

From: Miles and Mary Tuely [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 November 2025 17:20
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Cc: MILLER, Calum (MP); [REDACTED]
Subject: Botley West Solar Scheme

Dear Mr Wallis

My wife and I own [REDACTED] southeast of the village of Wootton.

We have written to your inspectorate on several occasions expressing our concerns about this scheme. We shall now try to summarise these without too much repetition:

1. Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA)

The applicant's RVAA states that [REDACTED] and barns are " 140 to 150m to the west and 70 to 130m to the north west " of the proposed scheme. This is a meaningless statement since the barns (now converted to housing) face north away from the scheme and [REDACTED] faces southeast directly at the scheme. It is also unclear from what boundaries the measurements are taken. The whole of this area is a considerable size and it is wrong to assess it all as one unit. The curtilage of the House is 133m from the nearest boundary of the Scheme. This is significantly closer than the 250m suggested by the ExA as the minimum distance from domestic properties. The survey prepared by RPS refers to " Access as well as location " (para 1.3.8) among matters to be assessed when dealing with visual amenity. In the case of [REDACTED] the distance of the solar scheme from the access road is only 115m.

The ExA's letter to the applicant of the 23rd October states that the effect of the scheme should be assessed from the upper floor windows of houses as well as from other parts. In the case of [REDACTED] it is clearly visible from those floors as well as from many parts of the garden. It is astonishing that, despite all the above, the applicant's adviser, RPS concludes that " the property ([REDACTED]) is not considered further for assessment ".

2. This is an example of the sloppiness of the applicant's case and how it has completely ignored the interests of the large numbers of people living within the huge area affected by its scheme. It has consistently refused to supply details that have been requested by the ExA and those which have been supplied often need further explanation.

3. It is requested that enclosure 1.12 should be totally removed from the scheme. There is very little left of the scheme in this field after much has already been removed because of archaeological concerns.

4. Archaeology

It has been demonstrated that there was an enormous Roman settlement centred on Sansom's Platt. This extended to enclosures 1.12, 1.11 and 1.13. Part of 1.12 has already been removed from the scheme and it is requested that the other fields should also be removed for the same reason. This is clearly a unique site which should not be damaged for the sake of a small amount of electricity generation.

5. Food Production

The majority of the northern sector is Grade 3 agriculture land and part is Grade 2. Despite this, the applicant asserts that the scheme does not take land out of food production but does not produce any evidence to support this. Their assertion is clearly absurd.

As part of their justification it is claimed that the land will be devoted to “ Community Food Growing “ but without any details as to how this will benefit local people or why this new production will be better than what is happening at the moment.

6. Funding

We are very concerned at the lack of information on how the scheme will be funded. We believe that the large solar scheme in Suffolk/Cambridge (Sunnica) started off as being sold with the benefit of planning permission but has now reverted to a different form of funding. This is the sort of muddle which is to be avoided at all costs and arises from uncertainty on funding at the time of planning permission.

7. Summary

In view of the multiple shortcomings of this application, the lack of information and the refusal of the applicants to supply answers to the ExA, we urge you to throw out the whole application and the SoS to refuse any appeal should one be mounted.

Yours sincerely

Miles and Mary Tuely