



Botley West Solar Farm

Consultation Report Appendix 5.1.9

Section 47 Applicant Response

November 2024

PINS Ref: EN010147

Document Ref: EN010147/APP/5.1.9

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q); Planning Act 2008; and Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations

Contents

Table 1: Section 47 feedback from notable organisations.....	3
Table 2: Question 5 – Please provide comments on our updated proposals for Botley West Solar Farm	206
Table 3: Question 6 – Do you have any comments on the information presented in our PEIR.....	553
Table 4: Question 7 – Do you have any specific comments on our cable routes for the project?	890
Table 5: Question 8 – Please provide any preferences for where you would like areas for community food growing to be placed.....	970
Table 6: Question 9 – Please provide any feedback on our approach to delivering opportunities beyond solar.....	1011
Table 7: Applicant response to feedback received by email	1125
Table 8: Applicant response to Section 47 feedback to targeted consultation	1296

Table 1: Section 47 feedback from notable organisations

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock</p>	<p>Agriculture and land use</p>	<p>A case has not yet been made for occupying significant areas of best and most versatile agricultural land</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System.</p> <p>The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Community benefits	If an amended proposal is to proceed, the scheme must offer much greater community benefit than is the case at present. In part, this should come through a direct community contribution. I believe that you had suggested £50,000 per year (or a bit less than £60 per MWh based on a 840MW plant). At the meeting of WODC Development Control Committee on Monday 5 February, a figure of £5000 per MW of output per year was proposed by Sustainable Woodstock. This seems a much more appropriate level. For reference, the much	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		smaller Southill Solar scheme provides, I believe, £30,000 per year of community benefit, from an output of 4.5MW – or around £6667 per MW of output.		mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.
Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Community benefits	In addition, any output from the scheme should increase the opportunity for local residents to obtain renewable electricity. I therefore urge you to work swiftly to confirm the details of an offer of reduced price, renewably sourced energy for local residents.	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell the Project's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity – see ES Chapter 15, Table 15.25 [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Community benefits	Furthermore, I hope you will engage meaningfully with the local community to discuss how any scheme can reinforce community-led efforts to intensify the use of renewables and champion net zero.	Yes	Chapter 3 outlines the Consenting and Consultation Process [EN010147/APP/6.3], furthermore the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] provides details of the consultation process, including the Applicant's engagement community groups who are leading efforts to intensify the use of renewables and champion net zero.
Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Community Impact and consultation	Support for the objective of more solar energy production does not mean that all solar schemes should be approved without scrutiny. I therefore welcome the extensive work undertaken by a number of local community groups, parish councils and, especially, West Oxfordshire District Council (WODC) as the lead local authority, to assess the present proposals. I am	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has worked closely with host Local Planning Authorities, from the phase 1 informal consultation stage through to submission, under the auspices of a Planning Performance Agreement, and the Applicant expects to develop further the draft Statements of Common Ground, which have already been shared with the LPAs, for agreement prior to examination.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>grateful to them for their leadership.</p> <p>However, I urge you to listen carefully to the response to your consultation and to engage openly with local representatives and residents before proceeding with any revised proposal. I hope you will take the opportunity to do something in partnership with local communities that delivers real social and environmental good.</p>		<p>The Applicant is already working with a number of interested local bodies as well as the LPAs. The Applicant will work with them to deliver the Community Benefits Agreement.</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to consultation and engagement, including the consideration of feedback received, is described in the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p>
<p>Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock</p>	<p>Green Belt</p>	<p>I do, however, note that this bundle of information did not include all the information I would have expected to see. Critically, there was no justification of the very special circumstances that would</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8. [EN010147/APP/7.1.]</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>permit development in the green belt. Without making this case, there is no basis for any agreement to the scheme so I urge you to publish their grounds and invite consultation feedback on them before proceeding further with their proposals.</p>		
<p>Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock</p>	<p>Historic Environment</p>	<p>The scheme is situated too close to a scheduled monument (Samson's Platt), listed buildings and the UNESCO World Heritage Site of Blenheim Palace - there should be a greater barrier between them and any scheme.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets, including the Scheduled Monument at Sansom's Platt, is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Following on from detailed geophysical survey and evaluation, additional areas of solar installation have been omitted from the design, at Sansom's Platt and in numerous other locations across the Project. The strategic approach to archaeological trial trenching has</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>been agreed with the County Archaeologist, and the application is supported by an Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for the continued management and monitoring of the work [EN010147/APP/7.6.5].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets as a result of change within their setting is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Hydrology and flood risk	Significant portions of the scheme lie in areas subject to flood risk.	Yes	<p>From the outset, a core principle of the design has been not to develop any installation within the areas of high flood risk. This is set out in the Outline Layout and Design Principles Document [EN010147/APP/7.7] and Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Whilst the Project Site area includes land that is prone to flood risk (for example the Evenlode River flood plain) there is no solar development proposed in the highest flood risk zone (Zone 3).</p>
Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Landscape and visual	I believe there are good grounds to reduce significantly the scale of the scheme. These are well laid out in the report from WODC. Having spoken to many local residents about the matter, the key concerns are:	No	<p>This comment is noted. The NGET contract is for the export of 840MW to the NETS.</p> <p>The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock</p>	<p>Landscape and visual</p>	<p>You have not adequately justified claims of an improvement in biodiversity as a consequence of the scheme and that, on the contrary, current government guidelines provide a temporary exemption (to 2025) for National Strategic Infrastructure Projects which you may be exploiting.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The effects of the Project on biodiversity are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Landscape and visual	The sightlines of the scheme are significant and will disturb the visual amenity of a number of adjacent communities (including Bladon, Cassington, Church Hanborough, Wootton and the Rousham Gap and Woodstock) - there should be a greater barrier between them and any scheme	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed, including visual amenity fore residential receptors. [EN010147/APP/6.3] A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is in proposed and further evaluation of impacts has followed post PEIR.
Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Project description	It is very regrettable that the government has deemed that major solar schemes should be taken out of the hands of the local planning authorities for determination. Local decision-making and accountability is a core tenet of planning policy; it is critical to sustaining local	No	Noted. The Project falls to be considered under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) regime, in line with the 2008 Planning Act. The NSIP process takes account of local views, and the position of local authorities, in the decision-making process.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>consent. The councillors who were elected to represent the area are better placed to represent the views of residents than a detached planning inspector. A huge solar energy plant of this scale should only proceed with local support.</p>		
<p>Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock</p>	<p>Project description</p>	<p>I appreciate that you are free to apply directly to national government for permission, but I urge you to take seriously the feedback received through this consultation and to engage with the relevant district, parish and county councils as the local representatives of the communities affected by the scheme. Blenheim Palace and the Blenheim Estate are a major part of the local community and</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The feedback received, and the Applicant's response to this, including how it is addressed by the Project or the Applicant's evidence, is set out within the body of the DCO submission, including the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>The Consultation Report also demonstrates the Applicant's compliance with relevant legislation and guidance.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		economy. The Blenheim Trustees describe themselves as stewards of their estate and of its relationship to its local community. I hope they would also wish to be a local force for good and develop a proposal that commands local support.		
Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Project description	The core argument in favour of such a huge scheme appears to be that you have committed to National Grid that you will generate production of 840MWe. Nothing in the documents provided indicated that a scheme of this size is necessary. Undoubtedly, having as a partner the Blenheim Estate which owns such a large area of land makes it possible.	Yes	The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) including the Green Belt Case [EN010147/APP/7.1] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		However, as Merton College has demonstrated, being able to do something does not make it the right thing to do.		
Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Project description	Questions have been asked about the funding of this scheme and the incentives for those involved in its promotion. I would urge you to show maximum financial transparency in order to build trust with the local residents who will be affected by the scheme.	Yes	Information on funding can be found within the Funding Statement. [EN010147/APP/4.2.]
Calum Miller, Prospective Liberal Democrat candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Site location and alternatives	I hope that your partner, the Blenheim Estate, will become a sector-leader in the sustainability of new properties on its estate. It could begin by changing policy to put solar panels on them by default as I believe Pye Homes has not to date. I commit to work	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		with other elected representatives to improve building standards so that new properties are much more sustainable.		
Conservative Oxfordshire MPs: Robert Courts, John Howell, and Victoria Prentis (feedback submitted ahead of 2024 general election). Rupert Harrison, Prospective Conservative Parliamentary Candidate for Bicester	Agriculture and land use	Residents are concerned that your proposals would result in the loss of vast swathes of productive agricultural land. A significant area of the site has been identified as Best and Most Versatile – a classification reserved for our most fertile and productive farmland nationally	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
and Woodstock				<p>The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p> <p>In terms of EIA, the assessment is based on the impact of the entire proposal on agricultural land quality and is not therefore split within specific areas of the proposal. All of the technical ALC data is available within Volume 3 Appendix 17.1: Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Survey Report [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
Conservative Oxfordshire MPs: Robert Courts, John Howell, and Victoria Prentis (feedback submitted)	Agriculture and land use	The war in Ukraine has only reinforced the importance of a resilient domestic food supply. Residents also do not accept that a lifespan of 40 years constitutes a temporary or fully reversible development.	Yes	Noted. The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) including the Green Belt Case [EN010147/APP/7.1] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>ahead of 2024 general election). Rupert Harrison, Prospective Conservative Parliamentary Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock</p>		<p>We agree that the long-term loss of such a large area of productive agricultural land is entirely unacceptable.</p>		<p>The Applicant notes that the consent being sought is temporary and will require all panels, cables (other than those beneath highways, rivers and railway) and all associated equipment to be removed at the end of the term of the consent. The application is supported by an Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p> <p>The Project will retain agricultural use in the form of conservation grazing throughout much of the site, and areas of up to 30ha are also being offered to local food growing groups.</p>
<p>Conservative Oxfordshire MPs: Robert Courts, John Howell, and Victoria Prentis</p>	<p>Community benefits</p>	<p>It is also felt strongly that the Community Benefit Funding of £50,000 per annum currently proposed – should your scheme ultimately be approved – is woefully inadequate for a</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>(feedback submitted ahead of 2024 general election). Rupert Harrison, Prospective Conservative Parliamentary Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock</p>		<p>development of this scale. This will scarcely ameliorate the detrimental impact of these proposals for local communities. We believe any funding must go further, and be delivered more widely, to ensure the benefit is proportionate to the negative impact residents are expected to endure.</p> <p>Community groups argue that a starting point for discussion should instead be £3 million.</p>		<p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Conservative Oxfordshire MPs: Robert Courts, John Howell, and Victoria Prentis (feedback submitted ahead of 2024 general election). Rupert Harrison, Prospective Conservative Parliamentary Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock</p>	<p>Consultation process</p>	<p>Residents feel that this consultation has failed to provide sufficient, objective information to justify the plans.</p> <p>We are aware that several villages affected have not received any communication from your company regarding the consultation, and those who have believe the information provided was inadequate. This has led to residents feeling misled, fostering further distrust among the community.</p> <p>As this process moves forward, we implore you to provide the appropriate level of detail and objectivity required to listen to and address the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1]. To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		concerns that residents rightly have.		This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Conservative Oxfordshire MPs: Robert Courts, John Howell, and Victoria Prentis (feedback submitted ahead of 2024 general election). Rupert Harrison, Prospective Conservative Parliamentary Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock</p>	<p>DCO process</p>	<p>Your amalgamation of three distinct, clearly separated sites as one vast development ensures that they are considered as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. This in itself has caused considerable anxiety, as our District Councils will play less of a role in the determination of the scheme. We believe residents are right to be concerned that your proposals will escape an important level of local scrutiny as a result.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Each of the three Site Areas comprise key parts of the same Project as they will be under common ownership and are functionally interdependent.</p> <p>For example, the Northern Site Area and Central Site Area contain the larger areas of solar installation area, whilst the Southern Site Area facilitates the main Project substation and connection into the National Grid network.</p> <p>A DCO is required for the Project as it falls within the definition and thresholds for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under sections 14(1) and 15 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008).</p> <p>This is because it consists of a generating station with a gross electrical output capacity exceeding 50MW. Section 103 of the Planning Act 2008 then confirms that the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>Secretary of State has the function of deciding an application for an order granting development consent.</p> <p>However, each of the District Councils will have the opportunity to engage during Examination and the draft DCO [EN010147/APP/3.1] also provides that the responsibility for the discharge of many requirements falls with the relevant planning authority (or relevant planning authorities). This ensures that final plans for the Project will be subject to a local approvals process.</p>
<p>Conservative Oxfordshire MPs: Robert Courts, John Howell, and Victoria Prentis (feedback submitted ahead of</p>	<p>Green Belt</p>	<p>It cannot be overlooked that roughly three quarters of the development is located within the Oxford Green Belt.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8. [EN010147/APP/7.1]</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
2024 general election). Rupert Harrison, Prospective Conservative Parliamentary Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock				
Conservative Oxfordshire MPs: Robert Courts, John Howell, and Victoria Prentis (feedback submitted ahead of 2024 general election). Rupert Harrison, Prospective	Historic Environment	Each of the three sites are located in proximity to sensitive receptors. These include the Blenheim World Heritage Site, multiple Conservation Areas, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Ancient Woodlands and Public Rights of Way.	Yes	The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets as a result of change within their setting is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Conservative Parliamentary Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock				An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
Conservative Oxfordshire MPs: Robert Courts, John Howell, and Victoria Prentis (feedback submitted ahead of 2024 general election). Rupert Harrison, Prospective Conservative Parliamentary	Landscape and visual	The proposals would further have a significant impact on the character of some of Oxfordshire's most iconic, rolling countryside.	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
y Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock				Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4]
Conservative Oxfordshire MPs: Robert Courts, John Howell, and Victoria Prentis (feedback submitted ahead of 2024 general election). Rupert Harrison, Prospective Conservative Parliamentary Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock	Landscape and visual	It is clear that your proposals are not sensitively located and would cause unacceptable harm to the surrounding area.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>Following publication of the PEIR for consultation, further work has been undertaken to alter and reduce areas of installation to mitigate for impacts on known areas of archaeological sensitivity, and additional landscape proposed to mitigate for visual impacts.</p> <p>Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] provides additional details in terms of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				changes to the Project since the PEIR.
<p>Conservative Oxfordshire MPs: Robert Courts, John Howell, and Victoria Prentis (feedback submitted ahead of 2024 general election). Rupert Harrison, Prospective Conservative Parliamentary Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock</p>	<p>Project description</p>	<p>We cannot support your proposals in their current form and we urge you to reconsider. Given the strength of feeling this development has generated locally, we could only support a radically different approach.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Conservative Oxfordshire MPs: Robert Courts, John Howell, and Victoria Prentis (feedback submitted ahead of 2024 general election). Rupert Harrison, Prospective Conservative Parliamentary Candidate for Bicester and Woodstock</p>	<p>Site location and alternatives</p>	<p>We firmly believe that its deployment should be focused on rooftops, commercial and brownfield sites wherever possible.</p> <p>Any greenfield developments should be proportionate and sensitively located. Given this development would, if approved, be the largest solar farm in Europe, we do not think it comes close to meeting these criteria.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The development pressures in the region are a key driver for renewable energy generation to meet existing and future needs.</p> <p>Solar panels on roofs, or on suitable brownfield sites, are an important contributor, as recognised in the Government's British Energy Strategy, but will not in their own right provide sufficient energy generation, even if they can be connected to the grid or provide a local 'private wire' connection to a local offtaker.</p> <p>The target for solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet targets.</p> <p>The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Agriculture and land use	Much of the environmental impact of this proposal will only be able to be judged with the full BNG assessment and Environment Statements which are not yet available.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on biodiversity are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3]. It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG.</p> <p>Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p>
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Agriculture and land use	The loss of productive agricultural and cereal-growing land is a major source of concern. However, it is highly likely that if schemes such as this are rejected, the land will in time be turned over to the production of biofuel, with enormous social and environmental impacts.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation grazing, as set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				The Project also includes offering up to 30ha to local food growing groups.
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Agriculture and land use	As part of the scheme, areas of highest quality Grade 3a agricultural land must be allocated for allotments, community gardens and commercial market garden businesses at low or no cost.	Y	<p>The Applicant notes that the Grade 3a land is dispersed throughout the Project Site.</p> <p>The Applicant is reviewing the most suitable areas for community food growing use in liaison with interested groups. This is not just based on soils, but also on proximity to communities and considering amenity and access.</p> <p>The management of the community growing areas will be via an Agricultural Lease.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Agriculture and land use	The scheme's developers must continue to heed the great concern locally and mitigate the losses caused by its construction on agricultural land.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land. The Project will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p> <p>The Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains an</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Outline Soil Management plan that includes measures to limit the impacts on soil resources, wherever practicable, through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management.
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Green Belt	Our position on Botley West Solar Farm is to support the principle of this application, but to insist that significant work remains to be done – notably through the Environmental Statement and BNG Assessment – to ensure the mitigations planned will effectively compensate for the effects of this development which sits entirely within the green belt in its Vale site.	Yes	<p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p> <p>The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8. [EN010147/APP/7.1.]</p> <p>Mitigation measures are presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule. [EN010147/APP/6.5.]</p>
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Green Belt	The scheme's developers must continue to heed the great concern locally and mitigate the losses caused by its construction on green belt.	Yes	<p>The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8. [EN010147/APP/7.1.]</p> <p>Mitigation measures are presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule. [EN010147/APP/6.5.]
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Human health	The potential for chemical pollution into surface and ground water from the ongoing use of cleaning products at such a scale needs to be accounted for.	Yes	<p>The Applicant does not propose to use cleaning solvents or chemicals to clean PV panels.</p> <p>As detailed in Appendix 16.1: Human health consultation and engagement of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5.], pollution of surface and ground water has been scoped out of the health assessment, due to best practice measures (e.g. related to spill avoidance) being implemented using appropriate management plans.</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice indicates measure for pollution control in relation to the construction stage [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Landscape and visual	In general, buffer zones should be a minimum of 15m around all woodland, and should exceed this Natural England guidance around SSSIs, locally important wildlife sites, ancient woodland, the Thames and other watercourses.	Yes	A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is in place and a minimum 15m from ancient woodland in accordance with guidance and 5m from existing hedgerows.
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Landscape and visual	Landscape and visual impact assessments need to be undertaken for all of the land parcels under consideration, particularly where effects nearby have been acknowledged to be significant.	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p>
<p>Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council</p>	<p>Landscape and visual</p>	<p>As a demonstration of good faith, the applicant should be working towards meeting the policies contained in the new Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire Joint Local Plan currently in development, including tranquillity and dark skies. The new JLP will set a significantly higher bar for planning proposals, and we would expect the applicant to actively contact Vale planning officers to seek their advice while the JLP is in draft form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The relevant adopted and emerging policies of the various local Development Plans are considered within each Chapter of the ES, and are also weighed within the planning balance set out in the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Applicant has been in active liaison with the four host authorities throughout the pre-application period, and the emerging South and Vale JLP is considered within the PSS.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Landscape and visual	The scheme's developers must continue to heed the great concern locally at the scheme's enormous scale.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4]</p>
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Local ecology	It is vital that the developers of this scheme prioritise showing in detail how they will minimise the impact of this scheme on existing ecological sites, habitats and landscape	Yes	The impacts to interest species are assessed and the approach to mitigation outlined in the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		features through well considered and substantial buffer zones, appropriate native tree planting, wild corridors and natural flood management. We anticipate more of this information being in the Environmental Assessment.		Habitat creation and enhancement will implemented and managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Local ecology	In the Vale portion of the proposals, the scheme must link up rather than further isolate important areas of woodland and wildlife habitat between the Thames, Farmoor reservoir and Cumnor.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Through the Project, it is the intention for a number of new woodland, hedgerows, trees and meadow grasslands to support the provision of connectivity to these areas.
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Local ecology	The applicant needs to pay more attention to ensuring the substation does not form a barrier between the reservoir and other wildlife habitat.	No	Noted. Whether the NGET substation is within the Project site, or on land directly adjoining, the Applicant has given careful attention to the connectivity of habitats.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Local ecology	We consider that the mitigation and enhancement areas identified to the west and north of the substation area are not sufficient in the current plans.	Yes	The updated approach to mitigation is outlined in the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Local ecology	The proposals for solar arrays that range from 1.8 to 2.5m above ground level to allow sheep grazing are welcome and must be included in the final design.	Yes	Noted. The Project Description at Chapter 6 of the ES at Table 6.3 [EN010147/APP/6.3] indicates the height range will be up to 2.2m on the high edge (2.3m on sloping ground) and 0.8m on the lower edge – which is still suitable to allow for sheep grazing.
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Local ecology	We welcome the clear statement that there will be “no removal of hedgerows, woodland, waterbodies, or watercourses” and expect this to be demonstrated in practice	Yes	During Project design, subsequent to the submission of the PEIR, the need to remove small lengths of hedgerow to facilitate access was identified, in particular for visibility splays for site access, and in some locations for open trenches where the use of HDD would be unsuitable.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>Paragraph 6.4.20 in Volume 1, Chapter 6 Project Description [EN010147/APP.6.3] explains the approach in detail.</p> <p>A crossing schedule had been produced detailing planned crossing point by location, method and if applicable length of hedgerow lost [EN010147/APP/7.3.9].</p> <p>The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations. However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.</p>
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Local ecology	The applicant needs to provide evidence that proposed mitigations for e.g. loss of skylark habitat will be adequate in number and effective	Yes	<p>Skylark plots are included in the masterplan in order to provide skylarks with suitable access to additional foraging habitats throughout their breeding season.</p> <p>The provision of Skylark plots is at a ratio of more than two plots per</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>hectare. This ratio for potential lost territory is an accepted and widely used mitigation strategy for developments that will result in the loss of Skylark territories. Skylark plots also benefit other farmland bird species.</p> <p>This mitigation is set out in the Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule at Appendix 6.1 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Local ecology	We support Cumnor parish council's request for migratory birds to be considered, given Farmoor's proximity and significance.	Yes	Bird surveys have been undertaken, consideration of which is presented in Volume 3 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] (Appendix 9.9 and 9.10).
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Local ecology	The proposed 70% biodiversity net gain is an ambitious target, and evidence of how this is to be delivered in a sensitive, appropriate way that will be	Yes	It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		managed for the life of the site must be provided.		<p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Local ecology	While provision for skylarks feature prominently in current proposals, there is a whole range of wildlife to be considered with detail provided about mitigation, habitat restoration and enhancement.	Yes	Noted. The approach to mitigation outlined in the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation. A number of management plans, including the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, have been developed for the Project, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.]

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Project description	However, we feel that the scheme, if delivered well, is necessary in order to help drive the energy transition that is needed at scale, and in accordance with the PAZCO and Oxon Net Zero route maps.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Project description	We understand that the proposals will utilise a new high voltage National Grid connection to a main pylon line, enabled by the extra capacity at the recently upgraded Cowley substation. It is vital that opportunities such as this are taken where they exist, and that we do not simply assume that infrastructure to meet the energy needs of counties such as Oxfordshire can be outsourced to other communities, either within the UK or abroad.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Project description	We recognise the improvements that have been made between the first and second consultations.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Green Party Group, Vale of White Horse District Council	Project description	The developer must show how they will deliver clear financial, social, amenity and environmental benefits to local communities and surrounding area.	No	The Project benefits are presented within the chapters of the Environmental Statement, corresponding figures and appendices [EN010147/APP/6.3] , [EN010147/APP/6.4] and [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
Layla Moran, Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for Oxford West and Abingdon	Agriculture and land use	There is concern on the loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land within the Vale and the impacts this will have on future food security	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p> <p>The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]</p>
Layla Moran, Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for Oxford	Community benefits	There has been little attempt to outline what community benefits will flow through from such a scheme	Yes	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
West and Abingdon				<p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p>
Layla Moran, Liberal Democrat	Decommissioning	Residents have also questioned the reversibility of this scheme and ask	Yes	The consent being sought is temporary, not permanent and will require all panels, cables (other

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Member of Parliament for Oxford West and Abingdon		whether a 40 year life span can be considered temporary, and suggest this proposal equates to a permanent removal of Greenbelt.		<p>than those beneath highways, rivers and railway) and all associated equipment to be removed at the end of the term of the consent. The land then reverts to farmland. The land is not being removed from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] provides the Project description, and the parameters used for assessment purposes, including removal of equipment.</p> <p>The Applicant has also produced and outline Decommissioning Plan which will provide the means by which the detail can be agreed and secured [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p>
Layla Moran, Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for Oxford	Green Belt	The case for the very special circumstances needed to develop land in the Oxford Greenbelt has yet to be adequately demonstrated.	Yes	The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
West and Abingdon				included within Appendix 8. [EN010147/APP/7.1].
Layla Moran, Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for Oxford West and Abingdon	Historic Environment	Concerns have been voiced about the impact on listed and non-designated heritage assets.	Yes	<p>The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets as a result of change within their setting is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Layla Moran, Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for Oxford West and Abingdon	Historic Environment	The land in Farmoor Valley sits between several stands of ancient woodland, in proximity to the SSSI at Wytham Woods and Local Wildlife Sites, which has raised concerns about the impact on bat and bird species in the area.	Yes	The impacts of the project on bat and bird receptors are assessed and the approach to mitigation presented within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Additional bat surveys were undertaken in the summer of 2024 to tag and monitor bat species, to gain a greater understanding of their presence and movements.
Layla Moran, Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for Oxford West and Abingdon	Landscape and visual	There is significant concern that the sheer size and scale of the proposal will have significant adverse impacts on the landscape in an area that is particularly sensitive and that too little consideration has been given to the existing Landscape Character Assessments within Local and Neighbourhood Plans	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, including upon Landscape Character, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The relevant adopted and emerging policies of the various local Development Plans, including Neighbourhood Plans, are considered within each Chapter of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				the ES, and are also weighed within the planning balance set out in the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS). [EN010147/APP/7.1]
Layla Moran, Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for Oxford West and Abingdon	Landscape and visual	There are specific concerns about the interpretation of the Cumnor Parish Neighbourhood Plan : Important Views Policy and that visualisations are not complete or an accurate representation of the visual impact of the solar arrays and associated sub-station. The mitigation as it stands would not be sufficient from higher viewpoints	Yes	<p>Important Views within the Cumnor Parish Neighbourhood Plan were reviewed as part of the Project baseline and in consultation on the Representative Viewpoints. Not all Important Views were appropriate for inclusion, and so were discounted.</p> <p>A number of final Representative Viewpoints have been selected as being equivalent or as near to, from publicly accessible locations, the Important Views within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities, including Cumnor Parish. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Layla Moran, Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for Oxford West and Abingdon	The Consultation Process	I am concerned that in the Botley West Scheme, we are seeing a deficit of local democracy and I have raised this directly in Parliament. The Phase 2 consultation has been completely developer-led with the ultimate planning decision being made by central government. My concern is that in by-passing local communities in this way, critical local knowledge will be lost.	No	<p>The Project falls to be considered under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) regime, in line with the 2008 Planning Act. The NSIP process takes account of local views, and the position of local authorities, in the decision making process.</p> <p>A DCO is required for the Project as it falls within the definition and thresholds for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under sections 14(1) and 15 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008).</p> <p>This is because it consists of a generating station with a gross electrical output capacity exceeding 50MW. Section 103 of the Planning Act 2008 then confirms that the Secretary of State has the function of deciding an application for an order granting development consent.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>However, each of the District Councils will have the opportunity to engage during Examination and the draft DCO [EN010147/APP/3.1] also provides that the responsibility for the discharge of many requirements falls with the relevant planning authority (or relevant planning authorities). This ensures that final plans for the Project will be subject to a local approvals process.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
<p>Layla Moran, Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for Oxford West and Abingdon</p>	<p>The Consultation Process</p>	<p>Many residents have voiced serious concerns to me about the consultation process itself, with poorly briefed representatives at consultation events, poor visualisations of how the scheme would look and lack of engagement with villages such as Yarnton.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant's pre-application consultation is described and evidenced in the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken a series of defined phases of consultation during the pre-application period, to allow for iterative involvement, engagement and feedback throughout the development of proposals.</p> <p>This included a non-statutory phase one consultation on early-stage proposals, held for seven weeks between 03 November 2022 and 22 December 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant's strategy of undertaking an iterative consultation process has allowed for feedback to inform the development of the Project in a timely manner, including reporting back to consultees at an interim stage.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>The Applicant has actively sought and taken due regard to feedback provided by stakeholders on its approach to community consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant has complied with commitments made in its Statement of Community Consultation, which was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Consultation responses to each stage of consultation have been carefully documented and considered as part of the iterative development of the Project, with stakeholders playing a key role in the design of the proposals.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Green Belt Network	Agriculture and land use	OGBN are concerned about the adverse effect of this development on the loss of agricultural land within the site, of which the PEIR accepts that 40% would be classed as the Best and Most Versatile land. It is probable that more than 40% of the farmland to be lost would be more realistically classified as BMV, based upon its potential rather than simply its current land use.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p> <p>The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Green Belt Network	Agriculture and land use	Linked to the problem of this loss of agricultural land would be the associated loss of biodiversity since most of Oxfordshire's farmers will be engaged in ELM schemes to promote biodiversity net gain.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on biodiversity are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>
Oxford Green Belt Network	Agriculture and land use	The linking together of so many former farmers' fields with security fencing surrounding the solar panels presents a serious physical barrier to the current interconnection between sites of high biodiversity, nature	Yes	All deer fencing will be designed to be permeable to smaller mammals such as badger and fox to ensure permeability of the Project site for these species will be retained.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>conservation schemes, and species protection sites, and this is contrary to the Oxfordshire Nature Recovery Strategy promoted by the Oxfordshire local Nature Partnership, all of the District Councils in Oxfordshire, and is part of Defra's 25-year Plan.</p>		
Oxford Green Belt Network	Agriculture and land use	<p>There is no evidence of biodiversity gain resulting from the establishment of solar farms, and the case studies of sheep farming on solar farms indicate no long-term success.</p>	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on ornithology and invertebrates are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
Oxford Green Belt Network	Green Belt	The very great extent of the area of Green Belt land which would be used by the proposed solar farm of 1,400 hectares is so great that it would significantly and adversely affect the essentially rural setting of the City and University of Oxford within the Oxfordshire countryside.	Yes	The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8. [EN010147/APP/7.1.]

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Green Belt Network	Green Belt	The introduction of 2 million solar panels and the required industrial style buildings including 156 power converter stations, each up to 12m long and 3m high, six high voltage transformers each 18m long and 6 m high, and over 100km of 2m high security fencing would destroy the openness and rural character of a wide sector of the Green Belt on the north and west sides of Oxford.	Yes	The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8. [EN010147/APP/7.1.]

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Green Belt Network	Green Belt	Such loss of Green Belt land for industrial development can only be justified, even for a NSIP, if there are no alternative locations to locate that development elsewhere, whereas in this instance there are alternative locations for the generation of electric power from solar panels, so the "very special circumstances" required to justify this solar farm over such a wide geographical area of the Oxford Green Belt do not exist.	Yes	The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8 [EN010147/APP/7.1] . Alternative locations are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3]
Oxford Green Belt Network	Site location and alternatives	Since Oxfordshire's domestic and commercial roofs provide three times as much area as that, OGBN believes that the County's future solar power should come from solar panels mounted on the County's roofs, and the	No	Solar panels on roofs are an important contributor, as recognised in the Governments British Energy Strategy, but will not in their own right provide sufficient energy generation, even if they can be connected to the grid or provide a local 'private wire' connection to a local off-taker.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		priority should be investing in the appropriate infrastructure to deliver this.		The target for solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
Oxford Green Belt Network	Site location and alternatives	We respectfully ask you to consider our viewpoint which is essentially that Botley West solar farm is proposed in a location where it is wholly inappropriate because of the harm which it will cause to the delivery of other important local and national policies which are already in place to mitigate the impacts of the Climate Emergency and the Biodiversity Emergency.	Yes	<p>Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered, including whether other local and national policies are delivering the pressing need to deliver renewable energy at scale [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Local and National policies relating to climate change, and including biodiversity, are identified within Vol 3, Appendix 14.1: Climate Change Policy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Ornithological Society	Local ecology	<p>In their communications, Photovolt Development Partners have stressed the potential benefits of the project for biodiversity and local wildlife. However, it is not clear that there exists a substantial evidence base for their optimism.</p> <p>A serious concern is the dearth of objective, independent studies of the impact of photovoltaic (PV) solar farms on biodiversity, ecology and wildlife conservation. Very few studies have been performed in the UK, and none have considered PV farms of anything like the proposed scale of Botley West.</p>	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on ornithology and invertebrates are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Ornithological Society	Local ecology	<p>As far as I am aware there have been no UK studies of solar farms of size anywhere approaching that of the Botley West project.</p> <p>The second limitation is that all the fields studied were between 1 and 4 years old. To my knowledge, the longer term (perhaps multi-decade) effects of PV arrays on wildlife have not been studied in similar situations and are currently also unpredictable.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that external studies are inherently limited as such; however, the breeding bird surveys were conducted over two years (provided as Appendix 9.9) and wintering bird surveys over three years (provided as Appendix 9.10) [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The surveys were agreed with Natural England and follows current best practice methodologies.</p>
Oxford Ornithological Society	Local ecology	The proximity of parts of the Botley West Solar Farm to water bodies of significant importance to birdlife: Several waterbodies of importance to birdlife may be affected by the solar farm project, including the River	Yes	Impacts to statutory and non-statutory designated sites, waterbodies and watercourses are assessed within Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Evenlode and the Cassington gravel pits, but the one of outstanding concern is Farmoor Reservoir. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of this site		
Oxford Ornithological Society	Local ecology	The southern section of the solar farm will be located almost immediately to the south west of the Reservoir, and there is ongoing and widespread concern that large PV panel arrays can be confusing to overflying birds, possibly being mistaken for standing water and causing birds to collide with the arrays. This issue would be expected to be particularly severe for arrays located close to 'real' water bodies, especially those used as heavily by birds as	Yes	Impacts due to the 'lake effect' on ecology receptors have been considered within the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Farmoor Reservoir. To my knowledge this risk does not appear to have been recognised in the Botley West literature so far, and it is difficult to see what effective mitigation measures could be put in place to avoid it.		
Oxford Ornithological Society	Local ecology	The impact of fencing within and around the Solar Farm sites. The very large size of the Botley West project will necessarily require the erection of a large amount of fencing. Fencing is, of course, ubiquitous on farmland, but close attention should be paid to the height and design of the fencing used in this project, and its permeability to different wildlife species.	Yes	All deer fencing will be designed to be permeable to smaller mammals such as badger and fox to ensure permeability of the Project site for these species will be retained.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Ornithological Society	Local ecology	A particular concern with this project is that some substantial areas of woodland appear to be largely (such as Bladon Heath) or, in some cases (such as Burleigh Wood), completely surrounded by site boundaries that will presumably be fenced.	Yes	All deer fencing will be designed to be permeable to smaller mammals such as badger and fox to ensure permeability of the Project site for these species will be retained.
Oxford Ornithological Society	Local ecology	A major cause for concern and uncertainty is the scarcity of high-quality research on the impact of PV solar farms on ecology and wildlife. Any assertions of likely benefit (or harm) are thus based on very little firm evidence.	Yes	The studies are indeed inherently limited in such way; however, the surveys were agreed with Natural England and follows current best practice methodologies.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Ornithological Society	Local ecology	A specific concern is the possibility that the reflective surfaces of the PV panels can cause birds and bats to confuse them with open water and result in collisions, which will be particular important given the proximity of some PV sites to water bodies, including the exceptionally important bird site of Farmoor Reservoir.	Yes	Impacts due to the 'lake effect' on ecology receptors have been considered within the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Ornithological Society	Local ecology	The huge scale of the Botley West project may bring additional risks, including the effect of large amounts of fencing, but above all serves to raise the stakes much higher than when considering a more modest PV site of, say, 20 ha. Any factors, predictable or otherwise, that turn out to have a harmful effect on wildlife, operating on such a scale could have an enormous impact at the whole-county level.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on biodiversity are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Preservation Trust	Community benefits	Details of the exact schemes and their benefits are needed. They should be a condition of any consent.	Yes	<p>Mitigation measures, and Commitments being offered, are presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule. [EN010147/APP/6.5.]</p> <p>These will be tied to relevant Requirements for approval by the Local Authorities prior to commencement.</p> <p>The benefits, and harm, arising from the Project are weighed in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Preservation Trust	Decommissioning	OPT requests that conditions are placed on any consent granted to ensure that the proposed site be protected, at the end of its life span as a solar farm, from further development. It should instead be retained as valuable green space within the Oxford Green Belt.	Yes	<p>The application is supported by an Outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] and Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147.APP/7.6.3] and Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4]</p> <p>These will be subject to Requirements, associated with any DCO consent, for approval by the Local Authorities prior to commencement.</p> <p>The development is not permanent, and the land is not being removed from the Oxford Green Belt.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Preservation Trust	Historic Environment	OPT is encouraged by the proposals to protect the setting of those local heritage assets and conservation areas close to the proposed site.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Oxford Preservation Trust	Landscape and visual	The fields across the site should retain their historic field margins and hedges, with new hedging and trees introduced where needed, to shield the panels from publicly accessible viewpoints and to protect the wider rural setting, special characteristics and nature of the Oxford Green	Yes	<p>An overarching principle of the project from its inception has been to retain existing hedgerows and trees and to protect the existing network of fields. This is reflected in the Outline Layout and Design Principles document [EN010147/APP/7.7].</p> <p>During Project design, subsequent to the submission of the PEIR, the need to remove small lengths of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Belt. This should be a condition of any consent.		<p>hedgerow to facilitate access was identified, in particular for visibility splays for site access, and in some locations for open trenches where the use of HDD would be unsuitable.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.4.20 in Volume 1, Chapter 6 Project Description [EN010147/APP.6.3] explains the approach in detail.</p> <p>A crossing schedule has been produced detailing planned crossing point by location, method and if applicable length of hedgerow lost [EN010147/APP/7.3.9].</p> <p>The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations.</p> <p>However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Preservation Trust	Local ecology	The Blenheim Estate plans to manage the grassland across the proposed site in a way which will increase its biodiversity and quality of the grassland. Evidence should be provided for the viability of sheep-grazing underneath the panels, along with detailed plans for achieving a 70% Biodiversity Net Gain across the site, taking into account the construction and decommissioning elements of the proposed scheme.	Yes	<p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant has also worked closely with Savills and Blenheim Estate to review the viability of</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				conservation grazing across the site, which is being proposed.
Oxford Preservation Trust	Needs case	For this proposal OPT recognises that as a national infrastructure project, the overall capacity for solar power within the Oxfordshire area will be greatly enhanced.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The need case for the Project is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]
Oxford Preservation Trust	Project description	OPT is encouraged by the proposed mitigations, but it is clear that more detail and evidence is needed to demonstrate that they can be realised.	Yes	Updated mitigation measures are presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule. [EN010147/APP/6.5.] and will be subject to Requirements for their approval by the Local Authorities prior to commencement.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Preservation Trust	Public Rights of Way	All public footpaths and bridleways should be retained across the proposed site and should be hedged, providing a wide enough margin to ensure the best possible experience for the public using them.	Yes	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project.</p> <p>This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxford Preservation Trust	Public Rights of Way	Further details of the new footpaths and cycle paths should be clarified, their routes and locations designed to increase the experience and enjoyment for the public to enjoy access to green spaces. They should be a condition of any consent.	Yes	The Applicant is actively working with Oxfordshire County Council, including the Public Health team and the PRow officer, to advance the design and deliverability of the new permissive paths and cycle paths.
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	The Consultation Leaflet states: <i>Effects on heritage assets are considered reversible, and impacts on buried archaeological remains are deemed insignificant, ensuring the responsible progress of our Project.</i> We would challenge this assessment.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment from OAHS. The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets, including adjustments made to further recognise and accommodate archaeological features of significance that have been mapped following geophysical survey, is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The archaeological fieldwork is being

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>progressed in line with a strategy agreed with the County Archaeologist, and the application is supported by an Outline Written Scheme of Investigation, which will be tied to any consent by Requirements. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	<p>We note that you have consulted various sources including the Archaeology Data Services' Archsearch and County Historic Environment Record systems. There is a good possibility that these sources do not contain all the information concerning known remains. The Archsearch system is due to be replaced in September 2024 and it not known when the HER will contain the range of information envisaged in section 230 of the</p>	Yes	<p>The acquisition of baseline data is described within Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>This has included data sources beyond the HERs and Archsearch, such as the PAS, historic maps, aerial photographic review, LiDAR imagery and geophysical survey.</p> <p>Section 230 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 has not yet been enacted, and no timetable for enactment has been put forward by the Government.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023.		
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	<p>We note that a magnetometry survey has been carried out over much of the area. Other schemes, such as the West Oxford flood relief channel, have used other methods in addition to magnetometry. Magnetometry on this type of soil is likely to locate ditches, but less likely to locate limestone walls or burials and won't locate flint scatters.</p> <p>We understand that some 1350 hectares of magnetometry is proposed and have been able to examine the draft report by Atlas Geophysics on 470 hectares. A smaller survey of the Red House farm</p>	Yes	<p>The methodology for the geophysical survey was discussed in advance with the Archaeology Team Leader at Oxfordshire County Council.</p> <p>A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) was submitted to, and agreed with, the Archaeology Team Leader at Oxfordshire County Council prior to commencement of the survey.</p> <p>The methodology for the survey, and for reporting, is in accordance with the relevant guidance prepared by the Archaeology Team at Oxfordshire County Council.</p> <p>A separate geophysical survey was undertaken at the Red House Farm solar farm on behalf of the applicant for that proposed development,</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		area was received by Botley on 24 January, but has not been considered here.		albeit that application has currently been withdrawn.
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	<p>Our observations on the Atlas survey interim report are:-</p> <p>a) It has been carried out using equipment where several sensors are towed behind a vehicle. This is efficient but can leave a ripple in the data and small gaps between tracks which have not been surveyed. The reading density is not clearly stated, but is assumed to be 4 per square metre.</p> <p>b) The printed versions are on A4 paper with the survey plots saying they are 1:5000 at A3, (although linear scales are also</p>	Yes	The methodology for the geophysical survey was discussed in advance with the Archaeology Team Leader at Oxfordshire County Council. A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) was submitted to, and agreed with, the Archaeology Team Leader at Oxfordshire County Council prior to commencement of the survey. The methodology for the survey, and for reporting, is in accordance with the relevant guidance prepared by the Archaeology Team at Oxfordshire County Council. It is agreed that the geophysical survey has resulted in the identification of buried archaeological remains that were previously unknown. The results of the survey are presented within Volume 3, Appendix 7.3:

