

1. Comments on the Applicant's RVAA and on ExA Rule 17 letter of 23/10/25

The Applicant's belated RVAA is an insult to both residents and ExA. It has clearly been completed hurriedly, attempting to incorporate the little material they already had with some hastily taken photographs (date marked 14/10/25 ie after the hearings) mostly taken in poor light, from the wrong position, at ground level only and looking in the wrong direction. Unlike the ExA, the Applicant failed to visit even the most impacted properties so were unable - or unwilling - to include views taken from any property looking outwards into the panel area. Thankfully ExA have taken the trouble to visit many properties including several on an ASI visit to key properties in the central site so have seen the actual views for themselves.

It is nearly impossible to navigate or cross reference the Applicant's RVAA documents.

- Appendix A: Residential Property Data Sheets list 330 properties 50-250m from panels,
- Appendix B: PVDP Buffer Zone Analysis lists just 20 "Farms" - most of which are not farms, indeed some are rows of houses in villages.
- Table 2 lists 33 properties or groups of properties as "Individual Residential Receptors"
- Table 4 lists 17 properties or groups of properties as "Residential Receptors"
- Site photography and photo location maps were provided for 30 properties.

The Applicant gives only a cursory and muddled explanation of the purpose of each list.

It is not clear on what basis properties were chosen from the 300 in Appendix A, for further analysis or why just 30 out of over 300 properties were photographed.

The Applicant reports that they "found that of those highlighted as potentially experiencing significant effects, only 7 were considered to experience likely significant effects. These include Weaveley Farm, Barrow Court (Cassington), College Farm, Goose Eye Farm, New Barn Farm, Purwell Farm and Denman's Farm"

In their Rule 17 letter of 23/10/35, the ExA themselves have pointed out many errors and omissions in the Applicant's RVAA. I also note that several highly impacted properties that I personally visited were not fully assessed and some were completely omitted eg Dornford Cottage, Wootton; Burleigh House, Bladon; Farways, The Elms, The Chase and other properties on Yarnton Rd, Cassington; Pelican House, Lower Road and 14 other properties in my own village of Church Hanborough. The assessments of other properties were wrong in describing screening that does not exist.

Note: If the ExA would like to check the views from these and other highly impacted properties missing from the Applicant's RVAA, may I refer them to section 7 pp 29-44 of SBW's Community Impact Report [REP2-081]?

Despite all this the Applicant stubbornly repeats their conclusion that "the effects resulting from the Project would fall below the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold" ie would not be "overwhelming or overbearing".

In view of the Applicant's late, incomplete and inadequate response, I entirely agree with ExA that there should be a new requirement (without prejudice to any recommendation the ExA makes) that:

"There shall be a distance of no less than 250 metres between the edge of any part of the proposed operational solar array and any residential dwellinghouse"

I would further ask that the order limits be changed by 250m in the vicinity of properties to ensure that these buffers are guaranteed and the land can be returned to agricultural use. As the Applicant is already claiming 70% BNG, they do not need any further areas for this.

2. Comments on the Applicant's response to Rule 17 letter of 14/10/25.

Point 3: Location of food growing areas.

Applicant states:

"The Applicant held a meeting with representatives of Stop Botley West before the last Phase Two consultation event at Eynsham on 19th January 2024. The location of community food growing areas and the participation of Cutteslowe Community Larder were discussed."

I was present at that meeting.

The conversation referred to (starting at 00:23:27 minutes) was about the Consultation leaflet sent by PVDP to 22,000 homes. SBW were concerned that most people would see only this document when deciding on the merits of the proposal and that the content of the leaflet was inaccurate, incomplete, biased and misleading. The most glaring omission being that the SIZE of the site was never mentioned - no area given in acres, hectares or sq km. Claims about Cutteslowe larder's involvement were discussed and shown to be inaccurate. (00:31:39-00:33:42 and 00:37:06-00:37:40) and they have never been mentioned since.

I can confirm that NO locations of community food growing areas were discussed.

The only "formal consultation" carried out was between the Applicant and a few individuals, not connected with the local community, who were offered the chance to use some land within the site.

The only references to locations was in 2 comments made by [REDACTED]:

1. At 00:32:40 he said that [REDACTED] "indicated the areas where he would like to put areas to grow for the larder"
2. At 00:41:21 he said "When we publish the ES, you will be able to see areas set aside for community agriculture"

ie NO consultation with the community just imposition

A full audio recording made by StopBotleyWest with the agreement of PVDP of the meeting on 19 Jan 2024 and transcript are attached.

The Applicant has produced no evidence that the food growing areas they have imposed were suggested by any individual or group in the local community, neither have they published any feedback received on this issue at the Statutory Consultation.

Fields 2.002 in Bladon, 2.034 in Long Hanborough, 2.115 and 2.116 in Church Hanborough were chosen, according to the Applicant, "*to make access easy for villagers*" but since they are now to be set up almost entirely as commercial enterprises against the wishes of and with no benefit to the local communities, this argument cannot now be justified.

The Applicant has failed to consider; heritage, conservation area status, flooding, access, traffic, loss of high yielding (ALC 2/3a) agricultural land and, most importantly, the communities' views regarding the need for these food growing areas or the appropriateness of their locations

In view of all these factors, I would respectfully ask the Examiners, without prejudice to any recommendation they make regarding the Application as a whole, to remove these 4 fields from the Order Limits.