

6th November 2025

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

Closing Statement opposing Botley West Solar Farm

Since my first submission (Martin Oldfield 1 RR _______.pdf) on 25th January 2025 opposing the vast Botley West solar Farm project, I have read the masses of communications from interested parties, and replies from PVDP, as well as watching the Public Hearings. With one partial exception, I have not seen any changes made by PVDP which adequately address my concerns in my first submission. I remain strongly opposed to the Botley West Solar farm.

Taking items in the order in my 25th January 2025 submission:

- PVDP has continued to give misleading, inadequate, and sometimes factually incorrect replies to the ExA's questions. They have dug their heels in and conceded minimal changes.
- Their classification of the agricultural land is misleadingly negative. Local fields are productive.
- The threat to the green belt remains severe and no "very special circumstances" have been established to justify it.
- The damage to the surroundings of Blenheim Palace as a World Heritage site has not been adequately addressed by PVDP
- PVDP has, in my opinion, made the minimal removal of solar panels in the fields South of London Oxford airport to provide inadequate protection from "Engine Failure After Takeoff". They have not addressed the glint and glare danger adequately, and, in the matter of thermal plumes have given an invalid analysis of this problem (see Martin Oldfield 4 RR
- PVDP have not demonstrated why solar panels should be on valuable agricultural green belt land rather than on roofs of buildings.
- PVDP have not adequately examined more suitable alternative sites for the solar farm.
- PVDP have not justified the ruining of the environment of the 11,000 houses within one mile and the 16 surrounding villages.
- The flood risk analysis assessment is faulty and inadequate.

- The analysis of danger to wildlife is faulty. There were hundreds of birds in the field next to us this morning, and the fences around the solar farm would restrict the movement of deer and other mammals.
- Glint and Glare suffered by upper floors of the many surrounding houses is not fully addressed.
- The financial backing behind the scheme remains obscure, with the suggestion that offshore Russian money was involved. PVDP did admit that it would sell quickly on, if given permission to proceed, but gave no convincing assurance that removing the panels after 40 years was fully funded.

Please recommend that this Solar Farm proposal does not go any further.

Yours sincerely, Prof. Martin Oldfield,