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>shown). This is too small to be of much use and a long way from the 1:1000 suggested in the EAC Guidelines.</p> <p>c) Many anomalies are identified as being 'ferrous points'. Whilst many might be horseshoes and similar, some of the larger ones may be tree throw holes, corn driers or hearths. Trace plots, as suggested in the EAC Guidance could help distinguish these.</p> <p>d) There is a tendency to attribute some responses as being of natural origin when 'unknown' may be more appropriate and may indicate the need for further investigation.</p> <p>e) This survey has located,</p>		<p>Geophysical Survey Report of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		probably Bronze Age, round ditches, a possible Romano-British farmstead and other remains which would have otherwise have been unknown.		
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	<p>There appears to be a conflict between the applicants who allocate a 'low to negligible sensitivity to Heritage assets with importance to local interest groups or that contribute to local research objectives'.</p> <p>This varies from the views of the County Archaeology section, although the applicants claim to have taken account of those views.</p> <p>If only National Scheduled monuments and similar are to be considered relevant,</p>	Yes	The assessment of likely impacts and effects on buried archaeological remains is presented in Section 7.9 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment [EN010147/APP/6.3] , which addresses archaeological remains of all levels of importance.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		(as this is apparently a nationally important infrastructure project), avoiding consideration of non-nationally important remains may account for the applicants swerving the usual Local Authority planning route.		
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	<p>For all the listed buildings, an assessment should be made of the effect of the proposed development on its setting – in 'normal' planning applications, consent would be refused if the development had a major deleterious affect of its setting – unless of course the 'public benefit' outweighed the harm.</p> <p>Experience of recording farm buildings has shown that even if a structure is not listed, it has potential</p>	Yes	<p>The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>This includes effects arising from changes within the settings of listed buildings (including farmhouses).</p> <p>Additional information is presented within Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES.</p> <p>No buildings (historic or otherwise) would be physically impacted by the construction, operation and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>for shedding light on datable constructional features (materials, roof structures, fittings etc) and hence past (and current) agricultural practices. It should, therefore, not be assumed that an unlisted building is of no significance in terms of the definitions used by Historic England. Regardless of their listed status, therefore, all the affected buildings should be fully recorded before the plans for the development are decided upon.</p>		<p>maintenance, or decommissioning of the Project. No historic building recording is therefore proposed.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	<p>The effects on the historic environment have been assessed by the RPS Group (a Tetra Tech company) and are set out in Chapter 7 of the project PEIR (Preliminary Environmental Information Report)</p> <p>It is clear from that document that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It seems that none of the relevant conservation officers has been consulted 2. the report does not consider Grade II listed or unlisted buildings to be of significance 3. those that compiled the report have not studied local neighbourhood plans or conservation area appraisals to identify non-designated heritage assets (and indeed have 	Yes	<p>The Project is located in land that falls within the administrative areas of three local planning authorities. Consultation with these local planning authorities has been ongoing throughout the preparation of the DCO application.</p> <p>The Conservation Officers at these local planning authorities have therefore been able to offer advice and comment as necessary, along with officers at Historic England. The methodology used for the assessment of impacts and effects on the historic environment is set out in Section 5.7 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>Grade II listed buildings are generally allocated a Medium level of value/sensitivity, whilst non-listed or locally-listed buildings are generally allocated a Low level of value/ sensitivity. This is in line with</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>considered these of such minor importance that the effects of the scheme on them can be ignored).</p>		<p>similar methodologies established by UK government agencies (e.g. National Highways). No adverse comments on the methodology and its application have been received from Historic England or Oxfordshire County Council.</p> <p>All relevant Conservation Area Appraisals and Neighbourhood Plans have been reviewed as part of the assessment. These are identified within Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] and further discussed where appropriate within Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	<p>The report states that no designated heritage assets will be directly impacted by the development. This is somewhat disingenuous. All the sites listed in Appendix 1 have farmhouses, which are probably in domestic use. The report is silent as to who owns these buildings – but while we understand two are freehold, the Blenheim Estate owns the remainder, and we believe that they are currently tenanted, perhaps by those who also lease agricultural land and farm it as an occupation. These people will presumably lose their livelihoods as a result of the development and may be compelled to leave the properties. But who is going to live in the</p>	No	<p>It is not within the remit of the Applicant to determine the future use of listed farmhouses and associated historic farm buildings, or their future viability – this is a matter for the owners and occupiers of such buildings.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>farmhouses surrounded by solar panels? It seems likely that neither farming families (who will not have anything to farm) nor people wishing to exchange town life for the countryside will be interested in living in these places. To the extent that there are historic buildings, these could be at serious risk of neglect and deterioration.</p>		
<p>Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society</p>	<p>Historic Environment</p>	<p>Overall, the general view taken by the PEIR is that there are few adverse consequences for the historic built environment. This is based on a very narrow legalistic definition of what constitutes significance and ignores context and unintended consequences. They also state that there are</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1; Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>No information is presented with regard to the potential future use of agricultural buildings adjacent to the Project Site - this is a matter for the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>'uncertainties' about the impacts and think that these can be dealt with by further efforts of mitigation if they arise. This is disingenuous and it is necessary for as full as possible an assessment be made BEFORE decisions are taken. We should ask for an assessment showing which buildings will be needed to support the limited agricultural use on the site (lambing barns etc.) and which will be redundant.</p>		<p>owners and occupiers of such buildings.</p> <p>Agricultural use on the site will not be limited – the intention, established since the PEIR stage, is to operate conservation level grazing across the majority of it, and to offer up to 30ha for community food growing groups.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that it is therefore possible that existing agricultural buildings, such as lambing sheds, will continue in their use.</p>
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	<p>The 'setting' of the WHS, listed buildings and conservation areas is usually defined in terms of visual impact measured at ground level, or, as with the Oxford view cones, from specific points in the landscape. There is scope</p>	Yes	<p>The detailed assessment of impacts and effects arising from changes within the settings of designated heritage assets is presented within Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>here for arguing that the impact has been minimised only through ground-level mitigation measures such as hedge-planting, while the viewpoints and aerial aspects of setting have been ignored.</p>		<p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] and this is to be supplemented by additional winter photography of 17 viewpoints agreed with Historic England, prior to examination. The summer photography for these views has already been captured.</p>
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	<p>This is a lot narrower than the factors potentially contributing that the historic England guidance which covers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • physical surroundings (e.g. topography, vegetation/land use, other historic features, historic character of the vicinity) that may be changed • perceptual characteristics 	Yes	<p>Where relevant, these non-visual elements of setting have been considered within the assessment presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Setting Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5], although it is noted that the Historic England guidance as set out in their Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd edition, December 2017) states that '<i>The contribution of setting to the</i></p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>(eg visual interrelationships and noise context) and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • associative factors (eg historical, artistic, traditional). <p>It might also be taken to suggest that settings cannot be affected unless there is a direct visible link – whereas it is about how historic attributes and relationships to physical surroundings are 'experienced' which can involve the experience of moving through the landscape.</p>		<p><i>significance of a heritage asset is often expressed by reference to views, a purely visual impression of an asset or place which can be static or dynamic, long, short or of lateral spread, and include a variety of views of, from, across or including that asset.'</i> (paragraph 10).</p>
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	<p>There are four Conservation Areas immediately adjacent to the proposed locations of solar panel arrays, two of which are impinged by the development. These and other CAs are rural villages, historically reliant</p>	Yes	<p>The detailed assessment of impacts and effects arising from changes within the settings of designated heritage assets is presented within Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/AP/6.5]. This includes the assessment of impacts and effects on Conservation Areas.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		on farming containing several listed buildings, including in some cases churches with towers or spires intended to be seen from the surrounding landscape.		
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Historic Environment	The focus of the mitigation measures such as new cycleways is simply on the provision of a sterile amenity in the form of a straight-line pathway through the panels. No account is taken of the possibility that people do not want to walk though acres of technology when they go for a walk or bike ride in the countryside – they want trees, agricultural land, wildlife and so on – it is a matter of connecting with the landscape, or a	Yes	<p>The full list of mitigation measures, across a range of topics, is presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule [EN010147/APP/6.5.].</p> <p>The effects of the Project upon the desire for users to use the network of paths and bridleways, and their overall recreational experience, is assessed in Chapter 16 Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>Details of typical footpaths and cycle paths, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the outline</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		spiritual experience – not simply exercise. If that's all people wanted they could do it in a gym. The open countryside is an intangible natural asset that is generally valued for its own sake, yet this has been ignored.		Landscape Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]. The overall harm and benefits of the Project are considered in the planning balance set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Community benefits	Considering the scale and ultimate profitability of the proposals, we do not consider that the bursary fund of £50,000 pa is nearly sufficient recompense for the harm to their local heritage and landscape.	Yes	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p>
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Community benefits	<p>Notwithstanding our overall view that the proposal is unacceptable, Oxfordshire Gardens Trust would like the following changes and benefits made to the scheme to mitigate impacts if the scheme goes ahead: Long term management and monitoring in a transparent way, to inform interpretation/education projects</p>	Yes	<p>The application is supported by a series of management plans, to cover the construction, operation and decommissioning stages. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>The Applicant has also proposed land suitable for an Education Area, and the full list of mitigation measures, across a range of topics, is presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule. [EN010147/APP/6.5.]</p>
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	<p>The PEIR (Volume 1 chapter 7) argues that the land take of the proposals avoid any overlap on areas of designated heritage assets and therefore has a minimal or low adverse impact on their significance .The large scale proposals are however spread across an extensive area of rural landscape which is the valued setting for Blenheim WHS and RPG and many other heritage assets, (including parks and</p>	Yes	<p>The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets as a result of change within their setting is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		gardens of local interest, listed buildings, archaeology, conservation areas) and their settings nested into this landscape. The assessment of views (PEIR non-Technical Summary) is incomplete and does not fully assess the effects in operation. Views are in one direction only but should be to and from view points on PROW and of key heritage assets including Blenheim Palace, listed buildings, archaeology, ancient woodland.		presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	The value of Historic Routes is an omission and has yet to be assessed (Akeman Street, Dornford drove road, Eynsham toll road, long distance routes-Oxford Greenbelt Way, Oxfordshire Way). Despite	Yes	The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>the available guidance the PEIR fails to adequately define, assess, and give appropriate weight to the value of setting and its contribution to the significance of designated assets and in particular the WHS and RPG as advised by policy and other national guidance.</p>		<p>assets as a result of change within their setting is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The effects of the Project on the users of long distance routes is assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES, Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	The PEIR acknowledges that as part of a compliant HIA, a full analysis including the "Impact on the Blenheim Palace WHS as a result of change within its setting" is still work in progress and recognizes the importance of the HIA process being iterative. It is also stated that there are "uncertainties" about some of the impact conclusions (particularly those concerning the WHS) but that these impacts can be dealt with by further mitigation if they arise. This is disingenuous and underlines the need for a fuller evaluation before further decisions in the NSIP process are taken.	Yes	<p>The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets as a result of change within their setting is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>This has been informed by continuing discussions with Historic England.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	The conclusions of the Preliminary Heritage Assessment in relation to the WHS and its setting are oversimplified and flawed when the heritage assessment method relies primarily on visual criteria only and ignores the sensitivity and value of the wider landscape setting and the contribution this makes to the OUV of the WHS and other designated assets.	Yes	<p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>This has been informed by feedback received at the PEIR stage and continuing discussions with Historic England, with particular regard to the OUV of the WHS.</p>
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	Potential impacts on the OUV and setting of the WHS should not be screened out at this stage and should be reconsidered in a comprehensive HIA prepared using UNESCO guidance. The large scale and wide spread of the solar farm and its	Yes	<p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>This has been informed by feedback received at the PEIR stage and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>intervisibility with the wider landscapes would severely impact on the character of a sequence of local and distinctive landscape character areas. These are interconnected with subtle transitions and form a coherent whole of high value and sensitivity. This quality is in large part a result of the presence of features and patterns in the landscape that create a time depth and historical dimension.</p>		<p>continuing discussions with Historic England, with particular regard to the OUV of the WHS.</p>
<p>Oxfordshire Gardens Trust</p>	<p>Historic Environment</p>	<p>The rating fails to reflect the high value of the landscape as a setting for designated heritage assets including the WHS and the presence of numerous undesignated heritage sites, landscape features and patterns that create a time depth and historic</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		dimension in the landscape. It also fails to take proper account of the current and cumulative development pressures and threats that are changing the character of the emerging "in between" landscapes and creating an even greater sense of sensitivity for these areas as perceived by local communities and stakeholders.		This has been informed by feedback received at the PEIR stage and continuing discussions with Historic England, with particular regard to the OUV of the WHS.
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	The PEIR acknowledges that the wider landscape including the Project Site has a role as setting for the WHS as described above and that there will apparently be "potential impacts and residual effects" on the Blenheim WHS as a result of change within its setting" (Table 7.17 Para 7.14 .1.2 of	Yes	An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This has been informed by feedback received at the PEIR stage and continuing discussions with Historic

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Volume 1 Chapter 7 Historic Environment). However, these critically important impacts on setting have not yet been defined and evaluated but will be examined in a separate HIA which " is being undertaken to review the potential for the Project to harm the significance of the WHS as a result of change within its setting." If the concept of a valuable and sensitive setting for the WHS is accepted and the large scale and wide extent of the project is imposed on this, there seems little doubt that a severe and adverse impact on the character and functions of the WHS setting would result.</p>		<p>England, with particular regard to the OUV of the WHS.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	Despite the available guidance the PEIR fails to adequately define, assess, and give appropriate weight to the value of setting and its contribution to the significance of designated assets and in particular the WHS and RPG as advised by policy and other national guidance.	Yes	<p>The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets as a result of change within their setting is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	The conclusions of the Preliminary Heritage Assessment in relation to the WHS and its setting are oversimplified and flawed when the heritage assessment method relies primarily on visual criteria and ignores the sensitivity and value of the wider landscape setting and the contribution this makes to the OUV of the WHS and other designated assets.	Yes	<p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>This has been informed by feedback received at the PEIR stage and continuing discussions with Historic England, with particular regard to the OUV of the WHS.</p>
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	The sensitivity of the landscape of the Project site is undervalued by the PEIR analysis. The rating fails to reflect the high value of the landscape as a setting for designated heritage assets including the WHS and the presence of numerous undesignated heritage sites, historic routes,	Yes	The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets, including the character of the historic landscape, is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		landscape features and patterns that create a time depth and historic dimension in the landscape.		
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	A full Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) during the early design stages of the project, as would be expected by best practice to ensure an iterative process of project development and before critical site and design decisions were made, was not undertaken.	Yes	Heritage issues were considered throughout the development of the Project design. Further information on this is provided within Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	The critically important impacts of the Project on the setting of the WHS have not yet been defined and evaluated. If the concept of a valuable and sensitive wider landscape setting for the WHS is accepted and the large	Yes	An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		scale and wide extent of the project is imposed on this, there seems little doubt that there would be a severe and adverse impact on the character and functions of the WHS setting.		This has been informed by feedback received at the PEIR stage and continuing discussions with Historic England, with particular regard to the OUV of the WHS.
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Historic Environment	Overall the PEIR initial assessment of impacts of the Project on the components of the historic environment underplays the degree of adverse impact that would occur. It also states that the refinement of the Project design will enable the magnitude of the impacts to be reduced and that the consequent level of effect would be insignificant. Once the assessment of the impact of the Project on the setting of the WHS is	Yes	<p>The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets as a result of change within their setting is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		completed this is highly unlikely to be the case.		7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This has been informed by feedback received at the PEIR stage and continuing discussions with Historic England, with particular regard to the OUV of the WHS.
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Landscape and visual	Our view is that the PEIR does not adequately assess the cumulative impact of development in this large area. Non Technical Summary 6.3 Landscape and Visual Resources: 6.3.13 'There are likely to be very few people who would experience significant visual adverse effects as a result of the Project'. 6.3.15 states 'no significant cumulative landscape or visual effects on visual	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Chapter gives consideration to the cumulative effects of other developments, and these are also summarised in Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects & Interrelationships [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		receptors have been identified as a result of the Project.' which seriously underestimates the impacts. Although other developments are listed in the PEIR (eg section 9), they are not shown on the plans. For instance the Botley West site adjoins the north east boundary of the proposed Salt Cross garden village of 2200 dwellings, meaning there will be continuous development from Eynsham to Hanborough, Bladon and beyond.		
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Landscape and visual	The LVIA is incomplete and does not seem to fully assess the effect in operation. Many would say the effects are more than 'minor adverse' . There are only 18 photomontage visualizations so far and	Yes	ES Chapter 8 [EN010147/APP/6.3] is a complete assessment. It includes an assessment of effects from 55 No. agreed Representative Viewpoints. 31 of which have been subject to photomontage at winter

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>many of the most severe impacts are not illustrated. For example, viewpoints with high visual impact and no photomontage include viewpoint 9 near Grade II* Hordley House and historic landscape; a reverse of this view looking towards the house is also needed to establish the impact on setting.</p>		<p>Year 1 and summer Year 15, in accordance with LI TGN 06/19.</p>
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Landscape and visual	<p>The PEIR considers that the 6 landscape character areas in the Project Site corridor that are affected directly by the solar farm development are judged to be only of "medium to high sensitivity" to change. The sensitivity of the landscape of the Project site is undervalued by the PEIR analysis.</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, including upon landscape character, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant notes that there will always an element of subjectivity and professional opinion exercised</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				in the LVIA process, resulting in differing opinions.
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Landscape and visual	The PEIR fails to give proper weight to the current and cumulative development pressures and threats that are changing the character of the emerging "in between" landscapes and creating an even greater sense of sensitivity for these areas as perceived by local communities and stakeholders.	Yes	<p>An updated review of relevant cumulative schemes was completed prior to submission of the ES. These schemes are considered in the individual technical chapters, and a summary is presented in Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects & Interrelationships [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 20 includes associated Figures at Appendix 20.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>These Figures are divided into three parts for ease of reference; West Oxfordshire (Fig. 20.1), Cherwell (Fig 20.2) and Vale and Oxford City (Fig 20.3). The Figure numbers have changed since the PEIR, as there is now an additional Chapter on Air Quality (Chapter 19) [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Landscape and visual	Notwithstanding our overall view that the proposal is unacceptable, Oxfordshire Gardens Trust would like the following changes and benefits made to the scheme to mitigate impacts if the scheme goes ahead: Increase buffers around WHS and other heritage assets to protect the character of the rural setting and approaches to the WHS.	Yes	An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site, including whether changes to increase buffers or remove components of the Project, is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This has been informed by feedback received at the PEIR stage and continuing discussions with Historic England, with particular regard to the OUV of the WHS.
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Landscape and visual	Notwithstanding our overall view that the proposal is unacceptable, Oxfordshire Gardens Trust would like the following changes and benefits made to the scheme to mitigate impacts if the scheme goes ahead: Reduction in the scale and	Yes	The full list of mitigation measures, across a range of topics, is presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		density of the scheme would help to reduce the impact on the landscape character and its role in setting		
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Landscape and visual	Notwithstanding our overall view that the proposal is unacceptable, Oxfordshire Gardens Trust would like the following changes and benefits made to the scheme to mitigate impacts if the scheme goes ahead: Hedgerows with occasional trees either side of wide new footpaths/cycle routes with wildflower strips (not just narrow paths between tall fences)	Yes	Details of typical footpaths and cycle paths, the planting strips and hedgerow widths, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Landscape and visual	Notwithstanding our overall view that the proposal is unacceptable, Oxfordshire Gardens Trust would like the following changes and benefits made to the	Yes	The full list of mitigation measures, across a range of topics, is presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule. [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		scheme to mitigate impacts if the scheme goes ahead: Reinforce the landscape character by adding substantial hedgerows outside new fence lines		
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Landscape and visual	Notwithstanding our overall view that the proposal is unacceptable, Oxfordshire Gardens Trust would like the following changes and benefits made to the scheme to mitigate impacts if the scheme goes ahead: Long term management and monitoring in a transparent way, to ensure that landscape benefits are delivered in the long term	Yes	The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor landscape and ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Local ecology	<p>Illustrative Masterplan Figure 2,4c, Section 9 of PEIR, Vol 3 Appendix 9.2 Both cable routes are part of the local Nature Recovery Network which includes c550 people. The Network began at Long Mead LWS which is an important ancient floodplain meadow and centre of a conservation project which has attracted national attention. Only 4 square miles of this habitat survive in the UK. The project is restoring wildflower rich floodplain meadow all along the Thames from Northmoor and into Oxford. It is essential that detailed engagement with land owners and managers is carried out before decisions are taken.</p>	Yes	<p>Long Mead Meadow has been removed from within the Project site with proposed Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) now to the east of the Swinford Crossing in order to ensure no impacts to the LWS. HDD is proposed to be used to lay underground cables under watercourses and priority habitats, including the Thames and associated floodplain meadow.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Local ecology	The fields adjoining the Thames in the southern section of northern (red) cable route have just been taken into management by the Nature Recovery Network. Work by around 50 volunteers on these fields began on 28 January 2024 and included hedgeplanting along the boundary identified as a cable route. The southern (blue) route passes through or under Long Mead and Swinford Meadow (Oxford Preservation Trust) which was also successfully enhanced using green hay from Long Mead.	Yes	Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) will be used to lay underground cables under hedgerows, woodland, watercourses and priority habitats. This will include the River Thames and associated flood meadows.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Local ecology	Section 9 of the PEIR page 25 states that at Long Mead and Swinford (farm) meadow LWS use of HDD (Horizontal Directional Drilling) means it will have no impact. Please provide details of depths and location of compounds which must be outside these meadows and method statements and risk assessments to ensure that impacts on irreplaceable habitats are avoided. This should apply to any of the meadows along the Thames.	Yes	Long Mead Meadow has been removed from within the Project site with proposed Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) now to the east of the Swinford Crossing in order to ensure no impacts to the LWS. The application is supported at Vol 3, Appendix 6.2 by a Cable Laying Methodology and Indicative HDD Crossing Locations [EN010147/APP/6.5]
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Local ecology	I am concerned that Vol 3 Appendix 9.2 Phase 1 habitat survey has so little detail and no survey of Long Mead and Swinford meadows (page 208 of section 9 Appendices 9.1 to 9.4). They are not even	Yes	Long Mead Meadow has been removed from within the Project site with the proposed Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) now to the east of the Swinford Crossing in order to ensure no impacts to the LWS.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>indicated on the habitat plans, although identified in Table 3.1 in Appendix 9.1 (desk study). Nor are they included in other surveys such as Appendix 9.9 breeding birds. There is a need detailed surveys including the main flowering time in May/June to set the baseline; and a need for close consultation with the owners of Long Mead.</p>		
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust	Local ecology	<p>Notwithstanding our overall view that the proposal is unacceptable, Oxfordshire Gardens Trust would like the following changes and benefits made to the scheme to mitigate impacts if the scheme goes ahead: Long term management and monitoring in a transparent way, to ensure that biodiversity benefits</p>	Yes	<p>The biodiversity of the site is implemented, managed and monitored under the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan is provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		are delivered in the long term		
Stop Botley West	Agriculture and land use	The proposed project would cause a substantial loss of productive agricultural land for at least 35-42 years as well as causing potential longer term damage to the productivity of the land.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>
Stop Botley West	Agriculture and land use	Until recently, PVDP and Blenheim Estate have consistently dismissed the proposed site as comprising only poor, low-grade agricultural land. This transpires not to be the case. The provisional data presented in the PEIR	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>indicates 38% of the site is Grades 1, 2 and 3a and is therefore classified as best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.</p>		<p>Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Project also intends to offer up to 30ha to local food growing groups.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stop Botley West	Agriculture and land use	<p>Stop Botley West and others asked Botley West for a breakdown of BMV land for the three sites but it was refused. However we have obtained independent estimates based on GIS studies that show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Central Site (comprising 64% if of the total land proposed for solar panels) is 45% BMV, i.e. very high and high value land. The remaining 55% is grade 3b, i.e. medium-value land. •The Northern Site (comprising 30% of the total land proposed for solar panels) is 48% BMV, i.e. very high and high value land. The remaining land is 52% grade 3b, i.e. medium-value land. •The Southern Site (comprising 6% of the total 	No	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>It is a single Project and the calculations have been undertaken accordingly.</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System.</p> <p>The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p> <p>The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>land proposed for solar panels) was not quantitatively determined but estimated to be about 25% BMV land. Taking all three sites together, about 45% of the total land proposed for solar panels is BMV, i.e. very high and high value agricultural land.</p>		<p>approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p> <p>In terms of EIA, the assessment is based on the impact of the entire Project on agricultural land quality and is not therefore split within specific areas of the Project.</p> <p>All of the technical ALC data is available within Volume 3 Appendix 17.1: Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Survey Report [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stop Botley West	Agriculture and land use	A full ALC survey is pending but it is likely the proposed project conflicts with NPPF guidance that requires developers to 'consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land'.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p> <p>The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>In terms of EIA, the assessment is based on the impact of the entire proposal on agricultural land quality and is not therefore split within specific areas of the proposal. All of the technical ALC data is available within Volume 3 Appendix 17.1: Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Survey Report [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>A large proportion of BMV is taken by the NGET substation, the location of which is limited to a position close to the existing OHL, and another proportion taken by the water retention pond incorporated into the Project as a benefit to the residents of Cassington village who experience intermittent flooding.</p>
Stop Botley West	Agriculture and land use	BMV agricultural land should be removed from the proposed project site.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land, including BMV, are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>A large proportion of BMV is taken by the NGET substation, the location of which is limited to a position close to the existing OHL, and another proportion taken by the water retention pond incorporated into the Project as a benefit to the residents of Cassington village who experience intermittent flooding.</p> <p>The majority of the Project site avoids BMV.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stop Botley West	Agriculture and land use	The proposal suggests that not all the productive agricultural land of the project site would be lost because opportunities are being considered to maintain agricultural productivity in the project area including sheep grazing and community-based agricultural production. No detail is provided on these ideas. There has been no proper assessment of their viability and no discussion with communities.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Project also intends to offer up to 30ha to local food growing groups.</p>
Stop Botley West	Community Impact	The proposed project would cause considerable disturbance to the communities surrounding the sites during the construction, operational	Yes	The Applicant has assessed relevant significant effects of the Project during all phases of the Project.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		and maintenance and decommissioning phases.		The Applicant has prepared an Outline Construction Management Plan, Outline, Operational Management Plan and Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] , [EN010147/APP/ 7.6.2] and [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .
Stop Botley West	Consultation process	<p>There is widespread dissatisfaction in the affected communities with the way the proposal has been presented for the Phase 2 Community Consultation</p> <p>The consultation documents did not provide sufficient information to allow proper consideration.</p> <p>The information was not made available in an accessible way. It was not easily interpretable and insufficient time was</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>allowed to consider the proposal and respond.</p> <p>The consultation was inadequate and should be re-done.</p>		<p>Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p>
Stop Botley West	Cumulative effects	<p>The cumulative effects of the proposed project are not properly considered in the PEIR and the consultation documents greatly underestimate the cumulative impacts.</p> <p>The cumulative effects assessment fails to take account of major developments including 19,000 houses coming forward through Local Plan allocations and the ground-mounted solar farms already allocated in</p>	Yes	<p>An updated review of relevant cumulative schemes was completed prior to submission of the Environmental Statement. These schemes are considered in the individual technical chapters, and a summary is presented in Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects & Interrelationships [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 20 includes associated Figures at Appendix 20.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>These Figures are divided into three parts for ease of reference; West Oxfordshire (Fig. 20.1), Cherwell</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Oxfordshire, totalling over 1,000 hectares.</p> <p>The map in the PEIR of other developments is limited to the immediate surroundings of the proposed project (it does not consider major developments proposed around Didcot, Harwell, Abingdon or Bicester) but nevertheless it shows the cumulation of solar and other developments would create a swathe of urbanised countryside from Wootton in the north-east almost to Cumnor in the south-west.</p> <p>The assessment of cumulative effects in the PEIR inexplicably does not consider the effects of 'within-project' cumulative</p>		<p>(Fig 20.2) and Vale and Oxford City (Fig 20.3). The Figure numbers have changed since the PEIR, as there is now an additional Chapter on Air Quality (Chapter 19).</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>impacts arising from the overwhelming scale and repetitive nature of the proposed development. Twelve times larger than the biggest existing solar farm in the UK, it would cover an area of 1300 hectares with well over 2 million solar panels, 156 power converter stations each up to 12m long and 3m high, six high voltage transformers each 18m long and 6 m high, and over 100km of 2m high security fencing.</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stop Botley West	Cumulative effects	<p>The environmental statement should provide much better consideration of the unprecedented scale of impacts of the project itself as well as the context of other changes in the area expected over the next 35-42 years. It should include a summary table showing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Amount and proportion of the Green Belt that would be taken by the project, and by other development already shown in Local Plans •Number and length of PRowS affected •Number of properties that would have a view over the project •Hectares of (separately) grades 1, 2, 3a and 3b agricultural land that would be taken in each of the 	Yes	<p>The Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) includes a consideration of operational phase noise impacts. The assessment identifies that operational phase noise will cause a minor adverse impact at receptors, which is not significant.</p> <p>As shown, there are no receptors where the noise from the project is greater than 3dB above the Background Sound Level.</p> <p>Noise from the operation of the Project is considered fully within the technical information provided in Volume 3, Appendix 13.3: Operational Phase Noise [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>three sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Number of wildlife sites of different designations affected •Number of heritage properties whose settings would be affected •Number of properties that would be affected by more than 3dB and 10dB increase in noise. 		
Stop Botley West	Green Belt	<p>The grounds for establishing the 'very special circumstances' required to justify building on the Green Belt - requested by the Inspectorate in its Scoping opinion - was a particularly serious omission in the PEIR.</p> <p>Over 76% of the proposed site is located within the City of Oxford Green Belt</p>	Yes	<p>The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8. [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>and would occupy over 3% of that Green Belt. This is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) guidance which makes clear that renewable energy projects, including solar farms are 'not appropriate development for Green Belt land.'</p> <p>Green Belt land and land in the immediate vicinity of towns and villages should be removed from the proposed project site.</p>		
Stop Botley West	Historic Environment	<p>The proposed project would have a dramatic impact on the setting of the UNESCO World Heritage Site of Blenheim Palace.</p> <p>A Heritage Impact Assessment for the WHS at Blenheim Palace is required by Historic</p>	Yes	<p>An update assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		England and UNESCO but none has so far been done.		
Stop Botley West	Historic Environment	<p>The proposed project would have a detrimental impact on numerous other important heritage assets such as the Historic England Protected Monument site of Sansom's Platt, the burial place of Sir Winston Churchill in Bladon, and many historic and listed buildings in the 15 villages and towns bordering the proposed sites.</p> <p>Immediately adjacent to the proposed sites there are also four Conservation Areas which are intended to maintain the historic character and setting of these rural communities.</p>	Yes	<p>The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets as a result of change within their setting is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Historic sites of national and international importance and their settings should be removed from the proposed project site.</p>		
<p>Stop Botley West</p>	<p>Human health</p>	<p>The proposed project would cause a significant loss of amenity and green space for healthy living, impacting the physical and mental health and wellbeing of tens of thousands of people. There is much robust evidence now to demonstrate that open green space plays a significant part in people's physical and mental health. The loss of beautiful rural landscape would have a serious impact on amenity gained from exercise,</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The concern on the issue of green space and the public rights of way network is acknowledged and is a prominent feature of the Environmental Assessments, including Volume 1: Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources; Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way; and Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010147/APP/7.6]..</p> <p>Chapter 16 specifically considers the issues of physical and mental health in the Section 16.9 assessment of the public health implications of changes to open space, leisure and play.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		walking and viewing wildlife in the open countryside.		<p>The assessment has specific regard to the amenity of people, including vulnerable groups, travelling through the Project's solar array areas.</p> <p>Informed by Volume 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, there is an analysis of the routes where there would be significant visual change.</p> <p>The role of existing and new hedgerows and other vegetative screening is considered.</p> <p>The potential for adverse effects is noted prior to new planting maturing.</p> <p>The Project is however committed to substantial mitigation to deliver planting and offset distances that reduce the visual impacts of the Project. The health assessment</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>concludes that significant adverse effects would be short term and that the maturing of screening and the provision of other enhancements on the public rights of way network, including information boards and signage would maintain the amenity of the periods of journeys passing through the array areas.</p> <p>The wider significant public health benefits of renewable energy security in the context of the climate crisis are also noted elsewhere in Chapter 16.</p> <p>Consultation responses on this issue has informed the professional judgments reached in the assessment and the design and mitigations of the Project.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stop Botley West	Human health	Heat island effects are also likely with such a large area of solar arrays in close proximity to residential areas.	No	<p>The Applicant notes concerns raised regarding the potential for solar heat island effects is noted.</p> <p>However, the scientific literature on this issue is sparse and the available evidence indicates that any effect is likely to be relatively small and geographically limited in the context relevant to this project (for example, Fthenakis and Yu 2013).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the studies that tend to identify solar heat island effects tend to be from arid or desert contexts (Barron-Gafford et al 2016), with the greatest temperature variations being at night and within the array areas.</p> <p>Recent studies show solar farms may have a cooling effect (Xu et al., 2024). The role of vegetation within the Project, including the planting of trees and hedgerows is likely to</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>contribute to cooling and shade for those passing through array areas.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider there to be the potential for a likely significant population health effect on this issue and as such it has not been scoped into the Environmental Assessment.</p>
Stop Botley West	Hydrology and flood risk	The proposed project could increase the risk of surface water flooding, affecting hundreds if not thousands of homes. It could also affect the flood-prone city of Oxford a few miles downstream.	Yes	<p>Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The approach concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stop Botley West	Hydrology and flood risk	The consultation documents provide minimal and incomplete information on proposed mitigation measures, particularly for the soil compression that would result from vehicle movements, earthworks and the extensive driving of foundations for solar arrays into the land which is a major contributor to flood risk. These works are also likely to damage existing field underdrainage.	Yes	<p>The potential impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The chapter concludes that during construction, operation and decommissioning the impact would be negligible in consideration of the set out mitigation measures.</p> <p>An Outline Code of Construction Practice (oCoCP) [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] has been prepared to be secured as DCO requirement. A detailed CoCP would be developed in line with the oCoCP and agreed with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>An outline Operational Management Plan (oOMP) is also provided as part of application for development consent [EN010147/APP/7.6.2]. Detailed OMP's would be developed</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>in line with the oOMP and agreed with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>An outline Decommissioning Plan is provided as part of application for development consent [EN010147/APP/7.6.4]. A detailed Decommissioning Plan would be developed in line with the Outline Decommissioning Plan and agreed with relevant stakeholders.</p>
Stop Botley West	Hydrology and flood risk	The environmental statement should include a comprehensive flood risk assessment and a comprehensive land and water management and monitoring plan for the operational phase.	Yes	<p>A FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The approach concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stop Botley West	Landscape and visual	<p>The proposed project would dramatically transform the landscape of a substantial area of rural Oxfordshire adjacent to the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). It would significantly change several Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (OWLS) district landscape types.</p> <p>The landscape does not have the capacity to accommodate a solar farm of this scale. The proposed project would result in unacceptable long term, severe landscape and visual impacts that would be incapable of effective mitigation.</p> <p>The project would turn this into a semi-industrialised</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4]</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		landscape of solar arrays on a scale that is unprecedented in the UK.		Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.
Stop Botley West	Landscape and visual	<p>The 'Zone of Theoretical Visibility' (ZTV) map in the PEIR shows the project would be visible over a very large area. It would be visible from the Cotswolds AONB.</p> <p>The mitigation types proposed would not effectively screen the solar arrays and other infrastructure of the solar farm.</p>	Yes	<p>The Project would be visible from a very small part of the Cotswolds National Landscape. It is considered that there would not be a significant visual effect upon and there would be no direct landscape characterising effect upon any part of the Cotswolds National Landscape.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stop Botley West	Landscape and visual	<p>The proposed solar farm would be unprecedented in terms of its proximity to human habitation.</p> <p>Consultation leaflets were sent to 22,000 households within 2km of the site, indicating the number of people who would be impacted.</p>	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Stop Botley West	Landscape and visual	The solar arrays would be visible from hundreds, if not thousands, of properties as well as numerous roads and footpaths	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p>
Stop Botley West	Landscape and visual	Villages adjacent to the site would be engulfed - for instance Bladon and Cassington would each have about 50% of their parish's land taken over by the project and 30% of Hanborough Parish would be covered. Some residents' homes would be	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed, including visual amenity for residential receptors. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		within 15m of the project site.		A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is proposed and further evaluation of impacts has followed post PEIR.
Stop Botley West	Landscape and visual	The environmental statement should include a full Residential Visual Amenity Assessment.	No	It is not considered that the Project will give rise to effects (Substantial adverse) which would trigger an RVAA in accordance with the LI guidance.
Stop Botley West	Landscape and visual	Views from many more footpaths would be of solar panels instead of agricultural fields. The mitigations proposed in the PEIR are wholly inadequate to address the impacts.	Yes	The full list of mitigation measures, across a range of topics, is presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The effects of the Project upon the desire for users to use the network of paths and bridleways, and their overall recreational experience, is assessed in Chapter 16 Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3]

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>Details of typical footpaths and cycle paths, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The overall harm and benefits of the Project are considered in the planning balance set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]</p>
Stop Botley West	Landscape and visual	<p>In order to provide an adequate understanding of the project's impact on PRow, the environmental statement should provide an overlay of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (Fig. 8.3).</p> <p>It should provide an analysis of the length of existing PRow that would be adjacent to or surrounded by the project,</p>	Yes	<p>Ordnance Survey (OS) base mapping has been used for Zone of Theoretical Visibility materials. The Applicant notes that PRow are shown OS base mapping.</p> <p>The assessment of effects is of individual Representative Viewpoints. However, it is acknowledged and noted within the LVIA that effects would be along lengths of PRow for example and not just from one location.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		and the length of PRow that would be within 100m of the project or where the project would be clearly visible.		
Stop Botley West	Local ecology	<p>The proposed project would cause significant, long-term damage to wildlife and in addition it would prevent opportunities for nature restoration.</p> <p>The wide variety of habitats leads to a rich and diverse fauna and flora, significant elements of which would be severely degraded or even lost as a result of the proposed project because many elements of the wildlife, especially birds, require farmland in rotational cropping, along with hedgerows and other</p>	Yes	<p>The impacts to interest species are assessed in the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		landscape features to thrive.		<p>ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p> <p>Skylark plots are provided within the solar arrays to help improve foraging resources for this (and other) species of bird. Habitat managed for the benefit of breeding skylark comprises large areas of meadow that will be managed specifically for birds. Details will be set out in the Farmland Bird Strategy.</p>
Stop Botley West	Local ecology	The PEIR recognises that the land hosts healthy populations of red- and amber-listed birds, bats, badgers, hares and other wildlife but the mitigation measures described in the PEIR would be wholly inadequate to compensate for the massive loss of habitat for this wildlife	Yes	<p>The impacts to interest species are assessed and the approach to mitigation outlined in the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.</p> <p>A number of management plans have been developed for the Project, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		caused by 900 hectares of solar panels, 100km of security fencing and other infrastructure.		All deer fencing will be designed to be permeable to smaller mammals such as badger and fox to ensure permeability of the Project site for these species will be retained.
Stop Botley West	Local ecology	The proposed site includes land that is part of the current Nature Recovery Network for Oxfordshire. The proposed project would prevent such nature recovery activities from reaching their full potential as well as damaging wildlife dependent on a mosaic of habitats including farmland. This opportunity cost is not considered in the PEIR.	Yes	As set out in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] , the Project has considered the aims of the Oxfordshire Nature Recovery Network and will include a diverse range of habitats. As set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] , this has led to the Project predicted to achieving over 70% habitat BNG, a significant gain over the current baseline.
Stop Botley West	Local ecology	Key information for understanding the proposed environmental mitigation plans is missing from the PEIR and should be provided in the environmental statement.	Yes	The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is provided in Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5] Appendix 9.13. A number of management plans, including the outline Landscape and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		This includes the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report and the Environmental Management Plan. The former is essential to justify the entirely unsubstantiated claim in the PEIR that the project would result in a minimum 70% BNG. The latter is required to understand the management of mitigation measures throughout the lifetime of the scheme.		Ecology Management Plan, have been developed for the Project, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.]
Stop Botley West	Noise	In the operation phase there would be disturbance from continuous maintenance as well as noise associated with operation.	Yes	The assessment includes a consideration of operational phase noise impacts, the assessment identifies that operational phase noise will cause a minor adverse impact at receptors, which is not significant. The Project will require infrequent maintenance and will not be continuous. Noise from the operation of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Project is considered fully within the technical information provided in Volume 3, Appendix 13.3: Operational Phase Noise [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
Stop Botley West	Project description	There is an urgent need for clean renewable energy including solar energy but the need for Botley West Solar Farm has not been demonstrated.	Yes	The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8. [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
Stop Botley West	Public Rights of Way	Numerous Public Rights of Way (PRoW) within the proposed project area are used by the local communities as well as visitors for exercise and leisure. Figure 17.5 suggests that several dozen footpaths would change from traversing agricultural fields to traversing a solar farm.	Yes	The effects of the Project upon the desire for users to use the network of paths and bridleways, and their overall recreational experience, is assessed in Chapter 16 Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Details of typical footpaths and cycle paths, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Panels would be mounted up to 2.5 metres high so footpath views could be of the underside of the solar panels.</p> <p>The consultation documents say PRoW would be retained or even increased but make the baffling assumption that a walk through a solar farm is equivalent to a walk through farmland. The PEIR assumes people would continue using the footpaths within the solar farm for exercise and recreation but it is more likely they would instead drive to real countryside (thus increasing traffic and emissions) or stop walking altogether.</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>As a result of the proposed project, many footpaths would in effect become corridors through fenced-in solar arrays, power converter stations and high voltage transformers.</p>		
Stop Botley West	Site location and alternatives	<p>Together with locations such as brownfield sites and roofed carparks, there are viable alternatives for accommodating Oxfordshire's solar power that are not considered in the consultation documents.</p> <p>The consultation documents do not give due consideration to alternative locations for a utility-scale solar farm like Botley West. The choice of location appears to have been led by land availability and proximity to a grid</p>	No	<p>The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The development pressures in the region are a key driver for renewable energy generation to meet existing and future needs.</p> <p>Solar panels on roofs, or on suitable brownfield sites, are an important contributor, as recognised in the Government's British Energy Strategy, but will not in their own right provide sufficient energy generation, even if they can be connected to the grid or provide a</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>connection rather than by a comprehensive assessment of the environment to ensure the project is in an appropriate place.</p>		<p>local 'private wire' connection to a local offtaker.</p> <p>The target for solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet targets.</p>
<p>Stop Botley West</p>	<p>Site location and alternatives</p>	<p>The availability of the connection to a new National Grid Electricity Transmission system via a new substation to be constructed by the National Grid west of Botley appears far from settled.</p> <p>Key information on the new substation and other new infrastructure on which Botley West Solar Farm would depend is not available and applications have not been made for the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Project will connect to the National Grid, via a new 400kV National Grid substation, to be located close to the existing National Grid 400kV overhead line which runs between Cowley, in Oxford, to Walham in Gloucestershire.</p> <p>Whilst, at the time of preparing the Applicant's DCO submission, a final decision has yet to be taken by NGET, it is likely that the NGET substation will be located in one of two possible locations:</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		necessary planning permissions.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On land within the Order Limits at the Southern Site, south of Farmoor reservoir; or 2. On land near and to the west of the Applicant's Southern site, south of Farmoor reservoir. <p>For assessment purposes the Applicant assumes that the NGET substation will be within the Site as described in Option 1 above, and powers will be taken to consent the substation as part of the Applicant's DCO. NGET will make an application to the Local Planning Authority under the Town and Country Planning Act for Option 2.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Stop Botley West	Site location and alternatives	<p>The consultation documents give no consideration to options for a network of smaller-scale solar farms that could be designed to fit into the landscape. These could be more community-based in their design, ownership and benefits.</p> <p>The proposal also gives no consideration to alternative sources of renewable energy. The environmental statement should give due consideration to the various viable alternatives that are available.</p>	Yes	Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered. [EN010147/APP/6.3]
Stop Botley West	The Consultation Process	The Stop Botley West campaign believe that the public currently has not been provided with enough access or detail to engage properly in the Phase 2 consultation.	Yes	The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>We therefore request that the consultation is re-run when all the missing information is available to include a re-written more truthful and objective Community consultation leaflet, full engagement with all affected residents, more accurate information in more easily navigable files, sufficient notice to inform rural communities and appropriately advertised venues.</p> <p>The Community Consultation leaflet was distributed in an unmarked envelope during the busy pre Christmas period when some were late, some not delivered at all and many likely to have been overlooked among the</p>		<p>described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Christmas post. This leaflet is what most residents are likely to have used to inform their views yet it contained several inaccuracies, many unsubstantiated claims and little objective detail.</p>		
<p>Stop Botley West</p>	<p>The Consultation Process</p>	<p>Despite requests from SBW, WODC, CPRE Oxfordshire and Robert Courts MP to delay the consultation until after Christmas, it went ahead on 30 Nov with 4 in-person events in mid-December. The disparity in attendance figures before/after Christmas demonstrates the importance of this request.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a comprehensive pre-application consultation on the Project, which is described and evidenced in a Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to consultation has been informed by and complied with the requirements of the 2008 Act, and associated guidance and legislation. The Applicant's strategy of coordinating consultation activities across the Project has resulted in a high level of engagement and consultation responses, as described in the Consultation Report.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>The Applicant purposely carried out the Section 42 consultation and phase two Section 47 consultation in parallel to enable consultation on the PEIR with Section 42 consultees and the community. A consultation period of 70 days was provided for responses to the PEIR and phase two consultation information, exceeding the statutory requirement of 28 days.</p> <p>The ten week consultation period exceeded the minimum eight week consultation period originally suggested in the draft SoCC. The Applicant increased the consultation period to account for the festive period overlapping with the consultation period. Accordingly, no public information events were held 10 days prior to Christmas Day or 10 days following New Year's Day. The Applicant considered the period of 10 weeks to be sufficient time to</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>engage with the consultation materials provided.</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p> <p>The Applicant is grateful to all residents, consultees and interested parties that have taken the time to engage with and respond to the consultation activities undertaken.</p>
Stop Botley West	The Consultation Process	Inappropriate venues and unsuitable times of consultations meant that	No	The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>many residents were unable to attend due to work commitments, transport and parking difficulties.</p>		<p>Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>The Applicant recorded over 1,000 public attendees across the series of public information events held during their phase two (statutory) consultation.</p>
<p>Stop Botley West</p>	<p>The Consultation Process</p>	<p>The statutory minimum notice was applied to this consultation disregarding the exceptional size of the proposal and the large number (15+) of rural communities who needed to be informed.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The ten week consultation period exceeded the minimum eight week consultation period originally suggested in the draft SoCC. The Applicant increased the consultation period to account for the festive period overlapping with the consultation period. Accordingly, no public information events were held 10 days prior to Christmas Day or 10 days following New Year's Day. The Applicant considered the period</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>of 10 weeks to be sufficient time to engage with the consultation materials provided.</p> <p>The consultation was publicised two weeks in advance through the publication of the SoCC on 16 November 2023.</p>
Stop Botley West	The Consultation Process	Whilst recognising that the PEIR is preliminary, nevertheless significant key information was completely missing so could not be consulted on.	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant considered the PEIR to be appropriate for consultation in line with legislation, guidance and good practice.</p> <p>The Applicant purposely carried out the Section 42 consultation and phase two Section 47 consultation in parallel to enable consultation on the PEIR with Section 42 consultees and the community.</p>
Stop Botley West	Traffic and Transport	Detailed traffic and construction management plans are not provided in the consultation documents which means it is impossible to assess the	Yes	<p>A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3). An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (EN010147/APP/7.6.2) has been</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>impact. However, given the construction would take two years, involving numerous traffic movements, pile driving of foundations for the solar arrays to depths of up to 2.5m, earthworks and other infrastructure, disturbance to tens of thousands of people in the local communities could be high.</p>		<p>prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.</p>
Sustainable Woodstock	Agriculture and land use	<p>Tenant Farmers. We would like to know if tenant farmers who have lost land as a result of the proposal are being supported in the short, medium and longer-term.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant has worked collaboratively with Project landowners and their respective interests throughout the development of the Project. The Applicant is committed to continued engagement in this way.</p>
Sustainable Woodstock	Climate change and energy need	<p>Sustainable Woodstock supports the application from PVDP for Botley West Solar Farm in principle. We acknowledge it because we understand the scale of the climate emergency and</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>recognise the need for urgent and largescale action and transition to the generation of clean and renewable energy. We believe this development is necessary.</p> <p>Projects such as this are urgently required to combat global warming alongside of nature recovery. As a result of insufficient urgent action in the last decade or so, and until other technologies have advanced sufficiently, solar installation is recognised as a correct choice of clean energy solutions to rapidly, and cost effectively, reduce our dependence on fossil fuels.</p> <p>This could be an excellent opportunity for PVDP and</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>the main landowner (Blenheim Estates) to show what can be achieved when building a solar development of this size.</p> <p>Considering Oxfordshire County Council's report that Oxfordshire needs 3 more such solar developments then hopefully BWSF can be held up as an excellent example of the standards required. If the bar is set high from the beginning, then surely communities and nature will benefit. It may also lead to increased acceptance of these much-needed projects in the future.</p>		
Sustainable Woodstock	Community benefits	The impact on homes nearby should be lessened.	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed, including visual amenity for residential receptors. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is proposed and further evaluation of impacts has followed post PEIR.</p>
Sustainable Woodstock	Community benefits	<p>An appropriate and proper fund, carefully managed and delivered could have a great positive impact on local people.</p> <p>PVDP will rightly deliver rewards to their investors but there should be appropriate, just, and fair community benefits for the duration of the project. This is a very large solar development that impacts many local communities</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>and the developer and landowner should understand and appreciate that it deserves a more significant level of community benefit. The community benefit package offered by PVDP is wholly inadequate and demonstrated when comparisons are made with similar UK projects.</p> <p>The community benefit package being offered by PVDP is wholly inadequate. £50,000 community funding being offered represents about 1 hour of revenue generated on a single sunny day in July.</p> <p>Related to the circumstances listed below, we think that the amount of</p>		<p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO. Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>£5,000 per MW of renewable energy developed would be appropriate; we would expect the range to be up to £4.2m per year. Whatever sum is agreed, it must be index linked or otherwise linked to the revenues of the solar farm, so that it does not lose its value over time. The reasons for a higher figure include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the high percentage of this project sited on green belt (72%) 2) the percentage of project on grade 1-3a agricultural land (38%) 3) the size of the project 840MW 4) the land is adjacent to a UNESCO World Heritage Site 5) the impact on the local 		<p>would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant's intention is to establish a new retail electricity company and for that company to offer Project electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone could be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>amenity - as the solar farm surrounds local green spaces.</p> <p>Legacy – The agreement must be protected and passed on if the developer sells the farm to another company to run and remains index-linked.</p>		
Sustainable Woodstock	Community benefits	<p>We welcome the recognition of the need for land for local community food production including the provision of land for food production. We support both Cherwell Collective and Cutteslowe Community Larder.</p> <p>Ground/Soil should be augmented/improved for use.</p> <p>Explore the possibility of community allotments.</p>	Yes	<p>The Project intends to offer up to 30ha to local food growing groups.</p> <p>Access to this land for Cherwell Collective and Cutteslowe Community Larder will significantly increase the volume of fresh fruit and vegetables they have available to distribute to those suffering from food insecurity.</p> <p>The Applicant is receptive to approaches from members of the community who wish to grow food on any scale on the areas of the site set aside for community growing.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>Education: A new facility - creating a facility that would be beneficial to all communities, visitors and trainees. A learning/training/visitor centre that can be used by schools, colleges, public, for training, etc., to promote the values of climate change resilience, sustainability and renewable energy generation.</p>		<p>The Applicant has also proposed land suitable for an Education Area, and the full list of mitigation measures, across a range of topics, is presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule. [EN010147/APP/6.5.]</p>
Sustainable Woodstock	Community benefits	<p>We support the suggestion that you are "Exploring Community Energy Opportunities".</p> <p>We welcome that you state that you are "are actively exploring potential mechanisms through which the project could directly</p>	Yes	<p>Once consented, the Applicant's intention is to establish a new retail electricity company and for that company to offer Project electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone could be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>supply electricity locally at a discounted rate."</p> <p>Whatever sum is agreed for the reduction of energy bills, it must be index linked or otherwise linked to the revenues of the solar farm, so that it does not lose its value over time.</p> <p>We would support and would like to see more details, and keen to find out how this might work in practice.</p> <p>If the developer is to supply local communities with electricity this must be done at cost (no profit) for the developer to make it a true benefit to the community. It cannot be regarded as a benefit if the developer is making money from it. It should also be</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>offered in a way that is flexible and easy to understand for the local communities, for example some companies offer different tariffs at night when wind generated electricity is in surplus.</p>		
Sustainable Woodstock	Community benefits	<p>We understand the developer has ruled out the opportunity to explore any form of community ownership. We understand that the technical and financial requirements of this proposal would make it very difficult either to split the site or the investment.</p> <p>However, it is mentioned often by community members and an opportunity that would be very much valued. We would ask, therefore, that the developer explore</p>	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		options with us to see if there is any that could fit the bill. Low Carbon Hub have considered ways in which this may be implemented and may be found soon on their website.		
Sustainable Woodstock	Decommissioning	We welcome a dedicated reserve to cover decommissioning costs and that the land will return to its original use, and not become brownfield land.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] provides the Project description, and the parameters used for assessment purposes, including removal of equipment.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the consent being sought is temporary and will require all panels, cables (other than those beneath highways, rivers and railway) and all associated equipment to be removed at the end of the term of the consent. The application is supported by an Outline</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p> <p>The Project will retain agricultural use in the form of conservation grazing throughout much of the site, and areas of up to 30ha are also being offered to local food growing groups.</p>
Sustainable Woodstock	Landscape and visual	<p>The mitigation measures suggested in the consultation for landscape and visual impact with larger buffer zones and ecological development are very welcome but there should be a firm commitment rather than simply an 'exploration' of these elements as noted in the consultation.</p> <p>Given the farmland, the local communities and rural setting we think a</p>	N	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed, including visual amenity for residential receptors. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is proposed and further evaluation of impacts has followed post PEIR.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>commitment with regards the impact on the visual and local resource is a necessity.</p> <p>Buffer zones - Specification unclear. Increasing buffer zone - Agree with WODC comments that: some buffers such as in Cassington and Bladon, the zones should be much greater dependent on the lie of the land.</p> <p>It is important to specify the minimum buffer zone for residential homes : Minimum 50m or much greater in some areas such as Cassington, depending on the lie of the land.</p> <p>You note that buffer zone is increased "between solar arrays and any building" .</p>		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		We think this zone should be at least 50m		
Sustainable Woodstock	Landscape and visual	We welcome that there would be no permanent operation of security lighting but there will be infrared sensors.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Lighting will be installed but only within limited areas of the development, generally around the high voltage infrastructure for safety and security. No lights will be permanently switched on.
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	Mitigation measures should also include a much more ambitious commitment to biodiversity gains than that stated in the consultation document.	Yes	It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p> <p>BNG for the Project has been agreed with Natural England during pre-submission discussions with the Applicant.</p>
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	We also welcome your commitment to work with landowners and relevant stakeholders to explore how particular features of your proposals – such as planting, landscaping, and permissive access – could provide continued benefits by remaining in place beyond the life of the solar farm.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		We strongly support Blenheim Estate becoming the environmental steward for the site for the duration of BWSF. This would provide a simple and direct route for feedback regarding BWSF for local residents.		
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	We would like PVDP to make a clear commitment and not simply write that you have been "exploring the potential" for mitigation.	Yes	The approach to mitigation is presented within the ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP.6.3] including details on how it will be secured by the Project. A number of management plans have been developed for the Project, provided in [EN010147/APP.6.3]
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	We'd like to see Commitment to biodiversity net gain. Studies should demonstrate the condition prior to the start of the solar farm, managed appropriately and	No	It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5].

