

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 October 2025 13:02
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: DEADLINE 7: Mon 10 November 2025 re Botley West Solar Farm Proposal Plan
Attachments: FINALBWSFobjectiontoPINS.docx

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

Dear Sir / Madam,

Please accept my attached Statement of Objection to the above proposal. I live in hope that you **will sensibly not recommend the go ahead** for the Botley West Solar Farm Project. Thank you for listening and reading my statement.

Cheers,

Dr Mike Franklin
Resident of Long Hanborough
West Oxon

My PINS ref Number [REDACTED]

November 1st 2025

Dr Michael Franklin, Long Hanborough, [REDACTED]

My final objections to Botley West Solar Farm

I initially heard to my absolute horror in December 2022, that Blenheim Estate along with the developer, PVDP were planning to build Europe's largest solar farm on my very doorstep!

I have looked back at my initial objections to this farm when it was first proposed. It was quietly first proposed over the Xmas and the New Year holiday period to very obviously to avoid West Oxfordshire community notice. **It was misnamed Botley West Solar Farm (BWSF) since it was not in Botley** but covered lands from north of Woodstock through to Botley in the south of Oxford. There were to be 3 areas, with north, central and southern sections. The area covered was to be 2400 acres of prime farming land. It was the size of Heathrow Airport and the biggest in Europe. One morning in early January a yellow covered booklet arrived by post on my doorstep from PVDP. This contained very vague plans of BWSF and made it sound as though that 330,000 Oxfordshire homes would be getting very much of its energy needs from this new source, this was a mere fabrication as it would of course go straight into the national grid and not stay local. Since this initial plan, PVDP and Blenheim the co-conspirators have continuously issued vagaries or downright lies of what they think are plans for BWSF both to the public and the planning inspectorate and often in answer to very specifically aimed questions. They have never really engaged the local residents/communities who live in close proximity of their planned BWSF. This I am afraid, is very typical and is all about making money without due care for the local community, wildlife, farmers and all. Their plan covers more than 30% of our parish of Hanborough with solar panels and we were not asked whether we thought this was a good idea or not.

It has become rather more obvious to me and I am sure others that the developers have not changed their spots! They continue to abscond from direct questioning or return extremely vague answers put to them by the examining body.

More specific objections to recent issues:

The Examiners cannot recommend the application be accepted when so much evidence is missing and the SoS should come to the same conclusion when considering the proposal on merit”.

1. During the final examining period the examiners asked the developers to produce Residential Visual Amenity Assessments (RVAAAs), There were concerns by the local communities that the developer showed no concerns about the visual impacts of solar panels on resident's homes/gardens etc. This was put to the developers as a very important and unanswered question by the examiners. Eventually, they did respond with a typically vague, inaccurate RVAA. This contained a huge number of errors, poor photos and map presentations. It is very obvious that from many houses close to fields containing solar panels that they will be observed from bedrooms if not by ground floor rooms and this should not be the case within limits of 250 metres. The developers state that in their judgement that “such effects will not affect the living conditions of the residents”. **I wholly disagree with this statement.**
2. The developers still do not have a plan for the scaling down and eventual clearance and disposal of solar panels after 40 years. **This is totally not acceptable.**
3. The **examiners have been critical of the developer's assessment of the impact of solar panel positioning on landscapes. PVDP have stated mostly that these are either of very moderate impact or “not significant”.** Many of the solar panels are to be sited on hillsides (e.g. along Lower Road near Long Hanborough) and so will be in direct view to all around. In other instances, the panels will be set far higher (panel angle setting will affect height from ground levels) than present hedging around fields in many situations. This is not to mention ugly security fencing and lighting. The recent Oxfordshire Host Authorities (OHA) report asks that many panels are removed from the plan for many of the above reasons. They also state that panels be removed because of what they call “heritage sensitivity” reasons. A good example being the Hanborough parish church in Church Hanborough which is in view of panels sited along the Lower Road (Central Area). The examiners asked why you were prepared to remove panels from Heritage assets such as around the World Heritage Site of Blenheim Palace, but not consider such settings as that mentioned earlier ((i.e. St Peter and Paul, Church Hanborough). Even if some of these panels are removed from the plan, OHA state that due to the size of this proposed solar farm that serious and significant effects would remain a problem. **From my reading of the situation at least half of the panels are in critically sensitive places and should be removed from the plan, indeed the plan should not be allowed anyhow.**
4. There seems to be no defining plan for decommission of the panel sites after 40 years. **This is not good or even acceptable.**

5. There is not yet a clearly defined plan of how to get cables under the River Thames near Eynsham / Farmoor to the sub-station near Botley. **How, when and where, i.e. typically vague once again and another failure!**
6. The developers are planning to put solar panels on fields designated for housing just off the Lower Road at Long Hanborough. The same fields have been allocated for housing by Blenheim Estates in the emerging Local Plan for West Oxfordshire 2043 by WODC. **Are they [REDACTED] or do they not talk to one another?**
7. There have been a number of articles in the Private Eye magazine concerning the ownership and finances of PVDP recently. The examiners have now picked up on this and are asking about the rather dubious nature of PVDPs funding of this project. They, PVDP appear to give no acceptable responses or none at all. They have a record of never finishing what they proposed to start such as a solar farm in Japan. **Not acceptable, pull them out.**
8. There appears to be no plan in place as to the siting of a National Grid sub-station, battery storage facility. How can this plan ever get off the ground if such vagueness is allowed to happen? **Refuse this plan.**
9. PVDP's whole attitude makes a mockery of the Planning system by failing to respond in a timely manner to or, in some cases completely ignoring, the Examiners' questions or requirements. **"This leaves a significant gap in the knowledge and data available on which the examiners are required to make a robust recommendation."**

My conclusions:

For all the reasons stated above I object to this going ahead. How this ever got off the ground I am not able to understand, the developers appear to be wholly incapable of getting a coherent plan together let alone executing one. They do not care for the communities or the landscapes around the proposed industrial megalith of a solar. All they care about is making as much money as they can and then seemingly passing out to nations far afield from the UK. They then leave us all with the problem of getting back to where we started since they have no plans in place to decommission.

I care about the people and communities that surround me along with the wonderful landscapes and flora and fauna that we coexist with, whereas the developers, PVDP and Blenheim Estates obviously do not.

This is intolerable and cannot be given the green light, it fails on all levels for me and hopefully you the examiners and later the Secretary of State will agree with me too!