

3 Minutes

Good afternoon,

My name is Keith Stubbings, I am co-Chairman of BEPS but today speaking here solely as an Interested Party

I'm not a planning or landscape expert. I'm simply a concerned local resident who has spent a lot of time looking through the East Pye application and has seen first-hand the distress caused by how close some of the proposed sites are to people's homes..

I want to raise one concern about Residential Visual Amenity, particularly the applicant's decision to stop the detailed assessment at 100 metres.

The Applicant starts with a study area of 500 metres and identifies both 250 and 100 metre distances.

But in practice, only properties within 100 metres have been individually assessed. Twenty properties were identified, and only two were taken forward for detailed assessment.

The Applicant then concludes that no further detailed assessment is required beyond 100 metres.

And that is the bit I struggle with.

How can we be confident that a house at 150 or 200-metres won't experience an unacceptable impact if it hasn't actually been assessed?

With a development of this scale, surely it isn't simply about distance. The position and orientation of the house, its elevation, what can be seen from the main rooms and garden, and the effectiveness of screening can all make a difference.

There is also, I believe, an important point of consistency.

In the Botley West Solar examination, the Examining Authority proposed a 250-metre separation between the edge of the solar array and the residential curtilage.

I accept that Botley West is not binding on this Examination.

But I think it raises a very reasonable question:

What is it about East Pye that makes 100 metres appropriate here when 250 metres was considered necessary at Botley West?

If East Pye is materially different, surely the Applicant should be able to explain why.

And this isn't just a theory. At 22 Hillcrest Court at Pulham Market, the Applicant itself assesses the upper floors as having Major to Substantial Adverse effects in Year 1, and still Adverse and significant effects in Year 15.

So the Applicant accepts that significant residential visual effects will remain even after mitigation.

3 Minutes

I'm therefore asking the ExA to look at this carefully, rather than just simply accept the 100-metre cut off

I'm not saying that every property within 250 metres must automatically be unacceptable.

But I am asking whether **a 250-metre residential buffer**, measured from the residential curtilage, similar to that proposed at Botley West, is justified here ,particularly when the East Pye assessment has not properly tested the properties between 100 and 250 metres.

If the Applicant cannot demonstrate why East Pye should be treated differently, I would ask the ExA to **consider adopting a 250-metre requirement**.

For me, the question is quite simple:

If 250 metres from residential curtilage was considered an appropriate safeguard for residential amenity at Botley West, what is the evidence that 100 metres is enough at East Pye?

Thank you.