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>monitored to maximise pollinators and aim to maximise nature recovery.</p> <p>Given the previous use of some of the land that may have been farmed intensively using fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides, the biodiversity net gain should be substantially greater than the proposed 70% (70% of very littleis very little). Conversely, we understand there may be some fields that have been fallow for years and be species-rich already - consequently data collection and analysis is important. For some areas, the target could/should be more ambitious and demonstrate to other developers that biodiversity can be an enhanced</p>		<p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		considerably. Can biodiversity be enhanced by 2-300%? The figure will be dependent on the starting point/baseline surveyed.		
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	<p>We'd like to see Commitment to habitat fragmentation and wildlife corridors. Habitat fragmentation is a major contributor to nature and biodiversity loss. This is a largescale development and wildlife corridors appear to have no mention.</p> <p>The creation of appropriately-sized wildlife corridors should be incorporated in the design to maximise nature recovery.</p> <p>We'd like to see Commitment to the</p>	No	<p>The Project provides for the inclusion of new hedgerow and buffer corridors.</p> <p>Habitat creation and enhancement will implemented and managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>This includes the planting of native species rich hedgerows along PRoW in a number of locations across the Project site. Hedgerows will be planted and managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>creation of wildlife woodland belts. Again, choices to maximise, landscaping, potential future resource and nature recovery.</p> <p>We'd like to see Commitment to planting and management of lengths of new hedgerows along lengths of PRow. Hedgerow planting should be specified and have elements for biodiversity/nature recovery. Management of hedgerows is important for nature recovery, for example, pruning on a 3year cycle, to maximise food sources/wildlife cover while still allowing good and easy access for RoW users. Pruning should be completed at a suitable</p>		<p>Wildlife corridors are included within the landscaping scheme in the form of 26.5km of new hedgerows, 22km enhanced hedgerow and woodlands 15ha of woodland. More details are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, [EN010147/APP/7.6]. How project mitigation will be secured for ecology and nature conservation is set out in Volume 1, Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>time of year so that fruits and berries are not destroyed/stripped before or during the winter food-source season.</p> <p>Reinforcement of existing field boundary hedgerows. We'd like to see Commitment. Same comments as in iv above in order to support nature recovery.</p>		
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	<p>CCTV will help with the security of solar farm (some may have personal issue with CCTV) but due to loneliness of some parts of a route with 2.1m high flanking security fencing, solutions should be considered/sought to allow for points of egress. There may be safety issues regarding long stretches of footpath enclosed with high</p>	Yes	<p>As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that changes in deer movements will be brought about by perimeter fencing.</p> <p>The effects of the Project upon the desire for users to use the network of paths and bridleways, and their overall recreational experience, is assessed in Chapter 16 Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		fencing. I believe this will deter the public from using these footpaths and rights of way. Secondly it will restrict the free roaming of larger mammals such as deer. There should be some possibility of "escape".		Details of typical footpaths and cycle paths, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	Meadow grassland to perimeter of solar array areas and areas of enhancement. We'd like to see Commitment. Should be managed appropriately and monitored to maximise pollinators and nature recovery.	Yes	Meadow grasslands are managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	Planting of individual trees where appropriate. We'd like to see Commitment. Choice of trees for wildlife and possibly future resource.	Yes	Individual trees are managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	Skylark plots and bird recovery more generally. We'd like to see Commitment. Establishing new plots between the solar arrays. Monitoring / surveying of birdlife more generally and publishing results aiming for nature recovery.	Yes	Bird-specific enhancements are implemented, managed and monitored in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	Bird and bat boxes. We'd like to see Commitment. Placing bird and bat boxes in appropriate sites on trees and monitoring, publishing results aiming to maximise nature recovery.	Yes	Bat-specific enhancements are implemented, managed and monitored in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	Bee hives. We'd like to see Commitment. Establishing bee hives on the site and managing /protecting them for the future long-term health of our bee populations and nature recovery (and honey	Yes	Beehives are implemented, managed and monitored in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		collection possibly). Advice should be sought from bee/conservation specialist such as Filipe Salbany (Blenheim Estate)		
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	Buffer zones. Minimum buffer zones should be greater and aim to maximise nature recovery for example, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Minimum 10m for hedgerows, trees, ponds and woodland, ➤ Minimum 10m buffer for watercourses ➤ Minimum 30m for ancient woodland and Weavely Furze 	Yes	The approach to mitigation is presented within the ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation. [EN010147/APP/6.3] A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is in place and a minimum 15m from ancient woodland in accordance with guidance and 5m from existing hedgerows.
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	We welcome the specified mitigation measures to minimise the effects on ecology such as:- no removal of hedgerows, woodland, waterbodies, or watercourses.	Yes	During Project design, subsequent to the submission of the PEIR, the need to remove small lengths of hedgerow to facilitate access was identified, in particular for visibility splays for site access, and in some locations for open trenches where

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>the use of HDD would be unsuitable. Paragraph 6.4.20 in Volume 1, Chapter 6 Project Description [EN010147/APP.6.3] explains the approach in detail.</p> <p>A crossing schedule had been produced detailing planned crossing point by location, method and if applicable length of hedgerow lost [EN010147/APP/7.3.9].</p> <p>The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations.</p> <p>However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	We welcome the specified mitigation measures to minimise the effects on ecology such as:- Creating a new landscape-scale corridor along the Evenlode River that maximises nature recovery. xv. Log piles. Providing log piles and other refugia maximises nature recovery.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	We welcome the specified mitigation measures to minimise the effects on ecology such as:- Log piles. Providing log piles and other refugia maximises nature recovery.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	Maximising possibilities of environmental stewardship. Specialists such as Wildlife Trust Consultancies, RSPB and others should be used/commissioned to better understand and maximise opportunities.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	Environmental stewardship - we welcome the use of studies, surveys, long-term monitoring to ensure success and failure stories are shared and knowledge gained to aid nature recovery .	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	Environmental stewardship - Education. Working with study groups such as Brookes University, University of Oxford, DEFRA and/or other appropriate bodies so that results and commitments are reported, published, shared and lessons learnt	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Sustainable Woodstock	Local ecology	Opportunities for sheep grazing are mentioned. Sharing use of the land is desirable but careful management to ensure that enhanced biodiversity is maintained and is not neglected. This would	Yes	Noted. Biodiversity Net Gain will be managed and review in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		require careful management practices to maintain nature recovery.		
Sustainable Woodstock	Noise	The number of inverters is significant ~ 156. Solutions for noise-proofing should be employed.	Yes	<p>The assessment includes a consideration of operational phase noise impacts. The assessment identifies that operational phase noise will cause a minor adverse impact at receptors, which is not significant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the PCS units are evenly distributed around the Project, and have been located and positioned to reduce any impact on receptors.</p> <p>Noise from the operation of the Project is considered fully within the technical information provided in Volume 3, Appendix 13.3: Operational Phase Noise [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Sustainable Woodstock	Project description	Sustainable Woodstock supports the application from PVDP for Botley West Solar Farm in principle.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Sustainable Woodstock	Public Rights of Way	We welcome proposals for new footpaths and cycle routes. Regarding cycle routes, we recommend that you consult with local cycling organisations, groups and the Village Travel Network.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Sustainable Woodstock	Public Rights of Way	We welcome a new footpath to connect Cassington and Church Hanborough	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Sustainable Woodstock	Public Rights of Way	We welcome upgrade of existing footpaths e.g. connecting Bladon to Campsfield.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Sustainable Woodstock	Public Rights of Way	We welcome all PRoWs are protected from disruption during construction.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Sustainable Woodstock	Public Rights of Way	<p>Improvement of the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route No 5 from Woodstock to Upper Dornford in order to create a viable and popular long distance cycle link north from Woodstock.</p> <p>Upgrading of the existing bridleway between Bladon and Begbroke to enable use for routine active travel as well as use for recreational purposes.</p> <p>Upgrading of existing bridleway between NCN Route 5 and Sturdy's Castle (A4260) to create a viable link to Tackley village.</p>	Yes	<p>The Project seeks to secure new recreational routes, including permissive paths, cycleways and Green Ways, to mitigate potential adverse effects on public health associated with changes in the use of the PRow network.</p> <p>The opportunity for other active travel routes and suggested cycle paths has been identified elsewhere within the Project, between Bladon and Campsfield and Wootton and Sansom's Farm, and the Applicant has been in liaison with OCC's highways, PRow and Public Health teams to develop illustrative sections for routes – which can be seen in Figure 7.6.3.2 [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant is actively working with Oxfordshire County Council, including the Public Health team and the PRow officer, to advance the design and deliverability of the</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>new permissive paths and cycle paths.</p> <p>Table 16.25 of Chapter 16 (Human Health) of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] provides a summary of Project impacts to PRow, including newly proposed cycle paths.</p>
Sustainable Woodstock	Socioeconomics	The proposal should be an exemplar for ethical practice to which others can aspire and follow. All activities related to this proposal from PVDP and Blenheim must consider the climate emergency, biodiversity loss, and climate justice throughout the supply chain i.e., suppliers, methods and materials. The entire supply chain must be financed ethically and with ethical working practices.	Yes	The Applicant considers the importance of sustainable finance and ethical working practices in Chapter 15 of the ES, Appendix 15.2 [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Sustainable Woodstock	Socioeconomics	In the event of the "development" being sold on we would expect subsequent owners to be required to comply with all the recommendations of this consultative response	No	The Applicant notes this comment and that requirements would be secured through a Development Consent Order.
Sustainable Woodstock	Traffic and Transport	In association with OCC as the roads and traffic authority, improvements to safety for pedestrians and cyclists crossing the A4260 at Sturdy's Castle and the B4027 at Weaveley Crossroads (junc. With Banbury Road Woodstock)	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including any mitigation and enhancement measures required, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3). An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (EN010147/APP/7.6.2) has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
The Eynsham Society	Agriculture and land use	It effectively urbanises huge swathes of agricultural land (much of it high-grade) at a time when food security is becoming ever more important.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p> <p>The Project includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].
The Eynsham Society	Cable routes	No details are provided as to how the cable carrying the generated power will cross the Thames near Swinford Bridge, though Para 6.2.1.19 of the PEIR implies ("Depth under railway and river crossings - to be determined.") that it will pass under the river, and this is an absolute requirement. This particularly scenic stretch of the Thames is much	Yes	Noted. Long Mead Meadow has been removed from within the Project site with proposed trenchless techniques now to the east of the Swinford Crossing in order to ensure no impacts to the LWS. Trenchless techniques will be used to lay underground cables under watercourses and priority habitats, including the Thames and associated floodplain meadow.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		enjoyed by recreational boaters and must not under any circumstances be marred by unsightly raised metalwork carrying the cable over it.		
The Eynsham Society	Green Belt	It would occupy about 25% of the Green Belt in West Oxfordshire and have a severe visual impact on local settlements and on the landscape in general. It effectively urbanises huge swathes of agricultural land (much of it high-grade) at a time when food security is becoming ever more important.	Yes	Information on very special circumstances is included within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) including Green Belt Case. [EN010147/APP/7.1]. Landscape and visual impact considerations are included within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
The Eynsham Society	Landscape and visual	We strongly oppose this scheme on the grounds that the scale and location are entirely inappropriate.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
The Eynsham Society	Landscape and visual	It is noteworthy that this would be the largest solar farm in Europe, and one of the largest on the planet. All other installations of comparable size are in sparsely inhabited (or even uninhabited) areas at low latitudes where sunlight is reliably available for up to 12 hours a day. At this latitude in winter, the amount of sunlight available is severely limited even when the skies are clear. This makes it necessary to design in considerable overcapacity and hence take far more land than necessary.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
The Eynsham Society	Landscape and visual	Most of the vertical display space was taken up by unconvincing visualisations of the visual impact of the vast sea of panels - all apparently at sites chosen	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>for minimal effect. A more effective visualisation would have been a 3-D map of the entire area with the panels in place.</p>		<p>mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				A 3D map would not provide the same information, or be in accordance with the LVIA guidance.
The Eynsham Society	Local ecology	We are frankly unable to believe the glib assertion that there would be a net gain in biodiversity.	Yes	<p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
The Eynsham Society	Local ecology	We are sceptical that the ground under the panels could be used effectively for wildflowers or sheep grazing, both of which require active management	Yes	Grasslands under panels will be managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		which is unlikely to persist over the lifetime of the project.		
The Eynsham Society	Project description	This is the wrong project, in the wrong place, and should not be allowed to happen.	Yes	The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
The Eynsham Society	Recreation and amenity	Local residents would derive little or no direct benefit from the massive loss of amenity. Who would want to make recreational use of a retained right of way funnelled between high fences with no countryside to look at?	No	<p>The full list of mitigation measures, across a range of topics, is presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The effects of the Project upon the desire for users to use the network of paths and bridleways, and their overall recreational experience, is assessed in Chapter 16 Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3] .</p> <p>Details of typical footpaths and cycle paths, and how they will mature over time are provided in</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				<p>Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The overall harm and benefits of the Project are considered in the planning balance set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p>
The Eynsham Society	Site location and alternatives	Hence it will still be necessary to provide baseload generation (preferably via nuclear, which is reliable, compact and safe) and on-demand gas-fired generation for times when the wind does not blow and the sun does not shine (frequently at the same time in the depths of winter when domestic demand is greatest).	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
The Eynsham Society	Site location and alternatives	A better model is to install solar panels on domestic and commercial roofs, with local small-scale battery storage to accommodate the fluctuations in supply and demand, so that only the surplus or deficit is fed into, or drawn from, the grid. This distributed approach has little visual impact and also minimises the risk of large-scale outage as could happen in the event of equipment breakdown or cable failure in an installation as vast as the one proposed. It also allows for straightforward and unobtrusive replacement of panels as the technology improves; it is likely that the efficiency of solar panels will more than double over the 40-year lifetime of the project	Yes	The development pressures in the region are also a driver for renewable energy generation to meet existing and future needs. Solar panels on roofs are an important contributor, as recognised in the Governments British Energy Strategy, but will not in their own right provide sufficient energy generation, even if they can be connected to the grid or provide a local 'private wire' connection to a local off-taker. The target for solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		and that the land take will hence be far more than necessary, even before allowing for increased use of local generation.		
The Eynsham Society	Socioeconomics	Residents are likely to see a catastrophic fall in some property values.	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it was agreed any impact would not be significant.</p>
The Eynsham Society	The Consultation Process	In consequence, the laminated detail maps were stacked on tables where they were difficult to consult. In addition, the vast amount of highly technical documentation – obviously essential for a project of this nature – was not adequately summarised for digestion by members of the public. This applies also to the	No	<p>The Applicant's SoCC set out a range of methods to support an accessible and inclusive pre-application consultation.</p> <p>In seeking input from local authorities on the approach set out in the SoCC, the Applicant shared an early working draft of the SoCC on 02 May 2023 by email, alongside a database of organisations and contact details for prescribed Section 42 consultees, and non-</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		<p>material on the project website.</p> <p>All in all, the exhibition was underwhelming and inadequate. Given the very large amount of material which has been generated in support of this proposal, and the potentially devastating impact on the landscape and local communities, there should have been public meetings at which the proposal was explained in detail and questions invited from the floor.</p>		<p>prescribed consultees including gateway organisations representing potentially seldom heard groups and other community and interest groups.</p> <p>Through consultation, the Applicant has prepared and published a range of consultation materials available in a various formats to cater for differing preferences and levels of interest and expertise. For example, this includes: a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR); a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR; Community Consultation Leaflet; and a Feedback Form.</p> <p>The Applicant also maintained a range of free-to-use communication channels (Freephone, Freepost and email) throughout the pre-application period.</p>

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				The Applicant's pre-application consultation is described in the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
The Eynsham Society	The Consultation Process	The most disappointing aspect of the consultation is that owing to the project's excessive size it is not subject to consent from local planning authorities. We therefore have no confidence whatever that views of local residents – those who stand to be most affected by this excessive scheme – will be adequately taken into	No	The Project falls to be considered under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) regime, in line with the 2008 Planning Act. The NSIP process takes account of local views, and the position of local authorities, in the decision making process.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		account when the decision is made.		

Table 2: Question 5 – Please provide comments on our updated proposals for Botley West Solar Farm

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Local Ecology			
BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0022, BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0057, BW2_OFF_0059, BW2_PFF_0004, BW2_PFF_0020, BW2_PFF_0031, BW2_OFF_0075, BW2_OFF_0078, BW2_OFF_0091, BW2_OFF_0092, BW2_OFF_0095, BW2_OFF_0102, BW2_OFF_0106, BW2_OFF_0110, BW2_OFF_0113, BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0125, BW2_PFF_0044, BW2_PFF_0045,	<p>Respondents have expressed concern about damage to the local ecology, ecosystems and biodiversity, from the construction phase to throughout the project.</p> <p>There are concerns that as the site currently has a high biodiversity value, levels will not recover, and that improvements in biodiversity claimed by the proposals will not be achieved.</p> <p>Respondents have requested that the biodiversity is preserved, mitigated and improved across the site</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The effects of the Project on ecology and nature Conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9 [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving,</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0126, BW2_OFF_0128, BW2_OFF_0143, BW2_OFF_0146, BW2_OFF_0148, BW2_OFF_0157, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0160, BW2_OFF_0161, BW2_OFF_0170, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0181, BW2_OFF_0184, BW2_OFF_0188, BW2_OFF_0191, BW2_OFF_0199, BW2_OFF_0220, BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0223, BW2_OFF_0229, BW2_OFF_0232, BW2_OFF_0233, BW2_OFF_0239, BW2_OFF_0242, BW2_OFF_0244, BW2_OFF_0245,			habitats during the operation of the Project.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0253, BW2_OFF_0255, BW2_OFF_0257, BW2_OFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0310, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0348, BW2_OFF_0353, BW2_OFF_0354, BW2_OFF_0366, BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0375, BW2_OFF_0379, BW2_OFF_0385, BW2_OFF_0386, BW2_OFF_0396, BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_OFF_0413, BW2_OFF_0414, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0426, BW2_OFF_0427,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0434, BW2_OFF_0437, BW2_OFF_0441, BW2_OFF_0448, BW2_OFF_0457, BW2_OFF_0462, BW2_OFF_0466, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_OFF_0488, BW2_OFF_0516, BW2_OFF_0529, BW2_OFF_0534, BW2_PFF_0052, BW2_PFF_0083, BW2_PFF_0085, BW2_PFF_0100, BW2_PFF_0104, BW2_PFF_0143, BW2_PFF_0149, BW2_PFF_0154, BW2_PFF_0158, BW2_PFF_0160, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0163, BW2_PFF_0164,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0168, BW2_PFF_0177, BW2_PFF_0181, BW2_PFF_0191, BW2_PFF_0193, BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0232, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0240, BW2_PFF_0245, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0261, BW2_PFF_0262, BW2_PFF_0264, BW2_PFF_0265, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0280, BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_PFF_0299, BW2_PFF_0305			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0042, BW2_OFF_0044, BW2_OFF_0061, BW2_OFF_0062, BW2_OFF_0075, BW2_OFF_0097, BW2_OFF_0123, BW2_OFF_0135, BW2_OFF_0540, BW2_PFF_0114, BW2_PFF_0128	Respondents are pleased about the 70% increase in biodiversity and find it important to protect local ecology, but believe more can be done. Respondents would like to see rewilding take place, more planting to protect insects, and more specific commitments within panel areas.	Yes	<p>The proposals are supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p> <p>Further to BNG habitat gain, the Project will be managed to increase the value of habitat to interest species and will include specific enhancements including log piles, bee hives, bat boxes and bird boxes.</p>
BW2_OFF_0424, BW2_OFF_0514, BW2_PFF_0254, BW2_OFF_0488, BW2_OFF_0511, BW2_OFF_0513, BW2_PFF_0231,	<p>Respondents have expressed that the proposed 70% biodiversity net gain does not go far enough.</p> <p>Respondents have suggested a substantially greater with a target of 200-300%.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that while BNG is not currently required for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, it is expected to become a requirement from November 2025 at 10%.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_PFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0280</p>	<p>Respondents asked how can the project create a 70% biodiversity net gain without an agreed biodiversity metric and no baseline assessment.</p> <p>Respondents would like more detail on how this 70% biodiversity net gain would be achieved.</p>		<p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p> <p>The oLEMP includes a range of habitat creation such as: Circa 100ha of new floodplain mosaic habitats along the River Evenlode Corridor, at least 26.5km of new species rich, at least</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>22km of existing hedgerow to be enhanced through additional planting, circa 15ha of new native woodland creation, wildflower grasslands to be managed for wintering and breeding birds, tussocky grasslands alongside hedgerows.</p> <p>Hedgerow buffers will be at least 5m, flood attenuation features to north of Cassington are to be managed as wetland habitats, additional mixed scrub habitats alongside hedgerows and a range of grasslands within the solar arrays are to be managed for conservation value.</p>
BW2_OFF_0233, BW2_OFF_0244, BW2_OFF_0272, BW2_OFF_0333, BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0337 BW2_OFF_0463	Respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the proposed mitigation measures, commenting that they are not commitments.	Yes	The Applicant notes that the methods for securing Project mitigation for ecology and nature conservation is set out in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_OFF_0016, BW2_OFF_0102, BW2_OFF_0427</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern about increased ground heat.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes concerns raised regarding the potential for solar heat island effects.</p> <p>However, the scientific literature on this issue is sparse and the available evidence indicates that any effect is likely to be relatively small and geographically limited in the context relevant to this project (for example, Fthenakis and Yu 2013).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the studies that tend to identify solar heat island effects tend to be from arid or desert contexts (Barron-Gafford et al 2016), with the greatest temperature variations being at night and within the array areas.</p> <p>Recent studies show solar farms may have a cooling effect (Xu et al., 2024). The role of vegetation within the Project, including the planting of trees and hedgerows is likely to contribute to cooling and shade for those passing through array areas.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The Applicant does not consider there to be the potential for a likely significant population health effect on this issue and as such it has not been scoped into the Environmental Assessment.
BW2_OFF_0023, BW2_OFF_0062	Respondents believe the proposal is better for the environment and ecology than arable farming.	Yes	Noted. It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BW2_OFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0280	Respondents commented on the stewardship of the site and the potential for this to the Blenheim Estate, with comment that an independent steward would have more credibility.	Yes	The landscape works will be monitored and assessed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0482	Respondents are concerned that Farmoor site's ecology and biodiversity are at risk due to proposed 12 foot fencing, which could harm deer and other animals.	Yes	The fencing will be for operational security purposes and may be up to 2.1 m in height (less than 7 foot). The impact of habitat severance is assessed in in Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Security fencing will be designed to be permeable to small mammals including badgers and fox.</p> <p>As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that changes in deer movements will be brought about by perimeter fencing.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0477, BW2_PFF_0231, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_PFF_0263, BW2_PFF_0266</p>	<p>Respondents requested details regarding how biodiversity net gain would be achieved, and commented on conversations at the Applicant's public information events.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The calculation of BNG is set out in The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is provided in Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5] Appendix 9.13.</p> <p>The maintenance and monitoring of landscape elements of the site is set out in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0357, BW2_PFF_0128</p>	<p>Respondent has reported that biodiversity should be monitored throughout the life of the project.</p> <p>Respondent has also expressed that biodiversity should enhance by at least 100% by year 5 from the start of construction</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that while BNG is not currently required for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, it is expected to become a requirement from November 2025 at 10%.</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0414, BW2_PFF_0186, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0184</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern regarding potential impact to ancient meadow Long Mead due to the proposed cable installation.</p> <p>It was noted that the meadow is being restored by local residents through community projects.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Long Mead Meadow has been removed from within the Project site with the works now to the north of the Swinford Crossing in order to ensure no impacts to the Local Wildlife Site near Swinford toll bridge.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0424, BW2_OFF_0514	<p>Respondents commented that the creation of wildlife corridors should be part of the design to aim to maximise nature recovery to prevent habitat fragmentation.</p> <p>Respondent added they wanted to see a commitment to a creation of woodland belts to maximise landscaping and nature recovery.</p>	Yes	Wildlife corridors are included within the landscaping scheme in the form of 26.5km of new hedgerows, 22km enhanced hedgerow and woodlands 15ha of woodland. More details are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, [EN010147/APP/7.6] . How project mitigation will be secured for ecology and nature conservation is set out in Volume 1, Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0218, BW2_PFF_0287	Respondents state that the protection of green belt is clear government policy.	Yes	The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8 [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_OFF_0039	Respondent expressed support for the mitigation measures for impact on biodiversity, including the following: livestock grazing, planting of native plant.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0020	Respondent expressed concern about the potential of the battery at Cumnor catching fire or leaking, which would cause an environmental disaster.	No	The Project does not include any battery storage.
BW2_OFF_0069	Respondent would like the Applicant to support more environmental causes in Oxfordshire.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant proposes to deliver a Community Benefits Package, which could support environmental causes. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_OFF_0206	One respondent believes loss of agricultural land can be mitigated by significant increases in biodiversity.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0254	One respondent would like the ground beneath solar panels to be left for grazing and ecological use.	Yes	The ground beneath solar panels will be used in the stated way, more details are provided in the outline Landscape and

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_OFF_0258	Respondent has asked will contractors be supervised during the development and delivery stages to make sure wildlife is not disturbed or worse, injured or killed ?	Yes	The approach to mitigation is set out in Volume 1, Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] , this includes the use of Ecological Clerks of Works (ECoW), where applicable.
BW2_OFF_0265	Respondent is concerned that the removal of a very large area of arable land, thus reducing local food production with secondary consequences for CO2 emissions	Yes	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3], considers the lifetime Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions resulting from the Project.</p> <p>The chapter concludes that despite the GHG emissions resulting from the construction-stage of the Project, the magnitude of avoided emissions resulting from the operational and decommissioning stages of the development allows the Project to</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>enable avoided emissions from year 6 of operation (carbon payback period).</p> <p>Over the lifetime of the Project, it would result in 5,545,595 tCO₂e of avoided emissions (under the current grid average scenario).</p>
BW2_OFF_0268	Respondent expressed concerned about the local ecology and would wish to ensure that hedging, woodland etc are maintained.	Yes	<p>The impacts of Project on ecology and nature conservation is assessed in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Landscape features will be maintained in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p>
BW2_OFF_0283	Respondent has asked was existing biodiversity measured? Or were estimates of gains based on assumption there was little biodiversity in existing farmland?	Yes	<p>The calculation of BNG is set out in The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, provided in Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5] Appendix 9.13. This includes establishing a baseline measurement.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0313	Respondent has expressed that the farmland has many species living on it (not just in the hedges) for example hares which are a cause for concern in terms of conservation.	Yes	The impacts to all ecology and nature conservation receptors are assessed in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including hares.
BW2_OFF_0318	Respondent expressed concern for the displacement of local wildlife following the construction of the solar farm.	Yes	The impacts to all ecology and nature conservation receptors are assessed in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0321	Respondent has commented that the new proposals only slightly address the concerns in relation to ecological impact and the visuals provided do not present an accurate picture of the true impact.	Yes	The impacts to all ecology and nature conservation receptors are assessed in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0324	Respondent has commented that they would like to see more development around ideas such as grazing sheep as it would help the area feel less industrial. Respondent stated that introducing sheep or crops between the panels would soften the environment and make it feel more inviting.	Yes	The Project proposes conservation grazing throughout the site, other than on land set aside for community food growing or where there are permanent installations of equipment (PCS units, access tracks etc)

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0432	Respondent has asked what evidence do you have for enhanced biodiversity or is it all wishful thinking.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on ecology & nature conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9 [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0136	Respondent suggests incorporating beetle banks in the fields to help aid biodiversity gain.	Yes	Log piles and bee hives are included within meadow grassland areas, more details are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0136	Respondent suggests dips and mounds in flood plains so there is a gradation of dry- damp ground with ephemeral ponds for amphibia and temporary islands acting as refugia	Yes	Noted. Details of floodplain grasslands are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0136	Respondent suggests leaving behind small mounds of earth and/or stone from the construction process, as incomplete restoration of ground results in diverse features such as dry earth, damper earth, shady areas, sloping mounds, all good for mining bees and ephemeral meadow species.	Yes	Noted. Log piles and bee hives are included within meadow grassland areas, more details are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0136	Respondent suggests retaining lop and top from hedgerow works, pointing to lop & top retained in 2m+ high windrows at Besselsleigh Community Wood, which improved the soil and biodiversity. Respondent suggests leaving occasional ruts from vehicles as when	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Hedgerows will be managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	left they diversify the locale. Although these measures might be claimed to be unsightly by a vocal minority, much silent opinion would welcome the sanity of saving money by not removing a biological asset.		
BW2_PFF_0017	Respondent expressed that biodiversity will not appear, and that new low-grade biodiversity is likely to happen.	Yes	<p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0083	Respondent believes the loss of diverse habitat and ecology is vandalism on a grave scale.	Yes	The impacts to all ecology and nature conservation receptors are assessed in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0212	Respondent expressed that they are disappointed the results of consultations with local groups such as Eynsham's Nature Recovery Network has not been presented at this stage of consultation.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0213	Respondent expressed that the solar panels should not be placed on old meadows.	Yes	Noted. Solar panels will be primarily located on arable land with high value habitats for the most part protected.
BW2_PFF_0191	Respondent comments that ecological measures e.g. bat boxes are unlikely to be delivered, as this has been the case on previous projects.	Yes	How bat boxes will be secured by the Project for ecology and nature conservation is set out in Volume 1, Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0217	Respondent comments that countryside is important for nature and mental wellbeing, and that this should be a societal focus.	Yes	The benefits of the Project for Biodiversity and Nature are set out in Chapter 9 of the ES and the effects of the Project on Human Health, including impacts on mental health and behaviour, are set out in Chapter 16 [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent comments that the solar farm central area in fields 2.1-2.15 in Bladon will destroy a flourishing farmland ecosystem, in which nature is already recovering under a modern regenerative arable and grazing rotation by a farmer awarded Young Farmer of the Year 2023.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0237	Respondent recommends that, as without attention, perimeter areas will soon re-wild themselves, i.e. scrub regeneration, this will require machinery management, not environmentally or financially appropriate. Therefore, this could be an opportunity for small-scale hobby farmers with 'flying flocks' of sheep to control re-wilding.	Yes	Details of landscape management and grazing are detailed in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] . The Project includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, through using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent points to an admission in the PEIR that possible significant effects e.g. on the loss of good arable land (6.13.7) suggest that if mitigation measures are used effects will not be significant, so how is significance determined?	Yes	The impact of the Project on agriculture, the loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land, and the method of calculating its significance, is assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES (Agricultural Land and PRoW) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent would like to know how mitigation measures will be monitored?	Yes	The approach to monitoring is detailed in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0260	Respondent believes the project can only damage ecology and biodiversity irreparably, and that some of the mitigation measures are simply ludicrous	Yes	Noted. The impacts to all ecology and nature conservation receptors are assessed in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0266	Respondent believes the project would prevent important opportunities for nature and ecology restoration in the area.	Yes	Noted. The impacts to all ecology and nature conservation receptors are assessed in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent would like to know what evidence there is from other similar projects that rehabilitation of such a site can be successful? Respondent would like to see academic papers, named contacts, specific references.	Yes	The landscaping scheme has been designed by specialist consultants with vast experience in rehabilitation of similar sites.
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent is concerned at the way the biodiversity survey was done, pointing to the fact a freshly-mowed meadow was used, which would obviously be less biodiverse than before being mowed. As such, respondent asks if this was	Yes	It should be noted that whilst every effort has been made to provide a comprehensive description of the site, no investigation can ensure the complete characterisation of the natural environment.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	deliberate, and if not, will more surveys be done?		The Applicant's approach to assessing impacts to all ecology and nature conservation receptors is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent refers to findings in Phase Two Booklet p15 from Blenheim's Estate's monitoring data that will ensure accountability of any environmental commitments. Respondent interested in what this monitoring data encompasses and how the data is collected and evaluated, and what criteria is used.	Yes	The outline monitoring program is provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_OFF_0379	Respondent enquired whether the project, as a NSIP, will have a land use plan that will support biodiversity.	Yes	The maintenance and monitoring of landscape elements of the site is set out in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_OFF_0509	Respondent expressed concerns the project will be approved without independent input from ecological experts/bodies on the national level.	Yes	A number of national bodies (e.g. Natural England, Environmental Agency) have provided input that has affected the design of the Project. The maintenance and monitoring of landscape elements of the site is set out

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] , which will be subject to examination and approval.
BW2_OFF_0279	Respondent expressed that guardianship of land for ecological purposes is something that the Parish Council already do with a small section of Blenheim land in Bladon maintained by Bladon Wildlife Project.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0182	Respondent wants to know how much consultation has been undertaken with UKCEH, national experts in all things ecologically and environmentally.	No	The Project has been designed in conjunction with industry professionals. UKCEH has not been consulted given they are a research establishment.
BW2_OFF_0280	Respondent accused the claim of establishing bee hives, providing log piles and bird boxes for biodiversity net gain as "mitigation tokenism".	No	Noted. More details on the implementation of mitigation is provide in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_OFF_0514	Respondent expressed that specialists such as Wildlife Trust Consultancies, RSPB and others should be used to better understand and maximise opportunities.	Yes	Wildlife Trust Consultancies were contacted, and an array of industry professionals provided influence on the Project design.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0514	Respondent suggested studies, surveys, and long-term monitoring of nature recovery to ensure success/failure stories are shared, and to involve bodies such as Brookes University, University of Oxford, DEFRA and others so that results and commitments are reported, published, shared and lessons learnt.	Yes	The outline monitoring program is provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0086	Respondent queried whether the possibility of incorporating periods of solar generation into crop rotation after the initial solar array period has been considered.	No	The Applicant considers this to refer to plans beyond the Project lifetime.
BW2_OFF_0356	Respondent expressed that they are keen that the proposals enhance the biodiversity of the area, for example by incorporating new hedgerows and the planting of wildflower meadows among the solar panels.	Yes	Details of landscape enhancements are detailed in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0237	Respondent highlighted the need to understand the different approaches to biodiversity between northern, central and southern areas; soils, pH and thus plants and animals are very different.	Yes	All areas of the Project have been studied extensively during ecology surveys presented in ES Volume 3 Appendix 9.2 to 9.12 [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent expressed that the land selected for use by the development supports a unique ecosystem.	Yes	Noted. Higher value habitats for the most part will be protected during the Project. The approach to mitigation is set out in Volume 1, Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] , this includes the use of Ecological Clerks of Works (ECoW), where applicable.
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent claimed that any environmental benefits of the project will be lost if the site returns to agricultural use in 35-40 years.	No	<p>The Applicant notes that the consent being sought is temporary and will require all panels, cables (other than those beneath highways, rivers and railway) and all associated equipment to be removed at the end of the term of the consent. The application is supported by an Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p> <p>However, the Applicant also notes that some of the landscape mitigation planting is unlikely to be removed during decommissioning due to its ecological benefits</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0514	Respondent expressed satisfaction with the Blenheim environmental stewards scheme.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. .
BW2_OFF_0321	Respondent expressed concern that there was no environmental impact assessment available for review during the consultation.	Yes	<p>The impacts of the Project on the environment is assessed in the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant undertook consultation on a Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), as described in the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p>
BW2_OFF_0091	One respondent is particularly concerned about chemicals used in manufacturing of panels and their negative effects on the environment.	Yes	Chapter 14 of the ES considers the Climate Change implications of the Project, including the environmental effects of the materials used in manufacturing and transporting panels [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent would like to know whether there will be external scrutiny, e.g. expert ecologists and managers of sustainable recycling, to ensure the landscape does not turn into an industrial wasteland.	Yes	The Project is subject to scrutiny from national and local bodies. Mitigation will be implemented under various management plans, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The outline monitoring program is presented in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The approach to mitigation is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3], this includes the use of Ecological Clerks of Works (ECoW), where applicable.</p>
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent asks where the Applicant will find such large numbers of sheep for just part of the year.	Yes	<p>The application is supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3], which considers the approach to conservation grazing, and an Outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2], which considers the approach to managing vegetation.</p> <p>The grazing regime has also been informed by direct liaison with agricultural advisors, and in consultation with Blenheim Estate.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0136	Respondent would like to see small hazel copses established.	Yes	The details of the landscape elements are presented in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0279	Respondent has expressed that funding is needed for planting, rewilding, and maintenance over the 40-year lifespan of the solar farm.	Yes	The details of the maintenance of landscape elements are presented in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0321	A respondent reported that the visualisations for the ecological impact during the in-person consultation were not a true representation.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0094	Respondent states that the full proposals will not emerge until the ES and EIA are available, and so far the data the proposals are based on has not been shared, as such it is hard to address the proposals.	Yes	<p>The ES is presented in Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices presented in [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Applicant undertook consultation on a Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), as described in the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p>
BW2_PFF_0238	Respondent expresses that the wildlife mitigation measures detailed in the PEIR is not credible or detailed.	Yes	The approach to wildlife mitigation and how it will be secured by the Project is set out in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].
Wildlife			
BW2_OFF_0011, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0456, BW2_PFF_0009, BW2_PFF_0015, BW2_PFF_0018, BW2_PFF_0020, BW2_PFF_0035, BW2_OFF_0181, BW2_OFF_0265,	Respondents expressed concern about the fencing and how it will affect access to the site for animals.	Yes	<p>The impact of habitat severance is assessed in in Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Security fencing will be designed to be permeable to small mammals including badgers and fox.</p> <p>As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0343, BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0440, BW2_OFF_0488, BW2_OFF_0514, BW2_PFF_0052, BW2_PFF_0139, BW2_PFF_0144, BW2_PFF_0170, BW2_PFF_0185, BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_PFF_0233, BW2_PFF_0244, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_PFF_0294, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0298			changes in deer movements will be brought about by perimeter fencing.
BW2_OFF_0052, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_PFF_0009, BW2_PFF_0027, BW2_PFF_0038, BW2_OFF_0343, BW2_OFF_0427,	Respondents believe the solar farm will have adverse impact on the activities of various wildlife species, such as bats and owls, mammals and insects.	Yes	The impacts of the Project to ecology receptors are assessed in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0441, BW2_OFF_0456, BW2_OFF_0457, BW2_PFF_0164, BW2_PFF_0165, BW2_PFF_0194, BW2_PFF_0264, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0297			
BW2_OFF_0299, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0472, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_PFF_0054, BW2_PFF_0055, BW2_PFF_0062, BW2_PFF_0145, BW2_PFF_0197, BW2_PFF_0198, BW2_PFF_0280, BW2_PFF_0282, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0299, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_PFF_0103,	<p>Respondent have expressed that the Project will destroy wildlife.</p> <p>Respondents are not convinced by claims of the possibility of 70% net biodiversity gain.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_OFF_0514, BW2_PFF_0287			mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.
BW2_OFF_0515, BW2_PFF_0186, BW2_PFF_0251	Respondents comment that the proposed mitigation measures are not adequate in comparison to impact to habitat.	Yes	<p>The approach to wildlife mitigation and how it will be secured by the Project is set out in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0427	Respondents expressed concern for bees and is worried that the project will take away valuable pollination areas for them.	Yes	<p>Invertebrate habitats were identified in Volume 3 Appendix 9.6 Invertebrate Survey Report [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>These habitats will primarily be retained by the Project. More information on the management of habitats for invertebrates is provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_PFF_0281	Respondent is concerned that the migration and feeding routes will be interrupted for both mammals and birds.	Yes	<p>Impacts of the project on ecology receptors including migrating birds are assessed in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The impact of habitat severance is assessed in Volume 1 Chapters 9 of the ES EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Security fencing will be designed to be permeable to small mammals including badgers and fox. As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that changes in deer movements will be brought about by perimeter fencing.</p>
BW2_PFF_0080, BW2_PFF_0298	Respondents comment that impacts to wildlife and agriculture would be less if the proposal was on-shore wind rather than solar.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_OFF_0032	Respondents expressed concern about various animals including lizards, snakes and water vole. They would like protection for these species.	Yes	The approach to mitigation is set out in Volume 1, Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] , which includes protections for the mentioned species.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0034	One respondent understands that deer can jump over fences and has requested they are not overly high to ensure access to the site for the animals.	Yes	<p>The fencing will be for operational security purposes and may be up to 2.1 m in height.</p> <p>The impact of habitat severance is assessed in in Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Security fencing will be designed to be permeable to small mammals including badgers and fox. As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that changes in deer movements will be brought about by perimeter fencing.</p>
BW2_OFF_0134	One respondent would like more information on how swans will be protected	Yes	<p>Swans do not receive any specific protection from the Project as only Mute Swans were identified during Wintering Bird Surveys (Appendix 9.10 [EN010147/APP/6.5]) and are not of conservation concern.</p> <p>However, mute swans will benefit from mitigation proposed for wintering birds of conservation concern outlined in the approach to mitigation in Volume 1,</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>More information on the management of habitats for birds is provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p>
BW2_OFF_0262	One respondent asked, will wildlife, especially deer, be pushed towards roads?	Yes	As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that changes in deer movements will be brought about by perimeter fencing.
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent has commented that we were told that wildlife would be 'corralled' into new areas, where exactly? 3400 acres will be covered by this.	No	The Applicant notes the Project does not intend to move or "corral" wildlife
BW2_OFF_0432	Respondent has asked how are you going to support the hares when you install panels on their territory?	Yes	The impacts of the Project to hares are assessed and the approach to mitigation presented in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0456, BW2_PFF_0015	Respondents expressed concern regarding potential impact to deer.	Yes	As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that changes in deer movements will be brought about by perimeter fencing.
BW2_OFF_0480	Respondent has asked how the extensive wildlife will nest over winter and will they be protected?	Yes	The impacts of the Project to ecology receptors are assessed and the approach to mitigation presented in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0483	Respondent raises concern over the impact on wildlife and specific interactions between them, suggests that as this is the largest project of its kind in Europe, previous data regarding this would not be satisfactory, and that new research from global experts is needed to determine what effect the loss of these interactions will have on the larger eco-system.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_OFF_0514	Respondent would like to see bee hives established and properly managed on the site due to the likely displacement of bee populations during the project. Respondent provides context via an article link	Yes	Beehives will be provided within meadow grasslands. Further details of the management of beehives is provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>(https://www.apicultural.co.uk/do-managed-honey-bees-compete-with-wild-bees-for-floral-resources) Respondent also suggests the involvement of Filipe Salbany, a bee conservation specialist at the Blenheim Estate.</p>		
BW2_OFF_0519	<p>Respondent raises concern about the proposed 70% biodiversity net gain, believing that based on the report this gain is to come simply from stopping the current use of the land for agriculture, suggesting little additional biodiversity projects other than hedging. Respondent would like to see a greater gain and the inclusion of wildlife corridors and ponds.</p>	Yes	<p>The calculation of BNG is set out in The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, provided in Environmental Statement Volume 3 Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The maintenance and monitoring of landscape elements of the site is set out in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The oLEMP includes habitat creation which includes: Circa 100ha of new floodplain mosaic habitats along the River Evenlode Corridor, at least 26.5km of new species rich hedgerow, at least 22km of existing hedgerow to be enhanced through additional planting,</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>circa 15ha of new native woodland creation, wildflower grasslands to be managed for wintering and breeding birds, tussocky grasslands alongside hedgerows.</p> <p>Hedgerow buffers will be at least 5m, flood attenuation features to north of Cassington to be managed as wetland habitats, additional mixed scrub habitats alongside hedgerows and a range of grasslands within the solar arrays to be managed for conservation value.</p>
BW2_OFF_0521	Respondent attended the conference on Solar Power, Farming, and Nature at Westmill in June, where ecologists talked about the challenges of increasing/maintaining biodiversity around solar arrays, and concluded that it is unrealistic to expect the area under the solar array itself to make a significant contribution to biodiversity, only the margins.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0547	Respondent comments that the PEIR does not mention the impact on wildlife such as foxes and deer, or how rabbits and deer will get past enclosed solar arrays.	No	<p>The Applicant notes that these species are not of conservation concern and therefore are not considered as receptors in the assessment.</p> <p>Security fencing will be designed to be permeable to small mammals including fox and rabbits.</p> <p>As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that changes in deer movements will be brought about by perimeter fencing.</p>
BW2_PFF_0015	Respondent expressed concern about the project's impact on the ability to view animals from the fields.	Yes	The inter-visibility of fields within the Project is considered in detail in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN10147/APP/6.3] , whether they do or do not contain livestock.
BW2_PFF_0017	Respondent expressed concern about the cumulative impact of the number of housing developments in the area along with this project. They expressed that these projects will inflict devastating effects on wildlife around the fields and Pinsley Wood, an ancient woodland.	Yes	The cumulative impact of the project and other projects on ecology receptors are assessed in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0054	Respondent believes that steps to add walks, birdboxes, cycle paths etc. are small concessions for the loss of these natural components of the countryside.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0109	Respondent comments that as welcome as bat boxes, bird boxes, and log piles are, they will not improve people's views.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0194	Respondent asks what will happen to the animals when their habitat has been covered for 50 years?	No	The impacts of the Project to ecology receptors are assessed and the approach to mitigation presented in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0194	Respondent asks where do all the animals e.g. badgers, muntjac, deer, foxes, go when their land is covered?	Yes	The impacts of the Project to badgers are assessed and the approach to mitigation presented in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Deer and fox are not of conservation concern and therefore are not considered as receptors in the assessment.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0027	Respondents expressed that bats are scared off by electronic buzzes.	Yes	Noted. The impacts of the Project to bat assemblages are assessed and the approach to mitigation presented in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent comments that no BD assessment is forthcoming and no reference is made to the report 'Paths to a Zero-Carbon Oxfordshire, 2021' which detailed BD and nature recovery pathways on a basis of expert evidence with species lists.	Yes	The impacts of the Project to ecology receptors are assessed and the approach to mitigation presented in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent points out that Chapter 9 of the PEIR suggests installation of bat and bird boxes and beehives will generate biodiversity gain, believes this is absurd as it is clear that the solar farm central area in fields 2.1-2.15 in Bladon will destroy a flourishing farmland.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on ornithology and invertebrates are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3]. It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent raises issue of light pollution from security lights on wildlife and their lifecycles, especially pollinators and plants too.	Yes	The impact of lighting on ecology receptors is assessed in the Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0280	Respondent asks what are the bees, insects, skylarks and bats going to eat in this new vast sterile solar farm?	Yes	Details of how the Project will be managed for invertebrates, skylark and bats is set out in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0287	Respondent claims that solar panel fields see a reduction in wildlife such as bats and deer.	Yes	<p>The impact of the installation of solar panels on bats is assessed in the Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Deer and fox are not of conservation concern and therefore are not</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			considered as receptors in the assessment.
BW2_OFF_0309	Respondent recommended that pushing panels back to allow wider paths that aren't penned to provide more space for wildlife to move between parcels of land.	Yes	Noted. The approach to mitigation presented in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].
Birds			
BW2_OFF_0064, BW2_OFF_0052, BW2_PFF_0026, BW2_PFF_0027, BW2_PFF_0038, BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0514, BW2_OFF_0546, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0100, BW2_PFF_0145, BW2_PFF_0248, BW2_PFF_0299	<p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the skylark nesting plots and believe they will not be used by wildlife.</p> <p>Respondents commented that there is no evidence to show that skylark plots in solar farms work and they are worried that the development will contribute to the breed's decline.</p> <p>One respondent wants assurances from a trusted ecologist regarding skylarks.</p>	Yes	<p>Skylark plots are included in the masterplan in order to provide skylarks with suitable access to additional foraging habitats throughout their breeding season.</p> <p>The provision of Skylark plots at a ratio of two plots provided for each potential lost territory is an accepted and widely used mitigation strategy for developments that will result in the loss of Skylark territories.</p> <p>Skylark plots also benefit other farmland bird species. Areas of archaeological</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			interest within the Project will also be managed to provide habitat for these species in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0009, BW2_PFF_0261, BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0305	Respondent expressed concern about the project's impact on birds.	Yes	The impacts of the Project to birds are assessed Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0262, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_PFF_0143, BW2_PFF_0197, BW2_PFF_0248	Respondents have expressed that birds at risk of impact with panels has not sufficiently assessed.	Yes	The impacts of the Project to birds from the 'lake effect' are assessed in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0093, BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_PFF_0229, BW2_PFF_0261	Respondents believe over-wintering swans have been ignored. Respondents expressed that swans which winter in Cassington fields and by the Evenlode river near Lower Road will be prevented from doing so because of the solar panels and fencing.	Yes	Swans do not receive any specific protection from the Project as only Mute Swans were identified during Wintering Bird Surveys (Appendix 9.10 [EN010147/APP/6.5]) and are not of conservation concern. However, mute swans will benefit from mitigation proposed for wintering birds of conservation concern outlined in the

