

Simon Raywood

From: Frances Platt [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 July 2026 13:16
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Botley West

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [nt](#)

Dear Secretary of State,

I write as an Interested Party (local resident of affected area) to express my serious concern at reports that the Applicant intends to submit substantial new material on or around 16 July, including revised Masterplans, updated assessments and a revised Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA), despite the clear deadline of 9 June 2026 for responding to the Secretary of State's Request for Information.

As the Secretary of State you explicitly refused the Applicant's request for an extension beyond 9 June, stating that "the deadline of 23:59 on 9 June 2026 for response to the RFI therefore remains." That decision was accompanied by a clear explanation that maintaining discipline within the statutory framework is "of fundamental importance to the efficient and fair operation of the development consent regimes" and that granting further time would risk "undermining confidence in, and the integrity of, the planning process."

If the Applicant is now permitted to submit substantial new evidence after its deadline has expired, it would make a travesty of the entire examination process. Interested Parties, local authorities, and statutory consultees have all worked diligently to comply with every deadline imposed upon them. The Applicant should not be allowed to disregard the timetable that everyone else has been required to follow.

The purpose of the 16 July deadline is for Interested Parties to respond to material submitted by the Applicant by 9 June. It is not an opportunity for the Applicant to introduce significant new evidence or fundamentally revised proposals after its deadline has passed. Allowing this would be manifestly unfair and would undermine confidence that the Planning Act 2008 process is being applied consistently to all participants.

The Applicant has had ample opportunity throughout the Examination to complete and submit a robust Residential Visual Amenity Assessment. It has repeatedly been asked to address deficiencies in its work and has had many months in which to do so. If important assessments remain incomplete, that is a consequence of the Applicant's own failure to meet the examination timetable, not a justification for introducing new material at this late stage.

Furthermore, significant new submissions at this point would deprive Interested Parties of a fair opportunity to scrutinise and respond to them. Proper consideration would inevitably require further consultation, creating precisely the delay that the Secretary of State identified when refusing the Applicant's request for an extension. That would be contrary to both procedural fairness and the statutory decision-making timetable.

I have complied with every deadline throughout this process, as have many other Interested Parties. It cannot be right that the Applicant, having been refused additional time, should nevertheless be permitted to achieve the same result by submitting substantial new material after the deadline. To do

so would render the Secretary of State's refusal of the extension effectively meaningless and would seriously undermine confidence in the fairness and integrity of the examination process.

I therefore respectfully request that the Secretary of State declines to accept any substantial new material submitted by the Applicant after the 9 June 2026 deadline and ensures that the examination process is conducted in accordance with the timetable and principles of fairness previously set out.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Frances M Platt, FMedSci, FRS

A black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Professor Frances M Platt.