

From: Michael Saffrette [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 November 2025 16:51
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Submission on PVDP responses

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Dear sir

As a resident of Church Hanborough I fully agree with the Oxfordshire Host Authorities (OHA) very detailed, thorough and accurate assessment of their Residents visibility amenity report which unlike PVDP's shambolic attempts to down play this issue. PVDP conclusions are based on poor photography taken from selective sites and then use this flawed information to seriously downplay the negative aspects of the solar farm. A theme, that to me, underpins all their responses.

The ExA have also called out PVDP for its shortcomings and asked for a 250 metre buffer between the solar arrays and residential properties. I agree with this as a minimum but would like to see it increased in some cases where even this amount would not mitigate the adverse effects of solar panel standing up to 12 feet high. The down playing of the impact of the arrays as not "being significant" demonstrates PVDP's determination to push this project forward despite evidence to the contrary from their conclusions. I have been to public consultations where I have been told that I won't be able to see the panels. A nonsense!

Another aspect that concerns me is, and this is not only relevant to PVDP's plans but other big solar farms as well, is using farmland to site solar panels. The UK already imports a large percentage of its food. Due to climate change this is certainly set to increase with ramifications for our balance of payments. To tackle climate change more renewables are needed but doing it this way can actually contribute to more Carbon emissions as food miles will inevitably increase. Solar panels definitely have a part to play but just sticking them on every bit of farmland is not the way forward. Why gamble with the future when there are much more sensible options available that don't destroy productive land for a quick profit for a few individuals. More panels on roofs is one option or in this case take a leaf out of what's done on the continent where wind turbines are used in fields. So you keep the vast majority of your farmland and still get cheap energy. Especially as onshore wind is the least expensive form of renewable electricity.

In addition to the above are other aspects of the plans which include the increased flood risk to land already prone to flooding. The erection of miles of fencing crossing the land over public rights of way. The destruction of hedgerows important to wild life. The running of a cable through some of the only remaining water meadow in England near the Swinford toll bridge.

To cap it all PVDP have not been transparent as to where the funding for all this is coming from. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary we must assume that it is coming from Yulia Lezhem the widow of a Russian business man accused of scamming a Russian bank over a non-existent gold mine. Surely we can do better than this.

Ed Miliband while being interviewed by Laura Keunberg on the 19th October on the BBC said that each project would be decided on merit after proper process. Given the poor quality or indeed absence of so much evidence and its inherent bias I am struggling to see how an informed decision can be made and it should be refused. It is a bad scheme, bad for the environment, bad for the local population and funded by bad money. It mustn't be allowed to go ahead.

Yours faithfully

Mr Michael Saffrette,