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>approach to mitigation in Volume 1, Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>More information on the management of habitats for birds is provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1].</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0258, BW2_OFF_0313</p>	<p>Respondents are concerned that the ground nesting birds, such as the skylark and meadow pipit, are not well catered for, and leaving small inappropriate areas for them is not the answer.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Skylark plots are included in the masterplan in order to provide skylarks with suitable access to additional foraging habitats throughout their breeding season.</p> <p>The provision of Skylark plots at a ratio of two plots provided for each potential lost territory is an accepted and widely used mitigation strategy for developments that will result in the loss of Skylark territories.</p> <p>Skylark plots also benefit other farmland bird species. Areas of archaeological interest within the Project will also be managed to provide habitat for these</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			species in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_OFF_0273, BW2_OFF_0343	Respondents are concerned that the environmental reports overlook the impact on migratory birds.	Yes	Impacts to migratory birds are assessed within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0345, BW2_OFF_0427	Respondents expressed concern that rare birds such as tawny owls in the woods behind Bladon which will lose their feeding grounds.	Yes	The loss of habitat of birds is assessed within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0248, BW2_PFF_0298	Respondents enquired how the project will reduce the risk of bird collision from migrating flocks into panels in the general area of Farmoor reservoir.	Yes	The impacts of the 'lake effect' are assessed within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0009, BW2_PFF_0027	Respondent enquired how owls will hunt if they are penned in by fencing.	Yes	The loss of habitat of birds is assessed within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The fencing will be for operational security purposes and may be up to 2.1 m in height.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The impact of habitat severance is assessed in in Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Security fencing will be designed to be permeable to small mammals including badgers and fox.</p>
<p>BW2_PFF_0248, BW2_PFF_0298</p>	<p>Respondent expressed that all birds, including resident geese and shags on the reservoir will be affected by noise, lights and electrical vibrations from the development.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The disturbance of bird habitats is assessed within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
<p>BW2_PFF_0027</p>	<p>Respondent expressed that there is evidence that skylarks will not nest among solar panels no matter how many are planned.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Skylark plots are included in the masterplan in order to provide skylarks with suitable access to additional foraging habitats throughout their breeding season.</p> <p>The provision of Skylark plots at a ratio of two plots provided for each potential lost territory is an accepted and widely used mitigation strategy for developments that will result in the loss of Skylark territories.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Skylark plots also benefit other farmland bird species. Areas of archaeological interest within the Project will also be managed to provide habitat for these species in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0001	Respondent is particularly concerned about specific bird species, such as yellow wagtails and curlers.	N	The impacts to birds is assessed within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0258	Respondent has asked what evidence is there to support that your very small areas work for protecting birds?	Yes	<p>Skylark plots are included in the masterplan in order to provide skylarks with suitable access to additional foraging habitats throughout their breeding season.</p> <p>The provision of Skylark plots at a ratio of two plots provided for each potential lost territory is an accepted and widely used mitigation strategy for developments that will result in the loss of Skylark territories.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Skylark plots also benefit other farmland bird species. Areas of archaeological interest within the Project will also be managed to provide habitat for these species in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_OFF_0258	Respondent queried about the plans to mitigate against the loss of habitat used by a wide range of bird during the autumn and winter.	Yes	The approach to mitigation is set out in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . More details on how habitats will be managed for wintering birds are provided in outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .
BW2_OFF_0258	Respondent enquired whether there is any net gain for the birds.	Yes	The calculation of BNG is set out in The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, provided in Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5] Appendix 9.13. BNG is calculated based on habitat distinctiveness and condition, birds do not factor into this calculation. Details on how habitats will be managed for birds is detailed in the outline Landscape and

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1].
BW2_OFF_0343	Respondent expressed while the reports suggest that these bird flocks will be able to graze around the panels – it offered no clear scientific evidence of this happening in large scale fenced solar panel arrays in Western Europe.	Yes	Noted. Furthermore, areas of archaeological interest within the Project will also be managed to provide habitat for these species in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6].
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent commented that the area proposed in the South is adjacent to Farmoor Reservoir which is an important nature reserve. They stated that it is also far too close to Othmoor RSPB which hosts many different birds, including migratory birds and is of National importance. They argued that the vast area of solar glass will disorientate their routes, threatening their survival.	Yes	The impacts of the 'lake effect' are assessed within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_PFF_0129	Respondent supportive of plans to provide habitats for skylarks and bats.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0038	Respondent expressed that on a number of solar sites, it has been recorded that owls have reduced activity because of the panels.	Yes	Noted. The impact of the installation of solar panels is assessed within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0052	Respondent expressed that swans will mistake the panels for water and die upon landing, and that this has not been considered.	Yes	The impacts of the 'lake effect' are assessed within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0238	Respondent expressed concern over impact on red-listed farm birds.	Yes	The impacts of the red-listed farm birds are assessed within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent enquired about the production of skylark plots.	Yes	<p>Skylark plots are included in the masterplan in order to provide skylarks with suitable access to additional foraging habitats throughout their breeding season.</p> <p>The provision of Skylark plots at a ratio of two plots provided for each potential lost territory is an accepted and widely used mitigation strategy for developments that will result in the loss of Skylark territories.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Skylark plots also benefit other farmland bird species. Areas of archeological interest within the Project will also be managed to provide habitat for these species in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent commented that snow geese regularly congregate in fields adjacent to Tumbledown Dick hill where panels are proposed and near to the proposed site of the substation.	Yes	Snow geese were identified during wintering bird surveys (Wintering Bird Surveys (Appendix 9.10 [EN010147/APP/6.5]) and impacts are assessed with other wintering birds in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent enquired whether birds mistaking reflective surfaces as water has been taken into account in surveys.	Yes	The impacts of the 'lake effect' are assessed within Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
Trees, Plants and Flora			
BW2_PFF_0129, BW2_PFF_0130	Respondents are satisfied with the measures to safeguard hedgerows.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0294	<p>Respondents expressed that mitigation to trees, plants and flora are inadequate.</p> <p>Suggestion of leaving nature to take its course instead of mitigation, noting that flora and fauna will grow where it chooses.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Further details on the implementation of mitigation is provided in various management plans [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p> <p>Habitats will be managed in order to maximise their biodiversity value in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p>
BW2_OFF_0279	Respondent expressed that the Wildlife Project has planted nearly 3000 hedging plants in the proposed area, and protection should be sought during construction, operation, and decommissioning of the solar farm.	Yes	<p>Hedgerows will be for the most part retained and protected by 5m buffers in accordance with the approach to mitigation presented in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] includes a range of habitat creation such as at least 26.5km of new species rich hedgerow and at least 22km of existing hedgerow</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			to be enhanced through additional planting.
BW2_OFF_0381	Respondent commented that there should be no solar panels on the ground where there is unique flora and fauna such as descendants of Roman snails, oregano plants, orchids , meadow clary, there should be no solar panels on the ground.	Yes	Noted. The approach to mitigation presented in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0424	<p>Respondent recommended that hedgerow planting should be specified and have elements for biodiversity/nature recovery.</p> <p>Hedgerows should be managed so that they are pruned, for example, on a 3 year cycle, to maximise food sources/wildlife cover while still allowing good and easy access for PRow users.</p> <p>Pruning should be completed at a suitable time of year so that fruits and berries are not destroyed/stripped before or during the winter food-source season.</p>	Yes	<p>Hedgerows will be managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p> <p>This includes measures such as cutting new hedgerow after the first growing season at the end of Year 1 and again at the end of Year 3 to encourage dense growth and maintain an even shape. Where gaps occur, infill with native stock appropriate to planted hedge.</p> <p>From Year 5 onwards the sides of the hedgerow will be trimmed back on a 3-5 year rotation in late Autumn (i.e. with a</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>fifth to a third of all hedgerow cut each year).</p> <p>For retained hedgerow, gappy and species-poor hedgerows will be supplemented by species infill planting. A mixture of native species will be used.</p> <p>The hedgerows will be trimmed back on a 3-5 year rotation in late autumn (i.e. with a third-fifth of the hedgerow cut each year) to a broadly 'A' shape structure.</p>
BW2_OFF_0479	Respondent expressed concerned that seeing non-native American wildflowers (Monarda sp.) on the Botley West homepage instead of UK native plants makes me doubt the project's environmental goals.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Section 10 of the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] sets out the biodiversity objectives and targets for the Project.</p> <p>The plan includes a design objective to include native species and planting appropriate to the local area [paragraph 2.1.2].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0479	Respondent expressed that the existing woodland areas will become isolated, which is contrary to current thinking on the value of interconnected woodlands and hedgerows to increase their wildlife value.	Yes	Noted. The impact of habitat severance is assessed in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0514	Respondent suggested that trees should be planted for wildlife and as a potential future resource.	Yes	Significant tree planting is included as part of the landscape masterplan. Details of the management of trees are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_OFF_0542	Respondent expressed that there should be a legally binding requirement to ensure maintenance of the planting.	Yes	How the landscaping elements will be secured for ecology and nature conservation is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0544	Respondent enquired about which trees are intended to be removed.	Yes	The Project does not propose removing any trees

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0544	Respondent strongly supports retaining all established trees for their wildlife, landscape and natural heritage value and added that trees are not "temporary" unlike the proposed project.	Yes	Details of the management of trees are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0109	Respondent suggested planting low growing meadow plants under panels to improve biodiversity and reduce flood risk, and to choose certain plants that thrive in shade and sun.	Yes	Noted. The details of the management of under panel grasslands are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0136	Respondent expressed that hazel copses should be established, which also covers local heritage due to the region's history of traditional hazel copse growing and use. Respondent recommends small copses of 20mx20m planted intensively at 1.2x1.2m spacing, adjacent to allotments.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0224	Respondent suggested consideration of establishing locations for "veteran trees of the future". They stated that these specimen trees will be established for 40 years and will be ready to act as a legacy for the future.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent enquired about how hedges will be maintained by appropriate seasonal cutting.	Yes	<p>Hedgerows will be managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p> <p>This includes measures such as cutting new hedgerow after the first growing season at the end of Year 1 and again at the end of Year 3 to encourage dense growth and maintain an even shape. Where gaps occur, infill with native stock appropriate to planted hedge.</p> <p>From Year 5 onwards the sides of the hedgerow will be trimmed back on a 3-5 year rotation in late Autumn (i.e. with a fifth to a third of all hedgerow cut each year).</p> <p>For retained hedgerow, gappy and species-poor hedgerows will be supplemented by species infill planting. A mixture of native species will be used.</p> <p>The hedgerows will be trimmed back on a 3-5 year rotation in late autumn (i.e.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			with a third-fifth of the hedgerow cut each year) to a broadly 'A' shape structure.
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent expressed concern regarding the panels creating too much shade which will be detrimental to the growth of grass and other flora in the project site.	Yes	The biodiversity objectives set out in Section 10 of the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] includes maintaining the health and structure of wildflower grassland below and between solar panel arrays.
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent comments that it takes years to establish trees and restore meadow land for wild flowers and to create the environment for rich diversity of insects and bird life. Respondent states that bland assurances in 6.3.9 and 10 without any detail don't convince.	Yes	An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] has been prepared, which considers the management of retained and newly planted trees.
BW2_PFF_0266	Respondent expressed that the damage to flora and fauna, and thus the habitats they sustain, will be long term, as such, the mitigation measures would be inadequate.	Yes	Noted. The impacts on ecology receptors are assessed in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0294	Respondent expressed concern about the removal of trees when so many have already been removed in the area, particularly around the reservoir.	Yes	The Project does not propose removing any trees.
BW2_PFF_0295	Respondent expressed concern that certain species of wild flowers will disappear as a result of sheep grazing.	Yes	Noted. Grasslands will be managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0178	Respondent wants to see the use of local plant varieties, mixed, instead of single types.	Yes	Noted. Details on the landscaping elements are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0078	Respondent would like to see fruit trees planted near panels	Yes	The outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] includes the promotion of flowering/ fruiting of shrubs and trees through low intensive management.
Soil			
BW2_OFF_0379	Respondent expressed their belief that the PEIR plans were submitted prior to the land survey results on soil grading, as such the plans need to be amended	Yes	The PEIR included the extensive ALC survey work carried out within the area of the Project. This has been supplemented by limited further work for

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	or a second option proposed alongside the main proposal that frees up the best and most versatile graded land areas.		<p>the ES to make any necessary minor refinements to the PEIR findings and the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>All of the technical ALC data is available within Volume 3 Appendix 17.1: Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Survey Report [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_PFF_0211	Respondent expressed that the fields behind Cassington have good quality soil and should not be taken out of farming.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p> <p>All of the technical ALC data is available within Volume 3 Appendix 17.1: Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Survey Report [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent believes that plans to soil grade with boreholes is not sufficient for agricultural soil.	Yes	The ALC Survey work has applied survey techniques as outlined in Natural England Technical Note TIN049: Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile land, which advises that where surveys are necessary these should be undertaken "using handheld augers to examine soils to a depth of 1.2m".
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent suggested looking to the UK Young Farmer of the Year 2023, who farms in Bladon and keeps data on the relevant soil analyses and annual yield data, but has not been asked for this information.	Yes	The ALC Survey work has applied survey techniques as outlined in Natural England Technical Note TIN049: Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile land.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent advised that the ground/soil needs a good input of decaying organic remains to retain an optimal soil microbiome for future agricultural use.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0285	Respondent highlights that it can take many years for deep soil compaction to revert, or may even remain permanently damaged.	Yes	The Outline Soil Management Plan, as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains measures to limit impacts to soil resources, wherever practicable through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management.
BW2_PFF_0237	Respondent expressed that there is an opportunity here for soil regeneration with active wildflower planting to increase floral diversity.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The Outline Soil Management Plan, as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains measures to limit impacts to soil resources, wherever practicable

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management.</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_PFF_0285	Respondent stated that deep soil compaction is the main physical impact of PV solar farm construction, operation, and decommissioning.	Yes	The Outline Soil Management Plan, as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains measures to limit impacts to soil resources, wherever practicable through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management.
BW2_PFF_0294	Respondent concerned about chemicals leaking from panels into the soil, preventing the growing of safe, healthy food.	No	Solar panels do not leak chemicals and will be regularly inspected and maintained.
BW2_PFF_0046	Respondent believes the site chosen makes sense as solar farms on 'poor' agricultural land really will help regenerate biodiversity and the fertility	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	of the soil over the time that the panels are there.		details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent comments that 6.8.11 does not give detail on how dust pollution will be mitigated in the short term and in longer term, along with residue on the soil surface.	Yes	<p>A Dust Risk Assessment has been undertaken and a Dust Management Plan has been prepared for the site detailing how dust emissions will be mitigated during the construction period.</p> <p>The Outline Dust Management Plan forms part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1].</p>
Landscape and Visual			
BW2_OFF_0003, BW2_OFF_0007, BW2_OFF_0014, BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0022, BW2_OFF_0040, BW2_OFF_0047, BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0054, BW2_OFF_0060, BW2_OFF_0065,	Respondents have expressed concern about the size and scale of the project.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0066, BW2_PFF_0012, BW2_PFF_0014, BW2_PFF_0031, BW2_PFF_0036, BW2_OFF_0070, BW2_OFF_0080, BW2_OFF_0081, BW2_OFF_0085, BW2_OFF_0093, BW2_OFF_0095, BW2_OFF_0100, BW2_OFF_0102, BW2_OFF_0109, BW2_OFF_0110, BW2_OFF_0112, BW2_OFF_0113, BW2_OFF_0121, BW2_OFF_0125, BW2_PFF_0039, BW2_PFF_0042, BW2_PFF_0044, BW2_OFF_0127, BW2_OFF_0128, BW2_OFF_0130, BW2_OFF_0132,			<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.</p> <p>On balance, it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p> <p>In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0136, BW2_OFF_0141, BW2_OFF_0144, BW2_OFF_0145, BW2_OFF_0146, BW2_OFF_0148, BW2_OFF_0157, BW2_OFF_0159, BW2_OFF_0160, BW2_OFF_0164, BW2_OFF_0168, BW2_OFF_0169, BW2_OFF_0179, BW2_OFF_0180, BW2_OFF_0181, BW2_OFF_0182, BW2_OFF_0184, BW2_OFF_0185, BW2_OFF_0187, BW2_OFF_0191, BW2_OFF_0193, BW2_OFF_0194, BW2_OFF_0199, BW2_OFF_0200, BW2_OFF_0201, BW2_OFF_0202,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0209, BW2_OFF_0220, BW2_OFF_0224, BW2_OFF_0229, BW2_OFF_0231, BW2_OFF_0237, BW2_OFF_0239, BW2_OFF_0241, BW2_OFF_0243, BW2_OFF_0245, BW2_OFF_0249, BW2_OFF_0250, BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_OFF_0253, BW2_OFF_0255, BW2_OFF_0256, BW2_OFF_0260, BW2_OFF_0261, BW2_OFF_0263, BW2_OFF_0269, BW2_OFF_0274, BW2_OFF_027, BW2_OFF_0283, BW2_OFF_0292, BW2_OFF_0296, BW2_OFF_0301,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0308, BW2_OFF_0312, BW2_OFF_0319, BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0328, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0331, BW2_OFF_0334, BW2_OFF_0345, BW2_OFF_0348, BW2_OFF_0354, BW2_OFF_0359, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0362, BW2_OFF_0364, BW2_OFF_0366, BW2_OFF_0376, BW2_OFF_0379, BW2_OFF_0381, BW2_OFF_0382, BW2_OFF_0385, BW2_OFF_0388, BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_OFF_0393,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0397, BW2_OFF_0403, BW2_OFF_0404, BW2_OFF_0405, BW2_OFF_0408, BW2_OFF_0415, BW2_OFF_0416, BW2_OFF_0417, BW2_OFF_0418, BW2_OFF_0421, BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_OFF_0432, BW2_OFF_0437, BW2_OFF_0442, BW2_OFF_0444, BW2_OFF_0448, BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_OFF_0454, BW2_OFF_0455, BW2_OFF_0462, BW2_OFF_0463, BW2_OFF_0466, BW2_OFF_0469, BW2_OFF_0472, BW2_OFF_0473, BW2_OFF_0479,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0485, BW2_OFF_0491, BW2_OFF_0492, BW2_OFF_0506, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_OFF_0525, BW2_OFF_0530, BW2_OFF_0536, BW2_OFF_0541, BW2_OFF_0545, BW2_OFF_0550, BW2_OFF_0551, BW2_PFF_0050, BW2_PFF_0060, BW2_PFF_0064, BW2_PFF_0070, BW2_PFF_0079, BW2_PFF_0082, BW2_PFF_0085, BW2_PFF_0087, BW2_PFF_0101, BW2_PFF_0102, BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0104, BW2_PFF_0105,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0107, BW2_PFF_0111, BW2_PFF_0119, BW2_PFF_0124, BW2_PFF_0131, BW2_PFF_0133, BW2_PFF_0134, BW2_PFF_0138, BW2_PFF_0145, BW2_PFF_0150, BW2_PFF_0152, BW2_PFF_0160, BW2_PFF_0170, BW2_PFF_0171, BW2_PFF_0181, BW2_PFF_0182, BW2_PFF_0185, BW2_PFF_0189, BW2_PFF_0193, BW2_PFF_0194, BW2_PFF_0197, BW2_PFF_0198, BW2_PFF_0203, BW2_PFF_0206, BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_PFF_0208,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_PFF_0213, BW2_PFF_0076, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0218, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0228, BW2_PFF_0232, BW2_PFF_0233, BW2_PFF_0235, BW2_PFF_0236, BW2_PFF_0240, BW2_PFF_0241, BW2_PFF_0248, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0252, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0261, BW2_PFF_0262, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0271, BW2_PFF_0273, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0283,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0288, BW2_PFF_0290, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0296, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0299, BW2_PFF_0300, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_PFF_0303, BW2_PFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0306, BW2_OFF_0396, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0311			
BW2_OFF_0003, BW2_OFF_0007, BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0025, BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0029, BW2_OFF_0040, BW2_OFF_0047, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0060, BW2_PFF_0006, BW2_PFF_0011,	Respondents have expressed concern about the visual impact of the project.	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.</p> <p>On balance, it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0015, BW2_PFF_0026, BW2_PFF_0028, BW2_PFF_0031, BW2_PFF_0032, BW2_PFF_0036, BW2_OFF_0078, BW2_OFF_0079, BW2_OFF_0080, BW2_OFF_0091, BW2_OFF_0093, BW2_OFF_0097, BW2_OFF_0100, BW2_OFF_0102, BW2_OFF_0104, BW2_OFF_0112, BW2_PFF_0039, BW2_PFF_0044, BW2_OFF_0126, BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_OFF_0143, BW2_OFF_0152, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0164, BW2_OFF_0169, BW2_OFF_0170,			<p>significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p> <p>In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0172, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0180, BW2_OFF_0181, BW2_OFF_0184, BW2_OFF_0188, BW2_OFF_0202, BW2_OFF_0203, BW2_OFF_0212, BW2_OFF_0220, BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0223, BW2_OFF_0228, BW2_OFF_0229, BW2_OFF_0237, BW2_OFF_0238, BW2_OFF_0239, BW2_OFF_0241, BW2_OFF_0244, BW2_OFF_0249, BW2_OFF_0256, BW2_OFF_0262, BW2_OFF_0280, BW2_OFF_0308, BW2_OFF_0310, BW2_OFF_0321,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0331, BW2_OFF_0337, BW2_OFF_0342, BW2_OFF_0348, BW2_OFF_0348, BW2_OFF_0362, BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0375, BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_OFF_0398, BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_OFF_0415, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_OFF_0421, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0426, BW2_OFF_0433, BW2_OFF_0444, BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_OFF_0462, BW2_OFF_0475, BW2_OFF_0482, BW2_OFF_0483,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0490, BW2_OFF_0491, BW2_OFF_0506, BW2_OFF_0526, BW2_OFF_0549, BW2_OFF_0542, BW2_OFF_0550, BW2_OFF_0551, BW2_PFF_0048, BW2_PFF_0055, BW2_PFF_0059, BW2_PFF_0063, BW2_PFF_0075, BW2_PFF_0106, BW2_PFF_0119, BW2_PFF_0135, BW2_PFF_0141, BW2_PFF_0143, BW2_PFF_0147, BW2_PFF_0150, BW2_PFF_0154, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0164, BW2_PFF_0165, BW2_PFF_0179, BW2_PFF_0193,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0198, BW2_PFF_0204, BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_PFF_0076, BW2_PFF_0216, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0225, BW2_PFF_0228, BW2_PFF_0230, BW2_PFF_0233, BW2_PFF_0244, BW2_PFF_0252, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0265, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0271, BW2_PFF_0273, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0284, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0288,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0294, BW2_PFF_0296, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_PFF_0301, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_PFF_0305, BW2_PFF_0216, BW2_PFF_0229			
BW2_OFF_0078, BW2_OFF_0106, BW2_OFF_0126, BW2_OFF_0127, BW2_OFF_0136, BW2_OFF_0143, BW2_OFF_0160, BW2_OFF_0164, BW2_OFF_0169, BW2_OFF_0170, BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0223, BW2_OFF_0233, BW2_OFF_0238, BW2_OFF_0245, BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_OFF_0274, BW2_OFF_0275,	Respondents have expressed concern regarding development within the Green Belt, expressing that this should be protected.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The impacts of the Project upon the Green Belt, and the Very Special Circumstances in support of it are considered within the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0312, BW2_OFF_0329, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0351, BW2_OFF_0358, BW2_OFF_0359, BW2_OFF_0374, BW2_OFF_0379, BW2_OFF_0395, BW2_OFF_0413, BW2_OFF_0414, BW2_OFF_0415, BW2_OFF_0418, BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_OFF_0426, BW2_OFF_0433, BW2_OFF_0439, BW2_OFF_0444, BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_PFF_0040, BW2_PFF_0100, BW2_PFF_0154, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0163,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0168, BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_PFF_0209, BW2_PFF_0214, BW2_PFF_0218, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0248, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0261, BW2_PFF_0262, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0301, BW2_PFF_0302			
BW2_OFF_0126, BW2_OFF_0146, BW2_OFF_0337, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0392,	Respondents are unhappy about industrialisation of the green belt and questions whether special circumstances apply.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_OFF_0433, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0439, BW2_OFF_0444, BW2_OFF_0457, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_PFF_0132, BW2_PFF_0138, BW2_PFF_0153, BW2_PFF_0235, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0488, BW2_PFF_0185, BW2_PFF_0190, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0287			The impacts of the Project upon the Green Belt, and the Very Special Circumstances in support of it are considered within the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1].

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0017, BW2_PFF_0030, BW2_OFF_0210, BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0375, BW2_OFF_0498, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_OFF_0550, BW2_PFF_0175, BW2_PFF_0191, BW2_PFF_0030, BW2_PFF_0212, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0282, BW2_OFF_0464, BW2_OFF_0480	Respondents expressed that the visualisations are dishonest and misleading, and are biased to avoid areas of large visible panels.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0169, BW2_OFF_0536, BW2_PFF_0096, BW2_PFF_0145, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0294, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0292, BW2_PFF_0006, BW2_PFF_0236, BW2_PFF_0303, BW2_OFF_0456, BW2_OFF_0309	Respondents expressed concern over the appearance of related infrastructure, such as CCTV cameras and fencing.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>This includes assessment of Project in full, not just solar arrays.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the ES notes that the effects of the Project upon the Landscape Character Areas would be fully reversible, but there would be direct operational effects with the introduction of solar panels which would occupy much of the Project Site, along with associated structures such as invertors, substation, access tracks, security perimeter fencing and CCTV.</p> <p>The Project would occupy a large area within the local landscape but be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p> <p>The northern, central and southern sections of the Project would be generally visually separated from one another. Although in combination views of more than one section would be possible.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0266, BW2_OFF_0385, BW2_OFF_0475, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0296</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern that the farm will impact a significant swathe of Oxfordshire landscape, with concerns that this impact could be permanent.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The chapter acknowledges that the Project would occupy a large area within the local landscape but be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The northern, central and southern sections of the Project would be generally visually separated from one another. Although in combination views of more than one section would be possible.</p> <p>The assessment also notes that the effects of the Project upon the Landscape Character Areas would be temporary and fully reversible.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0136, BW2_OFF_0179, BW2_OFF_0343, BW2_OFF_0362, BW2_OFF_0413, BW2_OFF_0418, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0454, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_OFF_0286, BW2_OFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0434,</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern about impact on the greenbelt.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The impacts of the Project upon the Green Belt, and the Very Special Circumstances in support of it are considered within the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_OFF_0390, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_OFF_0102, BW2_PFF_0124, BW2_OFF_0500, BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0112, BW2_PFF_0282, BW2_OFF_0535, BW2_OFF_0544, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_OFF_0426, BW2_PFF_0287			
BW2_OFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0477, BW2_OFF_0487, BW2_PFF_0052, BW2_PFF_0176, BW2_PFF_0190,	<p>Respondents reported that the consultation event maps were clear, but the visualisations were inaccurate.</p> <p>One respondent provided an example that viewpoint 40, which shows the track</p>	Yes	<p>Following consultation on the PEIR, photomontages have been reviewed ahead of finalising the Environmental Statement.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_OFF_0283, BW2_OFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0294</p>	<p>leading up to Purwell Farm, Cassington, gives the impression that solar panels are not present in the first field. There will be solar panels to the left of the track right up to the back of Manor Farm.</p> <p>One respondent expressed concern about the absence of visualisations showing fields of panels along Lower Road.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that Bladon was missing from visualisations.</p>		<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities, including Cumnor Parish. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_PFF_0236, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_OFF_0396, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0048, BW2_PFF_0259	Respondents expressed concern about the perceived industrial scale of the Project.	Yes	The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1] . The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0500, BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0112, BW2_PFF_0282	Respondents blame the government's lack of foresight regarding the National Grid as reason Oxfordshire and region has so many solar farms whilst other solar projects in more suitable locations are held back.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_OFF_0012, BW2_OFF_0218, BW2_OFF_0154	Respondents expressed satisfaction with the landscape and visual mitigations.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_OFF_0307, BW2_OFF_0414</p>	<p>Respondents expressed that the proposals do not address the damage to the landscape and that the visualisations provided are misleading.</p> <p>Respondents commented that there were no visualisations of the area to the south of Church Hanborough.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Area to the south of Church Hanborough extensively photographed.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement includes 7 Representative Viewpoints in this area directly to the south, with 4 photomontages.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities, including Cumnor Parish. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0516, BW2_PFF_0036	Respondents believes the view from Cumnor across to Wytham Wood is something that should definitely be protected.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0248,	Respondents expressed that the project will take away the landscape which is appreciated by everyone and contributes to mental health and wellbeing.	Yes	Noted. Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement (Human Health) [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. Impacts on access to open green space is covered in great detail under the "Open space, leisure and play" determinant of the health assessment.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0272, BW2_PFF_0284	Respondents commented that the layouts of the solar arrays are very dense with little space between panels, and that this increases the impact of the project on the landscape and those crossing it.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The chapter acknowledges that the Project would occupy a large area within the local landscape but be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p> <p>The northern, central and southern sections of the Project would be generally visually separated from one another. Although in combination views of more than one section would be possible.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0229, BW2_PFF_0054	Respondents expressed concern about the disturbance to the meadows around Swinford lock	Yes	<p>Long Mead Meadow has been removed from within the Project site with proposed Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) now to the east of the Swinford Crossing in order to ensure no impacts to the LWS.</p> <p>HDD is proposed to be used to lay underground cables under watercourses and priority habitats, including the Thames and associated floodplain meadow.</p>
BW2_OFF_0324, BW2_OFF_0424	Respondents expressed that they support the idea of reducing the size of the solar farm to preserve more open space and countryside close to where people live because it will be to the detriment of people's physical and mental well-being.	Yes	<p>The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement (Human Health) [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. Impacts on access to open green space is covered in great detail under the "Open space, leisure and play" determinant of the health assessment.
BW2_PFF_0079, BW2_PFF_0236, BW2_PFF_0266	Respondent comments that the project will spoil the beauty of the Cotswolds	Yes	<p>The Project would be visible from a very small part of the Cotswolds National Landscape and would not have a significant effect upon it.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The chapter acknowledges that the Project would occupy a large area within the local landscape but be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			enclose the Project within the landscape.
BW2_OFF_0176, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_OFF_0451	Respondents would like to see more visualisations.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>31 Photomontages have been produced as part of the ES.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0264, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondent feels that, based on their visiting of a solar farm along the A44, the visual mock ups were misleading.	Yes	<p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p> <p>All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities, including Cumnor Parish. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
BW2_OFF_0105	Respondents expressed that the proposed site is not overly beautiful so have no issue with the proposals.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0270	Respondent expressed that more options should be provided for landscaping.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comments and considers the proposed mitigation to be proportionate and appropriate to the landscape character of the area and the Project.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>
BW2_OFF_0306	Respondent commented that while visual impacts matter, a comprehensive approach across the county can mitigate them. Concentrating installations in one area could overwhelm it.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The chapter acknowledges that the Project would occupy a large area within the local landscape but be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p> <p>The northern, central and southern sections of the Project would be generally visually separated from one another. Although in combination views of more than one section would be possible.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0309, BW2_OFF_0331</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern regarding potential impact of the Project to the landscape in proximity to Bladon.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0324</p>	<p>Respondent expressed that their main concern is preserving the landscapes around Church Hanborough and Cassington, particularly Purwell Farm hill behind Cassington. It's not just about maintaining scenic views, but ensuring there's enough distance between</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed,</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	houses and solar panels to maintain the village's human character, rather than feeling dominated by solar infrastructure.		including visual amenity for residential receptors. [EN010147/APP/6.3] A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is proposed and further evaluation of impacts has been implemented.
BW2_OFF_0343	Respondent referenced table 5.1 and expressed concerned regarding the height of the panels will contribute to the visual impact.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant has reviewed the height of panels. The Project Description within Chapter 6 of the ES at Table 6.3 [EN010147/APP/6.3] indicates the height range will be up to 2.2m on the high edge (2.3m on sloping ground) and 0.8m on the lower edge.
BW2_OFF_0343, BW2_PFF_0283	Respondents expressed concern that the panels in the southern site will be widely visible from Wytham Woods, paths at Farmoor Reservoir and views westwards from Botley & Cumnor.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0343	Respondent noted the difficulty of landscape mitigation considering the lie of the land in the southern site.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0343	Respondent expressed concern that National Grid substations will give off a lot of light versus their scale, believes the plans do not precisely quantify this.	Yes	Whilst, at the time of preparing the Applicant's DCO submission, a final decision has yet to be taken by NGET, it is likely that the NGET substation will be located in one of two possible locations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On land within the Order Limits at the Southern Site, south of Farmoor reservoir; or 2. On land near and to the west of the Applicant's Southern site, south of Farmoor reservoir. For assessment purposes the Applicant assumes that the NGET substation will

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>be within the Site as described in Option 1 above, and powers will be taken to consent the substation as part of the Applicant's DCO.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0359, BW2_OFF_0396, BW2_PFF_0091, BW2_PFF_0026, BW2_PFF_0288, BW2_PFF_0294, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0237</p>	<p>Respondents cited roads such as the Lower Road, Banbury Road, A44, B4027 from Wootton to the drama school, Burleigh Road, Cassington Road and Manor Farm Track from which solar panels would be visible when driving.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the solar arrays within the Project will not always be fully screened.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Project will be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p> <p>A Glint and Glare Study is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_OFF_0391	Respondent expressed concern that it will be difficult to eliminate the height of the solar panels, especially those intended to allow animal grazing underneath.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
BW2_OFF_0396	Respondent stated that even with mitigation, the extent of the solar "farm", combined with all the housing developments around Woodstock, Yarnton and Kidlington, means that from Wootton to the edge of Oxford the rural nature of our village-based countryside will be fundamentally changed	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the ES notes that the effects of the Project upon the Landscape Character Areas would be fully reversible, but there would be direct</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>operational effects with the introduction of solar panels which would occupy much of the Project Site, along with associated structures such as invertors, substation, access tracks, security perimeter fencing and CCTV.</p> <p>The Project would occupy a large area within the local landscape but be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p> <p>The northern, central and southern sections of the Project would be generally visually separated from one another. Although in combination views of more than one section would be possible.</p>
BW2_OFF_0451	Respondent refuted the statement in the PEIR that only a "few people would experience significant visual effects" as the Oxford School of Drama alone there will be over 150 people onsite on a daily	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the solar arrays within the Project will not always be fully screened.</p> <p>The Project will be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	basis who will experience extremely significant visual adverse effects.		woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.
BW2_OFF_0475	Respondent expressed that the Environmental Impact Assessment's claim of no significant residual landscape impacts by year 15 is not credible. They stated that it overlooks the massive transformation of a large area of Oxfordshire from agricultural to engineered landscape.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The chapter acknowledges that the Project would occupy a large area within the local landscape but be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p> <p>The northern, central and southern sections of the Project would be generally visually separated from one another. Although in combination views</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>of more than one section would be possible.</p> <p>The assessment also notes that the effects of the Project upon the Landscape Character Areas would be temporary and fully reversible.</p>
BW2_OFF_0475	Respondent commented that the 55 viewpoints are not enough to assess the visual impacts of the large site properly.	Yes	<p>The 55 Representative Viewpoints are considered proportionate to the scale of the Project. They were consulted on and agreed with all host authorities, with changes / additions requested and considered as part of the PEIR /ES.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p> <p>All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			authorities, including Cumnor Parish. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_OFF_0540	Respondent expressed that better mitigation of visual impacts may help satisfy opposition, such as the reduction of panels in fields most visible (e.g. on east side of hill north of Cassington), more/better hedges and planting, willow screens, and improved access (than currently planned) to offset lost access elsewhere.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_PFF_0120	Respondent expressed concern that the land close to Oxford Airport on the way into Woodstock will be blighted and the many green walks in the local area will be lost forever.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6]. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project.
BW2_PFF_0176	Respondent would like to see more viewpoints along the length of Lower Road and for consideration of views from rail lines.	Yes	<p>There are three viewpoints located along Lower Road, with several other located in proximity to it, including 5 photomontages.</p> <p>55 Representative Viewpoints have been developed for the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3], which is considered proportionate to the scale of the Project.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0188	Respondent supports the proposals but admits the project will be unsightly. Respondent sees climate change as more important.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0017	Respondent expressed that the visualisations taken from Station Hill footpath are misleading and do not show the panorama of the solar panels to left of Pinsley Wood. They stated that if you step 20m to the right, then you will see the solar panels forever.	Yes	All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0080	Respondent commented that the view from Frogwell path (Yarnton to Begbroke) currently has a wonderful vista across the rolling Oxfordshire countryside, and that no amount of buffer zones can compensate for this.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0209	Respondent expressed that Eynsham has already suffered with over-building and the loss of greenbelt.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. Location within the Green Belt, including a case for very special circumstances, is considered within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_PFF_0214	Respondent expressed that solar farms may be acceptable in areas of flat land, where mitigations such as large hedges might shield them from view, but in the case of the Southern site, in Farmoor valley, to place them in the bottom and sides of the valley that is overlooked from many directions.	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Chapter 8 of the ES notes that the effects of the Project upon the Landscape Character Areas would be fully reversible, but there would be direct operational effects with the introduction

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>of solar panels which would occupy much of the Project Site, along with associated structures such as invertors, substation, access tracks, security perimeter fencing and CCTV.</p> <p>The Project would occupy a large area within the local landscape but be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p> <p>The northern, central and southern sections of the Project would be generally visually separated from one another. Although in combination views of more than one section would be possible.</p>
BW2_PFF_0219	Respondent commented that the protection of the Church Hanborough conservation area is of prime importance.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0222	Respondent commented that providing more 'viewpoints' over what would be a sea of glass can in no way replace the current landscape.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent expressed concern about plans to use the roads from Farmoor to Cumnor and also to the reservoir and river near Lower Witley Farm as access to the site, as these are frequently used by residents.	Yes	<p>A full assessment of traffic and transport, including any mitigation and enhancement measures required, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3).</p> <p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (EN010147/APP/7.6.2) has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.</p>
BW2_PFF_0252	Respondent expressed concern about the possible visual changes to Tumbledown Dick between Cumnor village and Farmoor.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the solar arrays within the Project will not always be fully screened.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Project will be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p>
BW2_PFF_0265	Respondent described the future view of solar panels as looking like a prison camp.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Project will be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0270	<p>Respondent commented that the local landscape is a particular point of pride for residents, with the Evenlode and Cherwell valleys being classic English landscapes loved by residents and visitors alike. Respondent further backs this point by referring to the Forever Fields art exhibition, which unambiguously demonstrated the enormous public feeling for the landscape.</p> <p>Respondent commented that for visitors from London, the Evenlode is the first of the five rivers of the Cotswolds, and its valley provides the visual introduction to this internationally famous area.</p>	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent pointed out that the protection of dark skies is part of the plans of many villages in the area, and that the security lights/lighting in general will have a major impact on this, being very noticeable from the villages.	Yes	A lighting strategy, to minimise the impacts of lighting in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals / Bat Conservation Trust guidelines, will be implemented, as set out under the Outline Code of Construction Practice [(EN010147/APP/7.6.1)].

