

## Rachel Tibbetts

---

**From:** Jason Richardson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10 May 2023 14:59  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Objection Padbury Brook Solar Farm and Battery Storage

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Jason Richardson.  
Brashfield, Buckingham Road, Caversfield, OX278RE

This site is an asset to the local area, only a short drive from Bicester it saves travel further afield to access the countryside. It provides amenity to Godington and Stratton Audley and residents of Bicester including myself who use the footpaths regularly and enjoy the unspoilt countryside, views, wildlife and peacefulness away from urban areas. The area has already suffered from HS2, East West rail and Bicester Heritage. The Footpaths are very well used, and the site is haven for all species of wildlife.

Planning practice guidance notes that "large-scale solar farms can have a negative impact on the rural environment, particularly in undulating landscapes." This is the case with this site which can be viewed from the surrounding roads, settlements and footpaths.

The Applicant suggests a biodiversity net gain. This is appalling given the scale (150+ acres) of the proposed solar farm, battery storage and carbon required to build it. The production of this equipment and subsequent install of steel, glass, shipping containers, inverters, roadway aggregate, cabling, fencing provide a gain to the wildlife and biodiversity? NO. Not only will this infrastructure itself make hard passage and conditions for wildlife but the 20Db above background noise levels will also drive away species of all types. The disruption during the build process will be colossal to the village of Stratton Audley and the 6 month proposed build timeline is unrealistic and should be investigated.

There is no responsibility or consideration given by the developer to any of the adverse impacts this development has on Residents, tourism, business, equestrian centre, amenity or wildlife. This land is not part of a strategic or designated area for renewable energy or even chosen for its suitability or viability. The only reason this land is being chosen is because it has been offered by the landowner. There are far more suitable locations near existing infrastructure or brownfield sites where the negative impact is reduced. This food producing and amenity land rich in species should not be used.

The Government planning guidance states that solar farms should be focused on "previously developed and non-agricultural land...that it is not of high environmental value", This applies to this site.

The grain barn which gained permission (Grain production figures quoted by Land Agent Howkins and Harrison Ltd) state the output of production on this site is higher than the Government average (DEFRA). Now, the offer of Solar Farm has been made the land is suddenly unviable for agriculture? I urge Cherwell to investigate this situation and these figures very closely.

Were incorrect figures of grain production given by the certified land agent in grain barn planning application? or is the land actually produce like the land agent suggests, but now the output is being down played by the developer making the land appear unsuitable/unviable for farming?

I believe this application for a solar farm and battery storage to be unlawful for the reasons set out, including but not limited to all the objections made by local residents, Parish councils, and various consultees I hope Cherwell Planning department refuse this industrialisation of the countryside; the site should remain as farmland for food production and amenity for the local area, its residents and generations to come. I object to this planning application.