

I agree with the Stop Botley West Campaign's response, which is:-

There are still major disagreements and unanswered questions relating to these issues:

Reduction of panel area on Landscape grounds.

1.1. In their Rule 17 letter of 14/10/25 ExA asked: "Please can you explain why you were prepared to undertake the reductions in panel area that have been submitted in relation to the World Heritage Site (WHS) but are not prepared to give consideration to other areas that have been suggested by professional landscape architects and by the local authorities that have a deep understanding of their local area?"

1.2 The Applicant's very long answer concludes "Applicant is satisfied, based on its professional opinion and in recognition of the mitigation secured for the Project, that the residual adverse effects are acceptable on balance of the substantial benefit to be achieved. The Applicant's position is that this aligns with the national policy position."

Width of Public Rights of Way (PRoW). The Applicant continues to insist that PRoW should be just 5m wide and that "narrow greenways are characteristic in the area". ExA states that "it has been indicated by several IP's, and confirmed through the ExA's own site visits, that these instances are the exception and not the rule". ExA ask why Applicant hasn't responded to OCC's call for full 15m corridor between hedges.

66+ trenches with significant archaeological features and deposits have been identified in the only just published archaeological report. Nearly half of these have NO buffer. ExA asks whether buffers should be increased/added.

Risk relating to Flood, Storm Damage and Airport Safety - reports missing

Purpose and location of "Community" food growing areas - answer avoided. Deliberate blurring of what "Community" means and misleading statements about "consultation" (point 3 in ExA rule 17 letter)

Setting of Heritage Assets. Only WHS Blenheim Palace has been considered (and this only to an absolute minimum).

Unique prominent listed churches and houses ignored.

Loss of best and most versatile land for food production. Applicant's insistence that land is "poor" due to farming methods contradicted by tenant farmers and soil surveys.

Information on the funding for this project is still very sketchy and certainly not "normal" as PVDP claims.