

From: Kate Peck [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 November 2025 13:58
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: BOTLEY WEST SOLAR DEVELOPMENT - HAVE YOUR SAY RESPONSE FROM GEORGE PECK IP NUMBER [REDACTED]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

As the landowner at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], I wish to make the following points about the proposed development

1. **It is essential to residents, the 150 students and visitors to the School that the vistas and historical importance of the landscape is protected, as it forms a central role in tradition of the students' training therefore:**
 - The widths of public rights of way should be the full 15m called for by OCC
 - The fencing/other enclosures should be designed by an independent review panel to the satisfaction of the relevant planning authority
 - There should be a *minimum* of 250m between the edge of any panel array and a dwelling or occupied building
 - There has been a reduction in panels around the World Heritage Site (WHS) but the Applicant hasn't given consideration to other areas that have been suggested by English Heritage, ICOMOS-UK, professional landscape architects and local authorities about safeguarding Heritage assets, such as Hordley House, even though the Oxfordshire Host Authorities have stated that the effects of the current plans on Hordley would be 'overbearing' from the property and from the footpaths in this area. OHA also recommended that small patches of panels in OX20 1ER on elevated land, isolated from the rest of the development should be removed (response to ISH2 Action Point 16 Deadline 6)
 - The Applicant has only just published a vital archaeological report in which more than 66 trenches with significant archaeological features and deposits have been identified. Nearly half of these have NO buffer. In particular the area around Sansoms Platt should be fully protected from the development.
 - The Applicant failed to publish in a timely manner the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment which contains errors, poor photography and mapping
2. **There is a significant gap in the knowledge and data available to the Examining Authority to make a robust recommendation to the Secretary of State**

The process by which the Applicant undertaken the planning of the development has been haphazard, with late submissions, lack of proper consultation and ignoring questions put by the Examining Authority and submissions from interested parties which do not fit their own needs, for instance:

- there are reports missing relating to Flood, Storm Damage and Airport Safety
- the information about the funding of the development is nowhere near detailed enough
- the Applicant's insistence that land is "poor" due to farming methods has been contradicted by tenant farmers and soil surveys

- there are incomplete plans for the decommissioning of the site
- the definitive cable route through Eynsham and across the Thames is still missing
- there is a failure to justify how the Community Food Growing areas would benefit the local community

Yours

George Peck

IP [REDACTED]