

EN010147 Registration number 20053829

**To the Examining Authority (ExA):** botleywestsolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

From Dr Lidia Arciszewska and Prof David Sherratt FRS, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**1. Answer to question 2.13.8 (deadline 4 August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025)**

The proposal will have a detrimental impact on the landscape in so many places; these impacts will vary depending on specific area viewpoints. In general, hiding the panels behind tall hedges and therefore removing the views of the landscape altogether **is not** a mitigation. It may have an even more drastic visual effect than the panels themselves. A blanket strategy should not be applied here; rather, a careful site-specific consideration of mitigation and its scale should be employed. Solar panels should be removed from the fields of highly visually sensitive sites, such as fields on the slopes of the Evenlode valley, or from highly contoured areas, as suggested in the WO Local Impact Assessment. Equally, limited removal of the panels as a mitigation measure should be considered as opposed to high hedgerows in places proximal to human activity, such as near residential properties or along PRoWs. It is not acceptable to alter the PRoW into hedgerow tunnels or box residential properties with tall hedges for the “benefit” of mitigation.

Matters of mitigation should therefore be discussed at microscale levels with the local stakeholders, such as LPAs, specific local communities and affected residents.

If the development is approved, affected landscapes should be restored to their original state at the post-operational stage. Some hedgerows could be retained to provide a permanent ecological benefit. The decisions, which mitigating measures should be decommissioned should be made now, not in 40 years.

**2. Answer to question 2.9.4 for the Deadline 4 August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025**

We find the statement made by the applicant in Chapter 8 [Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, para 8.6.80] that: *“Due to the low level of the Project, particularly the solar*

*arrays, and proposed mitigation, there is no potential for any private views to be adversely affected to an extent that would result in a level of harm of Substantial, which trigger the threshold for an RVAA being required. As such, private views are not considered further...'*

This statement is uninformed, erroneous and arrogant!

The proposed 'mitigations and benefits' on the map APP\_7.3.3 - Landscape, Ecology + Amenities Plan (AS-022 in the Examination Library, shows a sketchy detail of what the Applicant envisions to provide around the periphery of our property, [REDACTED] We do not accept being surrounded on three sides by a cycle path located immediately close to the edges of our garden; it would result in a serious infringement of our privacy. Furthermore, the design of this cycle path is flawed and potentially dangerous as the path crosses Lower Road twice from its west side to the east and back. Lower Road is a busy, narrow country road carrying thousands of cars and HGVs in each direction every day. Even a primary school child working towards the school project would not endorse a cycling path crossing this road.

Moreover, as stated in our earlier correspondence, we do not wish any landscape amenity mitigation in the form of hedgerows or trees to be planted for our benefit near the border of our property.

Considering that the proposed solar installation will surround our property on three sides and overwhelm our visual amenity in all directions up to the horizon line in many viewpoints, we request that any buffer zone be at least 85 meters from the boundaries of our property and not 25 meters; and be applied on all three sides. We understand that an 85 metre buffer zone may have been accepted for other properties impacted by the development. Finally, we reiterate that the proposed land for solar panels west of the river Evenlode is ALC ~85% (and almost 100% of the land between the ~120 metre frontage of our property and the river Evenlode is ALC grade 1 and 2). Solar panels should not be placed on this grade 1 and 2 land and the best way of mitigating the blight of solar panels in this area would be to remove them totally.

**3. Comments on the applicant's response to Examining Authority (ExA) 1<sup>st</sup> written question 1.3.12**

We find the Applicant's answer to the written question 1.3.12 totally insufficient, vague and authoritarian. *"This distance [25 meters] was a professional judgement based on extensive experience (there is no such thing as scientific reasoning in this situation in planning terms)..... The landscape architect was aware that in some case they may need to consider applying a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA), if it was judged to be necessary. To date, that has not been triggered/judged to be necessary. In some cases too, additional landscaping was proposed to help screen the solar arrays from sensitive receptors."*

Despite our property being one of the most affected by the proposed installation, the Applicant has never made an effort to contact us and discuss the potential adverse effects it would have on us. An appropriate assessment of the impact on our property should be conducted urgently, and an appropriate buffer zone of 85 meters from our boundary should be applied. As stated in our answer to Q 2.9.4, we do not wish to be imprisoned in a box of tall hedges and trees planted around our property by the developer.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Lidia Arciszewska

Prof David Sherratt FRS