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Furthermore, no lighting will be permanently switched on. Emergency lighting will only be used, and operated manually.
BW2_PFF_0282, BW2_PFF_0190	Respondents commented that visualisations do not include infrastructure such as the substation.	Yes	<p>Noted. All Project elements have been modelled as part of the photomontages.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>31 Photomontages have been produced as part of the ES.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Representation of Development Proposals.</p> <p>All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
BW2_OFF_0266	Respondent commented on the decision of landowners to be involved in the Project.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_OFF_0302	Respondent expressed that renewable power sources should not alter and damage the environment, and should not negatively affect entire communities.	Yes	<p>The Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1] sets out the need case.</p> <p>The overall planning balance of benefits and harm are set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p>
BW2_OFF_0362	Respondent commented that the cable across Thames to west of toll bridge would ruin a beautiful spot, looking into the sunset, near a nature reserve, much used by swimmers & walkers	Yes	The Applicant notes that the cable would be installed underground, and therefore not result in a visual impact.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0432	Respondent expressed that they feel very strongly that the area of land between Wootton and Woodstock should be protected - on particular the low-lying fields in the very ancient landscape between Hordley and the drama school should not be used for solar.	Yes	The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0432, BW2_OFF_0479	Respondents commented on other proposed developments in the vicinity of Woodstock, with concern of cumulative impacts, urban sprawl, and undermining of rural areas.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. Relevant cumulative effects are considered. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>An updated review of relevant cumulative schemes was completed prior to submission of the ES. These schemes are considered in the individual technical chapters, and a summary is presented in Chapter 20:</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Cumulative Effects & Interrelationships [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 20 includes associated Figures at Appendix 20.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0468	Respondent commented that solar farms should not obliterate whole villages, rather, blend and merge with them.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Project will be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p>
BW2_OFF_0482	Respondent commented that only some installations on open countryside are necessary.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1] sets out the need case. The target for solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0222	Respondent suggested that a national strategy should be agreed to prevent the ruination of natural beauty.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0109	Respondent stated that a solar farm entirely surrounded by tall hedgerows and trees would work and satisfy locals.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Project will be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.
BW2_OFF_0503	Respondent believes the project will destroy too much land with very little local or national benefit.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_OFF_0482	Respondent commented that they noticed that the visuals in the application documents lack clear 3D representations, making them difficult to interpret and hindering accurate assessments by experts.	Yes	Photomontages have been produced in accordance with LI TGN 06/19 (Type 3 visualisations) with all main elements of the Project modelled in 3D.
BW2_OFF_0487	Respondent raises issue that photo 'Viewpoint 40' is still shown on the Botley West website. Asserts that a realistic picture of how the project will look when complete has not been provided	Yes	<p>This view has been specifically looked at and corrected as required.</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>31 Photomontages have been produced as part of the ES.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p> <p>All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
BW2_PFF_0176	Respondent comments that the text on visuals, number and description, are too small, and that half the views have not yet had photo montages done.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>31 Photomontages have been produced as part of the ES.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p> <p>All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent would like to remove the fields of 2.53-2.60 in the plan due to the proximity of panels to residential properties.	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed, including visual amenity for residential receptors. [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is proposed and further evaluation of impacts has been implemented.
BW2_OFF_0334	Respondent enquired about the plans for ongoing management of the landscape.	Yes	The maintenance and monitoring of landscape elements of the site is set out in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_PFF_0056	Respondent states there has been no proper appraisal of the capacity of the landscape to accommodate solar infrastructure and no topographical approval to assess appropriate scale of the development.	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed, including visual amenity for residential receptors. [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0256	Respondent comments the images seem to have been taken at the bleakest time of the year - no leaves on trees, or crops in fields - so no real sense of what might be lost at different times of year.	Yes	Photomontages have been completed illustrating the Project at winter Year 1 (worst case) and summer Year 15.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0256	Respondent points out there were no images of future views from potentially affected homes.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed, including visual amenity for residential receptors. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is proposed and further evaluation of impacts has been implemented.</p>
Screening and Buffer Zones			
BW2_OFF_0019, BW2_PFF_0011, BW2_PFF_0025, BW2_PFF_0026, BW2_PFF_0027, BW2_OFF_0100, BW2_OFF_0144, BW2_OFF_0145, BW2_OFF_0198, BW2_OFF_0244, BW2_OFF_0339,	<p>Respondents express dissatisfaction with the size of buffer zones.</p> <p>One respondent would like the minimum buffer zones increased with the aim of aiding nature recovery, and suggested 10m for hedgerows, trees, ponds, woodlands, 10m for watercourse, and 30m for ancient woodland and weavely furze, 50m for solar arrays.</p>	Yes	<p>The approach to mitigation is presented within the ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is in place and a minimum 15m from ancient woodland in accordance with guidance and 5m from existing hedgerows.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0368, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0488, BW2_OFF_0525, BW2_OFF_0542, BW2_PFF_0284, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_OFF_0514, BW2_PFF_0214, BW2_OFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0042, BW2_OFF_0324, BW2_PFF_0110, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0025			
BW2_PFF_0001, BW2_PFF_0219, BW2_OFF_0296	Respondents expressed satisfaction with the increased buffer zone.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_OFF_0324, BW2_OFF_0336	Respondents commented that the buffer zone between panels and footpaths needs to be bigger.	Yes	Footpaths and Green Ways have been considered specifically as part of the ongoing iterative design process.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>A minimum 5m offset from PRoW has been adopted, and in some cases up to 9m for PRoW corridors has been utilised.</p> <p>The approach to mitigation is presented within the ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>
<p>BW2_PFF_0052, BW2_PFF_0287</p>	<p>Respondents enquired about how it will be possible to screen the view of the panels when some are on a hillside, especially from Cassington and the hill to Purwell which is 120 higher.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the ES notes that the effects of the Project upon the Landscape Character Areas would be fully reversible, but there would be direct operational effects with the introduction of solar panels which would occupy much of the Project Site, along with associated structures such as invertors,</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>substation, access tracks, security perimeter fencing and CCTV.</p> <p>The Project would occupy a large area within the local landscape but be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p> <p>The northern, central and southern sections of the Project would be generally visually separated from one another. Although in combination views of more than one section would be possible.</p>
BW2_PFF_0037	Respondent expressed that the boundary should be increased in fields 2.20-2.21 in Bladon.	Yes	Additional planting has been added to mitigate views from Bladon.
BW2_OFF_0296	Respondent enquired whether there would be segregation/buffer zones from panels for grazing animals.	Yes	The Project includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation grazing as outlined

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0502	Respondent expressed that the buffers around Shipton Slate hamlet should be wider.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0518	Respondent enquired whether the site will be enclosed with fencing, what type and size, and whether any floodlights/lighting will be installed.	Yes	Refer to ES Chapter 6: Project Description for fencing details [EN010147/APP/6.3] . No flood lighting is proposed.
BW2_OFF_0544	Respondent expressed satisfaction that Wytham Wood is being spared from wraparound development, but that the 15m buffers with all other ancient woodland are meagre.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0545	Respondent stated that 15m buffers must be rigorously observed as an absolute minimum, as restorative decompaction of root zones is much more difficult and expensive than avoidance in the first place.	Yes	Buffer zones are a minimum.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0162	Respondent claimed that from their property the site cannot be hidden from view.	No	Noted. It is not possible or appropriate to completely screen a scheme of this nature. The local topography is such that views to parts of the Project would be available throughout the lifetime of it. Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0004	Respondent expressed that the fields used for the development should be some distance from roads so that there is still some countryside to enjoy when driving through the area.	Yes	Noted. The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0270	Respondent states that no concealment would be possible for the wide open slopes of the Evenlode valley, for example on either side of Lower Road in the Middle Site.	No	Noted. It is not possible or appropriate to completely screen a scheme of this nature. The local topography is such that views to parts of the Project would be available throughout the lifetime of it. Chapter 8 of the Environmental

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0287	Respondent points out the increased buffer zones around Bladon.	Yes	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0287	Respondent would like assurance that no solar panels will be visible from Cassington, even if that means higher hedgerows.	No	Noted. It is not possible or appropriate to completely screen a scheme of this nature. The local topography is such that views to parts of the Project would be available throughout the lifetime of it. Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0287	Respondent requested that the buffer zones are increased around Cassington, specifically removing proposed solar panels from fields 2.100, 2101, 2.102, 2.103 , 2.104, 2.110 (field numbers taken from your drawings Figure Number 9.1b).	N	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0178	Respondent enquired about how visual mitigation will work in winter when there are less leaves on hedges and trees.	Yes	<p>Visibility, as with any development, would inevitably be increased in winter months. The layering effect of existing and proposed vegetation will continue to provide some visual screening. Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.
BW2_OFF_0302, BW2_PFF_0109	Respondents expressed that the proposed hedges to grow to sufficiently work as a visual barrier- if they will even be planted according to the presentation.	Yes	Hedgerows, existing and proposed, will be maintained to an appropriate height. This is detailed further in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan ('oLEMP') [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
Glint and Glare			
BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_OFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0354, BW2_PFF_0144, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_PFF_0229, BW2_PFF_0277,	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of glint and glare on pilots, farmers, birds, drivers, on nearby water bodies,	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6] A Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0263, BW2_OFF_0273, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_PFF_0237, BW2_PFF_0277			
BW2_OFF_0239, BW2_OFF_0551	Respondents expressed concern about micro climate change caused by glare and reflection from panels. Respondent suggested providing modelling for potential micro climate changes.	No	Noted. See below
BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_PFF_0182	Respondents expressed concern that the proposals do not adequately address the issue of solar reflection.	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6] A Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BW2_OFF_0288,	Respondent expressed concern that the glint and glare issues from the nearby water body	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study including a Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0042	One respondent is concerned that visualisations do not provide an accurate representation of the glint and glare.	Yes	Chapter 8 'Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] includes photomontages of the proposed development are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.317 of Volume 2 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4] . A Glint and Glare Study including a Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0362	Respondent expressed concern that lighting by MV/PC spots will cause light pollution at night.	Yes	Lighting will be installed but only within limited areas of the development, generally around the high voltage infrastructure for safety and security. No lights will be permanently switched on.
BW2_OFF_0451	Respondent asked how the glint and glare from the PV modules affect those 150 people at the drama school.	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0451	Respondent enquired whether there will be motion sensitive lighting on the project site.	No	Lighting will be installed but only within limited areas of the development, generally around the high voltage infrastructure for safety and security. This will include Passive infra-red (PIR) motion sensor activated security / emergency lighting. No lights will be permanently switched on.
BW2_OFF_0547	Respondent would like to know whether glint and glare from residential properties has been considered, especially properties at elevation such as on Heath Lane in Bladon.	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6]
BW2_PFF_0162	Respondent enquired how glint and glare will be measured before the panels have been installed.	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6]
BW2_PFF_0287	Respondent states the effect of glint and glare on the residents of Cassington, including their eyesight and mental health, has not been considered, especially relevant with panels on hills facing the village.	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6] . The effects of the Project upon Human Health are assessed in ES Chapter 16 [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent has specific concerns about the security lights and light pollution, asks how long they will be on, and whether infra-red cameras would serve the same purpose but be less intrusive.	No	Lighting will be installed but only within limited areas of the development, generally around the high voltage infrastructure for safety and security. This will include Passive infra-red (PIR) motion sensor activated security / emergency lighting. No lights will be permanently switched on.
Archaeology and Local Heritage			
BW2_OFF_0102, BW2_OFF_0148, BW2_OFF_0160, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0185, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0362, BW2_OFF_0366, BW2_OFF_0379, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_OFF_0483, BW2_OFF_0542, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0131,	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the project's impact on the cultural and heritage legacy of the areas, especially regarding the site's proximity to Blenheim/UNESCO site and other historical sites.</p> <p>One respondent expressed concern that the solar farm will cause damage to the listed archeological site at Sansoms Platt.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that heritage assets such as Winston Churchill's grave at St Martin's Church Bladon should not be part of the project.</p>	Yes	<p>A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]. This includes reference to the grave of Winston Churchill in the churchyard of the Church of St Martin at Bladon and also to the Scheduled Monument at Sansom's Platt. The Project design has been adjusted to avoid and/or reduce harm to this Scheduled Monument as a result of change within its setting. This can be seen in the Illustrative</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0185, BW2_PFF_0218, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0294, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0299, BW2_PFF_0301, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0307, BW2_OFF_0414, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_PFF_0124, BW2_OFF_0307, BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_PFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_OFF_0286, BW2_OFF_0535			<p>Masterplan presented as Figures 2.1 - 2.3 within Volume 2, Figures of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0439, BW2_OFF_0473, BW2_PFF_0257, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0299, BW2_OFF_0330	<p>Respondents have raised concerns that Blenheim Palace could lose its UNESCO World Heritage status.</p> <p>One respondent enquired whether Blenheim Palace will be the fourth site in</p>	No	<p>A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	the World to lose its World Heritage status.		Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].
BW2_PFF_0027, BW2_PFF_0026, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0182, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_OFF_0474, BW2_OFF_0551, BW2_PFF_0285	Respondent is concerned about the impact on local heritage and ancient woodland, such as Pinsley Wood.	Yes	The assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. No likely significant effects have been identified.
BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_PFF_0273	Respondent requested specific protections for Purwell Farm due to a number of archaeological sites in the area.	Yes	A total of 43 areas containing significant buried archaeological remains have been avoided and sufficiently buffered within the Project design as shown on the Illustrative Masterplan presented as Figures 2.1 – 2.3 within Volume 2, Figures of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4]. This includes land in the vicinity of Purwell Farm. The mitigation measures established for the avoidance and/or reduction of potential impacts on significant archaeological sites are set out within Section 7.8 of Volume 1, Chapter 7:

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_PFF_0165	Respondent expressed that there will be considerable negative impact on heritage and conservation areas.	Yes	The assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4]. A more detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects arising from changes within the settings of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]. This includes likely impacts and effects on Conservation Areas.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0103	Respondent expressed concern that the site is in close proximity to listed buildings.	Yes	A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects arising from changes within the settings of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This includes likely impacts and effects on listed buildings.
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent has remarked that their family has lived in the area for generations and is concerned that their local history will be destroyed.	Yes	The assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . No significant adverse effects have been identified. All impacts would be fully reversible following decommissioning of the Project.
BW2_OFF_0540	Respondent expressed that the Cultural Heritage section of the PEIR lacks heritage knowledge and local knowledge.	Yes	A detailed account of the archaeological and historical background of the Project Site and adjacent land is presented within Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This has been subject to peer review by statutory

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			stakeholders including Historic England and Oxfordshire County Council.
BW2_OFF_0540	Respondent suggested working with communities to improve this as there could be creative ways to align the project with the local heritage and culture.	Yes	The Applicant would be keen to work with local heritage groups in order to advance knowledge and awareness of the local heritage and culture.
BW2_PFF_0130	Respondent enquired whether the project has consulted with archaeological experts.	Yes	The scope of the heritage input within the ES has been developed direct in consultation with relevant statutory and non-statutory consultees as detailed in Table 7.4 and Table 7.5 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0232	Respondent stated that all heritage and archaeological sites must be preserved.	Yes	A total of 43 areas containing significant buried archaeological remains have been avoided and sufficiently buffered within the Project design as shown on the Illustrative Masterplan presented as Figures 2.1 – 2.3 within Volume 2, Figures of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4] . The mitigation measures established for the avoidance and/or reduction of

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			potential impacts on significant archaeological sites are set out within Section 7.8 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . No designated heritage assets such as listed buildings and Conservation Areas would be physically impacted.
BW2_PFF_0237	Respondent does not want to see the information regarding Oxfordshire's cultural heritage to "moulder in the grey literature".	Yes	The results of any programme of archaeological work undertaken within the Project site would be collated and published in an appropriate format. This commitment is set out in the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010147/APP/7.6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0237	Respondent expressed that the cultural importance of old farmhouses must be preserved.	Yes	No buildings (historic or otherwise) would be physically affected by the construction, operation and maintenance, or decommissioning of the Project. Please refer to Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES for further detail [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0287	Respondent stated that the negative impacts on the historical conservation area in Cassington have not been considered.	Yes	The assessment of likely impacts and effects arising from changes within the settings of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This includes consideration of the Cassington Conservation Area.
BW2_PFF_0301	Respondent claimed that Blenheim Estate has reneged on its commitment to conserving historical environment by being part of these scheme.	No	No response required.
BW2_OFF_0547	Respondent wants to know why the PEIR does not acknowledge that St Martins Church in Bladon is of historical significance.	Yes	The assessment of likely impacts and effects arising from changes within the settings of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This includes consideration of the Church of St Martin at Bladon.
Traffic, Access, and Construction			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0045, BW2_OFF_0046, BW2_OFF_0049, BW2_OFF_0050, BW2_PFF_0026, BW2_PFF_0036, BW2_OFF_0126, BW2_OFF_0130, BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_OFF_0146, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0170, BW2_OFF_0198, BW2_OFF_0214, BW2_OFF_0262, BW2_OFF_0266, BW2_OFF_0273, BW2_OFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0307, BW2_OFF_0310, BW2_OFF_0345, BW2_OFF_0356, BW2_OFF_0357,	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the project's impact on increased traffic caused by construction.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about increasing traffic on minor roads such as the A40, which already experiences high traffic.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0395, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0440, BW2_OFF_0466, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_OFF_0516, BW2_OFF_0536, BW2_OFF_0541, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0055, BW2_PFF_0059, BW2_PFF_0072, BW2_PFF_0080, BW2_PFF_0091, BW2_PFF_0093, BW2_PFF_0100, BW2_PFF_0145, BW2_PFF_0150, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0164, BW2_PFF_0185, BW2_PFF_0198, BW2_PFF_0252,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0262, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0283, BW2_PFF_0294, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0299, BW2_PFF_0303, BW2_PFF_0026, BW2_PFF_0257, BW2_PFF_0290			
BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_PFF_0290, BW2_OFF_0545, BW2_PFF_0130, BW2_PFF_0219, BW2_PFF_0080	<p>Respondents expressed concern about increased traffic on the A40.</p> <p>One respondent expressed concern that ongoing construction of the park and ride, then the A40 bus lane, and a housing development in Eynsham, will all cause added traffic.</p> <p>One respondent expects to see measures to avoid congestion on the A44 and A40.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that both the A40 and A44 roads are heavily congested and the road between</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. An assessment of cumulative effects on traffic and transport during the construction phase is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. Mitigation and enhancement measures adopted as part of the Project are set out in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Cassington and Yarnton are not suitable for large vehicles.		[EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_PFF_0299, BW2_PFF_0300	Respondents have provided specific concerns about the impact on Botley Road, and they speak as someone who has suffered the consequences of the current 18-mth long closure due to the bridge repair at the station.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including the impact of the Botley Road closure is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0015, BW2_OFF_0049, BW2_OFF_0050, BW2_PFF_0154	Respondents expressed concern about cable routes and would like them to avoid residential areas	Yes	Pipelines and cables will be laid via trenchless techniques (e.g. HDD) which limits harmful effects above ground. Please also see Figure 5.1 to 5.5 [EN010147/APP/6.4] and Volume 3, Appendix 6.2 for the Cable Laying Methodology and Indicative HDD Crossing Locations [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0229, BW2_PFF_0294, BW2_PFF_0265, BW2_PFF_0290	Respondents expressed concern about the use of the Swinford toll bridge.	Yes	There are no HGV access routes over the Swinford Bridge, as confirmed in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0219, BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_OFF_0535</p>	<p>Respondents would like to know why there is no traffic management plan.</p> <p>One respondent asked what is being done to ensure that the vehicles needed during the construction phase do not add to the frustrating and costly delays already experienced.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO. A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. Mitigation and enhancement measures adopted as part of the Project are set out in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_PFF_0191</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern that there are no plans for managing construction traffic and access near Cassington.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0442, BW2_PFF_0173</p>	<p>Respondents expressed that the Eynsham Road cannot cope with heavy goods vehicles, nor would the Eynsham toll bridge.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area, weight of construction vehicles and construction access routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. There are no HGV access routes over the Swinford Bridge, as confirmed in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0096, BW2_PFF_0299	Respondent expressed concern that the A34, frequently at a standstill, will be made even more congested, with more use of alternative routes making situation worse.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including on the A34, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0290	Respondents expressed concern about increased traffic from both the site and the Salt Cross/Garden village development.	Yes	An assessment of cumulative effects on traffic and transport during the construction phase is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondents enquired about what provisions are built into the contract to cover maintenance and continued running / rehabilitation of the site in the event that the present company goes out of business?	Yes	The application is supported by a number of Outline Management Plans, which in turn will be developed into detailed Management Plans, including Landscape and Ecology, and Operational Management and Decommissioning measures [EN010147/APP/7.6.2, 3 and 4]
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondents expressed concern about increased traffic on the A44.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including on the A44, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0021	One respondent questioned where the construction workforce would be accommodated and how they will travel.	Yes	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO. The Site Construction Compound Accesses are also detailed at [EN010147/APP/7.3.1]
BW2_PFF_0042	One respondent requested that HGVs be barred from using Heath Lane, Bladon as it is narrow and used by children.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including construction access routes and justification for these routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0166	One respondent is concerned about traffic between Bladon and Eynsham on Lower Road.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0286	Respondent expressed that the project is underestimating the amount of travel disruption we will have to endure during the construction phase of this project.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0343,	Respondent expressed that all construction traffic will have to use narrow or minor roads such as A4095 Bladon to Witney, B4044, B4017, Lower Road, Eynsham, Eynsham/Yarnton Rd, Cassington and Burleigh Rd, Cassington.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The construction access routes and justification for these routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0137	Respondent expressed concern with the traffic management assessment being desk-based, which they state does not create confidence in the effectiveness of mitigations taken against reducing the impact of construction traffic.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] details the site-specific surveys undertaken to inform the base traffic flows of the ES. The location and results of the commissioned traffic surveys are presented in Appendix 12.2: Traffic Survey Data [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0137	Respondent expressed that the core working hours of 7am to 7pm, 6 days a week would require significant lighting if they are to be implemented between October and March.	Yes	The proposed approach to working hours and the need for lighting will be advanced from the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BW2_OFF_0370	Respondent has expressed concern about increased traffic on Farmoor Road, which has already seen extreme cyclist fatalities.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including highway safety, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			and transport study area is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0451	Respondent enquired about the location of traffic access routes the Northern site.	Yes	The construction access routes and justification for these routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0451	Respondent enquired about where the temporary construction sites will be situated.	Yes	The location of the temporary construction compounds are shown within Volume 2: Figures of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4] .
BW2_OFF_0451	Respondent enquired about where the vehicular access points will be.	Yes	The location of the vehicular access points are shown within Volume 2: Figures of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4] .
BW2_OFF_0451	Respondent asked whether there will be the disruption to OX20 1ER.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0480	Respondent enquired whether pollution from construction traffic has been worked into the carbon offsetting figures of the project.	Yes	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] . This includes assessment of construction traffic.
BW2_OFF_0480	Respondent enquired about the carbon footprint of the lorries and machinery associated with the construction of the site.	Yes	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] . This includes assessment of construction traffic and on site energy use. Further information can be found in Volume 3, Appendix 14.2: Greenhouse Gas Calculations of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0482	Respondent expressed that the documents lack details on mitigating transport impacts and integrating with the planned Botley to Eynsham cycle route. They stated that this oversight violates the 'agent of change' principle and contradicts local planning policies.	Yes	Mitigation and enhancement measures adopted as part of the Project are set out in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Details of typical cycle paths, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the Outline

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Landscape and Ecological Management Plan ('oLEMP') [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_OFF_0498	Respondent expressed concern that the proposed depot on the A44 will create a dangerous traffic situation and cause mud to be dragged onto the A roads.	Yes	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice ('CoCP') requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_OFF_0515	Respondent expressed that the developers have covered the destruction of the construction phase with platitudes.	No	No response required
BW2_OFF_0545	Respondent expressed concern that the work on the A40 bus lane not started yet, park and ride site still being built, both to alleviate traffic but may not be ready in time.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0064	Respondent expressed satisfaction that the construction traffic will not pass through nearby villages.	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0073	Respondent expressed that they would like to see the project proceed in a way that minimises traffic disruption in the early phases of construction.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice ('CoCP') requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_PFF_0073	Respondent expressed that the Botley area sees a huge amount of traffic.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0093	Respondent expressed concern over traffic on Howden Road, A40 during construction.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area and construction access routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0155	Respondent expressed that Cumnor already suffering from HGV traffic, and with 66 HGVs per-day envisaged for the	Yes	HGVs will not pass through Cumnor, as set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] to be secured as

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	project, further road damage will be caused.		part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice ('CoCP') requirement within the draft DCO. A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Mitigation and enhancement measures adopted as part of the Project are set out in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_PFF_0155	Respondent expressed doubt that HGVs will avoid the roads around Cumnor.	Yes	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO which includes measures to ensure HGVs only access the site via the proposed construction access routes and avoid HGVs passing through Cumnor.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0211	Respondent expressed that there is no room in their village in Cassington for large construction vehicles and equipment to pass through safely.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including highway safety, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0212	Respondent requested further clarification on the expected traffic disruption to Eynsham and Farmoor.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0252	Respondent expressed concern about accessing pavements that are used by HGVs.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including non-motorised user amenity and fear and intimidation, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO which sets out key traffic management and mitigation measures for traffic and transport that will be implemented during the construction phase of the project.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0252	Respondent expressed concern that HGVs will use up pavement space, making bus stops and carparking spaces inaccessible, especially for those who are disabled.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including non-motorised user amenity and fear and intimidation, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice ('CoCP') requirement within the draft DCO which sets out key traffic management and mitigation measures for traffic and transport that will be implemented during the construction phase of the project.
BW2_PFF_0260	Respondent takes issue with long indivisible loads using the A4095 through Bladon, which has a very narrow section at the western end of the village, is close to the local primary school, and has a sharp bend with narrow pavements.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including the impact of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs), is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0265	Respondent expressed concern the A34 and A40 becoming congested and causing accidents.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including highway safety, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0269	Respondent reports that the B4044 is dangerous for cyclists and feels this should be addressed at any future consultations.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including highway safety, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent expressed concern that planned building developments at Eynsham and north of Oxford are going to bring increased construction traffic.	Yes	An assessment of cumulative effects on traffic and transport during the construction phase is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0278	Respondent expressed concern that the roads involved in the Botley West proposal are those that will be used to bypass such disturbances.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An assessment of cumulative effects on traffic and transport during the construction phase is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0283	Respondent expressed concern that construction vehicles using the B4044-Eynsham Road and B4017 - Farmoor to Cumnor Road, which are already running beyond capacity as a result of	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] which has considered the impact of the Botley Road closure.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	on-going roadworks on the A34 and A420 (Botley Road) causing a significant nuisance to the local communities which they pass.		
BW2_PFF_0300	Respondent commented that installing cables under Botley Road will add to the current disruption, making it even harder to get into Oxford.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Please also see the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] , Figure 5.1 to 5.5 [EN010147/APP/6.4] and Volume 3, Appendix 6.2 for the Cable Laying Methodology and Indicative HDD Crossing Locations [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0301	Respondent expressed concern about large lorries using the A4095 during construction.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area and construction access routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0302	Respondent highlights that access roads in the area are narrow, winding, and dangerous.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including highway safety and baseline environment conditions, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] and within Appendix 12.1: Description of network links and sensitivity [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent asks what will be done to protect the ditches and streams in the area from pollution by construction traffic?	Yes	The outline (and subsequent detailed) Code of Construction Practice will provide details of protection of watercourses, and pollution control in general [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BW2_OFF_0331	Respondent has requested more precise details about the construction process as it was lacking from the consultation process.	Yes	The outline (and subsequent detailed) Code of Construction Practice will provide further details of the construction process relating to the management of Dust, Soil, Public Rights of Way, Site Resources and Waste, and Construction Traffic [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent points out that not much is said on waste disposal.	Yes	The environmental impacts of waste during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Project have been assessed in Chapter 18: Waste and Resources [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Construction wastes will be managed in accordance with the Site Waste Management Plan ('SWMP') which forms part of the Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] and will be agreed with the relevant planning authority. The SWMP will set out the type and quantity of wastes that will be generated and how the wastes will be managed.
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent would like to know who is paying for and regulating installation, construction, and maintenance?	Yes	The outline and subsequent detailed Code of Construction Practice will provide details of managing the construction phase [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] and the Operational Management Plan will provide details of the maintenance during operation [EN010147/APP/7.6.2]
BW2_PFF_0258	Respondent comments that the proposed working hours of 7-19hrs Monday-Saturday are too much.	Yes	Construction working hours are set out in the Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0316	Respondent has asked what agency will be checking the build process if the project does happen, and how can it be made independent of the project funders?	Yes	The process of development will be controlled through a series of Management Plans (please refer to [EN010147/APP/7.6.1-7.6.4] and Requirements to be approved by the host authorities in liaison with statutory consultees.
BW2_OFF_0509	Respondent unhappy that sites of new access roads and temporary compounds were omitted.	Yes	The location of the vehicular access points and temporary construction compounds are shown within Volume 2: Figures of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4] .
BW2_OFF_0509	Respondent highlights a lack of detail regarding how construction, habitat enhancement and the farm itself, when operational, will be monitored.	Yes	The outline and subsequent detailed Code of Construction Practice will provide details of managing the construction phase [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] and the Operational Management Plan will provide details of the maintenance during operation [EN010147/APP/7.6.2]
BW2_PFF_0222	Respondent comments that the PEIR report states that there will be 'NO significant adverse effects, temporary or permanent, on the local landscape character arising from construction and	Yes	Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3.]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	operation of the project' and that this is frankly laughable.		
Land use and agriculture			
BW2_OFF_0009, BW2_OFF_0016, BW2_OFF_0025, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0065, BW2_OFF_0068, BW2_OFF_0075, BW2_OFF_0079, BW2_OFF_0082, BW2_OFF_0087, BW2_OFF_0090, BW2_OFF_0095, BW2_OFF_0096, BW2_OFF_0099, BW2_OFF_0108, BW2_OFF_0113, BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0122, BW2_OFF_0126, BW2_OFF_0133,	<p>Respondent expressed concern about the use of agricultural land.</p> <p>One respondent expressed the destruction of agricultural lands demonstrate a lack of attention to a comprehensive vision for sustainability.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that first-generation biofuel production on arable land being an issue, hence biofuel is now produced on marginal land to stop destruction of and competition with food-production farms.</p> <p>One respondent believes the project is underestimating the value of the land for agricultural use.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_OFF_0136, BW2_OFF_0150, BW2_OFF_0152, BW2_OFF_0157, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0160, BW2_OFF_0164, BW2_OFF_0169, BW2_OFF_0170, BW2_OFF_0172, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0179, BW2_OFF_0188, BW2_OFF_0198, BW2_OFF_0199, BW2_OFF_0200, BW2_OFF_0213, BW2_OFF_0223, BW2_OFF_0225, BW2_OFF_0232, BW2_OFF_0233, BW2_OFF_0237, BW2_OFF_0240, BW2_OFF_0241,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0245, BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_OFF_0255, BW2_OFF_0272, BW2_OFF_0276, BW2_OFF_0280, BW2_OFF_0286, BW2_OFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0291, BW2_OFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0307, BW2_OFF_0312, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0316, BW2_OFF_0317, BW2_OFF_0319, BW2_OFF_0325, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0331, BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0339, BW2_OFF_0342, BW2_OFF_0343, BW2_OFF_0345,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0348, BW2_OFF_0351, BW2_OFF_0353, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0362, BW2_OFF_0363, BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0372, BW2_OFF_0374, BW2_OFF_0376, BW2_OFF_0381, BW2_OFF_0386, BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_OFF_0393, BW2_OFF_0395, BW2_OFF_0397, BW2_OFF_0398, BW2_OFF_0400, BW2_OFF_0401, BW2_OFF_0404, BW2_OFF_0405, BW2_OFF_0408, BW2_OFF_0414, BW2_OFF_0415, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0420,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0426, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0428, BW2_OFF_0433, BW2_OFF_0434, BW2_OFF_0441, BW2_OFF_0442, BW2_OFF_0444, BW2_OFF_0445, BW2_OFF_0448, BW2_OFF_0449, BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_OFF_0451, BW2_OFF_0452, BW2_OFF_0453, BW2_OFF_0456, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_OFF_0460, BW2_OFF_0463, BW2_OFF_0473, BW2_OFF_0474, BW2_OFF_0476, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0483, BW2_OFF_0485, BW2_OFF_0488,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0492, BW2_OFF_0494, BW2_OFF_0506, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_OFF_0510, BW2_OFF_0515, BW2_OFF_0516, BW2_OFF_0521, BW2_OFF_0532, BW2_OFF_0534, BW2_OFF_0536, BW2_OFF_0537, BW2_OFF_0541, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_OFF_0552, BW2_PFF_0009, BW2_PFF_0027, BW2_PFF_0028, BW2_PFF_0031, BW2_PFF_0038, BW2_PFF_0042, BW2_PFF_0044, BW2_PFF_0045, BW2_PFF_0046, BW2_PFF_0048, BW2_PFF_0050,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0053, BW2_PFF_0054, BW2_PFF_0055, BW2_PFF_0057, BW2_PFF_0068, BW2_PFF_0085, BW2_PFF_0108, BW2_PFF_0110, BW2_PFF_0112, BW2_PFF_0115, BW2_PFF_0116, BW2_PFF_0118, BW2_PFF_0124, BW2_PFF_0135, BW2_PFF_0142, BW2_PFF_0143, BW2_PFF_0145, BW2_PFF_0161, BW2_PFF_0163, BW2_PFF_0176, BW2_PFF_0187, BW2_PFF_0190, BW2_PFF_0197, BW2_PFF_0198, BW2_PFF_0205, BW2_PFF_0207,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0213, BW2_PFF_0250, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0261, BW2_PFF_0262, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0271, BW2_PFF_0273, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_PFF_0283, BW2_PFF_0284, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0288, BW2_PFF_0290, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0296, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_PFF_0298,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0300, BW2_PFF_0301, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_PFF_0303, BW2_PFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0286, BW2_OFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0434, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_OFF_0521, BW2_PFF_0124			
BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0079, BW2_OFF_0164, BW2_OFF_0172, BW2_OFF_0179, BW2_OFF_0213, BW2_OFF_0232, BW2_OFF_0245, BW2_OFF_0272, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0428, BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_OFF_0451, BW2_OFF_0488,	Respondents expressed concern about food security, for example the project's impact on food imports, limited production of food, food security is more important than energy security,	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0004, BW2_OFF_0025, BW2_OFF_0426, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_PFF_0179, BW2_PFF_0027, BW2_PFF_0028, BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_PFF_0214, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0224, BW2_PFF_0229, BW2_PFF_0233, BW2_PFF_0243, BW2_PFF_0244, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0280, BW2_PFF_0281,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0288, BW2_PFF_0290, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_PFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0483, BW2_OFF_0483, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0225, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_OFF_0521			
BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0338, BW2_OFF_0544, BW2_PFF_0124, BW2_PFF_0155, BW2_PFF_0205, BW2_PFF_0087, BW2_PFF_0048, BW2_PFF_0230	<p>Respondents expressed concern that the land could never be returned to its agricultural use after 40 years.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that the land will not return to agricultural use, points to the fact that farmers will not want to remove 11 million (4 x concrete or steel screw 'feet', 4 x 2.7million solar panels) structures from the ground.</p>	Yes	<p>The Outline Soil Management Plan, as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains measures to limit impacts to soil resources, wherever practicable through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management. Following decommissioning of the site, the land</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			could continue to be used for agricultural production.
<p>BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_OFF_0320, BW2_OFF_0334, BW2_OFF_0514, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_OFF_0427</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the impact of the project on local farming, farmers and tenant farmers.</p> <p>Respondents expressed that the project will discourage British farming.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that the impact of the solar farm will be detrimental to the displaced farmers.</p> <p>Respondents asked what provisions are being made for the tenant farmers who currently farm this land.</p> <p>One respondent enquired about a farmer who is currently second generation and wanting to pass the land onto his son, farm in a way that the land was unproductive.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]. The use of this type of conservation grazing is already being practiced by Blenheim Estate in the local area with an existing flock and therefore the capability to implement this type of land management is available within the vicinity.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>Respondent expressed concern that vital agricultural skills will be lost due to the project's use of agricultural land.</p> <p>Respondent expressed that the land should be used for farming instead.</p> <p>Respondent expressed that solar farms create minimal maintenance jobs compared to current farming jobs.</p>		
<p>BW2_OFF_0379, BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_PFF_0048, BW2_PFF_0262, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_PFF_0280, BW2_PFF_0118, BW2_PFF_0238</p>	<p>Respondents expressed that exceptional needs for the use of BMV land must be stated ahead of consent.</p> <p>One respondent expressed concern that the farm goes against government policy which states BMV land should not be used for solar panels.</p> <p>One respondent suggested that PEIR 6.13.7. shows permanent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>One respondent does not believe claims that the majority of land that will be used by the project is low quality agricultural</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>land.</p> <p>Respondents expressed that 38% of the site is in the best and most valuable category.</p> <p>One respondent stated that much of the land surrounding Cassington, which is proposed for the solar panels, is categorised as grade 3b: moderate quality.</p> <p>One respondent stated the categories of farmland take no account of the biodiversity present in low-grade farmland.</p> <p>One respondent stated that Defra's prediction that climate change could reduce UK's high-grade land by 3/4 by 2050 must mean that we conserve as much of the remaining land as we can.</p>		

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_PFF_0261, BW2_PFF_0004, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_OFF_0258, BW2_OFF_0511, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0332, BW2_PFF_0078, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_OFF_0521, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_PFF_0211</p>	<p>Respondents commented on the possibility of sheep grazing on fields with solar panels.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the viability of sheep grazing on fields with solar panels.</p> <p>Respondents expressed that sheep grazing does not increase biodiversity.</p> <p>Respondents claims sheep grazing is incompatible with leaving the land to rewild for bees and butterflies, both have been proposed.</p> <p>One respondent enquired about the guarantee that sheep will enjoy grazing on grass from which sunlight has largely been excluded by the panels.</p> <p>One respondent enquired how will fields be maintained when sheep will be using them for grazing.</p> <p>One respondent enquired who will be</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing, with lower stocking levels, as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]. Full details of the biodiversity gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The use of this type of conservation grazing is already being practiced by Blenheim Estate in the local area with an existing flock and therefore the capability to implement this type of land management is available within the vicinity.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>looking after the sheep.</p> <p>One respondent asked how effective the grazing sheep will be when they need to be moved and housed during the winter months.</p> <p>Respondents recommended using controlled sheep grazing to check rewilding.</p>		
<p>BW2_OFF_0061, BW2_OFF_0074, BW2_OFF_0105, BW2_PFF_0113</p>	<p>Respondents expressed that the land in Oxfordshire is a good location for the project and the proposed land is poor quality for farming.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_OFF_0379</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the classification of agricultural land selected for use by the project.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that that a significant percentage of the land under panels is graded at 3a, 2 and 1, and that this land is around 40% of the total area of the solar farm.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.
BW2_OFF_0483	Respondent enquired whether there is a plan to replace lost farmland.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] . The Outline Soil Management Plan as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains measures to limit impacts to soil resources, wherever practicable.
BW2_OFF_0516	Respondent commented that combined with the Red House Solar Farm plans, the proposals use far too much agricultural land.	Yes	The assessment of the cumulative effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES -

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0540	Respondent supports the mention of a License Agreement with community agriculture groups, but enquired why these were not mentioned during the consultation.	No	Community Agriculture was discussed during the consultation, as evidenced by the written feedback
BW2_OFF_0540	Respondent enquired why Agri-solar/solar and combined agricultural uses haven't been mentioned.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using] conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_PFF_0004	Respondent expressed that local farmers do not farm intensively and they do promote sustainable and carbon capture behaviour.	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0015	Respondent expressed that the area needs fields of agriculture to sustain Oxon	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] . The Oxfordshire Food Strategy (2022) published by Oxfordshire County Council identifies that less than 1% of Oxfordshire's food is currently sourced locally within the region.
BW2_PFF_0027	Respondent expressed that Blenheim Estate is in the perfect position to introduce regenerative farming, thus protecting food security and biodiversity.	Yes	The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, through using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0229	Respondent expressed that the fields along the Evenlode river either side of Lower Road are good agricultural land currently used for wheat, rape and barley, so would be a great loss.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land. According to the soil survey work undertaken alongside the Evenlode comprise the soil profiles are poorly drained and predominantly limited to lower quality Subgrade 3b according to a soil wetness limitation.
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent enquired whether the project has engaged with local expertise such as Farmed and BBOWT.	Yes	BBOWT has been consulted as a notable organization and comments received, and the Applicant's responses, are set out elsewhere in this Consultation report [EN010147/APP/5.1]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0302	Respondent states that the connection to the grid is hugely damaging to the farming valley.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0379	Respondent enquired whether the project, as a NSIP, will have a land use plan that will support food production.	Yes	Please refer to the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities Plan [EN010147/APP/7.3.3] which shows potential land available for a community food growing area. The provision of space for food growing community groups is also presented within the Outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0488	Respondent highlights chapter 9, which states the site is made up of intensively managed agricultural fields, yet the farmland around Bladon has not been intensively farmed, and as such the local ecosystem has thrived.	Yes	Noted. The effects of the Project on ecology and habitat are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3] . It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
Hydrology and flood risk			
BW2_OFF_0027, BW2_PFF_0001, BW2_PFF_0016, BW2_OFF_0095, BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0126, BW2_OFF_0127, BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_OFF_0159, BW2_OFF_0216, BW2_OFF_0223, BW2_OFF_0237, BW2_OFF_0240, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0301,	Respondents expressed concern about the project's potential impact on flooding risk.	Yes	The design of the Solar PV ensures that any water that would have fallen on to the land in the pre-existing baseline will continue to do so during the Project. A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms effect runoff and mitigation measures used during the design are outlined in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0316, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0373, BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0449, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_PFF_0055, BW2_PFF_0096, BW2_PFF_0104, BW2_PFF_0121, BW2_PFF_0124, BW2_PFF_0144, BW2_PFF_0177, BW2_PFF_0178, BW2_PFF_0187, BW2_PFF_0052, BW2_PFF_0264, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0290, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_PFF_0182			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_OFF_0031, BW2_OFF_0159, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_PFF_0063, BW2_PFF_0201, BW2_PFF_0235, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0262, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0273, BW2_PFF_0284, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0158, BW2_PFF_0063, BW2_PFF_0224, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0427</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concerns regarding water runoff from the panels and subsequent river capacity.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about the effect of water runoff on soil structure.</p> <p>One respondent expressed concern about potential water runoff into the Cassington ditches, leading to the flooding of gardens and sports grounds.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that increased water off could be addressed through attenuation bonds and swales which would hold excess water and creating habitat diversity.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus climate change event.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_PFF_0057, BW2_PFF_0062, BW2_PFF_0091, BW2_PFF_0115, BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_PFF_0236, BW2_PFF_0238,</p>	<p>Respondents have expressed concern about the recent and potential flooding in Cassington.</p> <p>Respondents expressed that Cassington residents are anxious about water run off from panels, as the area is on a hill and the present drainage ditch</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_PFF_0284, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_OFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_OFF_0544, BW2_OFF_0441</p>	<p>could overflow and cause damage.</p> <p>One respondent reported that residents north of Cassington's main village road will be significantly impacted. While there's a potential enhancement area along the River Evenlode to the west of Cassington, it frequently floods.</p> <p>One respondent expressed concern about Cassington which is surrounded by a flood plain, and subject to flooding at the bottom of Elms Road. The flood panels will contribute to an increase in speed of run off of water and given the proximity of panels to houses, I can see nothing in the plans to mitigate risk to houses already under threat of flooding.</p>		<p>climate change event.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_OFF_0544, BW2_OFF_0477</p>	<p>Respondents expressed disappointment that there was no hydrology expert present at the consultation event.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0039, BW2_OFF_0480, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0258	Respondents requested more mitigation measures to reduce flood risk.	Yes	The design of the Solar PV ensures that any water that would have fallen on to the land in the pre-existing baseline will continue to do so during the Project. A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms effect runoff and mitigation measures used during the design are outlined in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0035, BW2_OFF_0331	Respondents expressed concern about potential flooding causing road closures.	Yes	The design of the Solar PV ensures that any water that would have fallen on to the land in the pre-existing baseline will continue to do so during the Project. A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms effect runoff and mitigation measures used during the design are outlined in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0273, BW2_OFF_0547	Respondent expressed that developers haven't adjusted the proposal despite feedback on flood risks.	Yes	Noted. An FRA has been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_PFF_0258	<p>Respondents commented that the majority of the proposed mitigation areas are in fact the floodplain of the River Evenlode, so could not be used for panels in any case.</p> <p>One respondent enquired how will building on the Evenlode flood plain impact flooding.</p>	Yes	<p>Solar panels have been sequentially steered to areas of low risk of flooding (including Flood Zone 1). The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>An FRA has been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_PFF_0284, BW2_PFF_0121	Respondents expressed that climate change means there will be more deluge with rains and droughts, worsening flooding.	Yes	An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This includes consideration of climate change in the sequential design of the

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			solar farm and surface water drainage strategy. The strategy is presented in in Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0126, BW2_PFF_0059	Respondents expressed concern about the location in a flood plain.	Yes	Solar panels have been sequentially steered to areas of low risk of flooding (including Flood Zone 1). A FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0259	Respondent enquired how recent and future flooding could affect the project.	Yes	A FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This includes consideration of climate change in the sequential design of the solar farm and surface water drainage strategy. The strategy is presented in in Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed concern that, even with flood mitigation measures in place, there will be no where for water to go below the fields by Jericho Farmhouse, which have already experienced drastic flooding.	Yes	<p>A Surface Water Drainage Strategy for the Project has been prepared and details how runoff will be managed throughout the Project, this is included in Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>Compared to agricultural (arable and livestock) use, solar PV modules are likely to create an overall betterment in surface water drainage than a continuation of the existing use.</p> <p>The primary reason for this is the significant advantage from full year-round organically managed vegetated ground cover within solar PV module. A second environmental benefit of solar PV modules is soil quality improvement from cessation of intensive arable use and organic management of the land. It is expected that soil health will be improved through the Project.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>As part of the Project, solar arrays are to be each placed with a 1.5 m to 3 m gap to provide adequate spacing to prevent the concentration of surface water dripping from the solar arrays. Vegetation will be placed beneath the panels to allow for infiltration at the lowest leading edge of panels. These measures ensure there is no significant increase in runoff or gully erosion.</p> <p>The FRA concludes that as a result of the solar Project there is no increase flood risk on site and off-site in line with the NPPF and NPS [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed concern about fields 2.53 to 2.60 with regarding to flooding, especially increased water run off from panels and flood damage to nearby residential properties.	Yes	Noted. An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] . T

