

Submission ID: SFB4988FF

When I submitted my closing statement on Nov 6th, I was unaware that Calum Miller, MP for Bicester & Woodstock, had tabled Written Parliamentary Questions (88455 to 88459) the day before.

I fully support Mr Miller's stance on this issue as his questions very much align with the views I expressed in my closing statement. Thank you.

I would like to make a number of points in my closing statement viz:-

- 1) I find that the Applicant's response (or, to be more exact, lack of response) to the 2 questions I personally raised regarding Funding/Corporate Structure to be derisory (further details at the foot of this page).
- 2) And following on from that, and having followed the dialogue between the Examiners and the Applicant, I'm minded to agree with the Examiner's view (as set out in the ExA letter of 14/10/25 Para 10) suggesting that the Applicant "comes across as being very dismissive of anyone's view but your own. Given that the view on residual effects is shared by the Host Authorities, Historic England and many of the Interested Parties (IP's). The ExA find it extraordinary that you have just repeated your approach and methodology, when this has been questioned on numerous occasions both in writing and in the previous hearings. Many of the IP's as well as the host authorities and Historic England have made valid professional judgements that should be considered as such. Please could you explain why you still consider your approach to be correct and everyone else's approach to simply be subjective opinions that would not materially affect your assessments? This comes across as being very dismissive of anyone's view but your own".
- 3) Another example of this is the Applicant's failure to provide a satisfactory Residential Visual Amenity Assessment in time for it to be debated. As such, I would support the Examiner's recommendation (in his letter of 23/10/25) in respect of this, that there shall be a distance of no less than 250 m between the edge of any part of the proposed solar array and any residential dwelling house.
- 4) That insufficient consideration has been given to Heritage assets detailed by the Host Authority.
- 5) That no evidence has been given to prove the assertion that the Applicant isn't taking productive land out of food production.
- 6) There are other similar points that can be made with regard to flood risk, effect on Oxford airport etc but, suffice to say, that I don't feel that the Applicant has provided the necessary information required by the Examining Authority in order for it to carry out its duties, and it's for this reason, that I believe the Examiners cannot recommend the application be accepted.
- 7) And given that, on Sunday 19th October, the Secretary of State said on the Laura Keunssberg programme that "There has to be a proper process that we follow" and "each project is decided on merit" I also believe that he cannot accept the application for the very same reason.

Questions raised by me personally

I raised 2 questions with the Applicant and these are shown again below.

- 1) I'm not aware of any answer to the first part of Question 1 (acquiring funds etc) and their response to the second part of the question (Russian involvement) was simply that it was "all above board".
- 2) Their response to my second question was simply "This is noted" which, by definition, is not an answer!

First Question

Q1.5.26 - Funding and Corporate Structure

Having read the Applicant's response to this (and adjacent funding questions), I can see no demonstrable proof that the company (Solar Five Limited) or its parent company (Cranssetta Investment Ltd) has, or will be able to acquire, the financial resources required to build and maintain this national infrastructure project. Should there not be some requirement to provide such a guarantee before any potential consent is granted – including a remedy if the company is unable to raise the money or is sold off to a third party at any stage? (I have noted the Applicant's response to Q1.1.6 on decommissioning).

Whilst mentioning the parent company (Cranssetta Investment Ltd), I have not seen anything in writing which refutes any possible Russian link to the funding. I raised this with PDP and various government departments in early 2024 and the same question was raised in Parliament by the Oxford West and Abingdon MP, [REDACTED] on June 27th, 2023 @ 6.19pm as shown here [REDACTED]

A short extract from her question says.....

"The company behind it, Photovolt Development Partners, is registered in Germany but owned by Cyprus company Cranssetta Investments Ltd. The sole shareholder is a Yulia Lezhen. A New York court case last year revealed that Yulia Lezhen's husband, Dmitry Glukhov, was the primary beneficial owner of a goldfield development company that borrowed \$58 million from Uralsib bank. The litigating company said that there was never any goldfield to be found. It looked for infrastructure, but did not find it. It alleged that the company was, in fact, a front to syphon off assets. It further said that it was not the only one, and that there were dozens of such companies, of which Photovolt—about to build to Botley West—was one".

I would be very grateful if the Applicant could respond on these points.

Second Question

Q1.5.26 - Funding and Corporate Structure

[REDACTED] (Head of Mission Control at Dept of Energy), when interviewed on BBC World at One on Dec 13, 2024, said that "The biggest barrier [to achieving the energy system that we need] is actually the way in which we manage the queue of projects to connect to our grid. So, we already have in the queue more capacity than we will ever need for our energy system." Indeed, I understand that the existing pipeline of projects offering renewable energy will already provide more than five times the energy that the government says it will need by 2035 - so why do we even need to consider another massive project like this?