

**Interested Party Registration Number** [REDACTED]

**Peter Harvey** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**November 9th 2025**

Objections to Botley West: To whom it may concern

I live with my wife, [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. We own the field which abuts the Yarnton Road to the south. As an interested party (ref [REDACTED]) I am writing to express my opinion in the strongest possible terms, that you, the examiner, should NOT recommend the Development Consent Order for Botley West.

The consultation has been long and stressful, yet the impression we have had from the outset is that the conclusion was never really in doubt (as witnessed by local tenant farmers being bought out of their family farms), and that this extended consultation was merely to satisfy the requirements of the planning process, and to give the impression of having considered all options.

PVDP have repeatedly failed to answer core questions concerning all aspects of the solar "farm", have behaved arrogantly at a personal level in meetings, and have ignored requests by residents, national bodies such as Historic England and you the Examiner for answers to serious, legitimate concerns, as well as for specific reports.

Bizarrely, this scheme is on such an enormous scale that it is deemed too important to be decided at a local level, yet it would appear that it is likely to be decided by a single individual, Secretary of State Ed Miliband. This, despite the impact of thousands of residents. In these circumstances, it is surely up to the Planning Inspectorate and the Examining Authority to exert their influence to the utmost, to prevent what is a complex issue being decided on the basis of political expediency.

My areas of concern include:

- **Residential Visual Amenity Assessment** - This was requested over and over again and a sloppy report has just been presented by PVDP with mistakes, omissions, poor maps and photographs. It concludes with the INCORRECT assessment that Botley West will not affect living conditions in this area
- **Repeated requests for the reduction of the solar installation** - The Oxfordshire Host Authorities' report has highlighted the inappropriate location of Botley West on open, undulating landscape. The intrinsically rural character of the area will be destroyed and such a huge area of solar arrays will degrade the historic landscape for ever. Hedges will not be high enough to shield from view the high racks holding the panels (which will exceed typical hedgerow heights) and since so much of the land is not flat, panels on hills will be visible from below, and panels in dips will be visible from hills
- **Loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural Land for food production** - PVDP's statement that the land is poor is UNTRUE. Furthermore, food security in an increasingly uncertain world is essential for the future of the country
- **PVDP Funding** - The opaque nature of the scheme's funding - together with the huge financial rewards for some private individuals - does not sit well with the concept of a project of national significance. The financial details should be publicly available for scrutiny and the scheme's financial viability should be verifiable. The financial structure of both PVDP, Solar Five and the Blenheim Estate and Blenheim Charitable Foundation should be transparent and assessed. PVDP's claim that the sketchy details on the financing of this project is 'normal' is extraordinary and again is simply untrue

- **Historic villages, listed churches** - PVDP seem only to have considered the heritage value of Blenheim Palace. Unique and historic listed churches, houses and villages have been ignored. Our immediate area of Jericho Farm, Worton, Cassington, Bladon and Church Hanborough sits within the central section of the proposed Botley West site and includes many historic buildings and Grade 1 listed churches. They do not exist in isolation - the relationship between these unique buildings and the landscape in which they sit in crucial
- **Flood Risk Report still absent** - Despite many requests PVDP has still not provided proper evidence about increased flood risk from panel run-off in an area with a history of surface water problems
- **Supposedly "temporary" nature of Botley West; decommissioning** - The temporary nature of Botley West has been made much of by PVDP, but details of the decommissioning process after 40 years have not been published. The removal millions of concrete and metal piles from the ground in order to return the land to agricultural use is an enormous task, and consideration to how this will be done and financed **MUST** be made before polluting the land in this way. Since PVDP will probably sell their interest soon, it is of no interest to them what happens in the long term - "after Botley West". They **MUST** be required to explain exactly how this will be funded and executed
- **Cable Route** - How can this project be given permission without the final cable route being agreed? PVDP have failed to present a solution to crossing the Thames
- **Proximity to homes** - You the Examiner have proposed that there should be a distance of no less than 250m between the solar array and any house. Yet, for example, Plot 2.60 abuts the edge of the group of the houses here at Jericho Farm Barns and 2.57, 2.58 and 2.59 are extremely close, whilst plots 2.100, 2.102, 2.103, 2.109 and 2.110 are overwhelmingly close to the edge of Cassington Village
- **National Grid** - It is the case that there are many other solar farms yet to be linked up to the National Grid, and that the grid itself is a limiting factor in the supply of both solar and wind energy. Surely connecting these should be a priority of the highest importance.

I would be grateful if you would consider seriously the points that I have highlighted here, and hope that you will recommend **AGAINST** granting permission for Botley West.

Yours faithfully

Peter Harvey