

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 November 2025 18:41  
**To:** Botley West Solar Farm  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Botley West Solar Farm Application - Affected Person. Registration Number 20054922.  
**Attachments:** December 2023 Swans in the field next to our property ref 2.60..jpg; September 2024 - Canada Geese in the field next to our property ref 2.60..jpg; Canada Geese in the field (yesterday) next to our property (grid ref 2.60). .jpg  
**Categories:** Deadline, EO

Dear Sirs

**Introduction:**

As this is the last opportunity to submit a document I need to explain why I strongly object to solar panels being sited in fields 2.60, 2.57 and 2.58. [REDACTED] as you will know from your site visit, runs parallel to field 2.60 on the eastern side, separated by a boundary ditch of 3 metres between us and the field. Further eastwards are the other two fields. It is very frustrating that PVDP have never responded to my earlier documents nor the questions raised during the 4 consultations I attended. I am using this occasion to bring to the attention of the Inspectorate the negative effects it will have on this small community if the applicant is given approval. The decision by the absent landowner of fields 2.60, 2.57 and 2.58 to switch from food production and replace it with solar panels can, in my opinion, only be motivated by financial gain. Since he does not live locally he will not experience any visual impairment, inconvenience by any construction effects, or the destruction of wildlife habitat which will be lost to the community forever.

**Visual impact:**

In the eight years we have lived at [REDACTED] we have planted 65 metres of indigenous varieties of hedging to provide some screening from the western side of field 2.60 which borders our house. All the hedging was grown from root stock and is now approx. 1.5 metres in height but with gaps due to initial plantings failing which had to be replanted in later years. Importantly, the native varieties planted are for the most part deciduous, and between October and March of each year provide very little screening. Currently, PVDP have agreed the southern section of the field, directly in line with our house, will not have solar panels but I remain concerned this section will be deployed for storing equipment, materials, panels, machinery and HGV's to service their requirements to cover the 3 fields with solar panels if approval is secured. At the present time PVDP plan to site panels in the northern half of field 2.60 which we and neighbours will view from the eastern side of our respective homes for 5 months of every year. The proposed boundary from panels is a paltry 25m which is lower than any other NSIP proposal submitted to date. It should not be sited in these fields at all.

The Ex A's recent visit to Worton and [REDACTED] would have highlighted that fields 2.57 and 2.58 topography would result in solar panels being visible to many of the residents living in the area. I think it is questionable that hedges will be planted at 3-4m in height given the cost and labour involved for such a significant project. More likely they may be planted to 0.5 metre hedge which will take 15 years to achieve the proposed height they are quoting. Either way this is a no win situation for residents, who will view solar panels until the hedges grow to the required height, at which point the panels may be screened from view but replaced with an oppressive field of hedging. Of course the fields will no longer be contributing to home produced food and it's so unnecessary to site the panels at all when cleaner and more effective options are available.

**Flood Risk:**

I have already mentioned in several submissions to the Inspectorate and to PVDP that [REDACTED] has a history of surface water flooding, caused by persistently heavy surface rainfall coming off Spring Hill particularly during the winter months. This problem is widely known and West Oxfordshire District Council and Cassington Parish Council both of whom have records of localised surface water flooding in the area covering the last 20 years which supports this statement.

The report prepared by GWP consultants commissioned by Cassington Parish Council clearly demonstrates this point. [REDACTED] has a high water table which was proven by borehole trials to a level of 15m between May and June 2022. Following a prolonged dry summer readings ranged from 1.05 – 1.35. There were no boreholes undertaken during winter months when the water table would obviously be higher. The capacity for Oxford clay to absorb any volume of heavy surface water is low and run-off from the fields is a concern for all the neighbours. Siting an array of solar panels will exacerbate the risk of flooding and should be refused.

To mitigate the risk of surface water reaching our home we twice annually clear the 65 metre long ditch bordering our land and field 2.60, a task that is the responsibility of the joint landowners. Sadly, the owner of (fields 2.60, 257 and 258) does not carry out the clearance of ditches bordering his land which would help to manage surface water run-off. The increased risk of flooding has the potential to overwhelm the foul water treatment plant that serves the four properties at [REDACTED] in the absence of foul water mains drainage. It is for these reasons I feel the Inspectorate should refuse PVDP from locating solar panels in these fields.

#### **Wildlife Concerns:**

The array of wildlife that is present in field 2.60 is significant and varied and includes both Swans and Canada Geese who regularly feed in this field and who risk being injured or killed by mistaking solar panels for a water surface on which they assume they can land (see attached photographs). Wildlife, is in abundance including muntjak, hares and rabbits, field mice, partridge, pheasants and a wide variety of wild and garden birds all of who use the field throughout the seasons. Co-existing with this array of wildlife contributes to our mental health. It appears that private landlords are prepared to allow PVDP to lease their land in return for higher financial gain than might be gained from farming in complete disregard for the impact on wildlife and the community that lives in the area. Since there are more efficient alternatives available solar panels should not be permitted to destroy habitats that should be protected for future generations.

#### **Construction Effects in Jericho Farm Barns:**

We and our neighbours in [REDACTED] will have to endure a significant amount of noise, dust and inconvenience over an extended period if solar panels are allowed to be sited in fields 2.60, 2.57 and 2.58. There is very little information on the credentials of the developer, whether there is sufficient capital available for them to complete the works, no plan available for de-commissioning and nothing about cabling. There is also a risk they only carry out a small part of the programme and sell on the project to another party who may change their plan to the detriment of the communities affected. I believe the Inspectorate must have these matters satisfactorily addressed and recommend refusal given so much is unclear or missing from the applicants submission.

The absence of detail from PVDP is staggering, yet they continue to evade the many questions raised by the Inspectorate and IP's at this late stage in the assessment. Is this a deliberate attempt to move the decision to the Secretary of State and thereby bypass the Inspectorate because this practice was successful in the past? Were such a poorly prepared proposal put to any privately owned business it would have been rejected outright and its disappointing as well as worrying that PVDP behave in this manner which shows a marked lack of concerns for the communities that would be affected. I believe the Inspectorate should recommend the project is flawed and should be refused on the grounds it fails to meet the required standard to be seriously considered.

Dermot Magee

7 November 2025





