

**FURTHER SUBMISSION TO BOTLEY WEST SOLAR FARM EXAMINERS**  
**By C H Atherstone (Interested Party No [REDACTED], 15 July 2026**

Responding to recent submissions made by the Applicant

1. It should be noted that the Applicant admits that this project was originally motivated not by concern for the generation of electricity for the national grid, but by a request to find a project in the UK in which an investor from abroad might invest. Thus the overriding motivation has been for private profit.
2. When comparing cable routes for two possible locations, the Applicant makes much of obstacles to routing a cable from Cowley through the centre of the city of Oxford. To consider this impossible route was plainly absurd. Because it would be rejected does not mean that their alternative from Farmoor should therefore be accepted. Nor did they acknowledge that the Farmoor connection would first require laying an underground cable several kilometres long from Cassington and beyond, under the busy A40 highway, alongside the narrow lane towards Eynsham, then south through agricultural lands and past industrial buildings, under the Thames river (avoiding a meadow of historic and ecological significance), then some considerable distance passing the village and reservoir of Farmoor, before reaching the proposed substation beyond there (from which they begin their comparison with the Cowley route). Environmental, social and economic considerations relating to this route should have been noted.
3. Bearing in mind the number of villages that would be connected by acres of solar panels, fences and other infrastructure on an industrial scale, it seems crass to argue that they are only villages so do not need to be protected. It should be borne in mind that some of those villages have historical significance. Their character would be drastically affected if they were now to be subsumed in an enveloping solar complex of record-breaking proportions.
4. The Applicant argues that Green Belt legislation no longer requires them to protect spaces between villages, yet to fill such spaces with industrial solar panels and infrastructure will extend the urban sprawl of Oxford, Kidlington and Woodstock, surely relevant to Green Belt protections that should be in place relating to towns.
5. The Applicant argues that screening of the development from sight will ameliorate its impact upon the openness of the landscape, but allowing hedges alongside country roads and public rights of way to grow 15 feet tall in order to screen developments immediately restricts vision of the present fields and woodlands and so such measures of themselves impact the openness of and vistas of the landscape considerably.
6. The Applicant concedes that buffer zones alongside residential properties may be increased to between 100 to 250 metres. However, residents argue that a minimum of at least 250 metres should be imposed. Nor does it seem reasonable for the Applicant to argue that some structures may be visible but as they will not cut across the skyline they should not be regarded as obtrusive.
7. There is no evidence that community food growing plots, offered on unused spaces by the Applicant as a sop to local residents, are wanted by local people nor would be developed by them.
8. No satisfactory level of compensation for communities affected by this scheme has yet been put forward nor tested with local opinion.
9. Evidence of protections for wildlife that would be put in place remains unconvincing.