



Botley West Solar Farm

Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at the Open Floor Hearing 3 (OFH3)

October 2025

PINS Ref: EN010147

Document Ref: EN010147/APP/17.4

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.2	Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions at OFH3	1

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Photovolt Development Partners (PVDP), on behalf of SolarFive Ltd (the Applicant), submitted its application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) for the Botley West Solar Project (the “Project”) on 15 November 2024 (the “DCO Application”). The DCO Application was accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate on 13 December 2024.
- 1.1.2 In relation to the Project, Open Floor Hearing 3 (OFH3) was held at 9.30am on Friday 10 October 2025 as a blended event, with some parties in attendance at the Kings Centre, Osney Mead, Oxford OX2 0ES, and others using the virtual platform of Microsoft Teams. The hearings provided an opportunity for registered Interested Parties (IPs) and other local people to make oral representations about the application for the Project. Each IP making an oral submission was requested to provide a written summary note to the ExA for Deadline 6 (20 October 2025).
- 1.1.3 Oral submissions were made by various IPs covering a range of topics. The running order included at Annex A of [EV8-001] sets out those who had notified the Examining Authority of an intention to speak, although the Applicant notes that there were some alterations. Full recordings and transcripts for the hearing can be found under the ‘documents’ tab on the Planning Inspectorate’s website for Botley West Solar Farm.
- 1.1.4 Mr Toby Yeates, Associate at Pinsent Masons LLP (legal advisers on behalf of the Applicant), provided a response to the matters raised at OFH3 and it is his oral submissions that are summarised in this document.

1.2 Summary of the Applicant’s Oral Submissions at OFH3

- 1.2.1 Mr Yeates, on behalf of the Applicant, thanked the IPs for the manner in which they have conducted themselves throughout Examination and during the hearings. Mr Yeates welcomed the constructive engagement and acknowledged the IPs’ attendance at the hearings. Mr Yeates addressed the following key thematic points raised by IPs at OFH3.
- 1.2.2 Mr Yeates acknowledged that a wide range of topics had been raised, some of which were specific and technical. The Applicant recognises the importance of these and relevant matters are to be responded to at Deadline 6 including, for example, concerns raised around residential amenity matters.

Post hearing submission: The Applicant’s responses to each of the outstanding matters has been submitted as part of the suite of Deadline 6 documents.
- 1.2.3 Mr Yeates welcomed the support for the Project and the recognition of the substantial national benefits that it offers.
- 1.2.4 Mr Yeates, on behalf of the Applicant, indicated that the Examination process is rigid and therefore there is limited opportunity for the Applicant to make

changes following submission of the DCO Application. However, the ongoing engagement with IPs has helped to shape the design of the Project; both prior to submission of the DCO application and most recently as part of Change Request 2. For example:

- Change 1 of Change Request 2 was implemented to agree a no harm scenario with Historic England following engagement with Historic England as the key statutory consultee for the historic environment. Whilst this change was not driven by the landscape benefits that also arose as a result, Mr Yeates noted that this change also eradicated almost half of the residential viewpoint concerns.
- Change 2 of Change Request 2 facilitated the removal of panels in an area of land near to Oxford Airport following engagement with Oxford Aviation Services Limited. This change was in recognition of the discussions at and following Issue Specific Hearing 1, where Oxford Aviation Services Limited noted the previously affected area as land being its key safety concern.
- Change 10 of Change Request 2 was implemented to remove the educational facility from the Project, that the Applicant had proactively offered as a community benefit. The removal of this was following feedback from the local authorities that it was not wanted.

1.2.5 Whilst not a planning matter, Mr Yeates addressed the concern raised by many IPs in relation to community benefits. Mr Yeates confirmed that the community benefit fund being offered by the Applicant has substantially increased since submission in recognition of the feedback received.

1.2.6 Mr Yeates offered an update ahead of Deadline 6 on a couple of matters that had been raised during Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 and Issue Specific Hearing 2. Firstly, Mr Yeates confirmed that a route forward had been agreed with Siemens Healthcare Limited (Siemens) and the details of that would be submitted at Deadline 6. Secondly, Mr Yeates confirmed that the Applicant had met with the Oxfordshire County Council's (OCC) lawyer and the DCO would be further updated at Deadline 6 to align with some of OCC's requests.

Post-hearing submission:

(1) ***Siemens*** – *It was agreed between the Applicant and Siemens after CAH1 that Siemens' concerns would be effectively managed through: (a) updating the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to include traffic management provisions that would facilitate continued use of Wharf Road; (b) protective provisions to be included in Schedule 15 of the DCO to secure an indemnity in favour of Siemens; and (c) Requirement 11 (Code of Construction Practice) of the DCO to be updated to add Siemens as a consultee in respect of the CTMP insofar as it relates to Wharf Road.*

(2) ***OCC*** – *an updated version of the DCO has been submitted at Deadline 6. This includes various amendments made in response to representations from and discussions with OCC. This is explained in the Schedule of Changes to the DCO. Confirmation of the changes has been shared with OCC in advance of Deadline 6.*

1.2.7 Mr Yeates, on behalf of the Applicant, emphasised that the changes do not give any indication that the DCO Application at the time of submission had not appropriately applied the tests under the national policy. The changes are simply a demonstration of the continued application of the policy and as part

of the iterative design process. The changes offer clear and practical examples of the Applicant's recognition of the views of key statutory bodies and other IPs. The Applicant has noted the many other requests made by the ExA and IPs during the hearings and the Applicant will supplement its position in writing.

- 1.2.8 Mr Yeates ended by thanking all the IPs for continuing to contribute to the Project as the Applicant seeks to deliver critical national priority infrastructure.