

Dear Sir/Madam,

May I submit my objection to this proposal in its entirety.

As a general point, the Examiners cannot recommend the application be accepted when so much evidence is missing. The SoS should come to the same conclusion when considering the proposal on merit.

Specific points:

One of the most serious issues for the Local Community has been the failure to carry out an RVAA until the very last minute to determine whether the project would have an unacceptable visual impact on residents' enjoyment of their homes and gardens.

The ExA have already criticised PVDP's assessment of moderate Landscape impacts (eg views from PRoW) as being "not significant". The Oxfordshire Host Authorities (OHA), at the request of ExA, have submitted a very impressive response describing once more the areas recommended for panel removal, explaining the methodology they used to decide these areas and the impacts they feel remain.

Insufficient consideration has been given to Heritage assets (eg listed churches and buildings also mentioned by OHA).

ExA ask "please can you explain why you are prepared to undertake reductions in panel area in relation to the World Heritage Site (WHS) after concerns raised by historic England, ICOMOS-UK and others but are not prepared to give consideration to other areas that have been suggested by professional landscape architects and by the local authorities that have a deep understanding of their local area"?

Archaeological Assessments have finally been provided. In their letter of 23/10/25 the ExA identify 57 fields to be considered for increased buffer zones on archaeological grounds.

Failure to provide scientific evidence regarding increased flood risk due to panel run-off or regarding flood zones on the southern site.

No evidence to prove the assertion that they aren't taking productive land out of food production.

Failure to justify how "Community Food Growing" areas would benefit local communities and why this commercial enterprise is preferred to the currently successful agricultural enterprise.

Information on the funding for this project is still very sketchy and certainly not "normal" as PVDP claims.

Yours sincerely,

Thomas Butler-Bowdon