

To BotleyWestSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

16 JULY 2026

Dear Secretary of State

BOTLEY WEST SOLAR "FARM" SUBMISSION DEADLINE

I am resident of Cumnor Village overlooking Farmoor Reservoir and the proposed location of sub-station at the foot of Tumbledown Hill to serve the Botley West Solar Farm. This massive industrial scale sub station will cover over 3.8 Hectares, 12 - 15 m high (not including the associated power connections to the existing national grid powerline. In addition 6 secondary substations are proposed each with a footprint of some 200 sq metres and 4 to 6m high.

As such I am an Interested Party (registration identification number : [REDACTED] to the proposed development application submitted by PVDP on behalf of the applicant SolarFive Limited. I have previously sent my views of this proposed development to the relevant authorities including PINS.

However I am astonished by the suggestion that the developer of the proposed Botley Solar Farm (*Power Station*) is attempting to submit new detailed information and proposals long after the June 9th 2026 deadline set by the Secretary of State.

All necessary planning work should have been completed months ago long before the scheme was submitted for the Examination stage, and it is completely unacceptable that the Applicant can try to ignore the advice given in the SoS's "refusal to extend" letter which states: "The deadline of 23.59 on 9 June 2026 for response to the RFI therefore remains."

The planning process is already heavily structured to support broader economic and political goals, and this could be seen as leaving local affected residents with somewhat of a democratic deficit.

This developer has consistently displayed an attitude of unmitigated arrogance that this project WILL go ahead. The developer has treated the legitimate views and concerns of the affected parties with nothing short of contempt, no doubt relying upon the well documented structural and political biases favouring large scale infrastructure projects in the UK.

This reliance has led this developer to comply minimally with the regulations and procedures throughout every aspect of the planning process. Typically public consultations were reduced to a box ticking exercise to meet procedural requirements with little no meaningful engagement.

Despite the fact that that the developer has failed to satisfy the Inspectorate, it is nevertheless seeking yet another opportunity to get this project over the bar without the necessary public scrutiny which the planning process requires. For the Planning Inspectorate *and* the Secretary of State to consider these late untested submissions would appear to be a clear abuse of due planning process and a total disregard for democratic governance.

I respectfully request that the SoS should NOT accept submissions of new material from the applicant after the deadline of 23.59 16/7/26

I have previously made my opposition to this project clear:-

1] I am in favour of the planet doing whatever is possible to reduce the effects of global warming, however the tiny UK's influence is negligible when set against the carbon output of the rest of the planet.

2] Solar panels located in the UK have almost the lowest yield on the planet. P1/3

- 3] If more electrical energy *is* required in UK to meet net zero goals, wind or packaged nuclear should be considered which can be shown to provide the power output claimed by this developer on a fraction of the land that they propose to destroy.
- 4] In any case this project is NOT required as the National Grid (and other major power suppliers) have confirmed that they already have about 3 times the required supply of renewable energy for 2035 on its books.
- 5] I do not believe the developer has given any serious consideration to alternative sites.
- 6] Even if the above were not enough to abandon this futile project, there are many other reasons not to proceed further:-
- 7] The project is located within the setting of a World Heritage Site, on irreplaceable good productive agricultural land. (Not on 3rd grade land as the greenwashing developers would have you believe). This proposal is in fact industrialisation of the Green Belt. The developer has made little or no effort to justify the project's location nor to convince that it meets the threshold of "very special circumstances" sufficient to outweigh the damage to the Green Belt. Once such land is industrialised by a solar "farm" it would take more than a 150 years to return it to its original state. I know I won't be around but one knows that if this land is turned over to this developer, it will never be seen again.
- 8] The scale of the project is excessive. The panels will not be concealed by the hedge rows proposed by the developer. The lie of the land over three river valleys will negate any such attempted "concealment".
- 9] The scheme will have a disastrous ecological effect on wildlife, important trees and hedgerows.
- 10] Existing footpaths will be reduced to an industrial (prison like) environment with chain link tunnels, security cameras and high level floodlights.
- 11] Very lengthy construction impacts including trenching, pile driving, new access roads for heavy vehicles, noise pollution and congestion.
- 12] Increased risk of flooding from rainwater run off the panels
- 13] Reflected glare from solar panels affecting aircraft from Brize Norton and Oxford(London)Airport
- 14] Unacceptably savage arrangements for compulsory purchase demanded by the developer
- 15] Botley West Solar Farm is a cynical name for the project, designed to deceive. it is not located in Botley and it is not a farm. Blenheim Palace Solar Power Station might be more correct
- 16] It seems the PVDP proposal is an elaborate greenwashing device to launder ill-gotten gains for their backers, and brings to mind the recent PPE scandal during the Covid crisis
- 17] There have been many articles in the press regarding the dubious background of the backers of this project, and if that history is anything to go by they will sell the entire project on to other financiers as soon as they receive confirmed planning permission. These financiers will in turn sell the project on. By the time the project reaches its 42 year cut off point the project will probably be owned by a corporation with a value of £1 and no intention (or finance) to return the site to its original green belt status

I am unconvinced that the biodiversity net benefits claimed by the applicant can or will be achieved. These will entirely depend upon professional and committed conservation management of the site, which the applicant has failed to ensure.

Serious questions surrounding the funding of this application (see above) have not been adequately addressed by the applicant. In light of this I support the written Parliamentary Questions tabled by Calum Miller, MP for Bicester and Woodstock on November 5, 2025, and which was due for answer by November 12 2025.

These are vital issues of local and national importance which have been inadequately addressed by the applicant who now seeks to make amended submissions *without any public scrutiny*.

The Planning Enquiry is tasked with establishing that the economic and social need for this national infrastructure outweighs the local environmental and community disruption. P2/3

I, and professionals in the electricity industry, contend that there is no economic or social need for this project.

It is unnecessary and undesirable and a gross attempt to industrialise our Green Belt not to produce solar energy, but, I suspect as a cover for dubious financial arrangements.

Yours faithfully
Christopher Nuttall-Smith

cc Layla Moran MP <layla.moran.mp@parliament.uk>
cc Cllr Westcott [REDACTED] >
cc SBWComms [REDACTED]

P3/3