

1. Given the background of the Applicant as described in our RR as well as the scale of this scheme, BYG believes it would be appropriate to include in the Principal Issues something related to the ability of the Applicant to fund and deliver the scheme, including its Decommissioning, as is not presently the case.
2. We anticipate during the course of the Examination being able to explain our concerns and the Applicant being required to answer those concerns with facts rather than the type of generalisations it has given so far. In that context it is hoped we will be allowed to add to our evidence in the matters we raised in our RR.
3. In our RR you will also have noted our particular interest in the selection and definition of the Botley West Application Site by PVDP and the alternatives the Applicant claims to have examined (Principal Issue: "Assessment of Alternatives").
4. In this regard we note the ExA has specifically identified the Rochdale Envelope as being of relevance to the way this Issue will be examined. [We are aware of the latest Rochdale Envelope Advice Note published on 25 March 2025.] Are we correct in assuming that the ExA is going to explain in the Preliminary Meeting how it envisages the Rochdale Envelope will be used in this project?
5. In this respect, we note that a number of RRs draw attention to the fact that despite comments during the consultation process – for example, from WODC - the size of the Application Site has not been materially reduced from that set out in the consultation scheme. Some identify areas which should, in their opinion, be removed from the scheme. For example, Oxfordshire CC identifies a large area containing minerals which needs to be safeguarded; Heritage England and ICOMOS would like significant areas excluded to reduce the impact on heritage assets.
6. Can you please let us know whether the ExA would accept from the Applicant, within the Rochdale Envelope Advice, a substantially reduced area of panels within the same red line, perhaps based upon some or all of the suggestions exemplified above? If so, what would be the deadline for such change/s given the need to alter Examination documents and presumably allow other parties the chance to comment on them?
7. Does the ExA have the authority itself to materially reduce the area of panels within the red line and make recommendations about such a scheme to the Secretary of State? If so, would it be obliged to tell other parties to the Examination what was intended and allow them to make representations on that scheme before the end of the Examination?