

From: tim watson [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 July 2026 09:32
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Objection — Botley West Solar Farm

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing as a registered interested party to confirm that I remain concerned about PVDP's application for the Botley West Solar Farm.

My objection is not simply to the principle of the scheme. It is that the applicant has still not provided enough reliable, verified evidence for the Secretary of State to weigh the merits against the harm. Repeated requests from the Examiners for missing studies and assessments have gone unanswered, and the applicant's own request for a further three-month extension was refused. The work has not been done. On that basis the application cannot be fairly or lawfully determined, and should be refused.

The specific points that concern me are:

- Airport safety. London Oxford Airport handles around 70,000 training flights a year. Several major training operators were not consulted as they should have been, and have real concerns about glint and glare, turbulence, and insufficient panel removal near the flight paths.
- Flooding and hydrology. The applicant relies on dated literature to argue that panels don't affect runoff. More recent evidence points to a drip-line effect that increases it, which the applicant has not accounted for. With Cassington, Worton, Jericho Barns and the Cumnor area already vulnerable, and land drains likely to be damaged, this raises a serious flood risk.
- Wildlife and ancient trees. Key studies on habitats, species and root damage from cable trenching are incomplete or missing. Where mitigations are proposed, they are experimental, flawed or already shown not to work, and the Environmental Management Plan is simply promised for later.
- Community food growing plots. The need for these has been assumed rather than established with the community, access is not as safe or easy as claimed, one element is plainly a commercial enterprise rather than a community benefit, and the plots could easily end up as untended scrubland. These fields should be removed from the Order Limits.
- Substation timing. National Grid now expects the substation connection no earlier than late 2031, with no application yet submitted, while the applicant still claims late 2029. Both cannot be true. The applicant has effectively sidestepped the Grampian clause the Examiners proposed, which was meant to prevent building ahead of the substation gaining permission.
- Residential visual amenity and buffers. No proper property-by-property Residential Visual Amenity Assessment was ever produced. The masterplans imply a 250m buffer, but the actual proposal is a minimum of just 100m, with final decisions deferred until after the DCO is granted. That is both undemocratic, since we lose any say, and unworkable, as the local authorities have said they lack the time, resources and expertise to do it.

For these reasons I do not believe the application is in a state to be fairly determined, and I would ask that it be refused.

Yours faithfully,

Best

Tim

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Tim.