

From: tim watson [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 October 2025 12:58
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Cc: [REDACTED]@parliament.uk; [REDACTED]@parliament.uk
Subject: Closing Statement – Botley West Solar Farm (Deadline 7 Submission)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

I wish to record my continuing objection to the proposed Botley West Solar Farm (BWSF) on the grounds of inadequate evidence, flawed process, and unacceptable landscape, heritage, and community impacts. Having followed the Examination closely and reviewed both the Applicant's responses and the detailed submissions made by Stop Botley West (SBW), I fully endorse SBW's most recent written and oral representations as evidence of my objection.

1. Failure to follow due process

The Applicant (PVDP) has repeatedly failed to provide key information requested by the Examiners. Large gaps remain in evidence across landscape, heritage, archaeology, flood risk, and residential amenity. This failure undermines the proper functioning of the Examination and means the proposal cannot credibly be recommended for approval. As the Secretary of State himself has said, every project must be decided on merit and through a proper process. That process has not been met here.

2. Landscape and visual harm

The proposed scale—over 1,000 hectares—represents an industrialisation of the Oxfordshire countryside. The Applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been shown to be inconsistent, inaccurate, and dismissive of clear evidence of high-magnitude effects. The ExA's own correspondence confirms that the proposed buffers and visual mitigation are wholly inadequate. I fully support the ExA's recommendation that **a minimum 250-metre buffer** be applied between solar panels and residential dwellings.

3. Heritage and setting

Blenheim Palace is a World Heritage Site of international importance, and yet the Applicant's heritage assessment continues to focus narrowly on visual connections while disregarding the broader experiential and historical context that defines its setting. The impact on Blenheim and the surrounding listed buildings and churches has been under-represented, despite repeated warnings from Historic England, ICOMOS, and other professional bodies. The mitigation offered is insufficient and inconsistent with national policy.

4. Agricultural land and food security

The Applicant's own admission that a large proportion of the site comprises best and most versatile (BMV) farmland raises serious questions about long-term sustainability and food security. There remains no credible evidence to support the assertion that this project will not permanently remove productive land from agricultural use.

5. Community impact and consultation

The process has been characterised by poor consultation and a lack of transparency. The late, rushed, and error-ridden Residential Visual Amenity Assessment typifies this dismissive attitude.

Local residents have been left out of meaningful engagement from the outset, and promised “community benefits” have been vague, inconsistent, or quietly redefined.

6. Cumulative and procedural uncertainty

Key elements of the scheme remain undefined, including the National Grid substation, associated battery storage, and cabling routes. These omissions make it impossible for the Examiners to assess cumulative impact or long-term viability. No project of this size should be consented with so much uncertainty still unresolved.

In summary


The Botley West proposal is the wrong project in the wrong place. It is oversized, under-evidenced, and out of step with local and national planning policy. Renewable energy must be developed responsibly, not at the cost of our heritage, landscape, and community integrity.

I therefore urge the Examining Authority to recommend refusal of the Development Consent Order and for the Secretary of State to reject the application on the grounds of insufficient evidence, procedural failings, and disproportionate impact.

I endorse in full the content of the most recent **Stop Botley West (SBW) written summary of oral case (19 October 2025)** and submit this statement as my closing representation.

Best

Tim Watson

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

From: tim watson [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 November 2025 11:23
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Written Parliamentary Questions tabled by Calum Miller, MP for Bicester and Woodstock on November 5, 2025, and due for answer by November 12.

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Additional Supporting Statement – Funding, Governance & National Security Concerns

I wish to express my support for the Written Parliamentary Questions tabled by Calum Miller MP on 5 November 2025 regarding the financial viability, governance arrangements and potential national security implications surrounding the proposed Botley West Solar Farm.

It is highly concerning that, at this late stage in the Examination, there remains **no clear evidence of funding sources, financing structure, or investor provenance** for a project of this unprecedented scale. The Applicant has repeatedly declined to provide transparent information on how the £900m development would be financed, and no satisfactory explanation has been given as to the solvency, track record or delivery capability of Photovolt Development Partners or SolarFive Ltd.

Given reported links to overseas financing, it is critical that the Government confirms:

- whether **national security risk assessments** have been undertaken,
- whether the Office of Financial Sanctions Implementation has been consulted, and
- whether the Planning Inspectorate has the necessary processes to evaluate the **financial and geopolitical reliability** of major energy developers.

Until these questions are answered **clearly and publicly**, the DCO must not be granted.

Best
Tim Watson

[REDACTED]

Best
Tim

[REDACTED]