

I wish to comment on some of the responses by the Applicants to EXa2 questions

Q 2.1.5 there remains a lack of detail of how the panel tables and legs will be designed to take the weight involved - many other solar farm panels appear to have struts giving extra strength but these could restrict movement of sheep under the panels- can the drawings show more detail. (see Rep 2 -025).

Q2.1.9 the huge range of legs/piles etc has varied a lot since the original application. Can we be totally clear on exactly how many are involved as the greater the number the greater the impact on soil, drainage and subsequent damage at removal decommissioning stage will be.

Q2.10 and 11 Hours of working - the Host authorities have been very clear on this and the applicant is simply ignoring them and thousands of local residents who could be impacted. Consultation without listening and responding considerately is a golden thread running through the approach taken by the applicant.

Relying on codes of practice at a later stage is an empty promise when the code are being ignored as so often happens on major construction sites - it is very hard to enforce /police without permanent staff monitoring what is happening day by day -I speak from bitter experience.

Q2.1.17 decommissioning costs are in dollars - Why? Might this be AI at work?

Q2.3.1 did the applicant consider the 400KV pylon line from Cowley to the NG substation at East Claydon in Buckinghamshire which crosses a lot of fairly flat land of lower soil Grades and largely unconstrained by bgreen belt WHS or National Landsacpe designations.? If not why not?

Q2.3.7 and 3.11- no answers given - why not?

Q2.5.2 Still no further clarity on funding and any recent accounts of the applicant company and PVDP have been produced- all controlled by the two main owners.

There is some confusion as to whether [REDACTED] is one and the same as [REDACTED] - both appear to share an address in Limassol in Cyprus. Can this be clarified? See

D1 background checks referred to in [REDACTED] earlier reps.

Q2.5.6 the specification for decommissioning /reinstatement in the option/lease says "removal of all access road, electric cables, hard standings, and equipment above or below ground and reinstating all damage to grainage systems unless below 1metre" that is a a substantial task given the miles of underground cable let alone the piles and panels/tables etc that need to be removed.

Q2.5.9 the applicant has still not addressed the lack of clarity on funding nor have they answered the EXa question fully and one might question what "adequate equity ratio" might be!? It could mean anything.

Q2.7.7 applicant states the connection date in late 2029 is still very cautious - maybe for good reason as raised by myself and many others already.

The fact remains. that NGET and the applicant still have not signed off the revised connection date which therefore remains as October 2027 which is wholly unrealistic/undeliverable now. More importantly no third party investor will sign off release of funds until they can see work on the NGET sub station is underway and an end date for completion/connection is clear.

Q2.8.5 the winter roosting of swans along the fields in the Evenlode valley remains forgotten given they are very large birds and gaather near the flight line for Oxford airport. see also Q216.8

Q2.11.2 - back stop is mechanical cutting of grass under the panels - but how?

Annex 5 - Blenheim ownership structures- if Vanbrugh has a long lease from the Palace maintenance Fund - won't any solar rent go to the occupier rather than the Palace Fund Trust owner? Can that be clarified.

Annex 6 - RSPB and GWCT advice to farmers etc on managing habitats for larks clearly show that arable land is where larks like to nest and forage - much less in grass land.

on behalf of APs [REDACTED]

On the question of [REDACTED] it would appear that the applicant has listened to the [REDACTED] requests to remove the panels and inverters etc from the land restricted by covenants agreed with Blenheim twenty years ago - we await to see this confirmed in full detail at D5 in the second change documentation due in this Friday 12th Sept and in the meantime I attach a letter sent to the applicant about the matter and the related issue of costs that the [REDACTED] are now entitled to.