

Simon Raywood

From: ian coy [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 October 2026 21:08
To: Botley West Solar Farm; contact@stopbotleywest.com
Subject: Unresolved concerns and disappointment that the Applicant's late submissions have been accepted.

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Dear Secretary of State

Botley West Solar Farm:

Regarding unresolved concerns and disappointment that the Applicant's late submissions have been accepted.

- All organisations involved in the consideration of this project have, throughout the process, submitted detailed and well researched responses by the Examining Authority's deadlines. The Applicants are the exception. During key examination sessions (October25) a number of questions remained unanswered and this continues to be a major cause of concern in a project of this scope and size.
- The claim for a 935mw minimum size (to ensure economic viability) remains unjustified. There are many much smaller solar farms operating nearby presumably making a profit.
- A significant number of decisions yet to be made will be finalised, " after consent for development is granted", reinforcing fears of incomplete and inadequate planning at the outset.
- The National Grid Substation location remains undecided. No planning application has been submitted by NGET. How is it possible to move forward on a planning proposal without the substation, a significant part of that proposal, having planning consent.
- There is no further panel reduction to mitigate flood risk despite well-evidenced contributions by both Parish Councils and Hydrology experts. Cassington and Cumnor already have a significant problem with flooding without the addition of run off from a multitude of plastic panels.
- There is no further panel removal near London Oxford Airport although flight experts have made clear the risks for pilot safety.
- There is no decommissioning fund , or plan, in place. This was a recommendation of the Examining Authority.
- 75% of the panel area is on Green belt land and 40% is BMV land. At a time when the opportunity to import food could be significantly reduced due to world events affecting supplies it is becoming increasingly important to maintain sustainability.
- Reference the " outline Residential Visual Amenity Plan" and new Master Plan revision 5: the 250 default buffer recommended by Examiners is now 100m. There is a vague addition , " additional offsets up to 250m applied where needed", with no clear explanation of how this would be assessed. Another example of insufficient forward research and planning.
- These are by no means the only areas of significant concern. The latest submission shows few changes, despite extensions, and very real concerns remain particularly regarding the professional integrity of PVDP.

I am a supporter of the Stop Botley West campaign and fully endorse the comprehensive SBW submission of 16 July (c2-16). I also am aware of the need for alternative energy, of theright kind and in the right

place. There is enough evidence to prove that solar energy is not the most efficient and Botley West may never pay back the carbon debt it accumulates in construction and transportation and the production of over 2 million solar panels. I remain 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.

Ian Coy