

Submission ID: S04D21907

I support Stop Botley West and their Solar Panels on Roofs NOT on Fields stance

I stand by my submission of 5 February 2025 and do not wish to repeat any of the arguments here. I support the campaign of Stop Botley West which since 2021 has flown the flag SOLAR PANELS ON ROOFS NOT ON FIELDS.

The Fundamental Position remains that this scheme has NO VALID PURPOSE. Until every Industrial Building, Warehouse, Distribution Centre, & Data Processing centre etc in the United Kingdom is obliged to install solar panels on its roofing NO ground mounted solar installations should be considered for approval. A major advantage of solar panels located on existing buildings is that such buildings are already connected to the National Grid Electricity supply and under the terms of the Smart Export Guarantee Scheme (SEG) they can transfer any surplus power created by the solar panels back to the grid through existing connections and the owner can receive payment for the power so supplied. There is thus NO need for the massive PERMANENT industrial infrastructure proposed by Botley West Solar "Farm" to connect its proposed scheme to the National Grid at Farmoor at the bottom of Tumbledown Hill.

In addition to Solar power installations on existing industrialised roof tops it should be made mandatory for all new industrial developments to have full roof solar installations as a mandatory requirement.

Further the same mandatory requirement should apply to ALL new residential housing developments, except those developments in environmentally sensitive locations where a relaxation of mandatory requirements can be applied for. It is a disgrace that the Botley West Solar "Farm" scheme should be even be considered at all when most new buildings currently surrounding Oxford have no roof top Solar installations.

Even if my advice above is to be ignored by the powers that be I would also like to make the point that the Examiners CANNOT recommend the application be accepted when so much evidence is MISSING and the Secretary of State should come to the same conclusion when considering the proposal on merit.

Re Final comment from Forever Fields to the Planning Inspectorate 9 Nov 2025

I ask the planning authority to closely consider the final submission from FOREVER FIELDS, and I strongly support all of their submission, including in particular the following extract :-

"The applicant and the landowner appear disinterested in building and running solar farms or owning land. Neither are they seeking approval in order to satisfy their interest in civic duty. In refusing to write a comprehensive decommissioning and re-instatement plan or to commit to a process that ensures such a plan will be funded appropriately, **they demonstrate that their single motivation is to bank windfall profits.** They are not interested in the future of the scheme once it is approved. They have decided that agreeing to a plan that will fund decommissioning and re-instatement will dilute their return on investment when they sell the planning approval. They have assessed that financial transparency on this and other issues would not be helpful in achieving maximum financial yield. This is why they have not responded to Forever Fields recent submission (REP 5- 086) and this is why they have hidden behind invalid 'precedent' arguments"

Their submission ends:- "Botley West remains the wrong proposal, in the wrong place, motivated by the wrong reasons.

The credibility of the NSIP process and UK Government renewable energy strategy would be compromised and brought into question if Botley West is given approval.

Refusing the application will speed up the process of designing and building solar farms that do meet the needs of the country, by demonstrating the difference between good and bad.

The application for Botley West should therefore be refused."

and if for whatever reason their application is approved, the law should be changed so they are not permitted to sell or pass on the planning

approval to any other company conglomerate partnership or the like