OFFICIAL

From: Bojan Ivanovic [redacted]
Sent: 07 May 2026 11:28
To: DESNZ Correspondence <correspondence@energysecurity.gov.uk>
Subject: Fwd: A response from DESNZ to your recent query - DESNZ ref: TOB2026/06285

Dear Mr Collins,
Thank you for your further letter.
“Quasi-judicial” does not mean total silence. Government routinely comments on live, especially controversial, infrastructure matters, and public accountability is not suspended during decision-making. The language used in your correspondence is therefore unnecessarily broad and defensive.
This is now another letter that avoids stating what, if anything, the Department acknowledges about my detailed, clearly laid out, and legitimate concerns. Instead, it repeats reference to the Planning Act 2008 and the role of the Examining Authority, but this does not address the central issue raised: whether the project is properly before the decision-maker and whether the Examination is even lawfully constituted.
Those questions go to jurisdiction and lawful competence, which must be established BEFORE any merits-based determination can proceed.
In this context, I would like to reiterate my concerns about the premeditated aggregation of non-contiguous parcels used by the developer, Blenheim and its affiliates, to artificially meet the NSIP threshold, and to intentionally alter the applicable decision-making route away from the standard local authorities and well established procedures.
The continued reliance on the Secretary of State’s “quasi-judicial role” does not resolve these issues.
It increasingly reads as a procedural justification for avoiding scrutiny rather than engaging with the substance.
The repeated assertion that it would be “inappropriate” to comment has become a convenient means of maintaining distance from legitimate concerns while the process continues unchecked.
Within this context, it should be noted again that any approval by the Secretary of State would, through the exercise of "quasi-judicial" decision-making powers, directly determine a change in land-use designation, with associated long-term/effectively permanent implications for materially higher land rents, but more importantly, substantial land value appreciation, likely amounting to value uplifts in the order of billions of pounds, from which Blenheim and affiliated parties are likely to be primary beneficiaries.
It is difficult to accept that the Secretary of State is being effectively shielded by his own Department from scrutiny in relation to a highly controversial proposal on a scale comparable to Heathrow Airport, located within protected Green Belt and on productive agricultural land, particularly when far more suitable brownfield sites—closer to heavy energy users and better aligned with demand

profiles naturally correlated with solar generation—do not appear to have been properly and objectively considered.
Yours sincerely,
Bo Ivanovic

[redacted]

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **DESNZ Correspondence** <correspondence@energysecurity.gov.uk>
Date: Thu, 7 May 2026, 09:19
Subject: A response from DESNZ to your recent query - DESNZ ref: TOB2026/06285
To: <[redacted]

Dear Bojan Ivanovic,

Please find attached a response to your recent query to DESNZ.

Yours sincerely,

DESNZ Correspondence

Department for Energy Security & Net Zero

Department for Energy Security & Net Zero
55 Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HP

www.gov.uk

Bojan Ivanovic
[redacted]

Our ref: TOB2026/06843
Your ref:

May 2026

Dear Bojan Ivanovic,

Thank you for your email of 7 May, regarding Botley West Solar Farm.

The Department notes the points in your correspondence. As set out previously, the application is being determined in accordance with the statutory framework established by the Planning Act 2008.

The Department is unable to engage further on the specific points you raise outside the statutory decision process. Your correspondence will be treated as a post-examination submission and will be carefully considered alongside all matters that are relevant to the decision-making on the application for development consent in accordance with the Planning Act 2008. Any further correspondence you provide will be treated as the same. The Department will not be engaging in further correspondence on the matters raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]
DESNZ CORRESPONDENCE UNIT