Continuity:

- Risk / Challenges
  - Animal Biosecurity and Disease
    - Localised "exclusion zones"
  - Animal Husbandry and Welfare
  - Government Policy
  - Import / Export Legislation
  - One Off Events
    - Brexit
    - Pandemic

Commercial in confidence



# Business Continuity: Current Issue

- Rosefield Solar Farm:
  - Large scale solar development
  - Spread over three parcels, one directly impacting land used by PFL
- Primary Issues
  - Land take of ~140 acres, including E23 – the heart of the holding
  - Tenancy Situation and Notice to Quit
  - Construction compounds and long-term access route across PFL Holding
  - Adherence to ASPA / Home Office Licence Conditions
  - Access and construction = Biosecurity risks / Stress to animals
- Fundamental failure by Rosefield to adequately assess and mitigate impacts on the business and national healthcare


Commercial in confidence



# Discussion Points:


- Maps & Potential Impacts
- TCS / PFL concerns
- TCS / PFL mitigation proposals
- PFL Tenancy Position
- CPO discussion Rosefield => PFL
- TCS / PFL position as possible CNI

Commercial in confidence




Commercial in confidence






Commercial in confidence



Proposed parcel 3 as Per Wintering Bird Survey 2022




Proposed parcel 3 as per planning application


Commercial in confidence



Commercial in confidence








**LEGEND:**

|                                                  |                                                                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                  | Order Limits                                                                                                    |
|                                                  | Areas outside the Order Limits                                                                                  |
| <b>Existing landscape features</b>               |                                                                                                                 |
|                                                  | Existing vegetation (Trees and hedgerows)                                                                       |
|                                                  | Existing watercourse                                                                                            |
|                                                  | Existing ponds (priority habitat)                                                                               |
|                                                  | Existing ponds (non-priority habitat - potential to consider restoration and/or enhancement)                    |
| <b>Proposed green and blue infrastructure</b>    |                                                                                                                 |
|                                                  | Indicative area for mitigation and/or enhancement                                                               |
|                                                  | Indicative area for Solar PV and / or ancillary development, to include mitigation and enhancement under panels |
|                                                  | Indicative locations for strategic early planting / vegetation management                                       |
|                                                  | Former ponds (non-priority habitat - potential to consider recreation)                                          |
|                                                  | Indicative locations for proposed ecological pond                                                               |
| <b>Existing routes</b>                           |                                                                                                                 |
|                                                  | Existing Public Right of Way                                                                                    |
|                                                  | Existing permissive footpath                                                                                    |
| <b>Indicative proposed routes</b>                |                                                                                                                 |
|                                                  | Proposed Public Right of Way Diversion                                                                          |
|                                                  | Proposed permissive footpath                                                                                    |
| <b>Proposed Solar Development infrastructure</b> |                                                                                                                 |
|                                                  | Proposed Internal access track                                                                                  |
|                                                  | Proposed Rosefield Substation and Main Collector Compound                                                       |
|                                                  | Proposed BESS Compound                                                                                          |
|                                                  | Proposed Satellite Collector Compound                                                                           |
|                                                  | Proposed Solar PV modules and Inverter and Transformer Station                                                  |

Commercial in confidence






Source: Claydon Solar Action Group




Machinery Gateway





Livestock Gateway



Aerial image of Granborough Road marked to show relevant farm movements and interfaces








Source: Claydon Solar Action Group

Material showing the approximate 80m replacement-land access connection




Commercial in confidence



---

**Mapping details ref. email dated 29.7.26 from Deputy Director, National Supply  
Disruption Response**

---



**Copyright** GATELEY HAMER LIMITED. THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED PURSUANT TO AND SUBJECT TO THE TERMS OF APPOINTMENT BY THE CLIENT AND FOR THE SPECIFIC PURPOSES CONNECTED WITH THE PROJECT ONLY. IT SHOULD NOT BE RELIED UPON BY ANY OTHER PARTY OR USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE. GATELEY HAMER ACCEPTS NO LIABILITY WHICH MAY ARISE FROM RELIANCE ON USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OR THE DATA CONTAINED HEREIN BY ANY OTHER PARTY OR FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE.

Location Plan

**Notes**

- DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS DRAWING. USE ONLY PRINTED DIMENSIONS.
- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN METRES UNLESS STATED OTHERWISE.
- THIS DRAWING IS TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL OTHER RELEVANT DOCUMENTATION.

**Key to Symbols**

- Order land - the area within which the authorised development may be carried out
- Order land - land to be compulsorily acquired and in relation to which it is proposed to extinguish easements, servitudes and other rights
- Order land - new rights to be compulsorily acquired and land in relation to which existing easements, servitudes and other rights are to be compulsorily acquired
- Order land - new rights to be compulsorily acquired and land in relation to which existing easements, servitudes and other rights are to be compulsorily acquired

**Preston Farms Land Interest Plan**

- Land let to Preston Farms under a FOT
- Land let to Preston Farms under a FOT (outside Order Limits)
- Land let to Preston Farms under a FOT (outside Order Limits)

|      |             |        |        |         |          |
|------|-------------|--------|--------|---------|----------|
| 1001 | First Issue | 100000 | 100000 | 100000  | 100000   |
| Rev  | Description | Date   | By     | Checked | Approved |

Release of Issue

**FOR INFORMATION**

**Gateley / HAMER**

One Eleven Edmund Street  
Birmingham  
B3 2HJ

Tel: 0121 534 0000  
Web: gateleyhamer.com

Client

**EDF ENERGY  
RENEWABLES LIMITED**

Project Title

**ROSEFIELD SOLAR FARM**

Drawing Title

**LAND INTEREST PLAN -  
PRESTON FARMS LIMITED**

**SHEET 1 OF 1**

|       |         |          |          |
|-------|---------|----------|----------|
| Drawn | Checked | Approved | Date     |
| KM    | VH      | JD       | 19/06/26 |

GH Project Number

201576.00002

Scale at A1

1:5,000

Drawing Number

GH-20157600002-LI-PFL

Revision

P01