

Pelican House
Lower Road, Church Hanborough
Witney, Oxfordshire

To: BotleyWestSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Date: 12 July 2026

IP REFERENCE NO: [REDACTED]

PROJECT: Botley West Solar Farm (BWSF) — Application Ref: EN010142

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a registered Interested Party and the homeowner of Pelican House to submit this formal objection to the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the proposed Botley West Solar Farm (BWSF).

Having examined the revised submissions by Photovolt Development Partners (PVDP), it is clear that the application remains deeply flawed, inaccurate, and incomplete. I wish to draw the Examining Authority's (ExA) immediate attention to factually misleading evidence regarding my property, which appears to be a deliberate attempt to deceive the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State.

1. Factually Misleading Visual Assessments: The Case of Pelican House (Figure 2.26)

In the Residential Properties Survey (Figure 2.26: "P26 - College Farm and Pelican House, located to the east of Lower Road"), the Applicant presents "Site photography" and commentary designed to project a false narrative that the industrial solar infrastructure will be hidden from our view. The text states:

"Views to the south from the side elevation are filtered by garden trees and a low garden fence and views to the east from the side elevation are screened by a maintained garden hedge and filtered by garden trees."

The Applicant's own localised technical description completely exposes the bad faith of this presentation, noting:

"The house is 50m to the west of the solar panels in the central section of the Project Site. It appears that views of the solar panels would be partially screened by the hedgerow and trees along the eastern perimeter of the property. Views of the solar panels 100m to the north and 80m to the south of the house would be screened by the vegetation which surrounds the property. There would be more distant views, from upper floors to solar panels on rising ground to the east on the Evenlode Valley sides."



A residential separation distance of a mere 50 metres from a massive industrial solar array represents a catastrophic visual intrusion. Standard domestic perimeter hedges and seasonal garden trees cannot mitigate or "screen" an asset of this scale.

Furthermore, the Applicant's photography deliberately ignores the vertical reality of the site: our upper-floor windows look directly over the top of existing garden vegetation, offering unobstructed, dominant views of the solar panels sprawling across the rising ground of the Evenlode Valley to the east. The photography has been selectively angled and framed to fabricate an illusion of complete screening, intentionally downplaying the true damage to our residential visual amenity.

To conclusively disprove the Applicant's claims, I have attached the true, unmanipulated views from Pelican House below:



Photo taken from upper floor looking East toward the rising ground of the Evenlode Valley, proving that the panels will be completely visible over the top of the hedges.

In the photo above, per the application, every single field in view, all the way to the horizon, will be full of solar panels. To suggest that these panels would not be seen and that this impact is not significant is deceitful.

2. Systemic Failures in the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) and Buffers

This misrepresentation is part of a wider pattern of procedural evasion. Despite clear and repeated instructions from the ExA, the Applicant has continuously failed to produce a satisfactory property-by-property RVAA.

Note, no attempt has been made by the Applicant to visit Pelican House and complete the site-by-site assessment as requested by the ExA. They have had ample opportunity and chosen not to engage properly.

In the absolute absence of this required data, the ExA logically proposed a mandatory minimum 250m buffer zone for all residential properties to preserve basic living standards.

The Applicant's revised masterplans represent a deliberate obfuscation of this requirement:

- **Enforcement of Substandard Buffers:** While trying to present an appearance of compliance, the Applicant is actually seeking to enforce a minimum buffer of just 100m. In the case of Pelican House, the proposed separation is an even more egregious 50 metres, directly violating acceptable planning parameters.
- **Democratic and Procedural Evasion:** The Applicant proposes to defer the final decisions on buffer boundaries until *after* the DCO is granted, leaving them to be finalised privately with local authorities. This mechanism is profoundly undemocratic, as it denies Interested Parties their statutory right to consult on final site layouts. Furthermore, it is entirely unworkable; local authorities have already stated clearly on the record that they lack the time, resources, and technical expertise to handle these complex micro-siting decisions post-consent.

3. Irreconcilable Infrastructure Timelines

The application presents a profound logical contradiction regarding grid connection. PVDP continues to maintain an unrealistic connection date of late 2029. However, National Grid explicitly forecasts that the required substation will not be completed or ready to connect until the final quarter of 2031 at the earliest. Crucially, National Grid has not yet finalised a location or submitted a planning application for this substation.

To prevent the landscape from being destroyed for an unconnectable asset, the ExA proposed a standard Grampian clause to ensure that no construction could begin on Botley West until the substation received planning permission. The Applicant has bypassed this safeguard, employing procedural devices to avoid waiting for substation approval. This forces the decision-maker to evaluate a highly speculative project with uncoordinated infrastructure impacts.

4. Conclusion and Request for Refusal

The common thread across all aspects of PVDP's application is a reliance on incomplete, inaccurate, and manipulated data, combined with a strategy of delaying critical assessments until after the DCO is secured. The Secretary of State for Energy and Net Zero has been denied the accurate, reliable information necessary to perform a lawful planning balance.

The Applicant previously requested a three-month extension to complete this missing work, which the Secretary of State rightfully refused. Time has finally run out for the Applicant, and the required work has simply not been done. **Any further submissions by the Applicant should be refused as there is no time for Interested Parties to review them as part of the democratic planning process.**

Because the application fails to meet basic evidentiary thresholds and relies on active misrepresentations - such as the visual screening claims for Pelican House - I respectfully urge the Planning Inspectorate to recommend the outright refusal of this application.

Yours faithfully,

Russell Tucker, Owner of [REDACTED], Registered Interested Party

Interested Party Reference [REDACTED]