

[REDACTED]

From: dermot magee [REDACTED] >
Sent: 14 July 2026 13:48
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: BOTLEY WEST SOLAR FARM Project: Affected Persons: Registration No. [REDACTED] & [REDACTED]
Attachments: Sketch.pdf

Dear Sirs

Considering the significant number of questions that have not been answered or without sufficient detail, we have no confidence that PVDP will ever provide the required level of detail to satisfy our concerns which we have summarised below. We believe it would have been more democratic for the application by PVDP to build a significant BWSF to have been refused outright after the original deadline had expired. To be given an extension was, in our opinion, undemocratic and a further request for yet another extension makes a mockery of the whole process. Quite rightly, a further extension was declined but the application (without significant detail) is still under consideration.

1. Hydrology & Flood Risk: For PVDP to rely on old scientific literature from 2013 to claim that solar panels will not increase the risk of surface water flooding at Jericho Farm Barns is frankly ridiculous. Jericho Farm Barns in Worton has a 20 year history of localised surface water flooding with records held by both the local and district councils. We attach a sketch (prepared by a neighbour) showing the flow of surface water from Spring Hill which lies to the north east of our property. Borehole tests were undertaken at another neighbour's property during May – June 2022 and identified that the water table was 1.05m below the surface. It is reasonable to conclude it will be closer to the surface during the winter period. The soil in the area includes Oxford clay which will not easily absorb any volume of heavy surface water. The claim by PVDP that vegetation will absorb/slow the flow has not happened in the +7 years since we have lived here and we are unwilling to believe them when they have not provided any scientific evidence to support their claim. PVDP has not conducted infiltration tests in this area in spite of the flood risk history. Constructing arrays of solar panels in field 2.60 will require a significant number of piles to be driven 3 metres into saturated soils that are, at best, only 1.05m from the water table. We are convinced that siting solar panels on any of the fields to the north and to the east (of our property) will increase the rate of runoff due to the drip-line effect and exacerbate the risk of serious flooding.

2. Residential Visual Amenity Assessment Buffers: Whilst the Inspectorate have visited our property, PVDP has not visited nor carried out an assessment. The eastern wall of our house and garden are a mere 4m from the boundary of field 2.60 on PVDP's map. The view from our kitchen windows also look directly eastwards to fields 2.57, 2.58 and 2.59 which are all at a raised altitude so any panels sited on these fields will be in full view and give off glare. Our eastern boundary has, in the last 2-3 years been planted with indigenous varieties of Hawthorn, Beech and Dog Rose but this screening will be lost during autumn and winter periods. Combined with the flood risk above we contend that field 2.60 should be excluded entirely from solar arrays, a buffer of 250m from our home should be guaranteed and suitable screening at the westerly boundary of 2.57, 2.58 and 2.59 and where they border the Cassington-Yarnton Road to reduce the impact of glare. This I believe should be agreed before a DCO is granted assuming it were to be approved.

1. Wildlife: Field 2.60 is also home to a wide range of wildlife and to allow this to be replaced with an array of solar panels would be a travesty to future generations if permitted. Swans and Canada Geese visit each year to feed off the remains of crops which have been planted every year that we have lived here. They also risk being injured or killed by mistaking panels for a water surface on which they assume they can land. Wildlife is also in abundance including muntjak, hares and rabbits, field mice, partridge, pheasants, bats and a wide variety of wild and garden birds who rely on the residual seeds, insects etc. All of this wildlife habitat would be lost to satisfy a demand for solar panels when cleaner and more efficient alternatives are available, but sadly PVDP has chosen not to explore these alternatives or locations.

2. Airport Safety: We are less than 3 miles from London Oxford Airport and directly in its flight path and therefore, concerned about our safety which may be at risk from glint and glare if panels are sited in or near the airport. We are also on the periphery of the flight path of aircraft servicing RAF Brize Norton and have not seen any evidence that PVDP can demonstrate there is no potential risk from thermal plume impacts.

3. Miscellaneous:

- We are still in the dark as to whether any cabling will be laid in our vicinity – or at worse, across our land.
- It is important to us to know exactly what works might be proposed which would impact on our property, or unregistered land bordering our property. No information regarding compensation has been divulged by PVDP.
- We remain worried that house values will decline if the panels are close to our home.
- It is still unclear how much land would be required or how many of the established trees and hedging will be removed that currently screen our property from the highway.
- The Mail on Sunday article published 14th June 26 reported Cleve Hill Solar Park drawing 500 gallons a day from South East Water to clean solar panels? If BWSF has a similar need (actually, greater – given the number of panels proposed) we may face water shortages, as experienced by residents in Whitstable.
- PVDP has not stated that they will take responsibility for clearing any of the surrounding ditches. There is a 65/70m long ditch bordering our property which requires clearance twice a year.

Yours faithfully

Dermot Magee & Jenny Dimmer

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

