

[REDACTED]

From: Steven Jenkins [REDACTED] >
Sent: 16 July 2026 23:27
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: EN010147 Botley West IP Submission from 20055190 Steven Jenkins (2)

EN010147 Botley West IP Submission
Registered Interested Party: Steven Jenkins
Registration Identification Number: [REDACTED]

FAO Secretary of State

I am writing to formally register my strong objection to the Development Consent Order (DCO) application submitted by Photovolt Development Partners (PVDP) for the proposed Botley West Solar Farm.

The application is fundamentally compromised by structurally flawed, incomplete, and unverified environmental and technical assessments. By attempting to defer critical evaluations until after securing approval, the Applicant has failed to provide a legally sound or reliable basis for determination. Following your refusal of a final three-month extension, the application remains severely deficient and warrants outright rejection.

1. Inadequate Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) and Deceptive Buffers

The Applicant has failed to produce a satisfactory property-by-property RVAA despite repeated requests. Furthermore, the proposed masterplans are highly misleading. Rather than adopting the Examining Authority's (ExA) recommendations on minimum residential exclusion zones, the Applicant intends to enforce a mere 100-metre boundary. Deferring the final buffer decisions to Local Authorities post-consent is both undemocratic, as it locks out public participation, and unworkable, due to the severe resource constraints faced by local councils.

2. Conflicting Grid Connection Timelines and Planning Evasions

A severe timeline conflict exists between the Applicant's projected 2029 operational date and the National Grid's estimated late-2031 substation connection window. The substation location remains undecided, and no planning application has been submitted. Crucially, the Applicant has actively bypassed the ExAs proposed Grampian clause, using alternative mechanisms to avoid waiting for substation approval before commencing construction.

3. Missing Ecological Data and Experimental Mitigation

Vital wildlife habitat surveys, tree root protection plans for cable trenching, and definitive environmental management strategies remain completely absent. The proposed mitigations for local species—such as skylark plots and bat corridors—are largely experimental, unproven, or structurally flawed. Promising a functional Environmental Management Plan at a later date is legally unacceptable.

4. Unsubstantiated Community Allotment Claims

The proposed community food growing plots lack local consultation or demonstrated demand. These sites feature unsafe access routes, mask commercial ventures as community benefits, and pose a high risk of abandonment into untended scrubland. These plots should be completely removed from the Order Limits.

5. Unmitigated Aviation and Hydrological Risks

The scheme introduces unmitigated glint, glare, and turbulence risks to the 70,000 annual training flights at London Oxford Airport without proper consultation with key aviation companies.

Furthermore, by relying on outdated runoff data, the Applicant ignores modern science regarding solar panel drip-line effects. This severely underestimates the heightened flood risks to vulnerable low-lying communities, such as Cassington, Worton, and Cumnor, while threatening the destruction of vital land drains.

Conclusion

Because the Applicant has run out of time to rectify these profound omissions, this application cannot be lawfully or fairly determined. I urge the Secretary of State to uphold rigorous planning standards and refuse the Development Consent Order.

Yours faithfully

Steven Jenkins