

[REDACTED]

From: George Peck [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 July 2026 09:35
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: RESPONSE TO PVDP's APPLICATION

Categories: SoS Consultation 2 Response

I believe that the application should be refused on the following basis:

The Applicant's (PVDP) inability to fully complete their response within the statutory guidelines is indicative of a mismanaged procedure and concerns me greatly. This means that there are important elements of the process that have not been completed or are missing, e.g. a property-by-property assessment of the impact of the development, protecting habitats such as tree damage mitigation and skylark mitigation.

Other concerns I have:

HERITAGE

PVDP continue to disagree with the expert bodies ICOMOS and Historic England on 'setting issues' for important buildings such as Hordley House.

AIRPORT

As my property is on the outskirts of Woodstock I continue to be concerned about Airport Safety, which has not been fully addressed by PVDP.

LANDSCAPE

PVDP have not undertaken a property-by-property assessment of the impact of the proposed development in relation to buffer zones, as was requested by the Inspectors during the Examination. The Oxford School of Drama was visited by the Examiners as part of their process, and not by PVDP.

PVDP have only supplied provisional sizes for buffer zones (between 100 and 250 metres). They have stated that the size will be finally decided after the Development Consent Order is granted. This would prevent residents and stakeholders from being consulted or having any meaningful role in the final decision.

PVDP have not completed the requested updated Landscape study (including footpaths and viewpoints) or carried out the full Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA), despite requests from both the Examiners and Interested Parties (IP) dating back over 12 months.

SUBSTATION

There is still not a decision on exactly where it will be sited and a disputed connection date.

COMMUNITY FOOD GROWING PLOTS

How can PVDP force 'community' food growing plots on communities that do not want them? PVDP have not consulted Church Hanborough, Long Hanborough nor Bladon Parish Councils or residents about this 75 acres of land. The Parish Councils have raised strong objections during the Examination process to these plots that are neither wanted nor needed as there is already sufficient allotment provision in more appropriate locations in all the villages. The residents also dispute PVDP's assertion that there is "easy and safe access" to these fields.

This land should be removed from the red line boundary to safeguard its status as productive agricultural land.

Finally, the granting of this application would set a dangerous precedent. It will encourage a land grab mentality by unscrupulous individuals who put profit above accountability and waste time and money trying to justify their greed. Viable alternatives should be investigated before the destruction of the British countryside.

George Peck
Founding Principal, The Oxford School of Drama