

Simon Raywood

From: Julie Hutton [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 September 2026 18:34
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Botley West Solar Farm: EN010147 - residential property 135m from boundary
Attachments: [REDACTED] email July 13th.pdf; [REDACTED] email June 20th .pdf

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am disappointed that the Applicant's late submissions have been accepted causing further delay in the decision regarding the Botley West development. I recognise that the recent changes in government and your recent appointment will understandably mean you will want to take time to make sure any decision made is the correct one for the country, energy security and the environment and that this must be carefully balanced against the potential detrimental effects on local communities, food security, local flora & fauna and the intrinsic beauty and unique nature of the countryside so close to Blenheim.

Specifically I would like to bring to your attention the two emails I sent to your predecessor (attached for your convenience) highlighting my ongoing concerns that 1) the applicant has not revised their flawed and inaccurate Residential Visual Amenity Assessment pertaining to my property and neighbouring properties located a mere 135m from the proposed development boundary and that 2) no clear justification for panels being placed this close to residential properties in the village of Cassington has ever been provided.

I would also like it noted that I am a supporter of the Stop Botley West campaign and fully endorse the comprehensive SBW submission of 16 July [\[C2-161\]](#). I am concerned that despite these new proposals the Application is still irretrievably flawed. Too many questions remain unanswered and the Applicant seeks to defer too many important decisions until after any development consent is granted when they will be beyond public scrutiny and challenge.

It is important that, as UK citizens, we are able to trust in due process. That we can be confident that decisions made with regard to projects of this scale have a common sense approach and that the locating of such projects follows a robust national plan to deliver on secure, environmentally sensitive energy. That we can rest assured that the government has taken a sensible overview of the number, type and location of such developments with regard to national infrastructure and local sensitivities rather than relying on identification of suitable sites by speculative or opportunistic developers primarily motivated by profit (not in itself an unreasonable objective but clearly a potential conflict of interest to the national good). Regardless of how these developments progress through the system it is imperative that the government do not set a precedent allowing developers to dictate their own timeline and repeatedly ignore valid queries from the inspectorate or members of the public.

I respectfully request the Secretary of State to refuse outright the grant of a DCO for this Application.

Name: Julie Hutton, [REDACTED]

Interested Party Registration No: [REDACTED]

Further to my email of June 20th I have since been led to understand that PVDP have requested to submit further information for consideration by yourselves/the Secretary of State (SoS) despite all deadlines having been and gone. This is extremely concerning as in effect this could mean they are given the green light on the development before any interested parties have the opportunity to consider and respond to the new plans/new information. Given previous submissions by PVDP have contained notable inaccuracies and omissions there is nothing to suggest these further submissions will adequately address outstanding concerns and be accurate and complete. If this "extension" was allowed not only will it potentially allow the development to proceed without proper consultation on any changes to the plans, it will also set a concerning precedent for other developers to submit incomplete/inaccurate plans with regards to future large scale developments in the hopes of securing permission prior to proper evaluation/consultation.

I would respectfully suggest that, if PVDP have failed to fully and satisfactorily answer all of the SoS queries by the deadline of July 9th, and given their failure to carry out an accurate and complete Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (please refer to my email of June 20th as a prime example of a property 135m from the proposed development that has been completely misrepresented in the RVAA) despite ample opportunity to do so, that PVDP's current application is not afforded any further leeway with regard deadlines. Should they attempt to submit any further plans or information (such as a new RVAA) then this should be treated, in my opinion, as a brand new submission and they should join "the back of the queue" while the SoS considers other applications and means to provide clean energy for the UK.

Should the process progress further I feel I must state that I now have very little confidence in PVDP's ability to deliver the project on time and inline with any provisions as they have demonstrated a distinct lack of ability to keep to deadlines and to produce accurate information in the planning stages. I have even less confidence that any complications that may arise during the development.maintenance and decommissioning of the solar installation will be dealt with in a timely, effective, honest and empathetic manner, given the applicant's track record.

