

It is appalling that the applicant and the major landowner have both failed to address three key issues - heritage & landscape, decommissioning & reinstatement, and mental health & wellbeing, all of which will be deeply negatively impacted by the proposed Solar Farm. The applicant has not responded to any of these concerns despite having opportunities to do so, and appears to have not listened at all to local people, local authorities, expert counsel or the examiners and chooses not to make even modest adjustments to their proposal even where they could materially reduce the negative impacts. The applicant refuses to materially reduce the scale of the proposal, refuses to increase buffer zone distances from housing, from PRoWs, and from heritage assets, and refuses to reduce the number of solar panels in particularly sensitive areas as well as refusing to increase the width of PRoW's from 5m to 15m.

This indicates that the applicant thinks they know better than any other interested parties about all these key issues, and have relied on technical and legal excuses rather than trying to understand other opinion or offering alternative solutions when it is clear from local opinion that the impact of this proposal on local people is devastating (as can be clearly seen, for example, by the strength of opinion shown in the Forever Fields project and on the anti Botley West SF sites). We feel ignored.

This lack of concern is particularly evident in terms of decommissioning and re-instatement of the Fields in 42 years' time. The applicant's response to this area of concern has shown that the applicant and the landowner appear disinterested in building and running solar farms or

owning land, or in any 'interest in civic duty'. By not providing a comprehensive decommissioning and re-instatement plan nor committing to a process that ensures such a plan will be funded appropriately, and showing no interest whatsoever in the future of the plan after approval, they show their single motivation is to ensure maximisation of their financial profit.

This lack of concern is exemplified by their hiding behind false precedent arguments (false because they are not comparable with the Botley West proposal, which is much larger and much more complex). This proposal should not be approved, but if it is then it is essential that the applicant and landowner be held to the responsibility to accept as a condition of planning approval, a financial plan which ensures acceptable recommission and reinstatement of the fields. Botley West cannot reasonably be described as 'temporary' if there is no plan and no money clearly identified to re-instate the landscape when the solar farm has fulfilled its role and the costs to do so will be measured in triple digit millions.

It is not right to force future generations to pay to fix a broken landscape, broken by greed.

I remain opposed to this proposal for the following reasons:

1. In its current form it will have multiple material impacts on mental health, well being, heritage and landscape. The design remains ill conceived.
2. In the absence of a fully detailed, fully costed decommissioning and re-instatement plan it cannot be described as temporary.
3. The applicant and landowner have shown significant resistance to amending the proposal to a more appropriate scale and form that could mitigate some impacts.
4. The financial aspects of the proposal; in particular the sources and uses of the funds necessary to build and maintain the scheme, remain unclear.

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.