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed that any mitigation schemes must be connected to the local watercourse, with watercourses at capacity already. In addition, when assessing the increased risk of flooding the appropriate statistics with reference to climate change must be applied.	Yes	An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This includes consideration of climate change in the sequential design of the solar farm and surface water drainage strategy. The strategy is presented in in Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed that when assessing the increased risk of flooding the appropriate statistics with reference to climate change must be applied.	Yes	An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This includes consideration of climate change in the sequential design of the solar farm and surface water drainage strategy. The strategy is presented in in Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent enquired about the large and old water main to the North of Jericho Farm Barn, and whether the construction of the panels will affect this and if it will be maintained.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0359	Respondent enquired how seasonal flooding on Lower Road will not be made worse by the project.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0440	Respondent expressed that the Evenlode valley is a natural flood plane and not suitable of this kind of development.	Yes	Noted. Solar panels have been sequentially steered to areas of low risk of flooding (including Flood Zone 1). An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0466	Respondent expressed concern about the insufficient research into Farmoor, which is high-risk to flooding.	Yes	An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This includes consideration of reservoir flood risk.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0466	Respondent enquired whether there will be a compensation scheme for residents if the project increases the risk of flooding.	No	The impact on flood risk is anticipated to have no significant impact when compared to the baseline flood risk.
BW2_PFF_0091	Respondent is seriously concerned over pipe lines/cables passing under flood plains and rivers.	Yes	Pipe lines and cables will be passed via trenchless techniques (e.g. HDD) which limits disruption above ground. The impact of the cable route on flood risk and water quality including any required mitigation is set out in Volume 1:, Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.5] . Please also see Figure 5.1 to 5.5 [EN010147/APP/6.4] and Volume 3, Appendix 6.2 for the Cable Laying Methodology and Indicative HDD Crossing Locations [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0136	Respondent would like to see French drains established along contours instead of directly downhill. Placed thus, they would accept surface runoff in flash floods following dry conditions and would delay the flux of water into adjacent water courses.	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0144	Respondent comments that storm drains are currently overflowing resulting in water running down Eynsham Road, Cassington and is concerned about increased flood risk potentially caused by the project.	Yes	<p>Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus climate change event.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_PFF_0016	Respondent stated that the valley near Long Hanborough to Eynsham is a flood plain and would not be suitable due to this.	Yes	Solar panels have been sequentially steered to areas of low risk of flooding (including Flood Zone 1). An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0260	Respondent concerned by the possibility that construction traffic, installation of panels and fencing is likely to fracture unmarked drainage pipes laid down in the flood plain of the river Evenlode, thus increasing the risk of further flooding.	Yes	Please refer to ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] for an assessment of the impact of solar panels including any required mitigation.
BW2_PFF_0273	Respondent reports that the project may impact future repair efforts for the network of old water mains feeding pikes across the fields, which continually burst.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0281	Respondent concerned by the possibility of panel run off leaking toxic chemicals into the ground water, rivers.	Yes	The impact of solar panels on water quality including any required mitigation is set out in Volume 1:, Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An Operational Management Plan has been provided as part of application for development consent [EN010147/APP/7.6.5] . Detailed OMP's will be developed in line with Outline OMP and agreed with relevant stakeholders. Detailed OMP's to be secured as DCO requirement and will include Pollution Prevention Plans.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0236	Respondent expressed concern regarding the water main, which has blocked the site and will be directly under affixed to solar panels according to the plans.	Yes	Thames Water assets have been indicatively located via Thames Water asset plans. Prior to any construction activities, detailed Thames Water surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken. Potential impacts to private water supplies are considered further within Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish the location of water supply and wastewater drainage infrastructure prior to intrusive work being undertaken. During construction, micro-routing or appropriate techniques will be employed where required to avoid impact to local services.
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed that a representative at the consultation event told them that the run-off from each panel does cause furrows on the land and that the trenches caused by such falling water could be filled with gravel below each panel. They stated that this seems highly improbable.	Yes	The Applicant does not intend to introduce large amounts of gravel on the Project site. The design of the Solar PV ensures that any water that would have fallen on to the land in the pre-existing baseline will continue to do so during the Project. A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms effect runoff

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			and mitigation measures used during the design are outlined in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0516	Respondent claims the construction of the energy transmission lines, especially the crossing of the River Thames at Swinford, the disruption in that area and the consequent traffic disruption seem very inconsistent with plans to be more energy efficient.	Yes	The impacts of construction on traffic are considered in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] and the application is supported by an Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent comments it is not clear what effects so many panels will have on drainage, and hence on retention of nutrients in the soil.	Yes	The design of the Solar PV ensures that any water that would have fallen on to the land in the pre-existing baseline will continue to do so during the Project. A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms effect runoff and mitigation measures used during the design are outlined in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Noise Impact			
BW2_OFF_0256, BW2_OFF_0434, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0541, BW2_PFF_0147, BW2_PFF_0250, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0262, BW2_PFF_0264, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_PFF_0303, BW2_OFF_0488, BW2_OFF_0547	<p>Respondents expressed concern about noise pollution caused by the project.</p> <p>One respondent believes noise pollution a problem, amplified by the topography of the area.</p> <p>One respondent believes the noise will be heard as far away as Winston Churchill's burial ground.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>As set-out in Volume 3: Appendix 13.3: Operational Phase Noise [EN010147/APP/6.5], the existing site topography has been included into the computer noise model which has been used to establish noise emissions from the PCS units.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0514, BW2_PFF_0270	Respondent comments that the number of inverters (156) is significant, and that solutions for noise-proofing should be employed.	Yes	The assessment includes a consideration of operational phase noise impacts, the assessment identifies that operational phase noise, from all of the 156 PCS units, without any additional noise mitigation, will cause a minor adverse impact at receptors, which is not significant. Furthermore, the PCS units are evenly distributed around the Project, and have been located and positioned to reduce any impact on receptors. Noise from the operation of the Project is considered fully within the technical information provided in Volume 3, Appendix 13.3: Operational Phase Noise [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0248, BW2_PFF_0250	Respondent concerned about the noise and vibrations caused by construction and the potential disruption residents will have to endure, day and night, for months.	Yes	During the construction phase, noise and vibration will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0250, BW2_PFF_0281	Respondents expressed concern about the noise impact on local ecology.	Yes	The impact of noise disturbance is assessed on ecology receptors in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0250, BW2_PFF_0251	Respondent expressed concern about the impact of noise on otherwise peaceful countryside/rural ambience	Yes	The noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] , with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4] , and ES Volume 3 (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The assessment shows that receptors will not experience a significant adverse effect from noise or vibration.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent stated that they do not believe the project will only create "humming" noises.	Yes	<p>The noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES [EN010147/APP/6.3], with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4], and ES Volume 3 (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The assessment shows that receptors will not experience a significant adverse effect from noise or vibration.</p> <p>The assessment considers any characteristics to the sound, (e.g. humming sound), impulsive sound (e.g. bangs) and intermittency (e.g. on/off states)</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed concern that they will be able to hear the infrastructure associated with the project from their residential property.	Yes	<p>The noise impact assessment, including in relation to residential receptors, has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES [EN010147/APP/6.3], with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4], and ES Volume 3 (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The assessment shows that sound from the development will be equal to or below the background sound level at all receptors, and so will not be a significant source of sound at any property.</p>
BW2_OFF_0451	Respondent enquired, in relation to the Oxford School of Drama, what noise pollution will there be from the site during the construction and after the construction period.	Yes	<p>The Oxford School of Drama is best represented by Sansom's Barn. As shown in ES Volume 3, 13.3 Operational Phase Noise (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5] the noise from the development will be 10dB below the background sound level at this receptor,</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			which has an impact magnitude of Negligible.
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent asks whether the impact of noise caused by construction on house foundations has been considered.	No	During the construction phase, noise and vibration will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent concerned over the noise that will be caused by trenching cables near Farmoor.	Yes	The noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES reference [EN]010147/APP/6.3] , with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 [EN010147/APP/6.4] , and ES Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The assessment shows that receptors will not experience

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>a significant adverse effect from noise or vibration, including from the installation of cables.</p> <p>Furthermore, during the construction phase, noise and vibration will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.</p>
BW2_PFF_0251	Respondent concerned that the landscape being covered with hard surface will reflect sound and thus have adverse effects on mental health and ecology.	Yes	<p>There is no clear link between reflected sound and an adverse effect on mental health and ecology.</p> <p>The noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES reference EN010147/APP/6.3, with additional</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>information provided in ES Volume 2 Figures [EN010147/APP/6.4], and ES Volume 3 Appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The assessment shows that receptors will not experience a significant adverse effect from noise or vibration.</p>
BW2_OFF_0273	Respondent has expressed concern that increased noise and pollution will disrupt residential areas and public pathways.	No	<p>The noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES reference [EN010147/APP/6.3], with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4], and ES Volume 3 (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The assessment shows that receptors will not experience a significant adverse effect from noise or vibration.</p>
Recreation and Amenity			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0164, BW2_OFF_0237, BW2_OFF_0310, BW2_OFF_0317, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0376, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0432, BW2_OFF_0441, BW2_OFF_0453, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_OFF_0462, BW2_OFF_0466, BW2_OFF_0468, BW2_OFF_0475, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0485, BW2_OFF_0488, BW2_OFF_0499, BW2_OFF_0529, BW2_PFF_0119, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0193, BW2_PFF_0207,	<p>Respondents are unhappy that recreational space will be ruined and reduced.</p> <p>Respondents wish to be appropriately compensated for the loss of recreation and amenity.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Impacts to recreational areas are considered within Vol 1, Socio Economics [EN010147/APP/6.3] and Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0240, BW2_PFF_0250, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0290, BW2_PFF_0299, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_PFF_0303, BW2_PFF_0305			
BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0469, BW2_OFF_0550, BW2_PFF_0123, BW2_PFF_0214, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0288	<p>Respondent expressed that no one would want to walk through a field of solar panels.</p> <p>Respondents, mainly from Bladon, have expressed concern that the village will be surrounded by panels - every approach road and every footpath.</p> <p>One respondent stated that adding new cycle paths and foot paths between acres of up to two-meter-high steel and glass holds no joy for recreation.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Information on footpath, cycle paths and roads is available within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3.]</p> <p>Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3.]</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0100, BW2_OFF_0181,	Respondents believe the plans are not enough and more amenities should be installed.	No	Noted, no response required.
BW2_OFF_0105, BW2_OFF_0539	Respondents believe that the loss of amenity is far outweighed by the benefits of renewables.	No	Noted, no response required.
BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_PFF_0048	Respondent has commented that a fence around the panel sites at a great height would be a total eyesore to anyone using the paths for recreation and from further afield.	Yes	Impacts to recreational areas are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way. [EN010147/APP/6.3.] Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_OFF_0405, BW2_PFF_0087	Respondent commented that the solar farm is against the residents' rights of enjoyment of their homes and local surroundings.	Yes	Impacts on local residents have been evaluated through out the EIA, and can be read in Vol 1, Chapter 21: Summary of Significant Effects. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_OFF_0290	Respondent has expressed that as long as Botley West increases amenity value, then they support it.	No	Noted, no response required.
BW2_OFF_0313	Respondent has expressed that the walk from Cassington's centre along the track is vital for mental health, as	Yes	Human Health, including mental health, has been considered within Vol 1,

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	emphasised during COVID and consistently valued. Views across fields enhance well-being, as depicted in the "Forever Fields" exhibition. High fences and solar panels, even partially obscured by hedgerows, won't provide the same benefit.		Chapter 16: Human Health. [EN010147/APP/6.3] Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, document reference [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent has remarked that the recreation area will end up being limited to Blenheim Park, which may not be free, or alternatively, we will need to drive to access open space.	Yes	Impacts to recreational areas are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 15: Socio Economics [EN010147/APP/6.3] and Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_OFF_0441	Respondent has expressed that the track leading away from Cassington is an important amenity for all of the residents and is one of the few local paths available for recreation.	Yes	The impacts on recreational use of footpaths are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_OFF_0516	Respondent raises that the fields as well as the paths are popular recreation sites, e.g. Begbroke, Bladon, and the fields nearest to the bluebell wood. Losing both the Farmoor and Begbroke areas of fields would be a loss of recreational land to both communities, and to other visitors.	Yes	Impacts on tourism and recreational areas are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 15: Socio Economics [EN010147/APP/6.3] and Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0516	Respondent expressed that losing both the Farmoor and Begbroke areas of fields would be a loss of recreational land to both communities, and to other visitors.	Yes	Impacts on recreational areas are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 15: Socio Economics. Document Reference EN010147/APP/6.3 and Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_PFF_0099	Respondent believes proposals for recreational spaces are vague.	Yes	Recreational use are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 15: Socio Economics. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] and Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health. [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_PFF_0136	Respondent supports the idea of creating allotments and suggests that these be established on better land where this is practical.	Yes	Whilst not being proposed as allotments, the Applicant has offered land in a range of locations, up to 30ha in total, which may be suitable for local food growing charities.
BW2_PFF_0136	Respondent suggests that the ground is improved for allotments by importing local compost from the recycling facility in Cassington.	No	Noted, no response required.
BW2_PFF_0209	Respondent expressed that Eynsham has already suffered from the loss of many pleasant walks due to other developments.	No	Noted, no response required.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent asked whether the developer will they liaise and consult with local authorities (Parish and District and County Councils) over rights of way.	No	Information on consultation is contained within the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BW2_PFF_0257	Respondent feels that enhancing areas around panelled fields will not work.	No	Noted, no response required.
BW2_PFF_0260	Respondent is concerned that the Bladon recreational area may be rendered unusable during construction work due to dust, glare and noise.	Yes	During the construction phase noise and vibration will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent unhappy at the lack of public parks in the area and in plans for developments in the area, including Botley West.	Yes	Recreational areas are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 15: Socio Economics. Document Reference EN010147/APP/6.3 and Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_PFF_0285	Respondent concerned that the project will take away access to the countryside for students, tourists, and city dwellers.	Yes	Access to the countryside is considered within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0287	Respondent states the mental health impact of seeing what will be akin to a vast prison fence encircling all the fields adjacent to the current Cassington path (and to the newly proposed paths in the Phase Two consultation leaflet) has not been adequately considered or mitigated against.	Yes	Health has been considered within Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health. [EN010147/APP/6.3] Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, [EN010147/APP/6.3.] Mitigation measures are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 21: Summary of Significant Effects. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_PFF_0290	Respondent comments that many people between Eynsham, Church Hanborough, Bladon and Cassington use the fields, to be enjoyed by them and their families, believes this will be destroyed by the plan.	Yes	Recreational areas are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 15: Socio Economics. Document Reference EN010147/APP/6.3 and Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health. [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_PFF_0300	Respondent is concerned by the effect of the project on Oxford, believing it may see an end to it being a commercial, heritage, and amenity city.	Yes	Socio-economic, heritage and amenity considerations are available within the chapters of the Environmental Statement. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_OFF_0262	Respondent expressed that it is a significant loss of land for recreational use e.g. footpaths for quiet walking (I	Yes	Footpaths and recreational areas are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	know they will be retained but with panels around)		[EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_PFF_0276	Respondent would like to register a strong request for the panels/project being moved further away from popular footpaths, to help improve wellbeing.	Yes	Health has been considered within Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3.] Footpaths are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_OFF_0262	Respondent has expressed that it is a significant loss of land for recreational use e.g. footpaths for quiet walking (I know they will be retained but with panels around)	Yes	The impacts of the Project upon footpaths are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_OFF_0370	This project is depriving the current and next generation of children of open space.	Yes	Land use is considered within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_OFF_0370	Respondent has commented that recent evidence shows children who have access to green space are healthier and do better educationally.	No	Noted, no response required.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0285	Respondent emphasises that the deleterious effects of such a monstrous development on the health and amenity of local residents have been seriously underestimated by the applicant.	Yes	Health has been considered within Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent expressed concern that fencing will limit residents' access to open spaces.	Yes	Land use is considered within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way. [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0379	Respondent enquired whether the project, as a NSIP, will have a land use plan that will support recreation and amenity.	Yes	Recreational areas are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 15: Socio Economics. Document Reference EN010147/APP/6.3 and Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_PFF_0272	Respondent states that the PEIR does not adequately assess the impacts on amenity to the cumulative impact of development in the area. Although other developments are listed in the PEIR (e.g. section 9), they are not shown on the plans they have seen.	Yes	Cumulative impacts are noted and considered within Vol 1, Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent states that the tenor of the PEIR is to minimise impact and does not convince that local residents,	Yes	Impacts on local residents have been evaluated throughout the ES, and the summary of effects can be read in Vol 1,

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	commuters, walkers etc. have really been considered. (6.12.11).		Chapter 21: Summary of Significant Effects. [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
Cycle Routes and Footpaths			
BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0065, BW2_PFF_0011, BW2_PFF_0026, BW2_OFF_0126, BW2_OFF_0366, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0442, BW2_OFF_0464, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_OFF_0535, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0057, BW2_PFF_0082, BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_PFF_0004, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0277,	Respondents believe cycle routes and footpaths will not be used as people do not want to walk amongst panels, high fencing, security cameras, or hedges with no views.	Yes	Noted, feedback suggests cycle routes will be very popular.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0280, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0294, BW2_PFF_0298			
BW2_OFF_0001, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_PFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0089, BW2_OFF_0100, BW2_OFF_0239, BW2_OFF_0311, BW2_OFF_0337, BW2_OFF_0362, BW2_OFF_0366, BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0375, BW2_OFF_0464, BW2_PFF_0057, BW2_PFF_0198, BW2_PFF_0225, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0303, BW2_PFF_0305	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the impact to footpaths, and the access to and through the site.</p> <p>Respondents have expressed concern about the impact that the project will have on dog walking through the site.</p>	Yes	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.</p>
BW2_OFF_0042, BW2_OFF_0044, BW2_OFF_0061,	Respondents are happy about the proposed foot and cycle paths but would like even more to be added, e.g. from	Yes	Noted.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0083, BW2_OFF_0124, BW2_OFF_0190, BW2_PFF_0150	Evenlode through Bladon and new circular routes.		
BW2_OFF_0516, BW2_OFF_0544, BW2_PFF_0137, BW2_PFF_0151, BW2_OFF_0424, BW2_OFF_0190, BW2_PFF_0258	<p>Respondents would like to see a B4044 cycle path which would be good for the local Botley and Eynsham communities and in keeping with a green energy scheme.</p> <p>One respondent stated that PVDP should commit to working with OCC to provide the long promised Eynsham - Farmoor – Botley segregated cycle route alongside the busy B4044.</p> <p>One respondent expressed concern that although there is provision for a cycle path along Lower Road linking Eynsham and the A40 with Long Hanborough, the station and Bladon, this might be delayed for some years due to this proposal and building.</p>	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0328, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_PFF_0108,	Respondents have expressed that a new footpath or cycleway won't negate the devastation caused by the project.	N	Noted

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0119, BW2_PFF_0214			
BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0320, BW2_OFF_0525, BW2_PFF_0170	<p>Respondents expressed that having a pathway that goes through the farm will not make up for or equate to uninterrupted views over rolling landscape.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that the proposed community paths are complete useless.</p>	N	Noted, no response required.
BW2_OFF_0516, BW2_OFF_0544, BW2_PFF_0137	Respondents would like to see well used footpaths to continue to be used.	Yes	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6]. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_OFF_0027, BW2_PFF_0298	Respondents expressed disappointment that some PROWs will be lost.	Yes	<p>There will be no permanent loss of PRoWS, just the need for temporary management measures during construction. The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site during construction are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent. PRoW are not proposed to be lost as a result of the project,</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			indeed enhancements to the network of recreational routes form part of the proposals.
BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0544	Respondents stated that if there were to be mitigations and concessions, there should be provisions for the B4449 Eynsham to Oxford Cycle path.	N	Noted
BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0544	Respondents recommended a cycle path from Green Lane in Yarnton to Kidlington.	N	Noted
BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0544	Respondents recommended a cycle path from Burleigh Road to Bladon.	N	Noted
BW2_OFF_0016	Respondent expressed concern that bridleways will be damaged.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site during construction are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6]. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_PFF_0042	One respondent would like access to be granted to other areas during construction to make up for loss of access to PRow.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project during construction are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_OFF_0256	One respondent is unhappy with the idea of having just one footpath created	Yes	More than one new permissive path is being created. Details are shown on the Illustrative Masterplans [EN010147/APP/6.4]
BW2_OFF_0286	Respondent has expressed concern that many of the paths and bridleways that they use on a daily basis will be inaccessible for long periods, or will no longer be worth walking on.	Yes	Noted. The Project will maintain access to public rights of way and other routes during construction, and provide new routes as well as enhancements to existing routes during operation. Further detail on access to PRow and associated health effects is discussed in Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0301	Respondent stated that the new path in Cassington goes through fields that are frequently flooded and therefore impassable.	N	Noted.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0301	Respondent stated that the new path to Church Hanborough is simply not needed.	N	Noted
BW2_OFF_0301	Respondent is concerned that the cycle route to Long Hanborough takes no account of how dangerous it is for a cyclist on the narrow roads to the station.	Yes	There is a pre-existing commitment from the Salt Cross AAP, and this will need to be the responsibility of the developer of the urban extension at Eynsham. The Applicant is offering to make land available within the site, and so taking cyclists off Lower Road if necessary, and reducing the risk of conflict with vehicular traffic. This is shown in the Illustrative Masterplan [EN010147/APP/6.4]
BW2_OFF_0311	Respondent commented that the proposal talks about a new circular walk close to Cassington but the language used is non-committal and vague, as are the plans to deliver community benefits.	Yes	The Applicant is proposing new permissive paths, and to enhance some existing routes to allow for cycling. Details of typical footpaths and cycle paths, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] A Public Rights of Way Management Strategy forms part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			On-going management of the scheme is set out in the outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2]
BW2_OFF_0324	Respondent commented that unless these footpaths are created sensitively, they are unlikely to be well-used or to have any positive effect on people living locally.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are set out in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . and a Public Rights of Way Management Strategy forms part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BW2_OFF_0334	Respondent enquired about the process of upgrading paths.	Yes	The Applicant is proposing new permissive paths, and to enhance some existing routes to allow for cycling. Details of typical footpaths and cycle paths, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] A Public Rights of Way Management Strategy forms part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] On-going management of the scheme is set out in the outline Operational

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2]
BW2_OFF_0334	Respondent would like to know how tall the fences will need to be.	Yes	Deer fencing will be 1.8 metres tall.
BW2_OFF_0334	Respondent enquired about the width of the established footpath provision.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site during construction are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_OFF_0351	Respondent has commented that the views from all their favourite walks, Spring Hill, Worton, Purwell Farm and many others will all be wrecked.	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, including

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			views from 55 agreed representative viewpoints, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_OFF_0357	Respondent expressed that access to existing paths and routes should be maintained or expanded, including appropriate pedestrian and cyclist access through all site fencing.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_OFF_0378	Respondent is concerned that their frequent walk between Church Hanborough and City Farm will be destroyed.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010147/APP/7.6]. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.</p>
BW2_OFF_0424	Respondent has recommended the proposed new footpaths and cycleways fail to reflect active travel desire lines.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant has been in dialogue with OCC PRoW officer and highways team about how cycle routes might be delivered, and will continue to work with stakeholders to assess the potential for active travel routes.
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent commented the cycle path they talk of constructing between Bladon and Begbroke will mean hard surfaces on what is now countryside, and there's already a decent cycle path along the A44 and the bridle path is, by its	Yes	The Applicant has been in dialogue with OCC PRoW officer and highways team about how cycle routes might be delivered, including the treatment of surfaces, and will continue to work with stakeholders to assess the potential for active travel routes. The implementation

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	designation, already done to be used by bikes.		of proposed routes will be subject to detailed design and approval by the LPAs prior to construction.
BW2_OFF_0451	Respondent has asked what is happening to public footpaths that are in the areas of grey on the map.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are set out in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . and a Public Rights of Way Management Strategy forms part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BW2_OFF_0482	Respondent is concerned that the proposed mitigation measures for the main walking routes are insufficient to address visual and noise impacts. These routes are significant and unique, with few alternatives available for the large local population.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are set out in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . and a Public Rights of Way Management Strategy forms part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] Noise from the operational phase will be controlled and limited by the Outline Operational Management Plan (OMP) [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] . This operational management plan will ensure that no

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			resident experiences a significant adverse effect. Furthermore, users of these routes are transient, which reduces their impact further.
BW2_OFF_0482	Respondent provided context that would appear to run contrary to VoWH Local Plan core policies 41 and 44; and the Neighbourhood Plan policies DBC7 and T13 (and similar WODC policies) the proposals fail to fully mitigate them leading to the conclusion that the development is disproportionate, out of scale or in layman's terms "greedy".	Yes	The relevant Development Plan policies are considered within each of the ES Chapters, as well as being set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]
BW2_OFF_0540	Respondent would like more footpaths and access, points out there's few footpaths within the site & some are overused and constantly muddy.	Yes	A number of new permissive paths are being created. Details are shown on the Illustrative Masterplans [EN010147/APP/6.4]
BW2_OFF_0540	Respondent points to the new community path in Blenheim from Long Hanborough as a great example of what can be done. There is lots of opportunity to have increased public access routes throughout the solar farm, and in the biodiverse sites around it (e.g. woodland and wetland).	Yes	Noted. The Applicant agrees that the Project will provide for additional routes, and connectivity provided by the Blenheim 'Velocity' project forms an important part of the wider active travel network.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0540	Respondent stated that there are many opportunities to increase public access routes throughout the solar farm, and in the biodiverse sites around it (e.g. woodland and wetland).	Yes	Noted. A number of new permissive paths are being created. Details are shown on the Illustrative Masterplans [EN010147/APP/6.4]
BW2_OFF_0542	Respondent would like a minimum width of 20 metres along all footpaths/cycleways with wider stretches in key sections of the Oxfordshire Way and Akeman Street footpaths.	Yes	Noted. Details of typical paths, their widths and landscape treatment, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan ('oLEMP') [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_PFF_0042	Respondent believes there should be public access granted to Bladon Heath for recreational exercise, improving community wellbeing.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0145	Respondent concerned regarding the turning of a bridleway into a cycle path, not good for pedestrians. People going for a quiet walk will be in danger from fast-moving + silent electric bikes.	Yes	Noted. Cycling is permitted on bridleways, just not on footpaths. The Applicant has been in dialogue with OCC PRoW officer and highways team about how cycle routes might be delivered, including safe shared use, and will continue to work with stakeholders to assess the potential for active travel routes

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0026	Respondent expressed that they are not sure why or how leading more footpaths across the site can be classed as a benefit.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0028	Respondent expressed that cycle routes everywhere is not the answer, as residents want to walk on the land.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0073	Respondent emphasises that cycleways and footpaths must be treated as integral as opposed to 'nice to have'.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant has been in dialogue with OCC PRoW officer and highways team about how cycle routes might be delivered, and will continue to work with stakeholders to assess the potential for active travel routes.
BW2_PFF_0214	Respondent expressed that the creation of new routes is laughable if it is to be sandwiched between panels.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0216	Respondent comments that new footpaths will be meaningless as walking through solar panels is not an amenity.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0222	Respondent states they appreciate that extending footpaths and adding cycle paths might be a good idea to some but surely not at the cost of the landscape and wildlife.	Yes	The impacts of habitat reduction and disturbance including from footpaths is assessed in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0222	Respondent states that no amount of artificial paths will make up for the lost paths and amenity.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0224	Respondent would like assurance that new paths link with the existing public rights of way and provide proper opportunities for low carbon transport use.	Yes	The implementation of proposed routes will be subject to detailed design and approval by the LPAs prior to construction, in line with Requirements attached to any DCO approval.
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent asks how will public footpaths be mowed, signposted and maintained?	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent. The proposed outline management of the landscape and ecology planting is laid out in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0239	Respondent would like to see support Bike Safe's campaign for a cycle route in Oxford.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0263	Respondent comments that the area needs cycle paths to encourage people to get on their bikes and out of their cars. This would massively help the environment but none of the suggested paths connect to the existing cycle ways in the area.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant has been in dialogue with OCC PRoW officer and highways team about how cycle routes might be delivered, and will continue to work with stakeholders to assess the potential for active travel routes.
BW2_PFF_0266	Respondent suggests it is wrong to equate paths through open fields with tracks through solar panels.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent reports that the provision of new cycle routes is of no benefit to many older residents.	No	Noted. Whether the particular benefits of elements of the Project are suited to all demographic groups is not a reason to not seek to provide them. In any case, many older residents do still cycle.
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent points out there is already a bridlepath from Heath Lane Bladon direct to Begbroke, as well as a hard-surface track, Orchard Field Lane, and segregated cycle paths both sides of the A44 from Woodstock to and from Begbroke.	No	Noted

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0244	Respondent highlights that some of the proposed new footpaths won't work because they cross areas that routinely flood.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0257	Respondent reports they walk on a regular basis from Eynsham to Church Hanborough and that this prospect will be ruined in the future.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0309	Respondent recommended that re-routeing the cycle path closer to the A34 and through the village, instead of towards the Science Park as this would mitigate impacts on pedestrians and school children.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant has been in dialogue with OCC PRow officer and highways team about how this cycle route might be delivered, and will continue to work with stakeholders to assess the potential for active travel routes.
BW2_OFF_0309	Respondent recommended pushing panels back to allow wider paths that aren't penned in would help reduce the landscape change.	Yes	Details of typical paths, their widths and landscape treatment, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan ('oLEMP') [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_PFF_0064, BW2_PFF_0072	Respondents would like to see a riverside walk along the River Evenlode to complement the landscape-scale corridor proposed, and suggest	Yes	Noted. A riverside path, along part of the River Evenlode, proposed at Phase 1 of the consultation, received little support. New permissive paths across the Evenlode valley, from Cassington to

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	extending the paths either side of the river further.		Church Hanborough are proposed. The Applicant will continue to review the opportunities for improved access to the countryside on land within the Order Limits.
BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0298	Respondent wants to see the 50 mile Oxford Green Belt Way, which is one of the many paths that criss-cross the proposed site, protected, primarily for the health benefits brought.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_OFF_0424	Respondent expressed, in reference to Illustrative Plans 2.1B, that the proposed cycle provision at Hordley is welcomed	Yes	Noted. The Applicant will continue to review the opportunities for active travel, in liaison with OCC, and the opportunity

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	but it is not a strategically significant connectivity route		to make connection between existing cycle routes between Hordley Farm and Sansoms Farm.
BW2_OFF_0424	Respondent expressed that the crossroads at Weaveley/Upper Weaveley is, however, a key carriageway connectivity route between Woodstock and Tackley and this crossroads is identified as a cable route on the plan 2.4A. They stated that PVDP should commit to working with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) – the Traffic Authority - to ensure that the busy and fast B4027 crossroads is made safer for cycles and pedestrians, at least with suitable lines and signs.	Yes	OCC will be responsible for approving the Project's Traffic Management Plan. [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BW2_OFF_0424	Respondent, referring to Illustrative Plans 2.2A and 2.2B. stated that the new Bladon to Begbroke cycle/footpath connection does not reflect any significant travel desire line. They suggested improvements to the existing bridleway that runs from the top of Heath Lane, Bladon, through Bladon Heath wood and emerges in Begbroke near to Hall Farm. They added that a	Yes	Noted. The Applicant will continue to review the opportunities for active travel, in liaison with OCC, and on land within the Order Limits, over which the Applicant has control.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	simple hard stone gravel surface to a width of two metres is all that is required.		
BW2_OFF_0424	Respondent does not support the belief that engagement should take place with the Eynsham Salt Cross development to part fund the Eynsham to Hanborough rail station segregated cycle route alongside Lower Road. They stated that this project should be entirely funded by the Salt Cross development under a S 106 or similar undertaking.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant agrees, this pre-existing commitment from the Salt Cross AAP will need to be the responsibility of the developer of the urban extension at Eynsham.
BW2_PFF_0145	Respondent notes the bridleway between Bladon & Begbroke is ancient and part of the Shakespeare way.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0072	Respondent would like to see cycle access from Cassington to the new cycle path on Lower Road.	Yes	The Project makes provision for new permissive paths to connect Cassington to Lower Road / Church Hanborough – but does not propose a cycle link here. This is being better facilitated by connections between the existing A40 cycle route and the proposed Salt Cross to Hanborough Station cycle route.
BW2_OFF_0396	Respondent comments that mitigation won't work for the footpaths and cycle path up the Dorn Valley, being	No	Noted

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	surrounded by solar panels on both sides; they will no longer be pleasant places to walk or cycle.		
BW2_OFF_0396	Respondent states that the B4027 from Wootton to the drama school will have panels on both sides of the road which will affect many of the views from other paths and bridleways nearby.	Y	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4] .
BW2_OFF_0248	One request for a cycle link from Eynsham/Cassington roundabout to the A4095.	No	Noted. The delivery of a new active travel route from the A40 to Hanborough Station forms part of a previous commitment from the Salt Cross Development, to be delivered by the developers of that scheme. The Botley West Project makes allowance for its incorporation into the Site, but the

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Applicant is not delivering the route itself.
BW2_PFF_0212	Respondent would like to see more impact on Farmoor, specifically the footpaths outside and around the reservoir.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0212	Respondent would like assurance that the footpath outside and around the reservoir in Farmoor will remain accessible as an important round walk, both during and after the wo.	Y	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_PFF_0212	Respondent expressed that the footpath outside and around the reservoir in	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Farmoor does not appear on any of the project's maps.		Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_PFF_0212	Respondent would not like the location of the substation to disturb the footpath in and around the reservoir in Farmoor.	No	The proposed location of the substation would not physically impact the path around the reservoir.
BW2_PFF_0214	Respondent expressed that the area around Denman's Lane in Cumnor is very widely used by walkers, with or without dogs.	Yes	Noted. The assessment of the effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are set out in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent mentions the proposed cycle path starting at School Lane Bladon is proposed as a cycling commuters' offroad route to Begbroke Science Park, however this would be opposed by Bladon residents and the parish council, which works to discourage cycling on this public footpath in view of conflict between vulnerable users and wheeled traffic.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant has been in dialogue with OCC PRoW officer and highways team about how this cycle route might be delivered, and will continue to work with stakeholders to assess the potential for active travel routes.
BW2_PFF_0260	Respondent reports there is a popular circular walk from Begbroke via Bladon that is used by many visitors to Winston Churchill's grave, but that no one is going to want to use it if it means walking on paths with 2m fences on either side.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are set out in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . and a Public Rights of Way Management Strategy forms part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] The effects of the Project upon the desire for users to use the network of paths and bridleways, and their overall recreational experience, is assessed in Chapter 16 Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The impacts of the proposal upon Tourism are also assessed in Chapter 15 Socioeconomics [EN010147/APP/6.3] All three of these Chapters have drawn upon information from footpath user surveys that were undertaken in the summer of 2024. Details of typical footpaths and cycle paths, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] The overall harm and benefits of the Project are considered in the planning balance set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]</p>
Climate Change and Energy Need			
BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0065, BW2_PFF_0004, BW2_PFF_0001, BW2_PFF_0014,	Respondents believe there is a need for renewable energy but do not support the proposals.	No	The Applicant notes this wider support for renewable energy, from these respondents.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0015, BW2_PFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0075, BW2_OFF_0097, BW2_OFF_0100, BW2_OFF_0108, BW2_OFF_0125, BW2_OFF_0132, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0164, BW2_OFF_0179, BW2_OFF_0185, BW2_OFF_0188, BW2_OFF_0202, BW2_OFF_0229, BW2_OFF_0231, BW2_OFF_0238, BW2_OFF_0241, BW2_OFF_0246, BW2_OFF_0250, BW2_OFF_0253, BW2_OFF_0309, BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_OFF_0499, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_OFF_0528,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0532, BW2_PFF_0055, BW2_PFF_0106, BW2_PFF_0120, BW2_PFF_0124, BW2_PFF_0138, BW2_PFF_0141, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0184, BW2_PFF_0197, BW2_PFF_0201, BW2_PFF_0214, BW2_PFF_0243, BW2_PFF_0246, BW2_PFF_0252, BW2_PFF_0253, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_PFF_0290, BW2_PFF_0292, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0303			
BW2_OFF_0031, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_PFF_0008, BW2_PFF_0016,	Respondents believe solar is not suitable for the UK climate. Respondents expressed solar panels in	No	As has been confirmed within the British Energy Security Strategy issued by the UK Government in 2022 " <i>There is currently 14GW of solar capacity in the</i>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0031, BW2_PFF_0036, BW2_OFF_0121, BW2_OFF_0128, BW2_OFF_0129, BW2_OFF_0136, BW2_OFF_0208, BW2_OFF_0212, BW2_OFF_0225, BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_OFF_0280, BW2_OFF_0291, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0374, BW2_OFF_0375, BW2_OFF_0386, BW2_OFF_0388, BW2_OFF_0430, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0440, BW2_OFF_0483, BW2_OFF_0499, BW2_PFF_0108, BW2_PFF_0126, BW2_PFF_0213, BW2_PFF_0288,	a climate where it rains a lot and there are many days of overcast skies is a massive waste of resources.		<i>UK split between large scale projects to smaller scale rooftop solar. The cost of solar has fallen by around 85 per cent over the past decade... We expect a five-fold increase in deployment by 2035."</i>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0292, BW2_PFF_0296, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_OFF_0431, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0316, BW2_OFF_0338, BW2_PFF_0101, BW2_PFF_0245, BW2_PFF_0257, BW2_OFF_0405, BW2_PFF_0101			
BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0199, BW2_OFF_0239, BW2_OFF_0242, BW2_OFF_0249, BW2_OFF_0256, BW2_OFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0318, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0331, BW2_OFF_0342, BW2_OFF_0345, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0375,	<p>Respondents concerned about carbon footprint associated with the construction of the project.</p> <p>A respondent has expressed that studies show that the carbon footprint of solar panel construction and maintenance outweighs the energy they produce.</p> <p>A respondent asked, assuming the average low proportion of the day in which these panels will be generating electricity, how long will it take before</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3], including an assessment of whole life effects.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0397, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0436, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0494, BW2_PFF_0230, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0256, BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_PFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0118, BW2_OFF_0431, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0483, BW2_PFF_0260	<p>the initial carbon footprint (construction, panel production) is offset?</p> <p>One respondent expressed that the carbon footprint of all the equipment and minerals has not been calculated.</p>		
BW2_OFF_0431, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0328, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0239, BW2_PFF_0122,	<p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the efficiency of solar power.</p> <p>One respondent also comments solar power is far less effective in winter, generating only 10% of summer output due to shorter days, fewer clear days,</p>	Yes	<p>Consideration of the overall need for, and efficiency of, the Solar Farm Project is set out within the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/PP/7.1]</p> <p>The proposal is to retain agricultural use of the Site for conservation grazing, so</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0139, BW2_PFF_0159, BW2_PFF_0160, BW2_PFF_0179, BW2_PFF_0186, BW2_PFF_0196, BW2_PFF_0206, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0226, BW2_PFF_0230, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0280, BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_PFF_0288, BW2_PFF_0296, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_PFF_0085, BW2_PFF_0127, BW2_PFF_0202, BW2_OFF_0427	<p>and the sun's lower position.</p> <p>One respondent points out that if solar is less efficient, especially considering the UK climate, than other green sources, then the land will actually be less productive than it was under its traditional use, agriculture.</p>		<p>the land will still have a productive, if less intensive, agricultural use.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0012, BW2_OFF_0023, BW2_OFF_0035, BW2_OFF_0041, BW2_OFF_0062, BW2_OFF_0074, BW2_OFF_0077, BW2_OFF_0084, BW2_OFF_0105, BW2_OFF_0116, BW2_OFF_0135, BW2_OFF_0154, BW2_OFF_0190, BW2_OFF_0207, BW2_OFF_0251, BW2_OFF_0516, BW2_OFF_0519, BW2_OFF_0524, BW2_PFF_0096, BW2_PFF_0128, BW2_PFF_0129, BW2_PFF_0130, BW2_PFF_0148, BW2_PFF_0188, BW2_OFF_0105, BW2_OFF_0251	<p>Respondents believe there is a significant need for renewable energy and are happy about the proposals.</p> <p>One respondent supports the proposals as a method of 'buying time' in the climate crisis, before other solutions are found.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This positive response and commentary is noted, and welcomed by the Applicant.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0532, BW2_OFF_0533, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0213, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0230, BW2_PFF_0256, BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_OFF_0294, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0232, BW2_OFF_0533, BW2_OFF_0071, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_PFF_0100, BW2_PFF_0248, BW2_OFF_0533, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0157, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0331, BW2_OFF_0533	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the use of imported panels from China.</p> <p>Respondents enquired about the carbon footprint of manufacturing and shipping panels from China.</p> <p>One respondent requested a detailed statement on the sourcing of the solar panels and whether this has been sourced via slave labour.</p> <p>Respondents enquired whether sourcing materials from only Britain has been considered.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>GHG emissions arising from shipping of materials to construct the project has been assessed and set out within Volume 2, Appendix 14.2: Greenhouse Gas Calculations [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0006, BW2_OFF_0016, BW2_OFF_0031, BW2_OFF_0057, BW2_OFF_0071, BW2_OFF_0087, BW2_OFF_0110, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0255, BW2_OFF_0490, BW2_PFF_0057, BW2_PFF_0059, BW2_PFF_0065, BW2_PFF_0104, BW2_PFF_0155, BW2_PFF_0240, BW2_PFF_0252	Respondents believe the project is not a renewable solution or is not environmentally friendly.	No	No response required
BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0532, BW2_OFF_0533, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0213, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0230, BW2_PFF_0256,	Respondents expressed that no detail on the carbon debt of the whole project, or detail on the pay back period. Respondents commented that maintaining and decommissioning the panels adds to carbon debt.	Yes	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0117, BW2_OFF_0458			
BW2_OFF_0003, BW2_PFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0341	Respondents believe the project is unsustainable as it will require a lot of maintenance.	Yes	The proposed approach to maintenance is set out in the Outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2]
BW2_OFF_0164, BW2_OFF_0528	Respondents would like a balanced and sustainable approach to renewable energy.	No	No response required
BW2_PFF_0250, BW2_PFF_0283	Respondents commented that the pollution caused by having to replace locally produced food with food from other farms or abroad, would be counterproductive to the idea of solar energy	Yes	The continued agricultural use of the land, for conservation grazing is a key part of the proposal, allowing for a dual approach to the land use. Land is also being made available for local food growing groups.
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent enquired whether the sewage treatment plant in Cassington, opposite Worton (fields 2.53 to 2.60), will be affected by the installation of the project.	No	It will not be impacted
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent has expressed concern that the sewage plant might be compromised and cause pollution.	No	It will not be impacted

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0304	Respondent has reported that there is a better way to address the climate crisis.	No	No response required
BW2_OFF_0342	Respondent has commented that this large-scale solar development puts energy production in the hands of an overseas company.	No	No response required
BW2_OFF_0431	Respondent expressed the booklet misleads on CO2 reduction and lacks comparison with other renewable energy forms.	Yes	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects.
BW2_PFF_0046	Respondent sees the need for local energy solutions and has heard that local industries are unable to grow due to a lack of energy in the grid due to new housing being built.	Yes	This need case is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]
BW2_PFF_0226	Respondent comments that using natural gas in winter and renewables in summer means we could end up with an oversupply of energy, produced by solar panels that only work in the summer,	No	The flexibility of a renewable sector that generates energy year-round and in a range of forms and locations is a cornerstone of the UK strategy. The most appropriate, affordable and deliverable form of renewable energy in

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	rather than windfarms which work all year round.		Oxfordshire, where there is both demand and capacity, is ground mounted solar.
BW2_PFF_0251	Respondent believes it is more important to remove CO2 from the atmosphere, and that shifting CO2 emissions elsewhere will not reduce climate change	No	Carbon capture is an important technology, but the UK Energy Strategy seeks a range of solutions, including ground mounted solar, in order to deliver against targets.
BW2_PFF_0251	Respondent believes that buildings and people will become more energy efficient, so the projects electricity will not be needed	Yes	A key reason for the temporary nature of the proposals is that, it is hoped, in due course, other green and renewable sources will allow for the removal of large scale ground mounted solar. At the moment, based on decarbonization and climate change targets, the clean energy is very much needed.
BW2_PFF_0258	Respondent concerned that the proposals of the Zero Carbon Oxfordshire '21 report have been ignored.	Yes	The Energy Strategy for Oxfordshire, performance by LPAs against climate change declarations and the delivery of Zero Carbon within the County, are considered in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]
BW2_PFF_0260	Respondent points out that the National Grid has inadequate storage capacity so the panels might have to be turned off in summer.	Yes	Energy storage capacity it is available at the Cowley Energy Hub, which is proposed to be connected to the Project via the NGET transmission lines.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0274	Respondent asks why does Oxfordshire need to increase its energy output to three-times what it is now when there are other counties in the UK.	Yes	The need case, including an assessment of capacity and demand, is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1] and the Alternatives Assessed are considered in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent claims the statement used that Botley West will lead the way in achieving 50% Carbon emissions reduction by 2030 is invalid due to the carbon footprint of construction, panel manufacture, and loss of biodiversity.	Yes	The overall carbon balance of the project is considered in the ES Climate Change Chapter 14 [EN010147/APP/6.3] The impacts on biodiversity are assessed in Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0286	Respondent states the project will have no measurable impact on global climate change as Britain is not a major polluter like China, India.	No	No response required
BW2_OFF_0389	Respondent expressed that the only way that this could truly increase energy security is for it to be not only UK owned but publicly owned – either nationally or via a community-based model.	No	No response required
BW2_OFF_0335	Respondent expressed a solar farm on this scale should have storage to be	No	Energy storage is not proposed as part of the Project, as it is available at the

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	effective in supporting decarbonisation of the National Grid.		Cowley Energy Hub, which is connected via the NGET transmission lines.
BW2_OFF_0379	Respondent enquired whether the project, as a NSIP, will have a land use plan that will support energy use.	No	Noted. The basis for the need and detailed justification for the Project is set out in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0074	Respondent believes the project is simply following the current trend for renewable energy.	No	No response required
BW2_PFF_0251	Respondent believes that energy generation should not be in the hands of privately owned companies, which are driven by profit and can be bought, which means no energy security.	No	No response required
BW2_PFF_0299	Respondent cannot support the project on the basis it seems to claim to be addressing climate change vastly, yet it comes at the expense of the countryside, contrary to government encouragement to embrace the countryside and encourage biodiversity.	No	No response required
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent enquired whether the developer will receive penalties or fines if CO2 emissions are not reduced by the project.	No	No response required

