

Simon Raywood

From: Peter Lister [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 October 2026 19:57
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Re: EN010147 Botley West Solar Farm

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Dear Secretary of State

Botley West Solar Farm: EN010147

I am disappointed that the Applicant's late submissions have been accepted causing further delay in the decision for Botley West and requesting yet another response from Interested Parties.

I support the Stop Botley West campaign and fully endorse their comprehensive submission C2-161, dated 15 July. I am concerned that despite these new proposals the Application is still irretrievably flawed. Too many questions remain unanswered and the Applicant seeks to defer many important decisions until after any development consent is granted when they will be beyond public scrutiny and challenge.

In particular, I would like to draw attention to the following:

- All land within 250m of residential areas should be placed outside the "red line" and removed from the application and any draft DCO, removing it from further consideration. The Applicant's claims that buffer zones will be applied "where needed" prompts the obvious reaction "whose need" and I am sure that the "need" will be that of the Applicant, not local residents.
- It appears clear that there has been no progress on the required substation; NGET have not applied for permission and we have no idea of whether NGET have surveyed an appropriate site or agreed a provisional design for such a substation. Any DCO should be conditional on an appropriate substation location and on NGET's agreement and planning authorisation being granted. The lack of such progress appears to demonstrate that this application is not a serious attempt at providing infrastructure for the UK; a serious proposal would have involved NGET from the start. NGET state that a substation could not be delivered until late 2031 at the earliest; the Applicant still appears to claim that it can produce power in 2029, which is obviously untrue.
- Funds for full decommissioning must be deposited, independently managed, securely out of reach of the Applicant or its successors as a condition of any DCO. The enormous expense of decommissioning nuclear power has taught us that the operators of any development with a limited life will inevitably try to dump decommissioning costs on future generations whether via national or local government, future users of the site or the descendants of local residents.
- The Applicant has still not considered the flood risk to much of the area, particular around Cumnor, which all local residents are aware of, and how this would affect a power station if built, and also how the run-off of the panels would increase the risk to local roads and residences.
- The potential of much of the central area of the proposed development to be a nationally significant SSSI should halt any application for a development of this scale - as well as the

threat to the existing SSSI of Cassington Meadows and a large area of irreplaceable ancient woodland and the effect on wildlife such as skylarks.

It pains me that I must write in opposition to such a misconceived application. I fully support our transition to renewable energy and support Stop Botley West's clear case that we need solar panels on every possible residential and industrial roof to generate power directly where it will be used; destroying agricultural land and wildlife habitat should be the lowest priority.

The Applicant's lack of diligence in the planning process - providing insufficient information and repeatedly responding late - is disrespectful to affected local residents, to the planning officers, and to the Secretary of State. To allow such a badly handled application to proceed would encourage further abuse of the planning system and on this basis alone, the Applicant should be told that any remaining patience has been exhausted.

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

Peter Lister
Cumnor