

Simon Raywood

From: Miles and [REDACTED] Tuely [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 July 2026 16:00
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Objections to the above

To the Secretary of State (SoS)

I have read PDVP's further representations and have the following comments:

1. The fact that the Applicant has requested a further three months to complete its replies to the questions put to it by the SoS in itself means that the SoS does not have the necessary information to make a decision.
2. In the absence of a proper individual assessment of all the properties affected by the scheme, the Applicant has not only failed to accept the Examiners' proposed minimum distance of 250 metres as a buffer but has counter-proposed a minimum distance of 100 metres with just a few individual properties having a buffer of 250m. It is then proposed that the buffer for each property should be decided by each Local Authority knowing that they do not have the resources to do so. In any case why should their ratepayers be put to that expense?
3. There is no agreed location for the Substation so, obviously, no planning permission. Despite this the applicant is still maintaining that the scheme will be connected to the National Grid late in 2029. This contradicts the prediction by the National Grid that the substation will not be ready for connection until the last quarter of 2031. The Applicant's plan to circumvent this anomaly must be resisted.
4. There is no Environmental Management Plan despite being requested by the Inspectors. This has been promised for later but bearing in mind the Applicant's failure to produce it and other information when it would be reasonably expected that the pressure was at its most intense, the chances of all this information being produced after a favourable decision is granted and pressure lifted is unlikely.
5. Community Food Growing Plots. There are so many holes in these proposals that it is difficult to know where to start. There is no proof of demand, for example and no safe and easy access to all of them. There is no fall-back plan if the plots are not used.
6. Airport Safety. There are still serious questions to be resolved about the dangers of siting the panels so close to the Airport.
7. Flooding. The Applicant continues to use out-of-date literature to deny that there will be a heightened risk of flooding. The southern part of the scheme is in an area where flooding is already a problem in the winter and there is now considerably more knowledge about the effects of solar schemes on local hydrology that a better judgement can be made and this judgement is that the scheme will cause even more flooding.

Regards

Miles Tuely
[REDACTED]