

To: BotleyWestSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
Project: Botley West Solar Farm Application EN010142
Interested party ref. [REDACTED]

Prof David Sherratt FRS and Dr Lidia Arciszewska, owners and residents of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

This submission should be considered alongside our earlier submission dated 14/07/2026

Dear Secretary of State

Botley West Solar Farm: EN010147

We are disappointed that the Applicant's late submissions have been accepted, causing further delay in the decision for Botley West and requiring yet another response from Interested Parties. We are also concerned that the Applicant's new, extremely large, submission is a major revision of its earlier 'final submission'; it does little to address concerns by the ExA and by many other interested parties, including those made by the July deadline.

We are strong supporters of the Stop Botley West campaign and fully endorse the comprehensive SBW submission of 16 July [[C2-161](#)]. We are concerned that despite these new proposals, the Application is still irretrievably flawed. Too many questions 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. This is totally unacceptable!

Area of major concern posed by the new submissions

A huge 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 zone now offered and drawn is 100m (compared with the 250m default recommended by the 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 is unclear how this "need" would be assessed post-consent when it will be beyond public scrutiny. This directly affects the residential visual amenity of our residence, along with many others.

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 major and unjustified change compared to the Applicant's submissions of 9 June, in which the Applicant admitted that the Installation would still be viable, with a panel area using a 250m buffer. The Applicant has not responded to our submission of 14/07/26 in which we point out errors and inconsistencies in their plan of 9 June.

Other unresolved issues to be addressed

- **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. The land not used for panels can then be returned to agricultural use and help mitigate the government-projected food shortage crisis in the coming years, as a consequence of climate change. Similarly, proposed community food growing areas should be removed from the red-line boundary. See REP5-072, REP5-093 and REP6-076 and our submission of 14/07/26.
- **Heritage, Landscape and Special Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI).** The Landscape Character Assessment requested by ICOMOS has not been undertaken and issues raised by ICOMOS remain unresolved. A large part of the central site **is now** on the Natural England's list of sites to be considered for SSSI designation, named The Three Rivers potential SSSI based on the presence of the rivers and river valleys in the region. This needs to be addressed.
- **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
- **Viability.** The Applicant has not justified its claim for a 935MW minimum 'economically viable' size for BWSF (other approved solar farms are all substantially smaller!) and has rejected without justification Oxfordshire Host Authority's proposals for a smaller installation, which would address a number of major concerns about the proposal. In our opinion, the Applicant has provided absolutely no evidence to indicate that a smaller development would be inviable and has ignores the effects of the proposed development on Residential Visual Amenity.
- **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 20).

We respectfully request the Secretary of State to refuse outright the grant of a DCO for this Application. The Applicant has demonstrated an arrogant disregard of recommendations from the ExA and concerns of IPs. Furthermore, it has demonstrated a complete failure to address many of the relevant concerns and questions raised by the ExA and IPs.

Professor David Sherratt and Dr Lidia K. Arciszewska
 Interested Party Registration No: [REDACTED]