



## *Begbroke and Yarnton Green Belt Campaign (BYG)*

### **Deadline 5, BYG re: Comment on Applicant`s Response to Examining Authority`s ExQ2.5.1.**

In **ExQ2.5.1**, the Applicant was asked to provide details of the ownership structure of the various Blenheim entities.

1. A specific request was made for information to support the claim that the Blenheim Palace WHS would benefit from £500,000 p.a. deriving from the Botley West Solar Farm project:

*`What is the legal method by which funds, and how much, will transfer directly to Blenheim Palace for the purposes of maintenance of the World Heritage Site (WHS), who will administer these funds and how is it secured? Explain how the Blenheim Maintenance Fund, a recipient of the lease monies, is related to these companies?`*

2. The Applicant has provided information in Annex 5 of **REP4-036** but the information included there does not answer the question. As BYG pointed out in **REP4-044 (1.5)**, it has been confirmed that all land outside the park is now leased to Vanbrugh Unit Trust (VUT). This includes any land owned by the Blenheim Palace 1984 Maintenance Fund.

3. In the absence of any proof to the contrary forthcoming, it can therefore be assumed that it is VUT which will benefit from any revenue flowing from the solar project. It has been confirmed that VUT has no legal obligation to fund the WHS. [Only the 1984 Maintenance Fund has such a legal obligation.]

4. Unless Blenheim provides the information requested, necessitating spelling out exactly how much land the 1984 Maintenance fund owns and what entitlement it has to the full benefit of increased rents (subject to any lease agreements in place), BYG contends that any statement made by the Blenheim Trustees about benefits to the WHS resulting from Botley West should be ignored.

5. If the statements they have made could be upheld, it would have been a simple matter to provide the detailed information requested by the ExA.

\*\*\*