

Simon Raywood

From: Rosalind Murrell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 October 2026 19:59
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Re: EN010147 Botley West Solar Power Station

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 am a supporter of the Stop Botley West campaign and fully endorse the comprehensive SBW submission dated 15 July [C2-161]. 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 too many important decisions until after any development consent is granted when they will be beyond public scrutiny and challenge.

For instance, I am concerned that the Applicant has now reduced the default buffer offer to 100m in comparison with the 250m default buffer recommended by Examiners and previously appearing in the Applicant's 9 June submission. The latest revision by the Applicant is a significant change to its 9 June submission in which it admitted that its project would still be viable with a panel area using a 250 m buffer. The Applicant now suggests that the exact width of the buffer in particular locations can be decided post consent according to 'need'. How would this 'need' be assessed, and whose 'need', once it is taken beyond public scrutiny and challenge? It seems vanishingly unlikely that the Applicant would voluntarily increase any buffer from 100m to 250m without being required to do so, since this would obviously be detrimental to its case.

The Applicant still has not addressed a number of other outstanding issues. Particularly, the requested Landscape Character Assessment has not been undertaken, and still no Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been done, with only a token skylark compensation strategy provided which is unworkable. The Applicant has still not supplied any flood risk mitigations, despite the well evidenced responses of Cassington and Cumnor councils and their hydrology experts. The location of the National Grid Substation has still not been decided. National Grid Electricity Transmission has not submitted a planning application as yet, and still says that a connection date at the earliest would be the end of 2031. This conflicts with the Applicant's target of the end of 2029. It also contradicts the Examining Authority's requirement that the NGET's substation must have planning consent before the Applicant can start the build.

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

Rosalind Murrell