

From: Gillian Townsend [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 October 2026 15:44
To: Botley West Solar Farm
Subject: Botley West Solar Farm: EN010147

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

For the attention of The 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.

In my email submitted in July I raised several unresolved issues of concern. Despite the extension given to the applicant there remain many unresolved issues and I, therefore, support 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. 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 me this has been the case since the first public meeting where it was clear the intention is to gain maximum output and maximum control.

Key points of concern (among many):

- 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.

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

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

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.

For this final deadline it is hard to condense the current applicant position except output increases to a 935MW requirement for viability. Perhaps it is sensible for the applicant to agree to establish

a substantial fund to be held by the Council should the project fail and in anticipation of decommissioning costs.

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

Gillian Townsend

Interested Party Number: [REDACTED]