

Raywood, Simon

From: Giles Lewis [REDACTED]@opvl.co.uk>
Sent: 01 June 2025 19:57
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Enquiries following BYG attendance at meetings in w.b. 12 May: PM and ISH1. BYG email 4.

Importance: High

Dear Simon,

[RR 20054484]

Following Dr. Hearne`s attendance at the PM and ISH1 and receipt of the Rule 8 letter, BYG would be grateful for clarification in respect of four issues:

The Rule 8 letter does not contain a revised list of Principal Issues.

The list in the Rule 6 letter was shown as being `Initial`. We were therefore anticipating a further or final version in R8. We hoped that it might include the Decommissioning and Funding Issue we raised at ISH1. We were also expecting it would include Aircraft Safety, as this is so fundamental a matter. Although BYG has no expertise in aircraft safety, the cone of panels identified at ISH1 as being of serious safety concern is adjacent to Begbroke. Having heard the evidence given at ISH1 we are now seriously concerned about this issue on behalf of residents in the village and would suggest that it should be made a Principal Issue.

Availability of SOCGs and LIRs.

From what the Local Authorities said at the PM it seems unlikely that the SoCGs and LIRs will be available by 4 June as per D1 in the Rule 6 draft timetable. The R8 timetable also replicates this deadline for the SoCGs and LIRs with comments being required on the LIRs by D2 on 1 July. BYG anticipates it will wish to comment on the LIRs and that the SoCGs are likely to form important background to that comment. We would, therefore, be grateful for confirmation that - if the SoCGs and LIRs arrive later than D1 - an extension of the time available to comment on the LIRs will be given.

Representation of the Applicant during ISH1.

Experts speaking for the Applicant in response to the ExA`s questions did not provide any information about their expertise or qualifications, or on their role in the planning and development of BWSF. In a planning inquiry such information would have been provided, giving all parties the information necessary to judge the credibility of their opinions. We suggest that as the Examination progresses all those providing expert opinions to ExA should be required to give their qualifications; and particularly those representing the Applicant be required to explain their involvement in the development of the project. Specifically, in respect of Mr Le Cointe, it needs to be officially recognised that he is no longer an *independent* planning consultant employed by RPS, but is now employed by PVDP. He is therefore a `company witness`. If the Applicant wishes to provide independent expert opinion when providing responses to ExA in respect of issues raised in R8 then it needs to use someone who is still independent! Mr Le Cointe can, of course, provide responses on behalf of PVDP provided his relationship to the Applicant is made clear.

Finally, please can you clarify if and when another version of the Principal Issues list will be published.

Thank you and best wishes,

Giles.
for Begbroke & Yarnton Green Belt Campaign.