I appreciate your time and consideration of the points raised here and in my previous email.

Julie Hutton

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Inspectorate,

I am writing to you as an Interested Party to follow up after PVDP's recent response to the Secretary of State's letter. My property is 135m from the development and located on the Eynsham road, Cassington.

I have been on the government webpage where there are 56 documents submitted on June 16th by PVDP, which unfortunately as a busy working [REDACTED] parent I have no hope of thoroughly reading and responding to by the July deadline. It is disappointing that the many opportunities that PVDP has had to communicate within the original timeline of the consultation have been missed with respect to individual households close to buffer zones for whom a concise report specific to their property could and should have been made available without hunting for a needle in a haystack of documents.

However I am able to report that my property, and its immediate neighbours, have never had a robust and accurate Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) despite PVDP being given ample time and opportunity to carry this out. I have not had any specific information from PVDP about the impact of the development on my visual amenity, nor have they requested additional information from me, despite my having been in contact with them requesting a site visit (to which I received merely a standard autoresponse acknowledging my email).

I have attached a number of pictures to try to illustrate my concerns and the errors made by PVDP in assessing the Visual Amenity with respect to the row of houses in which my home is situated. The first is a map of how the development will sit adjacent to Cassington, overwhelming the view to the North West for residents and the 360 degree views from the local footpaths (the one I walk daily with my dog being shown on this map - the path going from the village travelling NW between 2.102 and 2.103). The second attachment shows a closer view of Eynsham road pinpointing my property. This attachment includes photographs taken from the field behind the property - THESE ARE NOT REPRESENTATIVE of the backs of the residential properties (including my own) in this row of houses. The view is taken towards, rather than away, from the properties, it is located where the owners of the field have placed some temporary metal fence panels and have allowed overgrowth of hedging. It is disingenuous, in my opinion, for the developer to have based any kind of assessment of Visual Amenity on this picture. The final attachment is a picture from my garden looking over my 3'6" fence in a NNW direction to the treeline where the closest panels will be located just 135m from our properties (despite examiners suggesting a minimum 250m buffer). The view from both the lower and upper floors of my home (& other neighbours) across the fields to Blenheim (a steady incline incorporating multiple fields), will also be completely changed by the proposed development, with every field earmarked for panel installation.

The statement made by PVDP to accompany their maps/pictures is as follows:

Eynsham Road, Cassington Figure 2.1

This row of properties, located at the southwestern edge of Cassington, are approximately 135m to the southeast of the solar panels at the nearest point. Vegetation and outbuildings located to the rear of these properties filters / screens views to the north from rear elevations. Existing vegetation further to the north further filter views. Not included in the assessment.

Many of the properties have NO vegetation or outbuildings restricting their views towards the proposed development. Those that do have sheds or greenhouses still have large areas of unrestricted views. A simple, direct request for this information, or better still a site visit, would have corrected these assumptions very readily and allowed the developer to offer an increased buffer and other mitigation at a point in the consultation where residents would've had the opportunity to respond. The "existing vegetation further to the north" does not exist in any meaningful sense - as is quite clear from my own photograph there is a sparse line of a few medium sized trees along the boundary of the buffer zone which do not obscure the view - this sentence provided by PVDP is misleading and appears to be an easy "catch all" to avoid further scrutiny.

Overall I am disappointed at the lack of targeted and empathetic communication from PVDP, who have had ample opportunity to engage with residents in areas with less than 250m buffers during the lengthy consultation process. No explanation, mitigation or compensation has been forthcoming and the assessment on which PVDP's conclusions are based is simply inaccurate.

Thank you for your time reading this, I appreciate you have much to consider in your recommendations. I may well write again if I have time to read through more of the documents but wanted to highlight the keypoints above without further delay. If I can provide anything further to assist your review please do let me know.

Regards,

Julie Hutton

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