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent expressed that connecting the power generated directly to the National Grid means it won't specifically help Oxfordshire achieve net-zero emissions.	Yes	The energy will be sent to the National Grid, but largely consumed in the sub-region, including Oxfordshire.
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent expressed that the project will deliver energy to the entire UK, not benefiting Oxfordshire as claimed.	Yes	The energy will be sent to the National Grid, but largely consumed in the sub-region, including Oxfordshire.
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed that they were not given a clear answer on how many years it would take for the development to become carbon neutral.	Yes	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects.
Socioeconomics			
BW2_OFF_0045, BW2_OFF_0046, BW2_OFF_0047, BW2_PFF_0011, BW2_PFF_0017, BW2_OFF_0126, BW2_OFF_0144, BW2_OFF_0214, BW2_OFF_0216,	Respondents are concerned about house prices being negatively affected. Respondent is concerned, in relation to the Oxford School of Drama, that the proposals for Botley West Solar Farm will irrevocably damage current and future tenant's business.	Yes	An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it was agreed any impact would not be significant. The effects of development upon property value are not a material planning consideration.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0351, BW2_OFF_0375, BW2_OFF_0386, BW2_OFF_0413, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0468, BW2_OFF_0474, BW2_PFF_0088, BW2_PFF_0198, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0248, BW2_PFF_0264, BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_OFF_0534, BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0143, BW2_PFF_0177, BW2_PFF_0198, BW2_OFF_0451, BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_PFF_0146, BW2_OFF_0289	<p>Respondent expressed concern that the project is projected to knock an average of £25,000 off house values in Cassington, and that this is already affecting sellers in the area e.g. buyers looking elsewhere.</p>		<p>The impacts of construction noise and effects in relation to key receptors, including Sansom's Farm, which is in close proximity to the Oxford Drama School, are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES Noise and Vibration [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0045, BW2_OFF_0046, BW2_PFF_0036, BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0414, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_PFF_0206, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0292, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_PFF_0004, BW2_OFF_0534, BW2_PFF_0244, BW2_PFF_0292	<p>Respondents believe the project would negatively effect tourism in the area.</p> <p>Respondents expressed that the project will have a negative impact on people wishing to come and visit the area.</p> <p>One respondent believes the experience of both living and visiting West Oxfordshire will be degraded.</p> <p>One respondent believes the solar farm will put off the few people that visit Blenheim.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Tourism impacts have been evaluated in the Socio Economic EIA Chapter 15 at Section 15.9.5, [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>
BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_PFF_0187, BW2_OFF_0248, BW2_PFF_0264	<p>Respondents acknowledge that the project could provide employment opportunities but believe they are not needed in the area.</p> <p>One respondent stated that they would like to see guaranteed job opportunities for locals.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Please refer to the Employment and Skills Plan which outlines PVDP's employment strategy Chapter 15 - Appendix 15.2 [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	One respondent pointed out that employment opportunities will be short term as once the panels are up there will be no requirement to keep on many of the people employed.		
BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0045, BW2_OFF_0046	Respondents are concerned that the proposals could negatively effect small local businesses.	No	Please refer to the Employment and Skills Plan which outlines PVDP's employment strategy Chapter 15 - Appendix 15.2 [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BW2_PFF_0276	Respondent believes the project will drive young people out of the area.	No	The Applicant notes comment but does not consider it to be consistent with evidence.
BW2_OFF_0391	Respondent has commented that there may be scope for some extra employment, they do not feel there would be more opportunities than there would be for other use of the land.	Yes	Please refer to the ES Socio Economic Chapter 15 [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] and the Employment and Skills Plan which outlines PVDP's employment strategy Chapter 15 - Appendix 15.2 [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_OFF_0414, BW2_PFF_0103	Respondents commented that they have seen no evidence that this will add to the local economy but will no doubt de-value local asset values.	No	An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it was agreed any impact would not be significant.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Project Description			
BW2_OFF_0007, BW2_OFF_0008, BW2_OFF_0009, BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0029, BW2_OFF_0047, BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0068, BW2_PFF_0013, BW2_PFF_0019, BW2_PFF_0020, BW2_PFF_0030, BW2_PFF_0033, BW2_OFF_0075, BW2_OFF_0080, BW2_OFF_0087, BW2_OFF_0088, BW2_OFF_0095, BW2_OFF_0111, BW2_OFF_0117, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0162, BW2_OFF_0164,	Respondents have expressed opposition to the project. Respondents expressed that the project is not needed. Comments on the level of opposition and that an approval of the Project would be considered undemocratic.	No	The Applicant notes this opposition.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0165, BW2_OFF_0169, BW2_OFF_0191, BW2_OFF_0196, BW2_OFF_0215, BW2_OFF_0228, BW2_OFF_0232, BW2_OFF_0238, BW2_OFF_0243, BW2_OFF_0250, BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_OFF_0264, BW2_OFF_0265, BW2_OFF_0276, BW2_OFF_0348, BW2_OFF_0372, BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0428, BW2_OFF_0440, BW2_OFF_0445, BW2_OFF_0456, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_OFF_0483,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0494, BW2_OFF_0495, BW2_OFF_0503, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_OFF_0523, BW2_OFF_0543, BW2_OFF_0551, BW2_PFF_0050, BW2_PFF_0057, BW2_PFF_0067, BW2_PFF_0079, BW2_PFF_0088, BW2_PFF_0100, BW2_PFF_0104, BW2_PFF_0116, BW2_PFF_0126, BW2_PFF_0142, BW2_PFF_0143, BW2_PFF_0160, BW2_PFF_0181, BW2_PFF_0183, BW2_PFF_0204, BW2_PFF_0009, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0245,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0248, BW2_PFF_0250, BW2_PFF_0252, BW2_PFF_0262, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_PFF_0292, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0299, BW2_OFF_0314, BW2_PFF_0019, BW2_PFF_0193			
BW2_OFF_0004, BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0029, BW2_OFF_0057, BW2_OFF_0068, BW2_PFF_0007, BW2_PFF_0010, BW2_OFF_0075, BW2_OFF_0087, BW2_OFF_0092, BW2_OFF_0099, BW2_OFF_0110, BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_PFF_0043,	<p>Respondents have suggested that the primary aim of the project is to make profits rather than environmental gains.</p> <p>Respondents requested for more financial transparency.</p> <p>Respondents expressed that the project will provide income for a few very effectively, at the expense of others.</p> <p>Respondents believe that shareholders will be prioritised at the expense of public benefit.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes these comments.</p> <p>The need case for the Project is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0127, BW2_OFF_0131, BW2_OFF_0162, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0185, BW2_OFF_0197, BW2_OFF_0226, BW2_OFF_0240, BW2_OFF_0245, BW2_OFF_0309, BW2_OFF_0312, BW2_OFF_0316, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0329, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0333, BW2_OFF_0341, BW2_OFF_0353, BW2_OFF_0385, BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_OFF_0398, BW2_OFF_0400, BW2_OFF_0401, BW2_OFF_0405, BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_OFF_0407,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0411, BW2_OFF_0413, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0430, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0439, BW2_OFF_0452, BW2_OFF_0466, BW2_OFF_0476, BW2_OFF_0478, BW2_OFF_0485, BW2_OFF_0497, BW2_PFF_0053, BW2_PFF_0057, BW2_PFF_0107, BW2_PFF_0125, BW2_PFF_0177, BW2_PFF_0074, BW2_PFF_0230, BW2_PFF_0233, BW2_PFF_0240, BW2_PFF_0245, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_PFF_0293, BW2_PFF_0294,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_PFF_0303, BW2_OFF_0353, BW2_PFF_0245, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0013, BW2_OFF_0172, BW2_OFF_0191, BW2_OFF_0554, BW2_PFF_0087, BW2_PFF_0202, BW2_OFF_0544			
BW2_OFF_0002, BW2_OFF_0005, BW2_OFF_0010, BW2_OFF_0011, BW2_OFF_0015, BW2_OFF_0023, BW2_OFF_0024, BW2_OFF_0041, BW2_OFF_0042, BW2_OFF_0044, BW2_OFF_0049,	Respondents have expressed support for the project.	No	The Applicant notes this support.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0061, BW2_OFF_0062, BW2_OFF_0067, BW2_OFF_0074, BW2_OFF_0140, BW2_OFF_0077, BW2_OFF_0105, BW2_OFF_0116, BW2_OFF_0135, BW2_OFF_0137, BW2_OFF_0149, BW2_OFF_0166, BW2_OFF_0190, BW2_OFF_0207, BW2_OFF_0218, BW2_OFF_0251, BW2_OFF_0254, BW2_OFF_0266, BW2_OFF_0267, BW2_OFF_0270, BW2_OFF_0277, BW2_OFF_0281, BW2_OFF_0424, BW2_OFF_0461, BW2_OFF_0507, BW2_OFF_0514,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0519, BW2_OFF_0555, BW2_PFF_0046, BW2_PFF_0049, BW2_PFF_0114, BW2_PFF_0128, BW2_PFF_0129, BW2_PFF_0166, BW2_PFF_0188			
BW2_OFF_0199, BW2_OFF_0203, BW2_PFF_0169, BW2_PFF_0212, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_OFF_0127, BW2_OFF_0256, BW2_PFF_0216, BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_PFF_0209, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_OFF_0489	<p>Respondents expressed that the name of the project is unsuitable.</p> <p>Respondents expressed that they are dissatisfied with the project name as they believe the word 'farm' is inappropriate - they prefer 'power station'.</p> <p>Respondents believe the name Botley West suggests a localised and urban project, suggests Farmoor, Woodstock or Blenheim would be better names.</p>	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0256, BW2_OFF_0529, BW2_PFF_0200,	Respondents are untrusting of the developer	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0245, BW2_PFF_0263, BW2_PFF_0303			
BW2_PFF_0053, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0288, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0218, BW2_OFF_0308, BW2_PFF_0141, BW2_PFF_0181, BW2_PFF_0265	Respondents comment on the benefits to landowners through the Project. state that Blenheim will benefit whilst their land is left untouched and unaffected, and whilst residents outside of Blenheim will be negatively effected.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0545, BW2_PFF_0087	Respondents are concerned about the developer's ability to complete the project.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_PFF_0270	Respondents noted that the project would be the 6th largest in the world and the largest in a residential area.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0263	Respondent concerned over PVDP's lack of track record of building solar farms, believes they will quickly sell and realise their investment.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0051, BW2_PFF_0098	Respondents do not agree with the bypassing of local planning.	No	The Project falls to be considered under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) regime, in line with the 2008 Planning Act. The NSIP process

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			takes account of local views, and the position of local authorities, in the decision-making process.
BW2_OFF_0278, BW2_OFF_0285	Respondents expressed concern regarding alleged previous activities and ownership of the Applicant.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0122	Respondent expressed that the project is unnecessary and it is a knee-jerk reaction.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0042	Respondent believes the proposals do not take into account house building and light industrial development on agricultural land around Woodstock, Bladon, Begbroke, Eynsham, Hanborough.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0263	<p>A respondent has expressed that the project's PEIR isn't trustworthy because it's biased towards the developer's interests.</p> <p>Respondent expressed that it might have accurate information, but readers cannot fully rely on it because it lacks impartiality.</p>	No	Noted

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Respondent expressed that, to be more confident, an independent party should have prepared the PEIR.		
BW2_OFF_0279	Respondent has expressed that funding is needed for the maintenance over the 40-year lifespan of the solar farm.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and has prepared a Funding Statement as part of the DCO Application [EN010147/APP/4.2] .
BW2_OFF_0280	Respondent enquired whether any operating companies (if not now but in the future) will receive government subsidies for energy at times when it is not needed.	No	No public money is involved in the Project
BW2_OFF_0334	Respondent agrees that solar farms are needed and agree that this part of Oxfordshire is an important location for these to be built.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0210	One respondent believes the project is damaging to involved parties' reputations.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0335	Respondent commented that the project does not meet the governments framework for the provision of large Solar Farms.	No	The Applicant notes that the Project meets the demands of the suite of National Policy Statements, EN-1 and EN-3.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0420	Respondent commented that the entire proposal runs contrary to Cumnor's Neighbourhood Plan Policies.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0040	Respondent believes there is not anything else that can be done to make the proposition more acceptable.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0012	<p>Respondent expressed that there was not sufficient time to read the PEIR, as it was released 10 days before the second stage of consultation.</p> <p>Respondents expressed that the PEIR is only technically accessible to people trained in particular specialities.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant purposely carried out the Section 42 consultation and phase two Section 47 consultation in parallel to enable consultation on the PEIR with Section 42 consultees and the community. A consultation period of 70 days was provided for responses to the PEIR and phase two consultation information, exceeding the statutory requirement of 28 days.</p> <p>The Applicant considered the period of 10 weeks to be sufficient time to engage with the consultation materials provided.</p>
BW2_PFF_0212	Respondent enquired about the project's investment and delivery partners. They stated that they are disappointed that the information is unclear regarding the sources of funds, and the track record and behaviour of all parties.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and has prepared a Funding Statement as part of the DCO Application [EN010147/APP/4.2] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0225	Respondent comments that Churchill would be appalled at the desecration of the land by a German company.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant does not agree with the sentiment of the comment but does note that SolarFive Ltd, the Applicant, is a company registered in England and Wales.
BW2_PFF_0228	Respondent comments they are happy that Merton College withdrew from the project.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0228	Respondent believes the usefulness of the solar farm will be short term.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent expressed that, as PVDP is a German/Cypriot company, the UK will become reliant on foreign goodwill to generate sustainable energy through this project.	No	SolarFive Ltd, the Applicant, is a company registered in England and Wales.
BW2_OFF_0514	Respondent would like PVDP to set a high standard for future infrastructure projects.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0043	Respondent would like to see more detailed plans for the future of the project.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0154	Respondent expressed that they are irritated by the local "nimbyism" shown towards this project.	No	Noted

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0208	Respondent expressed concern regarding the press coverage of the project.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0531	Respondent welcomes measures outlined in section 6.3, 6.4 and 6.10 of PEIR	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_OFF_0431, BW2_PFF_0208, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_PFF_0085, BW2_PFF_0127, BW2_PFF_0202, BW2_PFF_0100	<p>Respondents expressed concern regarding the accuracy of the predicted energy output of the project.</p> <p>Respondents stated information regarding how many homes the farm could power was misleading.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that the project's output is exaggerated, using peak figures rather than realistic averages that account for panel limitations and UK conditions.</p> <p>One respondent commented that the solar farm 'could' generate 840MW, but this is not definitive.</p>	Yes	<p>This comment is noted. The NGET contract is for the export of 840MW to the NETS. The Project is being designed to fulfil this connection efficiently.</p> <p>The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0256, BW2_PFF_0297, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_PFF_0085, BW2_PFF_0127, BW2_PFF_0202, BW2_OFF_0280	<p>Respondents expressed that the technology used during the installation of the development will become outdated over the 40 year lifespan of the project.</p> <p>Respondents enquired whether solar will still be the best solution by the time the project is approved.</p>	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_PFF_0085, BW2_PFF_0127, BW2_PFF_0202	Respondents enquired whether the local National Grid will be able to handle the variable energy influx.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0078, BW2_PFF_0117	Respondent requested information on the life cycle of PV panels and the damage caused (use of chemicals etc.)	Yes	The Applicant notes that no chemicals or solvents will be used to maintain the solar arrays.
BW2_OFF_0171, BW2_PFF_0110, BW2_OFF_0328	Respondents believe there is not enough information about battery storage.	No	The Project does not include battery storage.
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed that it will not be possible to take a cable along the verge in front of the field linked to fields 2.53-2.60 because of an essential watercourse that is in the way.	No	Noted

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed concern regarding the proposed cable location near Battimer Brook.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed concern of the impact of cabling underneath broadband connection cabling.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed concern of the impact of cabling underneath gas pipes.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0300	Respondent expressed concern of the impact of cabling on residential properties.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0299	Respondent expressed concern about the substation being permanent infrastructure.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0094	Respondents would like a safety perimeter near residential areas	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0122	Respondents believe solar energy cannot be stored effectively.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0240	One respondent believes the technology used is untested and experimental.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0049	Respondent believes battery options are important to maximise the usefulness of solar energy.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0085	Respondent expressed that cables will cause irreversible damage.	No	Noted

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0225	Respondent would have liked the proposal to have taken a deeper look into the meaning of technology.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0251	Respondent comments that installing all panels at one time means there will be no gains from technological advances, with the panels staying for 40 years.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0287	Respondent would like more information on what the solar panels are made of.	No	The Applicant notes that solar panels typically comprise glass, silicon and aluminium.
BW2_PFF_0281	Respondent points out a number of issues with PV panels, such as containing toxic chemicals, being a fire hazard, confusing for birds, glint and glare, costly to produce yet cheaply made.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0281	Respondent raises the issue of PV panels creating a local heat island effect that raises night temperatures by several degrees, rendering very moot the idea that they reverse 'global warming'.	No	The Applicant notes concerns raised regarding the potential for solar heat island effects is noted. However, the scientific literature on this issue is sparse and the available evidence indicates that any effect is likely to be relatively small and geographically limited in the context relevant to this project (for example, Fthenakis and Yu 2013).

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Applicant notes that the studies that tend to identify solar heat island effects tend to be from arid or desert contexts (Barron-Gafford et al 2016), with the greatest temperature variations being at night and within the array areas. Recent studies show solar farms may have a cooling effect (Xu et al., 2024). The role of vegetation within the Project, including the planting of trees and hedgerows is likely to contribute to cooling and shade for those passing through array areas.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider there to be the potential for a likely significant population health effect on this issue and as such it has not been scoped into the Environmental Assessment.</p>
BW2_PFF_0174	Respondent wants to know when National Grid agreed to build the connection to the grid and whether they have got planning permission.	No	Connection agreement was signed in September 2021. The Applicant anticipates NGET may apply for planning consent from Q2 2025.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0516	Respondent suggested that the solar arrays could be linked to the national grid via substations at three local points, one in the north, one in the central block and one in the southern area. They stated that there are transmission lines in the Yarnton area which should be looked considered as able to provide a link.	No	The connection point is beneath the 400kV lines at Farmoor. The line at Yarnton is owned by SSEN and is 132kV, insufficient capacity for the Project's output
BW2_PFF_0110	Respondent would like more information on the plans to provide wholesale price electricity.	Yes	Once consented, the Applicant intends to establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer Project electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.
BW2_OFF_0013, BW2_OFF_0126, BW2_OFF_0172, BW2_OFF_0199, BW2_OFF_0240, BW2_OFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0541, BW2_PFF_0160,	<p>Respondents express concern regarding the future of the project and how it will be decommissioned at the end of its operational life.</p> <p>Respondents are concerned that decommissioning will be funded by the taxpayer in the event of developer bankruptcy.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant recognises the concern around the decommissioning stage of the project.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced an outline Decommissioning Plan which will provide the means by which the detail can be agreed and secured [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0182, BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_OFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_OFF_0449, BW2_OFF_0394, BW2_PFF_0181	One respondent expressed that commitments to decommissioning, including the financial cost of this, should be in a legally-binding contract.		The DCO Consent will be bound by Requirements, including in relation to decommissioning requiring that the land returns to its prior use at end of project life.
BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_PFF_0149, BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_PFF_0256, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0431, BW2_OFF_0357, BW2_OFF_0375, BW2_OFF_0449, BW2_PFF_0113, BW2_OFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_OFF_0449	Respondents expressed concern regarding the disposal of the solar panels during the decommissioning phase. Respondents enquired whether recycling of the panels will be possible. Respondents believes the solar panels will be landfilled at end of their life.	Yes	The Applicant notes that technology exists to support the recycling of solar panel materials. Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0035, BW2_PFF_0006, BW2_OFF_0482, BW2_PFF_0085, BW2_PFF_0073, BW2_PFF_0228, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_OFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_OFF_0449	Respondents would like more detailed commitments and information about decommissioning.	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .
BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0087, BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_OFF_0480, BW2_OFF_0298, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0326,	Respondents expressed concern regarding the classification of land after decommissioning, for example, respondents do not want to see the area become brownfield, some doubt that it will revert back to agricultural land. Some respondents expressed concern that the area will be used for further development after decommissioning, for example for housing developments.	Yes	The Applicant recognises the concern around the decommissioning stage of the project. The Applicant has produced an outline Decommissioning Plan which will provide the means by which the detail can be agreed and secured [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] . The Project, whilst for a lengthy period of time, is not permanent, and so does

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_OFF_0449</p>	<p>Respondents commented that there is no guarantee that the land can be quickly reverted to agricultural use after the lifetime of the project.</p> <p>One respondent stated that any future planning application must contain an absolute legally binding agreement that the land on which the scheme is proposed to be built on, will return to being farmland/ nature reserve after decommissioning.</p> <p>One respondent commented that there is no long term legal protection ensuring the land will be returned to its former state after the end of the project.</p>		<p>not fall within the definition of 'Previously Developed Land' in terms of the Glossary at Annex 2 to the NPPF.</p> <p>The DCO Consent will be bound by Requirements, including in relation to decommissioning requiring that the land returns to its prior use at end of project life.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_PFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0100, BW2_PFF_0044, BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0229, BW2_OFF_0444, BW2_OFF_0475, BW2_OFF_0479,</p>	<p>Respondents are dissatisfied with the lifespan of the project and believe 40 years is not temporary.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises the concern around the decommissioning stage of the project.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced an outline Decommissioning Plan which will provide the means by which the detail can be agreed and secured [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0500, BW2_PFF_0171, BW2_PFF_0193			<p>The Project, whilst for a lengthy period of time, is not permanent, and so does not fall within the definition of 'Previously Developed Land' in terms of the Glossary at Annex 2 to the NPPF.</p> <p>The DCO Consent will be bound by Requirements, including in relation to decommissioning requiring that the land returns to its prior use at end of project life.</p>
BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_PFF_0085, BW2_PFF_0127, BW2_PFF_0202	Respondents asked whether the underground cabling will be removed during the decommissioning stage.	Yes	Cabling is removed from fields at end of project life.
BW2_PFF_0230, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0288	Respondent comments that the decommissioning of all the materials will lead to an extraordinary amount of pollution which has not been factored into the overall carbon figures.	Yes	Please refer to ES Vol 1 Chapter 14 Climate Change [EN010147/APP/6.3] and the Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4]
BW2_PFF_0237, BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent would like to see careful planning and ring-fenced finance for dismantling, recycling and land	Yes	Please refer to the Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4]

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	restoration at end of technical lifespan of project.		
BW2_OFF_0283, BW2_OFF_0402, BW2_PFF_0125	Respondents have asked what guarantees will be in place to ensure funding is available during the decommissioning phase.	Yes	<p>The decommissioning phase will be bound into Requirements associated with any DCO consent.</p> <p>Please refer to Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p>
BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_PFF_0288	Respondents would like to know the carbon footprint of the entire decommissioning phase.	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3], considers the lifetime Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions resulting from the Project.</p> <p>The chapter concludes that despite the GHG emissions resulting from the construction-stage of the Project, the magnitude of avoided emissions resulting from the operational and decommissioning stages of the development allows the Project to enable avoided emissions from year 6 of operation (carbon payback period).</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Over the lifetime of the Project, it would result in 5,545,595 tCO₂e of avoided emissions (under the current grid average scenario).</p> <p>Please refer to ES Vol 1 Chapter 14 Climate Change [EN010147/APP/6.3] and the Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p>
BW2_PFF_0277	Respondent would like to know if the project fails, would the partially converted land be classified as brownfield and therefore available for housing.	Yes	The Project, whilst for a lengthy period of time, is not permanent, and so does not fall within the definition of 'Previously Developed Land' in terms of the Glossary at Annex 2 to the NPPF.
BW2_OFF_0141	Respondents believe the project has too short a lifespan to be worthwhile.	Yes	<p>Chapter 14 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3], considers the lifetime Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions resulting from the Project.</p> <p>The chapter concludes that despite the GHG emissions resulting from the construction-stage of the Project, the magnitude of avoided emissions resulting from the operational and decommissioning stages of the</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>development allows the Project to enable avoided emissions from year 6 of operation (carbon payback period).</p> <p>Over the lifetime of the Project, it would result in 5,545,595 tCO₂e of avoided emissions (under the current grid average scenario).</p>
BW2_OFF_0373	Respondent wants guaranteed disposal of panels that do not last more than 15 years at most.	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .
BW2_OFF_0343	Respondent asked will decommissioning work really remove nearly 2,000,000 piles driven 1.5m – 2.0m into the ground?	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent has expressed that the farm will leave the next generation a legacy of outdated mess to deal with on an unimaginable scale.	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .
BW2_OFF_0525	Respondent enquired why the decommissioning costs are presented but not the costs involved with the restoration of the land.	Yes	The land will be reused for agriculture. The ongoing Landscape and Ecology Management, based on the OLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] including Soil Management Plan, and the Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] identify the

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>general regime for maintaining the land quality, and so the improvement and maintenance of the land in general is on-going during the life of the solar farm. The Outline Decommissioning Plan sets out the overall approach to what 'restoration' incorporates [EN010147/APP/7.6.4]</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0020, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0057, BW2_PFF_0004, BW2_PFF_0010, BW2_OFF_0080, BW2_OFF_0093, BW2_OFF_0096, BW2_OFF_0103, BW2_OFF_0131, BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0240, BW2_OFF_0249, BW2_OFF_0259, BW2_OFF_0283, BW2_OFF_0294, BW2_OFF_0312, BW2_OFF_0359,</p>	<p>Respondents believe the developer has criminal and Russian links and are concerned. Respondents expressed concern about the use of foreign funding.</p> <p>Respondents noted that joint ventures with anyone connected with Russia are against the law and, as Private Eye points out, this 'poses serious questions over the scheme's compatibility with post-Ukraine invasion sanctions'.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant has prepared a Funding Statement as part of the DCO Application [EN010147/APP/4.2].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0364, BW2_OFF_0515, BW2_OFF_0544, BW2_PFF_0100, BW2_PFF_0132, BW2_PFF_0134, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0228, BW2_PFF_0293			
BW2_PFF_0274	Respondent reports there was no information on who SolarFive Ltd. and Photovolt Development are.	Yes	Chapter 1 of the PEIR, and Chapter 1 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] set out these details.
The Consultation Process			
BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0051, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0080, BW2_OFF_0159, BW2_OFF_0182, BW2_OFF_0185, BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0242, BW2_OFF_0280, BW2_OFF_0289,	Respondents commented on the consultation undertaken by the Applicant, with comments that it was considered inadequate.	No	Appendix 5.1.1 to the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1.1] describes how the Applicant's consultation has complied with relevant legislation and associated guidance. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0323, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0328, BW2_OFF_0331, BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0337, BW2_OFF_0345, BW2_OFF_0354, BW2_OFF_0359, BW2_OFF_0373, BW2_OFF_0374, BW2_OFF_0376, BW2_OFF_0395, BW2_OFF_0398, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0431, BW2_OFF_0447, BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_OFF_0478, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_OFF_0480, BW2_OFF_0497, BW2_OFF_0498, BW2_OFF_0503, BW2_OFF_0523, BW2_OFF_0527,			<p>authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p> <p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_OFF_0538, BW2_PFF_0012, BW2_PFF_0017, BW2_PFF_0023, BW2_PFF_0042, BW2_PFF_0055, BW2_PFF_0094, BW2_PFF_0098, BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0141, BW2_PFF_0146, BW2_PFF_0175, BW2_PFF_0182, BW2_PFF_0190, BW2_PFF_0263, BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_PFF_0278, BW2_PFF_0294 BW2_PFF_0305,			request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals.
BW2_OFF_0173, BW2_OFF_0193, BW2_OFF_0280, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0294,	Respondents expressed concern regarding the timing of the consultation, with a suggestion that timing of the consultation over the holiday period was deliberate, as it would limit working	No	The Applicant has undertaken a comprehensive and iterative pre-application consultation on the Project, which is described and evidenced in a Consultation Report

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0337, BW2_OFF_0354, BW2_OFF_0374, BW2_OFF_0398, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0431, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0487, BW2_OFF_0503, BW2_OFF_0509, BW2_OFF_0523, BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_PFF_0012, BW2_PFF_0026, BW2_PFF_0027, BW2_PFF_0041, BW2_PFF_0144, BW2_PFF_0146, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0242, BW2_PFF_0256, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_PFF_0277,	<p>people from attending the events.</p> <p>Concern was also raised regarding the timing of the consultation within the planning process - they stated that it happened too late.</p> <p>Respondents commented that the public information were too few and too short, with comments on the choice of venues and attendance of members of the Applicant's Project team.</p>		<p>[EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to consultation has been informed by and complied with the requirements of the 2008 Act, and associated guidance and legislation. The Applicant's strategy of coordinating consultation activities across the Project has resulted in a high level of engagement and consultation responses, as described in the Consultation Report.</p> <p>The ten week consultation period exceeded the minimum eight week consultation period originally suggested in the draft SoCC. The Applicant increased the consultation period to account for the festive period overlapping with the consultation period. Accordingly, no public information events were held 10 days prior to Christmas Day or 10 days following New Year's Day. The Applicant considered the period of 10 weeks to be sufficient time to engage with the consultation</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_PFF_0278, BW2_PFF_0303,</p>			<p>materials provided.</p> <p>The Applicant held a series of nine in-person and one online public information events across a range of dates and times, including events on weekends and events that remained open until 7:30pm on weekday evenings. The Applicant recorded over 1,000 attendees to this series of events, as presented in Section 7 of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The Applicant is grateful to all residents, consultees and interested parties that have taken the time to engage with and respond to the consultation activities undertaken.
BW2_PFF_0023, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0292, BW2_OFF_0472, BW2_PFF_0182, BW2_PFF_0287	<p>Respondents commented that the proposals hadn't significantly developed from the first phase of consultation.</p> <p>Respondents expressed that they are disappointed with the updated proposals fail to address concerns.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The Applicant's iterative approach to consultation involved consulting on initial proposals through a phase one (non-statutory) consultation, followed by more detailed proposals – accompanied by a PEIR – during a phase two (statutory consultation). Following this, the Applicant further consulted on specific changes to the Project prior to finalising the DCO application.</p> <p>The Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] describes this process and the Applicant's regard to feedback received.</p>
BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_PFF_0278	Respondents feel that there is a lot of box ticking in the report to ensure that	No	The Applicant's approach to consultation is described in the

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	the project complies with statutory requirements.		<p>Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>Appendix 5.1.1 to the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1.1] describes how the Applicant's consultation has complied with relevant legislation and associated guidance.</p>
BW2_OFF_0540	Respondent believes the limited engagement by the project has allowed a small group of vocal, well funded and apparently misinformed people to stifle other voices in the community who may have reasonable concerns or support the project.	No	The Applicant notes this comment, and has sought to engage openly with all parties interested in the Project.
BW2_PFF_0274	Respondent asks why have there been no results of any canvassing done? Respondent provides an example of what they mean: "X% of respondents are in support of Botley West or X number of farmers willingly have stepped away from their tenancies for this project to proceed?"	No	Following the review and consideration of feedback received to the phase one (non-statutory) consultation, the Applicant prepared a phase one consultation summary report to share details of the level engagement, statistics, themes of responses received, and updates regarding the Applicant's consideration of feedback and next steps for the Project.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The phase one consultation summary report was circulated to key stakeholders on 30 June 2023. It was circulated to those who had registered to be kept informed, the Stop Botley West campaign group, and other identified organisations on 04 July 2023. The document provided an overview of the feedback that the Applicant had received.</p> <p>The phase one consultation summary report was published on the Project website and issued to over 22,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, to help consultees understand how their feedback was being considered.</p> <p>This is described in Section 4 of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] and a copy of the phase one consultation summary report is provided as Appendix 5.1.3: Phase One Consultation Summary Report [EN010147/APP/5.1.3].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0039, BW2_PFF_0041, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0465, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0247, BW2_OFF_0280	Respondents commented on the feedback form, with views on the wording of questions and the combination of open-text and multiple choice response options.	No	The Applicant notes these comments. The Applicant prepared to feedback form comprising a combination of multiple choice and open-text questions to encourage responses. Feedback was available to submit in writing (not using the Applicant's feedback form) by email or Freepost.
BW2_OFF_0183, BW2_OFF_0256, BW2_OFF_0183, BW2_PFF_0043, BW2_PFF_0039	Respondents expressed that the PEIR left too many points unaddressed, and was considered unbalanced and biased.	No	The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant considers the PEIR to have struck that balance for the purposes of consultation.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0484, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_OFF_0292, BW2_PFF_0190, BW2_OFF_0328, BW2_OFF_0482, BW2_PFF_0012, BW2_PFF_0030, BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_PFF_0062, BW2_OFF_0480, BW2_PFF_0272, BW2_OFF_0271	<p>Respondents commented on the consultation materials provided, including their format, wording and level of detail.</p> <p>Some respondents considered materials too detailed with others considering them incomplete.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a PEIR, a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team.</p> <p>Consultation materials were available online and in paper copy. Paper copies were provided upon request to the Applicant, or from the Applicant's series of in-person public information events and five identified Community Access Points.</p> <p>The Applicant hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p> <p>The Applicant purposely carried out the Section 42 consultation and phase two Section 47 consultation in parallel to enable consultation on the PEIR with</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Section 42 consultees and the community. A consultation period of 70 days was provided for responses to the PEIR and phase two consultation information, exceeding the statutory requirement of 28 days.
Site Selection and Alternatives			
BW2_OFF_0004, BW2_OFF_0006, BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0029, BW2_OFF_0045, BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0054, BW2_OFF_0055, BW2_OFF_0068, BW2_PFF_0008, BW2_PFF_0015, BW2_PFF_0031, BW2_OFF_0079, BW2_OFF_0082,	Respondents have suggested that the site is not suitable, and that other sites should be considered.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0098, BW2_OFF_0106, BW2_OFF_0108, BW2_OFF_0113, BW2_OFF_0118, BW2_PFF_0040, BW2_PFF_0045, BW2_OFF_0132, BW2_OFF_0133, BW2_OFF_0146, BW2_OFF_0148, BW2_OFF_0152, BW2_OFF_0160, BW2_OFF_0179, BW2_OFF_0188, BW2_OFF_0189, BW2_OFF_0193, BW2_OFF_0239, BW2_OFF_0255, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_OFF_0348, BW2_OFF_0411, BW2_OFF_0440, BW2_OFF_0495, BW2_OFF_0510,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0517, BW2_OFF_0527, BW2_OFF_0551, BW2_PFF_0119, BW2_PFF_0133, BW2_PFF_0138, BW2_PFF_0183, BW2_PFF_0184, BW2_PFF_0242, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0303, BW2_PFF_0133			
BW2_OFF_0160, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0180, BW2_OFF_0182, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0319, BW2_OFF_0324, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0359, BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0393, BW2_OFF_0405, BW2_OFF_0423,	Respondents are unhappy that the panels are located close to housing.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed, including visual amenity for residential receptors. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is proposed and further evaluation of impacts has been implemented.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0453, BW2_OFF_0463, BW2_OFF_0308, BW2_OFF_0466, BW2_OFF_0510, BW2_OFF_0536, BW2_PFF_0123, BW2_PFF_0185, BW2_PFF_0254, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0305			
BW2_PFF_0034, BW2_OFF_0320, BW2_OFF_0403, BW2_OFF_0550, BW2_PFF_0113, BW2_PFF_0120, BW2_PFF_0123, BW2_PFF_0206, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_OFF_0037, BW2_OFF_0286,	Respondents would prefer more, smaller areas built on rather than fewer large areas.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_OFF_0273, BW2_OFF_0475, BW2_PFF_0076, BW2_PFF_0266</p>			
<p>BW2_PFF_0017, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0272, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_PFF_0282, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0088, BW2_OFF_0328, BW2_PFF_0200, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0270</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the cumulative impact of housing developments in the area and this project.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about southern section of the site being contiguous with Red House Farm.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that there has been no mention or information on the plans to build 600 homes at Hanborough Park towards Lower Road.</p> <p>One respondent expressed concerns that the proposal does not assess all the various impacts in relation to other major developments in the same area e.g. 1,000 hectares of ground-mounted solar farms already allocated and 19,000 homes in local plans.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Cumulative impacts are noted and considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 20 (Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships) [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>One respondent enquired whether the proposed development at Salt Cross has been considered.</p> <p>One respondent enquired whether the Eynsham Park and Ride development has been considered.</p>		
<p>BW2_OFF_0152, BW2_PFF_0157, BW2_PFF_0184, BW2_PFF_0187</p>	<p>Respondents suggested solar panels are installed in the grounds of Blenheim Palace.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0296</p>	<p>Respondent points out that solar farms of this scale are only really found in deserts or wastelands, not rural, agricultural, residential, amenity areas.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>
<p>BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0173, BW2_PFF_0298</p>	<p>Respondents does not understand why Farmoor has been chosen to house the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	substation and believes it must be adding a lot of cost to construction.		Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0173, BW2_PFF_0298	Respondents believe the substation will be too big and must be effectively shielded for reservoir walkers.	No	Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0328, BW2_PFF_0200, BW2_PFF_0227	Respondents expressed that the scheme is too close to too many communities.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0503, BW2_PFF_0154, BW2_PFF_0164	Respondents stated that the placement of the solar panels is wrong, particularly panels that are north facing. Respondent would like to know why this was chosen.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0173	One respondent has questioned why panels are on slopes and hills rather than flat ground.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0289	Respondent has expressed that the process for site selection and criteria remain unclear.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0096	Respondent queries whether the south plot is needed considering it doesn't add	No	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5:

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	much capacity yet is the closest plot to housing.		Alternatives Considered. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0217	Respondent points out that Yarnton already has solar farms.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0274	Respondent doesn't understand why Oxfordshire has been chosen, and would like to know where they can find out who ruled this and why.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The need case for the Project is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]
BW2_PFF_0276	Respondent would like to see the site moved further back from the northern side of Cassington and away from the track up to Purwell Farm.	No	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0287	Respondent suggests the reason for the choosing this site is that the landowner is willing to rent their land.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0295	Respondent reports that the proposed solar panels are too close to the airport.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A Glint and Glare Study has been

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			undertaken and is available within Vol 3, Appendix 4.4: Glint and Glare Study. [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0197	Respondent expressed that a solar farm already exists on the outskirts of Eynsham.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0309	Respondent has recommended that to improve the scheme's acceptability, distance is created from the village by omitting fields 2.2 and 2.4 and possibly using the field near the Bladon roundabout instead.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0140	One respondent believes solar power stations are needed and there 'have to go somewhere'.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0370	Respondent expressed concern that the solar panels were in close proximity to nursery and primary school.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 5 (Alternatives Considered) [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Human health has been considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 16 (Human Health) [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0298	Respondent expressed that this project seems to start with the presumption that because certain landowners have made the land available, it should be covered with solar panels.	Yes	The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0287	Respondent states there is no consideration for the proposal to build a new railway line from Carterton to Oxford, which would run through many fields adjacent to Cassington.	Yes	Cumulative impacts are noted and considered within Vol 1, Chapter 20 (Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships) of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0004, BW2_OFF_0014, BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0022, BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0029, BW2_OFF_0054, BW2_OFF_0058, BW2_OFF_0059, BW2_OFF_0060, BW2_OFF_0065, BW2_OFF_0075, BW2_OFF_0079, BW2_OFF_0082, BW2_OFF_0092, BW2_OFF_0099, BW2_OFF_0106, BW2_OFF_0108, BW2_OFF_0113, BW2_OFF_0117, BW2_OFF_0118, BW2_OFF_0121, BW2_OFF_0130, BW2_OFF_0133, BW2_OFF_0148, BW2_OFF_0150,	<p>Respondents have suggested that solar should be placed on rooftops, brownfield sites, old aerodromes, educational sites, existing warehouses, off-shore, car parks, new builds in the area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises respondents' requests for solar to be sited on alternative locations, and would be supportive of these being explored in addition to the Project.</p> <p>The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The need case for the project and the overall planning balance of benefits and harm are set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0162, BW2_OFF_0188, BW2_OFF_0193, BW2_OFF_0199, BW2_OFF_0203, BW2_OFF_0204, BW2_OFF_0205, BW2_OFF_0209, BW2_OFF_0212, BW2_OFF_0219, BW2_OFF_0225, BW2_OFF_0238, BW2_OFF_0243, BW2_OFF_0245, BW2_OFF_0246, BW2_OFF_0250, BW2_OFF_0251, BW2_OFF_0259, BW2_OFF_0261, BW2_OFF_0262, BW2_OFF_0273, BW2_OFF_0274, BW2_OFF_0275, BW2_OFF_0280, BW2_OFF_0295, BW2_OFF_0298,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0304, BW2_OFF_0312, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0316, BW2_OFF_0317, BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_OFF_0325, BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0327, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0338, BW2_OFF_0346, BW2_OFF_0347, BW2_OFF_0351, BW2_OFF_0354, BW2_OFF_0358, BW2_OFF_0360, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0362, BW2_OFF_0364, BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0372, BW2_OFF_0379,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0381, BW2_OFF_0382, BW2_OFF_0385, BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_OFF_0393, BW2_OFF_0398, BW2_OFF_0400, BW2_OFF_0404, BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_OFF_0407, BW2_OFF_0410, BW2_OFF_0413, BW2_OFF_0416, BW2_OFF_0418, BW2_OFF_0420, BW2_OFF_0427, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0439, BW2_OFF_0440, BW2_OFF_0442, BW2_OFF_0443, BW2_OFF_0445, BW2_OFF_0448, BW2_OFF_0449, BW2_OFF_0451, BW2_OFF_0453,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0455, BW2_OFF_0457, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_OFF_0466, BW2_OFF_0473, BW2_OFF_0478, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0499, BW2_OFF_0505, BW2_OFF_0515, BW2_OFF_0517, BW2_OFF_0532, BW2_OFF_0541, BW2_OFF_0544, BW2_OFF_0552, BW2_OFF_0553, BW2_PFF_0008, BW2_PFF_0009, BW2_PFF_0015, BW2_PFF_0025, BW2_PFF_0028, BW2_PFF_0031, BW2_PFF_0039, BW2_PFF_0043, BW2_PFF_0044, BW2_PFF_0045,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0050, BW2_PFF_0060, BW2_PFF_0065, BW2_PFF_0070, BW2_PFF_0082, BW2_PFF_0089, BW2_PFF_0093, BW2_PFF_0100, BW2_PFF_0102, BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0112, BW2_PFF_0117, BW2_PFF_0131, BW2_PFF_0145, BW2_PFF_0150, BW2_PFF_0153, BW2_PFF_0160, BW2_PFF_0163, BW2_PFF_0168, BW2_PFF_0181, BW2_PFF_0182, BW2_PFF_0183, BW2_PFF_0184, BW2_PFF_0189, BW2_PFF_0195, BW2_PFF_0197,			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0198, BW2_PFF_0199, BW2_PFF_0202, BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_PFF_0213, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0228, BW2_PFF_0240, BW2_PFF_0242, BW2_PFF_0243, BW2_PFF_0244, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0271, BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0284, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0305, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0285			

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0483, BW2_OFF_0333, BW2_OFF_0358, BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_PFF_0233, BW2_OFF_0246, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0263, BW2_PFF_0218	Respondents expressed that they would rather have solar panels on roofs of residential, commercial and industrial buildings; in car parks; on new build homes; on brownfield sites.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0306, BW2_PFF_0192, BW2_OFF_0521, BW2_OFF_0405, BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_PFF_0067, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0288	Respondent expressed that alternative forms of renewable energy should be considered, such as off/onshore wind, tidal, nuclear,	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0011, BW2_PFF_0011, BW2_PFF_0018, BW2_PFF_0027, BW2_OFF_0162, BW2_OFF_0256,	Respondent expressed that solar panels should be placed on the roofs of Blenheim Estates' new housing instead.	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0124, BW2_PFF_0207			
BW2_OFF_0146, BW2_PFF_0266	Respondents would like more information on why solar has been considered over other types of renewable energy.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0093, BW2_PFF_0043	Respondents believe this project is being undertaken as it is a cheaper alternative to installing solar infrastructure on buildings.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0111, BW2_PFF_0120	Respondent suggests putting solar on top of the many warehouses that line the M1 and M6 corridors, as well as car parks.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0298	Respondent has expressed that the PEIR report does not adequately cover an analysis of alternative sources of lower carbon energy sources such as wind, tide, water (fall) and even nuclear.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0414	Respondent has asked what alternatives have been considered?	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0435	Respondent remarked that they have a south-facing roof suitable for solar	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	panels and am open to installing them or participating in a local community-run solar project that supplies energy to the immediate area.		
BW2_PFF_0008	Respondent expressed that there is a huge demand for residential development, which should take precedent over this project.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0274	Respondent acknowledges the report does show solar comparisons with natural gas, but could not find comparisons with other renewable sources, e.g. wind.	No	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0156	Respondents would prefer a focus on recycling.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0423	Respondent has commented that if the farm is needed to join the grid 'somewhere between Didcot and Gloucester' there will be many more appropriate sites than those proposed by Botley West.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0432	Respondent has remarked that the solar farm would be much better sited along main roads and in area than lots of piecemeal bits would be much better	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	sited along main roads and in area than lots of piecemeal bits.		
BW2_OFF_0460	Respondent commented use both sides of the M40 instead of an agricultural area.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0491	Respondents expressed that the site should be kept away from approach roads to villages and residential areas.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0495	Respondent suggests an alternative site such as the purchased land for the now cancelled HS2 phase 2	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0500	Respondent suggests the 400KV grid between Botley and Gloucester as a better location, or anywhere in the east of England where there is less people and more sun.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0502	Respondent does not oppose project but has recommendations on the removal of certain fields from the proposals. Respondent suggests the following alterations or removals of fields: Central section 2.1 2.2 2.5 south west corners of 2.7 and 2.8 2.20 2.21	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The relationship with the Oxford Airport is also considered within the Glint &

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	2.28 2.33 2.34 2.61 2.63 2.36 2.67 2.116 2.117 2.83 whole or part of 2.84 nr Goose Eye Farm 2.85 pt of 2.97 2.107 2.111 2.112 south pt of 2.100 2.102 and 2.110 near Oxford Airport, wants the removal of panels from crash zone south of runway and A44 eg 2.14 2.18 and 2.19		Glare report and its Aviation annex [EN010147] .
BW2_OFF_0529	Respondent comments that given the beauty of the natural amenity and the criss cross of ancient paths, that the area between A44 and the B4027 should be excluded from development including the ancient field between Hordley and the School of Drama. This land is grade 2.	Yes	Land use is considered within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0551	Respondent suggests alternative plots further from the main residential areas could have been considered, potentially garnering less objection from locals. The	No	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	decision to use the current land solely because of the agreement with a single landowner lacks convincing justification.		
BW2_OFF_0553	Respondent suggests a European approach of putting solar panels on top of park and ride car parks/sites (For context, there is a park and ride under construction nearby).	No	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0028	Respondent expressed that all new housing and university buildings should have panels automatically added.	No	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0042	Respondent would like the fields adjacent to the children's recreation ground in Bladon removed from the plan, ideally extending to the five fields next to houses in Bladon, with a native species wood planted instead to retain the carbon emission sources, as well as the amenities and wellbeing benefits that everyone enjoys from the rural landscape at present.	Yes	<p>Land use is considered within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0218	Respondent points out there are appropriate alternative sites in the region (along A34/M40/A40) where landscape is already blighted.	No	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0219	Respondent explains why wind power is their preferred energy source, pointing to success in the Netherlands with wind turbines, and asks whether a scaling back of the solar farm to make room for sensibly placed turbines has been considered?	No	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0222	Respondent states they would prefer the use of solar panels on commercial and private buildings and car parks such as the new park and ride site in Eynsham to achieve some input to the National Grid without despoiling vast areas of farmland.	No	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0229	Respondent comments that solar panels on houses in the area would be far less labour-intensive to maintain and a more suitable option.	No	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0230	Respondent would like to see the Applicant sponsor an equivalent amount of wind turbines (approx. 12-15) to be placed in the North Sea, or, canvass	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	support for the North Oxford Gateway development to place solar panels on the roofs & land around the new buildings.		
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent comments that fields 2.1-2.15 In Bladon are evidently well-cultivated fertile land, as well as a priceless lung and informal social space or local residents, specially the old and young, so would be good to exclude these fields.	No	Land use is considered within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Impacts to recreational areas are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 15: Socio Economics. Document Reference EN010147/APP/6.3 and Vol 1, Chapter 16: Human Health. Document Reference EN010147/APP/6.3.
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent suggests using the land alongside the A44 currently used for Blenheim event car parking and sheep grazing, and that an equivalent area of solar panels could be placed as a roof over the car parking area and the sheep grazed in Blenheim Park.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0235	Respondent would like to see more, smaller solar farms, similar to completed ones in the area and built in proportion	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	with arable land and woodland, as opposed to one large solar farm.		
BW2_PFF_0284	Respondent suggests placing solar arrays on top of reservoirs, with the added benefit of preventing evaporation.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0302	Respondent unhappy that no alternative sites have been proposed by the project/developer.	Yes	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
Community Benefit			
BW2_OFF_0034, BW2_OFF_0038, BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_PFF_0020, BW2_OFF_0087, BW2_OFF_0102, BW2_OFF_0104, BW2_OFF_0127, BW2_OFF_0164, BW2_OFF_0167, BW2_OFF_0202, BW2_OFF_0223, BW2_OFF_0228,	Respondents expressed concern about the project's potential negative impact on local residents' mental wellbeing and quality of life.	Yes	Chapter 16 (Human Health) of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. This includes mental health impacts from perceived risks of the Project, as well as impacts on community identity. The human health assessment and associated mitigation and enhancement measures that have fed into the design of the Project, have been informed by

