

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
26 09.2026

Dear Secretary of State

Botley West Solar Farm: EN010147

I am extremely 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. It seems a never ending moving playing field, where residents are continually playing catch-up.

I am a supporter of 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.

The new submissions include an "outline Residential Visual Amenity Plan" (oRAP) [C1-108] and new Masterplan revision 5 [C1-111]. These are ambiguous and misleading as the new 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. This implies that very few buffers will be increased to anything near 250m, contradicting 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.

Following on from this the Red-line Boundary still includes 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. It can then be returned to agricultural use.

In the light of these and many other ongoing and severe shortcomings, I respectfully request the Secretary of State to refuse outright the grant of a DCO for this Application.

Mary Ann Canning

Resident of Freeland