

Simon Raywood

From: Ken Wilkins [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 September 2026 18:33
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Botley West Solar Farm - EN010147
Attachments: Botley West Solar Farm; Responses Botley West.docx

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Dear Secretary of State,

In my previous letter of 14th July (attached), I pointed out that, not only had the Applicant failed to comply with the 9th June deadline, to deal with the multitude of questions arising from the Examination stage, but you had also refused their request for a further 3 months extension. The time had obviously passed for making any further submissions. In your letter to the Applicant dated 8th June, you emphasised the importance of maintaining discipline, within the statutory framework established by the 2008 Planning Act. **You considered this was of fundamental importance to the efficient and fair operation of the development consent regime.** Despite all of this, I understand you have apparently now accepted even more late submissions from the Applicant! This is not provided for by the statutory framework. It will inevitably cause even more delay and has involved you in requesting yet another response from interested parties!

I am a supporter of the Stop Botley West campaign and fully endorse the comprehensive SBW submission of 16 July [\[C2-161\]](#). I am concerned that despite these new proposals, the Application is still irretrievably flawed. I have attached a schedule outlining some of the problems which still exist. As you will note, there are too many questions which remain unanswered, and the Applicant seeks to defer too many important decisions, until after any development consent is granted, when they will be beyond public scrutiny and challenge. Acceding to this request from the Applicant, would be patently unfair.

The plans that were submitted to the public enquiry were incomplete and many of the Applicant's submissions were disputed. Your letter to the Applicant of 14th April 2026 contained an unprecedented number of 70 questions, asking not just for minor clarifications, but for a wholesale reassessment and redesign of the proposal. The deadline imposed by this letter was ignored, and yet you have still accepted even more proposals. As I have explained in the attached schedule, the submission is still flawed!

I respectfully request the Secretary of State to refuse outright the grant of a DCO for this Application.

Name: Kenneth George Wilkins

Interested Party Registration No: [REDACTED]

BOTLEY WEST SOLAR FARM - EN010147

Response to PDVP's late submission

(A)

Areas of concern posed by the new submissions:

The principal concern is the introduction of an “outline Residential Visual Amenity Plan” (oRAP) [[C1-108](#)] and new Masterplan revision 5 [[C1-111](#)] in which the default buffer now offered and drawn is 100m (compared with the 250m default recommended by Examiners and previously shown in the Applicant's 9 June masterplan revision 4 [[C1-051](#)] “with additional offsets up to 250m applied where needed”. It's not clear how this “need” would be assessed post consent when it will be beyond public scrutiny.

The Applicant's amended Schedule 2, requirement 15 in the DCO states that the 100m buffer minimum will be used as “the starting point which has been amended to require the final plan to be substantially in accordance with this outline plan.” This implies that very few buffers will be increased to anything near 250m. This contradicts the Applicant's 9 June submissions in which the starting point was the 250m maximum to be adjusted downwards in some cases. This is a significant and unjustified change compared to the Applicant's submissions of 9 June in which the Applicant admitted that the Installation would still be viable, albeit marginally, with a panel area using a 250m buffer.

(B)

Unresolved issues still not addressed. These include:

Red-line Boundary. At least 300 hectares of land stated now by the Applicant not to be used for panels. The certainty that this land won't be used for panels should be secured by moving the red-line boundary. It can then be returned to agricultural use

Heritage and Landscape. The Landscape Character Assessment requested by ICOMOS has not been undertaken and issues raised by ICOMOS remain unresolved.

National Grid Substation. Location still not decided, no planning Application yet submitted by NGET who say earliest connection date is Winter 2031. No clause in DCO to say BWSF build cannot start until substation has planning consent.

Decommissioning fund. ExA recommended DCO should ensure a decommissioning fund (as well as a plan) is in place before construction starts. Not done.

Viability. The Applicant has not justified its claim for a 935MW minimum 'economically viable' size for BWSF and rejected Oxfordshire Host Authority's proposals for a smaller installation.

Flood Risk. No further panel pull-back to mitigate flood risk despite well evidenced responses from Cassington and Cumnor Parish Councils and their Hydrology Experts. See REP7-068, REP7-077, C2-162 and C2-169

Ecology and Bio-diversity net Gain. Arboricultural impact assessment still not done. Skylark compensation strategy unworkable.

Special Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI). A large part of the central site is now on the list of SSSI designation proposed development, named The Three Rivers potential SSSI site based on the presence of the rivers and river valleys in the region. This needs to be considered.

Community food growing - no further mention. These areas should be removed from the red-line boundary. See REP5-072, REP5-093 and REP6-076

Trainee pilot safety is at risk with the current panel layout. Further panel removal near the airport is essential. See C2-210 and C2-176

Proposed cycle path along Lower Rd still shown on Masterplan despite verbal agreement to remove from the Application (during the Examiners' Site Inspection on 7 October 2025).

Minerals and Waste. Oxford County Council (OCC) are still in disagreement with the Applicant regarding these issues.

Acquisition of roadside verges. This is another unresolved disagreement between the Applicant and the OCC

Simon Raywood

From: Ken Wilkins [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 July 2026 15:03
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Botley West Solar Farm

For the attention of The Secretary of State

Dear Sirs,

I live in Woodstock, and live in a property which would be severely affected if consent was granted for the proposed solar farm. I therefore registered as an "Interested Party" and duly submitted objections to the proposals both before, and at the Examination stage.

As you will be aware, the Applicant failed to comply with the 9th June deadline, to deal with the multitude of questions arising from the Examination stage. His request for a further 3 months extension was quite rightly refused by you. There is no question therefore, that the deadline for any further submissions has passed. All the way through the process, the applicant has substantially ignored the shortcomings of his application. He has simply gone through the motions of complying with the statutory planning procedures, which are laid down for such a major proposal. I am extremely concerned to learn that the Applicant is now making it clear, that he imminently intends making some substantial new proposals! If this happens, I would respectfully request that It should not be accepted.

In your letter to the Applicant dated 8th June, I note the emphasis you placed on the importance of maintaining discipline within the statutory framework, which was established by the 2008 Planning Act. You quite rightly considered that this was of **"fundamental importance to the efficient and fair operation of the development consent regimes."** I trust that your views have not changed over the last 5 weeks! You were very clear that the deadline of 9th June should be adhered to. Any deviation from the laid down RFI response period, would create an undesirable precedent. It would not comply with your own guidelines, and would undermine the integrity of the whole process.

Yours faithfully,
Kenneth Wilkins FCIOB

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]