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0233, BW2_OFF_0256, BW2_OFF_0266, BW2_OFF_0309, BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0331, BW2_OFF_0333, BW2_OFF_0343, BW2_OFF_0351, BW2_OFF_0354, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0395, BW2_OFF_0398, BW2_OFF_0404, BW2_OFF_0414, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_OFF_0441, BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_OFF_0456, BW2_OFF_0457, BW2_OFF_0475, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0505,			consultation with the community, as well as detailed discussions with local public health stakeholders.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0543, BW2_OFF_0549, BW2_PFF_0089, BW2_PFF_0099, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0163, BW2_PFF_0240, BW2_PFF_0254, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_OFF_0294, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_PFF_0279			
BW2_OFF_0056, BW2_OFF_0144, BW2_OFF_0145, BW2_OFF_0206, BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0228, BW2_OFF_0232, BW2_OFF_0277, BW2_OFF_0281, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0334, BW2_OFF_0335,	<p>Respondents have commented that the current community benefit fund of £50,000 is too small.</p> <p>Respondents would like the community fund to be increased significantly and for there to be more benefits, such as reduced energy bills.</p> <p>Respondents commented that the community fund should echo that of Scotland which is £5,000 per megawatt</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years).</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0357, BW2_OFF_0362, BW2_OFF_0368, BW2_OFF_0396, BW2_OFF_0424, BW2_OFF_0432, BW2_OFF_0451, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_OFF_0488, BW2_OFF_0504, BW2_OFF_0507, BW2_OFF_0512, BW2_OFF_0519, BW2_OFF_0540, BW2_OFF_0544, BW2_OFF_0546, BW2_PFF_0078, BW2_PFF_0136, BW2_PFF_0148, BW2_PFF_0287, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_OFF_0263, BW2_OFF_0268, BW2_OFF_0270, BW2_OFF_0424,	<p>per year, i.e. £4m+ per year for 40 years.</p>		<p>The Applicant anticipates the Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from the Applicant, the Blenheim Estate and local community leaders.</p> <p>It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0273, BW2_OFF_0332, BW2_OFF_0488, BW2_OFF_0519, BW2_OFF_0533, BW2_OFF_0546, BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_PFF_0128			
BW2_OFF_0100, BW2_PFF_0043, BW2_OFF_0129, BW2_OFF_0166, BW2_OFF_0248	Respondents are pleased with the idea of receiving reduced energy prices and believe locals should be the first to benefit.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0478, BW2_OFF_0529, BW2_PFF_0133, BW2_OFF_0353, BW2_OFF_0161, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0294	Respondent has commented that there are no benefits for the local community and few benefits for the wider community.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0054, BW2_OFF_0256, BW2_OFF_0434, BW2_PFF_0264	Respondents expressed concern about physical health issues caused by the projects, such as the untested biological effects of the electromagnetic fields.	Yes	Environmental Statement Chapter 16 (Human Health) [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Project. This includes assessment of EMF effects, as well as EMF risk perception.
BW2_OFF_0540, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0287	Respondents expressed that the biggest failing of the project is that most financial benefits will go to landowners rather than the local community.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0326, BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0419	Respondents expressed that the promise of reduced electricity bills is simply PR.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0254, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0279	Respondents particularly concerned with the negative effect on children and adults using the Bladon recreation ground, where solar arrays, security cameras and deer fencing will come right up to the ground's boundary and in adjacent fields.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this concern.</p> <p>Additional planting has been added to mitigate views from Bladon.</p> <p>Impacts to recreational areas are considered within Environmental Statement Chapter 15 (Socio Economics) [EN010147/APP/6.3] and Chapter 16 (Human Health) [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) of the Environmental Statement; provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed, including visual amenity for residential receptors. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>A minimum 25m buffer from residential properties is proposed and further evaluation of impacts has been implemented.</p>
BW2_PFF_0175, BW2_PFF_0190	Respondent stated there has been a lack of information on community benefits.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0056	Respondents would like the community fund to be used to fund more green schemes in the area.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0128	Respondent requests more information on the reduced energy bills proposal	Yes	<p>The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell the Project's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the Project would</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0417	Respondent expressed that Begbroke has been their life, and the community will be destroyed, and mental health ruined.	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this concern. Environmental Statement Chapter 16 (Human Health) [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project.</p> <p>This includes mental health impacts from perceived risks of the Project, as well as impacts on community identity. The health assessment also details the beneficial impacts of the Project on human health, which is aimed to raise community awareness and alleviate concerns.</p>
BW2_OFF_0466	Respondent has expressed that solar energy should be used specifically to meet local demands and directly benefit local communities.	No	Noted

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0128	Respondent would like a justification for what seems to be a very low annual grant.	No	A community benefit fund is not a requirement, it is a optional benefit provided by the applicant. The chapter has not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.
BW2_PFF_0099	Respondent concerned that as Yarnton village social life is mostly built around the countryside that borders it, the village life will die with this landscape.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0217	Respondent unhappy with the proximity of the project to local communities and believes this will have a negative impact seen in other communities.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent asks how will proposed community vegetable-growing be organised?	Yes	Further details provided in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0232	Respondent claims the promise of cheap electricity for the local population is false as it will be fed into the national grid.	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_PFF_0251	Respondent unhappy that there is no guarantee of affordable energy	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_PFF_0279	Respondent comments that Bladon already has allotments.	N/A	Noted

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0280	Respondent comments that community benefit plans will not compensate for the loss of countryside.	No	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p>
BW2_PFF_0280	Regarding lower energy bills, the respondent mentions that their electricity bill was £805 in 2023. Even if energy bills were reduced by half, are Botley West prepared to pay the £400 x 11,000 affected houses, which equals £4.5 million annually and rising?	N/A	<p>The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell the Project's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0427,	Respondent expressed that claims that the project will lower energy bills are misleading.	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0514	Respondent expressed that the developer needs to do more to appeal to the local community.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0357, BW2_OFF_0424, BW2_PFF_0205, BW2_OFF_0270, BW2_OFF_0424	Respondents have expressed that the project should have directly offered the community share options or cheaper electricity. Respondents expressed electricity costs	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell the Project's output to

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	to local communities should be discounted by 50 per cent.		consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0533, BW2_OFF_0540, BW2_OFF_0544	Respondents believe community ownership is a valid alternative as community benefit payments are not a meaningful way of involving communities in these projects.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0478, BW2_PFF_0279	Respondents support small-scale community solar farms; believe this should be encouraged.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0279, BW2_PFF_0287	Respondents would like to see compensation for loss in house values for the community.	No	An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it was agreed any impact would not be significant.
BW2_OFF_0248	One respondent suggested giving money to local charities as part of the community fund.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0077	One respondent suggested growing fruits and vegetables to donate to local food banks and support projects.	Yes	30 hectares have been set aside for community food growing. Growers will be allocated dedicated sites with easy access; these will not be in the panel

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			areas but in the areas set aside for mitigation.
BW2_OFF_0356	A respondent commented that they support the suggestion of “a state-of-the-art interpretation centre to raise awareness of climate change solutions”.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. There is land onsite allocated for a school visits centre and the Outline Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan details how the Applicant will work with schools to promote STEM [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0432	Respondent stated that the argument that this development brings employment to the area isn't beneficial; it could create more problems.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0451	Respondent has commented that the food growing areas promised are not good enough.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0130,	Respondent likes the suggestion of a local company to provide electricity at a discount to local people.	Yes	Once consented, the Applicant intends to establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer Project electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0298	Respondent comments that the proposal to create vegetable gardens as a project do not compensate for the grain yield lost.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0535	Respondent believes that Community Agriculture is just a way to get the community to carry out environmental management. Respondent also refers to the "talks" with farmers and community groups that were done prematurely as it appears the Applicant has not fully engaged or agreed actual plans with those claimed.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0130	Respondent would like to see suitable sites for camping provided.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0178	Respondent asks if a potential rail link between Oxford and Witney has been taken into account.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0042	One respondent is eager to help progress the proposals and provided suggestions including an information board around the site, detailing about solar and local wildlife, conducting studies into local water quality, and a pop-up information stall.	Yes	<p>The Applicant is grateful for these suggestions.</p> <p>There is land onsite allocated for a school visits centre and the Outline Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan details how the Applicant will work</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			with schools to promote STEM [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0080	A respondent recommended to research Thomas Heathwick to learn better ways of installing solar.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0107	Respondent requests for development to avoid any existing nature.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on ecology and nature Conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9 [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_OFF_0301	A respondent recommended that in the materials provided in consultations, there needed to be a picture from the top of Purwell Lane to show the extent of the solar panels that will surround Cassington. The village will be completely engulfed and so too will be Worton.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages,</p>

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p> <p>All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities, including Cumnor Parish. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
BW2_PFF_0073	One respondent suggests making use of digital signs (not too many) to show people live energy output, helping locals understand and engage with the project.	No	Noted

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0130	Respondent has a number of recommendations such as community involvement in specific projects for enhancement of biodiversity/amenity, opportunities for school children and young people or an on-going arrangement, and education opportunities e.g. a basic shelter could be provided in a suitable spot for classes to use when visiting/learning.	Yes	The Applicant notes that these initiatives could be eligible for community funding. There is land onsite allocated for a school visits centre and the Outline Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan details how the Applicant will work with schools to promote STEM [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0216	Respondent suggests the maps shown at the exhibition such as Figure 9.1b should be more widely circulated with future booklets as they show the detail better.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0217	Respondent reports that they have solar panels on their roof and believe this should be a more affordable option for others to support the green initiative.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0239	Respondent would like to see the developer consult and commit to community benefits in areas most affected.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0239	Respondent would like to see support for the Nature Recovery Network and its ambitious schemes in Eynsham.	Yes	The effects of the Project on ecology and nature Conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9 [EN010147/6.3] .

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0246	Respondent suggests people can be gently 'policed' into a change of behaviour so that they change their use of energy and other environmental matters (e.g. recycling). This also needs to be done nationally.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0287	Respondent would like to see a concrete and guaranteed scheme for residents within specific postcodes, adjacent to the proposed solar farms, to have meaningfully reduced energy bills.	Yes	Once consented, the Applicant intends to establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer Project electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.
BW2_PFF_0294	Respondent would like to see their council tax reduced.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0273	Respondent has expressed that the suggested annual community fund of £50,000 to compensate for lost amenities is considered insufficient and	Yes	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.

ID Code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	insulting to affected families and individuals.		<p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>
BW2_OFF_0546	Respondent wants PVDP/the project to fund community energy projects through the Low Carbon Hub in addition to increasing the community benefit figure.	Yes	The Applicant is in contact with Low Carbon Hub to discuss their suggestions for community involvement in Project.

Table 3: Question 6 – Do you have any comments on the information presented in our PEIR

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Local Ecology			
BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0212, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0358, BW2_OFF_0387, BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_OFF_0416, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_OFF_0494, BW2_OFF_0498, BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_OFF_0535, BW2_OFF_0538, BW2_PFF_0118, BW2_PFF_0185, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondents believe there is no evidence that the predicted 70% net gain in biodiversity and how this is justified.	Yes	The approach to and justification for the target of 70% habitat net gain is set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5.]. The key driver for the gain is the change from intensive arable to conservation-managed grasslands.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0110, BW2_OFF_0224, BW2_OFF_0491, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_PFF_0108, BW2_PFF_0208, BW2_PFF_0289, BW2_PFF_0302	Respondents expressed concern about the damage to local ecology and the environment.	Yes	The impact of the Project on ecology is fully assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0273, BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0294, BW2_OFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_OFF_0509, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondents were unsatisfied with ecological assessments performed.	Yes	The assessments presented in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] follow all good practice guidelines.
BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0057, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_PFF_0302	Respondents believe damage to the environment will still occur despite mitigation efforts.	No	Noted. The assessments presented in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] follow all good practice guidelines. It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0113, BW2_OFF_0191, BW2_PFF_0170, BW2_PFF_0302</p>	<p>Respondents do not believe that the mitigations to environmental impact are sufficient.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The assessments presented in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] follow all good practice guidelines. Impacts have been assessed and appropriate mitigations committed to ensure that, overall, the Project delivers a net benefit for ecology, in line with local and national policy.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0039, BW2_OFF_0074, BW2_OFF_0106, BW2_OFF_0248	Respondent would like to see expanded mitigation measures, especially in terms of biodiversity.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on Ecology and Nature Conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>Impacts have been assessed and appropriate mitigations committed to ensure that, overall, the Project delivers a net benefit for ecology, in line with local and national policy.</p>
BW2_OFF_0271, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0266	Respondents expressed that there is no environmental management plan or biodiversity net gain report in the PEIR.	Yes	Both are included in the ES - ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] and Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0102, BW2_PFF_0108	Respondents stated that this proposal will be a disaster for the environment.	No	Noted. The Applicant disagrees. The assessments presented in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] follow all good practice guidelines. Impacts have been assessed and appropriate mitigations

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			committed to ensure that, overall, the Project delivers a net benefit for ecology, in line with local and national policy.
BW2_OFF_0428, BW2_OFF_0471	Respondents stated that the environmental impact has been misrepresented.	Yes	The assessments presented in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] follow all good practice guidelines.
BW2_OFF_0498, BW2_OFF_0535	Respondents would like to know how the 70% BNG will be maintained in the long-term and what obligations the developers will have to maintain this and report on its progress.	Yes	The habitats that contribute to the BNG score will be managed as set out in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]. This includes a commitment to maintain and manage over the long term.
BW2_OFF_0183, BW2_OFF_0285	Respondents would like to see a map and table with the area of the different types of agricultural land by grade.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			See Figure 17.1, 2 and 3 [EN010147/APP/6.4] .
BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_PFF_0118	Respondents would like to know how the 70% BNG was calculated e.g. if the area under the panels should be classified as "meadow" or "urban". They state that the former would be an easy way to improve the biodiversity from a previous agricultural monoculture. The latter and a 70% gain would be impossible.	Yes	<p>The approach to and justification for the target of 70% habitat net gain is set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The key driver for the gain is the change from intensive arable to conservation-managed grasslands which are treated as meadow rather urban.</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
BW2_OFF_0048	One respondent is concerned with the laying of cables in sensitive areas such as Long Mead water meadows.	Yes	<p>The Project has been redesigned since the PEIR to avoid Long Mead water meadows with cable crossing now located to the north of this area. See Figure 5.5 [EN010147/APP/7.6.4]</p>
BW2_OFF_0229	One respondent still has concerns about what impact the project will have on the SSSI (Site of Specific Scientific Interest).	Yes	<p>The impact of the Project on SSSI in the surrounding landscape is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The conclusion of this assessment is that there would be no adverse effect.</p>
BW2_OFF_0248	One respondent would like to see monitoring of measures that are aimed at increasing biodiversity, with this monitoring needing to be performed	Yes	<p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	within the lifecycle of the project, with the assurance that a reduction in biodiversity does not occur.		<p>details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
BW2_OFF_0280	One respondent expressed that the claims of 70% NBD can be seen as "mitigation tokenism."	Yes	Noted. The approach to and justification for the target of 70% habitat net gain is set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5.] . The key driver for the gain is the change from intensive arable to conservation-managed grasslands.
BW2_OFF_0283	One respondent asked how the findings from baseline biodiversity measures compare to those by other independent	Yes	Records of wildlife from other organisations have been requested and incorporated into the assessment of effects, where

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	organisations recording local wildlife (e.g. BTO).		appropriate. Data are presented in ES Appendix 9.1 Desk Study [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0313	One respondent stated that if local ecology had been taken into account for different areas of Oxfordshire, brownfield sites that are available would have been used.	Yes	The ecology of the Project site and its surroundings have been accounted for within ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0313	One respondent would like more information on the site-specific surveys that were conducted for both habitats and fauna, how often they took place and the measures of biodiversity that were used to form the baseline on which the 70% increase in NBD is being predicted.	Yes	The surveys completed to inform the assessment of effects are set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . These form the baseline with respect to how the 70% BNG is calculated, as set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0313	One respondent would like more information on how the potential effects on ecology receptors were calculated.	Yes	The approach to the assessment of effects is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent commented that there seems to be limited provision for wet environments. They state that this is a shame considering the number of species which could benefit from this.	Yes	The Project includes the restoration of circa 100ha of flood meadow and associated habitats along the River Evenlode. Details are set out in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0329	One respondent does not welcome any changes to the environment, as it will be detrimental to wildlife and ecology.	Yes	As set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] , it is anticipated that the Project will result in an overall benefit for wildlife and ecology.
BW2_OFF_0336	One respondent stated that they are very sceptical about the number of items which include the comment "no significant residual effect" including on hydrology, ecology and nature conservation.	Yes	The approach to the assessment of effects is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and follows all good practice guidelines.
BW2_OFF_0336	One respondent stated that more careful and detailed planning is required to protect the environment owing to the lack of long-term studies on large scale solar installations.	Yes	Noted. The approach to the assessment of effects is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and follows all good practice guidelines.
BW2_OFF_0374	One respondent stated that there was no information available on the impact of cable routes on local ecology, including the impact of digging trenches and underground work on local ecosystems.	Yes	The impact of the cable routes on ecology is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0376	One respondent stated that they was very little hard data on what will actually be done, for example a list of things that might be done to mitigate the environmental impact	Yes	Details of ecology mitigations are set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] Other mitigation measures can be found at Volume 3, Appendix 6.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0376	One respondent stated that they would like more information on a) who and how many people conducted the site-specific surveys (including habitats and fauna); b) did PVDP or Blenheim Estates pay the surveyors to conduct the survey; c) the exact location of the studies; d) how often the surveys take place, for how long, and when; e) what measures of biodiversity were used to form the baseline on which the "70% increase" was predicted.	Yes	RPS undertook most of the surveys with sub-consultants recruited as necessary to ensure the correct effort was applied and to ensure surveys were collected in a timely fashion. RPS were employed by PVDP. Full details of the methods and outcomes of surveys used to inform the assessment of effects are set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5] The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.
BW2_OFF_0402	One respondent stated that the PEIR does not address the reduction in biocapacity of the site. They state that the laws of conservation of energy dictate that energy cannot be created or destroyed, removal of solar energy will reduce overall carbon capture and biomass in the area - which will impact	Yes	The great majority of the land used for the Project is currently used for intensive agriculture which, by its nature, removes the biomass from the soil every time the crops are harvested. The change to permanent grassland will ensure that there is a greater degree of carbon storage within the soil compared to the current baseline.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	the capacity of the ecosystem to support local wildlife.		
BW2_OFF_0402	One respondent stated that, although biodiversity is addressed in the PEIR, the overall biological impact is not included.	Yes	The approach to the assessment of effects is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and follows all good practice guidelines.
BW2_OFF_0435	One respondent stated that PEIR presented a "real lack of concern" for the local ecology, for real animals and habitats, which have been cast aside for a false concentration on only solar power.	No	Noted. The approach to the assessment of effects is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and follows all good practice guidelines.
BW2_OFF_0528	One respondent stated that it is difficult to see whether this development will enhance any of the local and national projects that are aiming to manage and sustain local ecology and nature conservation.	Yes	The Project has been designed to ensure that the aims of the Oxfordshire Nature Recovery Network through the creation of the River Evenlode Corridor.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0528	One respondent stated that small scale solar farms are better equipped than large scale ones in supporting biodiversity and providing new beneficial habitats for flora and fauna.	Yes	The large, landscape scale of the Project enables similar landscape-scale ecological gain to be realised. To this end, the Project includes the 100ha River Evenlode Corridor that will significantly increase the area of flood meadow habitat in Oxfordshire and enhance an important ecological linkage between the Blenheim Estate and the River Thames.
BW2_OFF_0542	One respondent expressed concern about the lack of information on the biodiversity baseline which aims to show improvements have been made.	Yes	Full details of the methods and outcomes of surveys used to inform the assessment of effects are set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0087	One respondent stated that the environment is quite happy as it is.	No	Noted. However, the Applicant is cognisant of the Governments increasingly challenging targets to decarbonize the electricity infrastructure and reach Net Zero. It is also cognisant of the Climate Change Emergency that has been declared by each of the host authorities in which the Project falls. The Botley West Solar farm addresses the urgent need for renewable energy but many more such projects are required. See

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_PFF_0093	One respondent stated that the environmental impact will far outweigh any advantages of the project.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant disagrees. Full details of the methods and outcomes of surveys used to inform the assessment of effects are set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the Project will deliver a net gain for ecology compared to the intensive agricultural baseline. See also the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_PFF_0098	Respondents stated that these proposals will contribute to a baron ecosystem.	Yes	Full details of the methods and outcomes of surveys used to inform the assessment of effects are set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the Project will deliver a net gain for ecology compared to the intensive agricultural baseline.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0117	One respondent stated that there should be a comparison between the environmental impacts on biodiversity of the proposed development versus if the site was rewilded or underwent a process of regenerative agriculture.	No	Noted. There is no policy requirement to undertake such a comparison. The assessments presented in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] follow all good practice guidelines.
BW2_PFF_0153	Respondents stated that the local ecology and biodiversity proposals are inadequate.	No	Noted. The Applicant disagrees. The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the Project will deliver a net gain for ecology compared to the intensive agricultural baseline.
BW2_PFF_0170	One respondent stated that none of the mitigation measures do enough to counteract the damage to local wildlife and the destruction of local, arable land, which currently work in harmony together.	No	Noted. The Applicant disagrees. The assessments presented in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] follow all good practice guidelines. The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the Project will deliver a net gain for ecology compared to the intensive agricultural baseline.
BW2_PFF_0188	One respondent expressed concern about the statement on the increase in biodiversity by 70%, which is dependent on Blenheim's management. They do, however, understand that its Blenheim's land and this is why it is this way.	Yes	The approach to and justification for the target of 70% habitat net gain is set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5.] . The key driver for the gain is the change from intensive arable to conservation-managed grasslands.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0188	One respondent stated that it seems the project has made strenuous efforts to reduce environmental impact as far as possible.	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes that statement which is a reflection of applying the mitigation hierarchy to the impacts identified and assessed.
BW2_PFF_0188	One respondent expressed disappointment that it was not possible to put hedges in front of the stock fencing as these hedges would have to be removed at the end of the project.	Yes	The Project will plant circa 26.5km of new hedgerow and enhance a further 22km of existing hedgerow. The fencing is generally placed behind existing and new hedgerow planting to reduce visual effects. When decommissioning, care will be taken to avoid hedgerow loss. None is expected as the Applicant will use current accesses to enter the fields during decommissioning.
BW2_PFF_0190	One respondent stated that possible destruction of watercourses has not been assessed.	Yes	The Project has committed to using trenchless techniques to cross any watercourse to ensure that no impacts occur.
BW2_PFF_0213	One respondent stated that they cannot see any environmental benefits as mentioned.	Yes	Full details of the methods and outcomes of surveys used to inform the assessment of effects are set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the Project will deliver a net gain for

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			ecology compared to the intensive agricultural baseline.
BW2_PFF_0213	One respondent stated that you cannot displace wildflowers and bugs from A to B, as nature does not work that way.	Yes	<p>Noted. Full details of the methods and outcomes of surveys used to inform the assessment of effects are set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the Project will deliver a net gain for ecology compared to the intensive agricultural baseline.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that the concept that the local landscape and habitat can be destroyed and then then enhanced by planting is ludicrous.	Yes	Noted. Full details of the methods and outcomes of surveys used to inform the assessment of effects are set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the Project will deliver a net gain for ecology compared to the intensive agricultural baseline.
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent does not believe the statement: "The fields themselves were considered to be of very little ecological value" is correct.	Yes	The Project site has been subject to a range of appropriate ecological surveys as set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The ecological value of each receptor has been determined based on a combination of best practice guidelines and professional judgement.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that the only way to improve ecology and biodiversity is to not build the panels and compounds in the first place.	No	Noted. The Applicant disagrees.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0233	One respondent stated that the environmental impact on the land will be huge during the prepping stage for the panels i.e. access to roads, mud, etc.	Yes	The assessment of the effects from construction-related activities is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains measures to avoid adverse effects during construction.
BW2_PFF_0251	One respondent stated that there is no guarantee of long-term environmental and ecological management.	Yes	The oLEMP sets out the commitment to long-term management and maintenance. Compliance with this is a Requirement of the DCO. [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the current proposed site (3.4 times the size of a football pitch), would represent the permanent industrialisation of green belt land in a valley next to the nationally important ecosystem surrounding Farmoor Reservoir, which is home to the 'Farmoor fly' (one of only 2 habitats remaining in the UK), which in turn attracts birds such as swifts and also bats	Yes	The assessment of the effects from the Project on ecological receptors (including Farmoor Reservoir) is set out in n ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that, despite BWS' assertion to the contrary in the PEIR which says that the fields in the Southern Site were "found to have very little ecological value", the construction and operation of the solar power plant would clearly have significant adverse effects on the local ecology and biodiversity as a result of habitat loss, fragmentation of existing wildlife corridors and noise and light pollution.	Yes	The assessment of the effects from the Project on ecological receptors is set out in n ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the Project will have a net gain for ecology, in line with local and national planning policy
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that there needs to be more clarification on the enhancement and improvement to local landscape and biodiversity.	Yes	The enhancement of the Project site with respect to ecology is set out in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the EIA does not appear to be entirely consistent with the independent EIA conducted by the Vale of the White Horse Council for the Red House Farm Solar EIA on what is essentially the same land. They expressed that the ES must therefore combine its findings with	Yes	The proposed Red House Farm Solar project is included with assessment of cumulative effects in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . It should be noted that at the time of writing this report, the Red House Solar farm application had been withdrawn.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>this document where relevant and where it is clear that species have been missed out or dismissed in relation to the project proposed land (especially as the observation of species is dependent on them/ or traces of them, being randomly present on specific days).</p>		
BW2_PFF_0269	<p>One respondent stated that there is no mention that the field in which the sub-station is proposed to be built, is a regular assemblage site for large flocks of migrating geese. They state that the PEIR is contradictory on this matter when it comes to the Southern Site: PEIR 6.4.7 suggests that “no individual species of wintering birds occurred in significant numbers,” while PEIR 6.4.13 says “significant adverse effects were identified on the wintering bird assemblage as a result of habitat loss, primarily the loss of arable fields during construction.”</p> <p>For this precise reason, the current proposed site of the sub-station should be discounted, because the adverse</p>	Yes	<p>There is no contradiction in this assessment. None of the wintering bird species, individually, occurred in large flocks in the Southern Site Area. However, the overall assemblage of wintering birds when all species are considered together, was considered to be of greater ecological value and with correspondingly greater effects.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	effects on wintering birds in Farmoor will continue beyond the construction phase.		
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that additional must be taken over winter months and incorporated into the ES and future documentation so that they more closely represent the reality of the ecology and biodiversity of the Southern Site than they do at present.	Yes	The surveys completed to inform the assessment of effects are set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The scope of surveys has been agreed with Natural England during pre-submission consultation.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that if the project is serious about enhancing its sites, it should omit fences entirely, plant thousands of trees around its boundaries, create lakes and additional hedgerows at every opportunity and allow locals far greater access for the creation of allotments and community land projects around and in-between the solar panels.	Yes	The fencing is necessary for the safe operation of the solar farm. However, the Project has sought to ensure that it will provide a significant net gain with respect to ecology, as set out in the Ecology Strategy in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that, for a company which professes to be a supporter of biodiversity, there is a lack of vision and ambition in PEIR section 6.1 (just 5 points long, and which says	Yes	The Project has sought to ensure that it will provide a significant net gain with respect to ecology, as set out in the Ecology Strategy in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] . Implementation of this strategy will ensure

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	nothing of any great consequence). They suggested partnering with BBOWT and let them plan the best use of the land from a biodiversity perspective.		the Project delivers over 70% net gain for biodiversity.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that driving 2-metre-deep piles into the ground for so many solar panels will create an ecological and human health nightmare for anyone within earshot of the sites.	Yes	The assessment of effects from the construction of the Project are assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and Section 16.9 of Volume 1, Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent expressed that they are concerned that Vol 3 Appendix 9.2 Phase 1 habitat survey has so little detail and no survey of Long Mead LWS or Swinford meadow LWS (page 208 of section 9 Appendices 9.1 to 9.4). They are not even indicated on the habitat plans, although identified in Table 3.1 in Appendix 9.1 (desk study).	Yes	The Project has been redesigned since the PEIR to avoid Long Mead water meadows with cable crossing now located to the north of this area. All areas of the Project have now been subject to appropriate habitat surveys, as reported in ES Appendix 9.2 Phase 1 Habitat Survey [EN010147/APP/6.5]
Wildlife			
BW2_OFF_0096, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0285	Respondents are concerned about the impact the project will have on bats.	Yes	The assessment of effects from the Project on bats are assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The conclusion of the

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			assessment is that, once appropriate mitigation is implemented, the Project will deliver an overall benefit for bats.
BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0183	One respondent is unsatisfied with the lack of data to show the impact of solar arrays on wildlife, such as the possible reduction in bat populations between periphery and centre of solar arrays.	Yes	The assessment of effects from the Project on bats are assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The conclusion of the assessment is that, once appropriate mitigation is implemented, the Project will deliver an overall benefit for bats.
BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0231, BW2_OFF_0359	Respondents expressed concern about mitigation measures such as fencing and how this might exclude mammals from the area.	Yes	The assessment of effects from fencing on ecological receptors is included in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0221	Respondents expressed concern for how larger mammals such as deer and foxes and native species will access fields if mitigation measures are in place.	Yes	The fencing surrounding the solar arrays will include gates to allow badgers and foxes to pass through it without hinderance. Although the fencing is designed to prevent deer from accessing these areas, solar installation areas only cover circa 839ha out of a total site area of circa 1,418ha. As such, there is still a significant area of habitat for deer to use.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0242, BW2_OFF_0538, BW2_PFF_0023	Respondents expressed that mitigation measures such as 'skylarks' and 'bird and bat boxes' are not sufficient for replacing the local environmental opportunities for these and other species of open fields.	Yes	The Project has sought to ensure that it will provide a significant net gain with respect to ecology, as set out in the Ecology Strategy in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] . Implementation of this strategy will ensure the Project delivers over 70% net gain for biodiversity.
BW2_OFF_0292, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondents expressed concern about how sheep grazing on solar fields can enhance biodiversity as this may lead to a monoculture grassland among the panels.	Yes	Sheep grazing at very low stocking rates is used by all wildlife organisations as a management tool to ensure that vigorous grasses do not dominate a sward. As such, it is considered appropriate and beneficial with respect to the management of grassland within the Project site.
BW2_OFF_0296, BW2_OFF_0359, BW2_PFF_0285	Respondents expressed that, although not classified as of conservation interest, deer, foxes and other indigenous fauna are important parts of the ecosystem and are not represented in the PEIR through impacts of fencing, barriers and human structures.	Yes	It is not possible for an Environmental Statement to consider effects on every potential ecological receptor. Therefore, as per good practice guidelines, the impact assessment reported in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] focusses on those receptors of conservation significance.
BW2_OFF_0352, BW2_OFF_0500	Respondents stated that the impact on wildlife with the many structures, sub stations and miles of fencing must be huge.	Yes	The assessment of the effects from the Project on ecological receptors is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			overall conclusion of this assessment is that the Project will have a net gain for ecology, in line with local and national planning policy
BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_PFF_0285	Respondents expressed that the Southern Site is unique in its position as being a wildlife corridor between the reservoir itself (the largest body of water in Oxfordshire), and the nature reserves along the River Thames in Farmoor, and beyond to the ultra-rare wildflower meadows to the south of Swinford Bridge and this could be affected by the project.	Yes	The assessment of the effects from the Project on ecological receptors is set out in n ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the Project will have a net gain for ecology, in line with local and national planning policy
BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_PFF_0285	Respondents expressed that there seems to be no mention of fencing incorporating vital, regularly spaced hedgehog/small mammal and fox tunnels. They wished for this to be incorporated into future ecology plans, including the ES. They would like this to be consistent with wildlife and ecology best practice.	Yes	The fencing surrounding the solar arrays will include gates to allow badgers, foxes and other small mammals to pass through it without hinderance.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0183	One respondent expressed concern about the impact large areas of smooth reflecting panels will have on bats and the effect on the acoustics used by bats.	Yes	The impact of solar arrays on bats is considered in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The overall conclusion is that, following the implementation of appropriate mitigation, there will be a beneficial effect of the Project on bats, primarily through the delivery of enhanced foraging and connectivity.
BW2_OFF_0190	Respondents expressed that the solar farm could be a sheep-grazing area.	Yes	The majority of the Project site, including all the solar array areas, will now be subject to conservation grazing with sheep.
BW2_OFF_0283	One respondent asked what impact the project will have on the local microclimate, for example, if it alters the air and/or ground temperature, airflow, drainage, etc.	Yes	The effect of the Project on the physical environment is described within the ES including ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation, ES Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood risk, ES Chapter 14 Climate Change and ES Chapter 19 Air Quality [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0313	Respondents stated that it is unclear how wildlife habitats will be improved and general statements on this are misleading.	Yes	The enhancement of the Project site with respect to ecology is set out in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0313	One respondent stated the underneath of solar panels will not provide an	Yes	The Project will include significant new grassland habitats that will enhance the site for hares.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	alternative habitat for the hare that currently occupy the fields		
BW2_OFF_0313	One respondent stated that it is misleading to refer to hares having "little ecological value".	Yes	ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] sets out the ecological value of hares. They are included as an Important Ecological Feature.
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent stated that the areas given over to wildlife are too small to ensure they are undisturbed during all phases of the development.	Yes	The Project, once constructed, is largely autonomous with no significant lighting and limited noise-generation, as such, the issue of disturbance is unlikely to have any effect on ecology receptors.
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent stated that the project should go beyond the minimum recommendations in protecting and enhancing the habitats of otters, water voles, newts, snakes, slow worms and all kinds of mammals and amphibians.	Yes	As set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] , the Project provides over 70% habitat BNG. This is significantly above the legal minimum requirement for developments of 10%, set out in the Environment Act 2021 and associated Regulations.
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent would like to see safe areas for hedgehogs.	Yes	The Project provides significant new habitat for hedgehog, including large areas of undisturbed grassland and enhanced buffers along all hedgerows on the Project site.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0359	One respondent has asked how will free movement of animals between the pockets of ancient woodland be protected.	Yes	Movement between the blocks of ancient woodland is a key aim of the Ecology Strategy for the Project, as set out in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] . This will be achieved through the provision of enhanced corridors along hedgerows that link the woodlands but also the creation of new hedgerow corridors in various locations where Public Rights of Way occur.
BW2_OFF_0359	One respondent has asked how it will be ensured that local wildlife are not driven out of the area during the construction phase?	Yes	The effect of habitat loss on ecology receptors is assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The necessary mitigation has been put in place to ensure that such loss does not have a significant adverse effect on any of the ecology receptors.
BW2_OFF_0359	One respondent would like to know how wildlife presence, behaviour and tolerance will be monitored during the construction phase.	Yes	As set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (oCoCP) [EN010147/APP/6.3] , the Project will include an Ecology Clerk of Works (ECoW), part of whose role will be to ensure that any wildlife present is suitably protected and the requirements with respect to such protection implemented.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0359	One respondent would like to know what steps will be taken to repair any damage and disruption to wildlife observed during the construction and operation phase.	Yes	As set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation, the majority of features of ecological importance within the Project site will be protected with appropriate buffers to ensure they are not damaged during construction. In addition, the Project includes a comprehensive oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] that describes how the landscaping within the Project will be created and managed. This includes the provision of extensive new grasslands, hedgerows, flood meadows and other features managed for ecological benefit.
BW2_OFF_0359	One respondent asked how the local wildlife breeding cycle will be protecting and not disturbed during the construction phase.	Yes	The impact of the Project on the life cycle of any ecology receptor is assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0470	One respondent stated that if the power cables need to cross the River Thames, this would mean digging up a unique wildlife site at Long Meadow that has been undisturbed for over 1000 years.	Yes	The Project has been redesigned since the PEIR to ensure that trenchless techniques are used to cross under not only the Thames but also the associated flood meadows. The launch and exit locations are still the subject of several options, but all will be in existing arable land.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0482	One respondent stated that they are concerned with the lack of analysis on the impact on wildlife in the area of the 2.1m deer proof fencing.	Yes	The effect on habitat connectivity as a result of the fencing has been included in the final ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0500	One respondent stated that the development of PV panels and high fencing will impact the connectivity of habitats, which is the key to successful nature recovery.	Yes	The effect on habitat connectivity as a result of the fencing has been included in the final ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0500	Respondents stated that the development will cause the loss of wildlife in the area.	Yes	As set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation The effect on habitat connectivity as a result of the fencing has been included in the final ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] , the Project will have an overall net benefit for ecology, delivering over 70% habitat BNG.
BW2_PFF_0048	One respondent asked who will be looking after the beehives, bird and bat boxes.	Yes	Responsibility for the management of the landscaping of the Project during operation will be determined post consent but the principles of such management are set out in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0105	One respondent stated that the big fences surrounding the solar panels will have an impact on wildlife.	Yes	The effect on habitat connectivity as a result of the fencing has been included in the ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0114	One respondent enquired whether it would be possible to change the panels to smaller/new/better ones if wildlife is adversely impacted.	Yes	Once constructed, it is not intended to change the panels, other than to replace any that might become damaged/degraded.
BW2_PFF_0114	One respondent enquired whether there will be monitors to assess the impacts on the wildlife (e.g. skylarks, insects and yellowhammers).	Yes	The Project includes monitoring of a variety of wildlife through the operational lifetime of the solar farm. This is described in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0118	One respondent stated that the suggestion of skylark plots, beehives, log piles and bird boxes are what you could have in a private garden.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0205	One respondent would like increased greenhouse gas effects from the methane produced by grazing sheep to be considered.	Yes	The impact of emissions from the Project on climate change is assessed in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change [EN010147/APP/6.3] . This does not include sheep grazing since the grazing regime for the Project will be at conservation stocking rates (circa six sheep per hectare), not commercial sheet farming rates. As such, the methane production from such animals will be minimal.
BW2_PFF_0218	One respondent stated that there needs to be a thorough investigation into the impact on the movement of animal species.	Yes	The effect on habitat connectivity as a result of the fencing has been included in the final ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that herding sheep is a fantasy.	Yes	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that the deer, hares and other mammals regularly cross over the fields from nearby woods and would be fenced off from the solar array fields.	Yes	The effect on habitat connectivity as a result of the fencing has been included in the final ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that there was no mention of the "Farmoor fly" in the PEIR, and the impact on this species needs to be addressed and investigated further in the ES.	Yes	The impact of the Project on invertebrates has been assessed in Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that the Southern Site is unique in its position as being a wildlife corridor between the alluvial floodplain (which the entirety of these fields were for many thousands of years, before the appearance of the reservoir) and this could be affected by the project.	Yes	The function of the Southern Site Area as a wildlife corridor will be enhanced post-development as the habitat connectivity along the hedgerow network will be improved through the provision of new buffer grasslands and more sensitive management of hedgerows.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that the Southern Site is unique in its position as being a wildlife corridor between the ancient Denman's Copse, Wytham Woods (a SSSI and the most studied piece of ancient woodland in Europe, if	Yes	The function of the Southern Site Area as a wildlife corridor will be enhanced post-development as the habitat connectivity along the hedgerow network will be improved through the provision of new buffer grasslands and more sensitive

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	not the world) and this could be affected by the project.		management of hedgerows. This will help improve connectivity between Denman's Copse and Wytham Woods.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that as custodians of an acre of woodland nearby the proposed site, which contains bat and bird boxes, as well as a proto-pond, they understand the importance of wildlife being able to freely traverse between the Farmoor nature reserves, the River Thames, Wytham Woods and Denman's Copse etc, via the fields on which the proposed solar plant would be sited, and therefore, are especially aware of the ecological impact that high fences would pose.	Yes	The effect on habitat connectivity as a result of the fencing has been included in the final ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Although the panel arrays will be fenced, the hedgerow corridors linking the fields will not be and, as such, it will be possible for animals to still move freely across the area, via the hedgerow corridors outside of the fence lines.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that in their small piece of woodland (which is not fenced on purpose) we regularly see (and capture on camera) hedgehogs, badgers (Wytham Woods has the largest population of badgers in Europe per square km, which spill out onto local fields), bats (mainly Pipistrelle), deer (Roe and Muntjac), stoats, grass snakes, frogs, toads, newts, buzzards, red kites, little owl, barn owl and foxes (and brown hares in the nearby field) etc, with the larger of these often traveling great distances each day/ night.	Yes	The impact of the Project on Wytham Woods and the ecology it supports has been assessed in Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The conclusion of that assessment is that there would be no adverse effect on the woodland.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent enquired that, despite the assertion that lights will meet with the Institute of Lighting Professionals Bat Conservation Trust guidelines, why are lights needed at all if there will be infra-red security cameras?	Yes	The only white light present in the final design will be on movement sensors around substations for security purposes. No other white light will be necessary.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that further restricting the movements of deer by building miles of deer-proof fencing around the 200 acres of the Southern Site, will inevitably lead to more deaths	Yes	The Project site will be permeable to deer and other wildlife through the provision of extensive hedgerow buffers and other habitats, linking woodlands together. This will help ensure that there is no requirement

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	and collisions on the roads. They stated that only last month, a large stag was killed in a collision that police were called to, close to the Farmoor roundabout.		for animals to enter onto roads more than is currently the case.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that there are no specific surveys for Otter and dormice were completed, despite the fact that Otters have been seen in and around the Thames near Farmoor and were recently captured on CCTV in a Cumnor garden. This must be addressed in the ES (footage can be supplied as proof of the Cumnor range of local otters).	Yes	Surveys for dormice have been completed and are reported in ES Appendix 9.11 Dormouse Survey Report [EN010147/APP/6.5] . No specific surveys have been completed for otter on the basis that their habitats have been retained. However, they are known from within the Project site and, as such, have been included as a receptor within ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0302	One respondent expressed that there has been little consideration for the impact of construction on wildlife.	Yes	The impact of construction on ecology receptors is fully assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0051	One respondent stated that the project will be a major upheaval, causing disruption to wildlife and locals.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0091	Respondents are concerned about the loss of habitat.	Yes	The Project will provide significant new habitat creation compared to the agricultural baseline. This is demonstrated

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			through the provision of over 70% habitat BNG as set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0091	Respondents expressed that there are no definitive plans to address the issue of loss of habitat.	Yes	The Project will provide significant new habitat creation compared to the agricultural baseline. This is demonstrated through the provision of over 70% habitat BNG as set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
Birds			
BW2_OFF_0065, BW2_OFF_0229, BW2_PFF_0126, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0285	Respondents are concerned about the impact the proposals will have on birds e.g. skylarks.	Yes	The Project site area has been subject to intensive bird surveys to ensure that the baseline populations can be fully characterised (as described in ES Appendix 9.9 Breeding Bird Surveys and ES Appendix 9.10 Wintering Bird Surveys [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The effect of the Project on bird populations has been assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_OFF_0500, BW2_PFF_0285	Respondents stated that the skylark plots are minimal and isolated and	Yes	The provision of skylark plots within the Project is at the 2/ha ratio recommended by the Government.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	recommend that the plots be greater in size and number.		
BW2_OFF_0057, BW2_PFF_0295	Respondents do not believe that the use of birdboxes will improve biodiversity.	Yes	The provision of bird boxes is to enhance the site for nesting birds through an increase in nesting options.
BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_PFF_0295	Respondents stated that in Chapter 6 they couldn't find any further details on skylark plots and stated that there is no evidence that this will work.	Yes	The provision of skylark plots within the Project is to provide additional foraging habitats for skylark and other bird species during the operation of the Project. As an open area without panels, they will develop a different floral characteristic, improving the diversity of habitats present.
BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0387	Respondents stated that when asked about the skylark plots at the consultation event, RPS stated that they "had to include them as we would have been reprimanded if we hadn't, but I am not sure what the evidence is that they will work."	Yes	Skylark plots have been included to improve the diversity of habitat structure within the panel arrays.
BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0274	Respondents stated that key information was missing from the PEIR/consultation information on the project's impact on birds, for example the impact on the swans landing on Yarnton fields.	Yes	The effect of the Project on birds is described in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0163	Respondents asked why environmental assessments were not carried out over 12 months to account for bird migration, nesting, etc.	Yes	The Project site area has been subject to intensive bird surveys to ensure that the baseline populations can be fully characterised (as described in ES Appendix 9.9 Breeding Bird Surveys and ES Appendix 9.10 Wintering Bird Surveys [EN010147/APP/6.5]). Surveys were completed twice over a two year period covering September/October to March (wintering) and March to July (breeding).
BW2_OFF_0174	One respondent believes that the PEIR may downplay habitat loss and its effects on biodiversity, particularly for wintering birds.	Yes	The impact of the Project on wintering birds is described in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . This acknowledges that there would be an overall loss of habitat for this receptor and that such a loss would be significant.
BW2_OFF_0177	Respondents expressed concern that mitigation measures such as fencing may disrupt migratory bird patterns.	Yes	The impact of fencing on habitat connectivity is fully assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0490	Respondents are satisfied with the mitigation measures included in the NTS 6.3.9, such as the skylark plots and other measures for farmland birds.	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes this support.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0500	One respondent stated that skylarks will not nest on the 5sq metre gaps in amongst the array of PV panels.	Yes	The skylark plots are not provided for the purposes of supporting nesting skylark, per se (although some may do so). They are more provided to enhance the foraging opportunities for this and other species to support nesting in surrounding fields and the larger areas of open grassland within the Project site.
BW2_OFF_0500	Respondents stated that they are concerned about the ability of low flying birds (e.g. barn owls) to avoid the fencing while hunting prey.	Yes	Predatory birds have exceptional eyesight and, as such, it is not anticipated that any such effect could occur.
BW2_PFF_0098	One respondent stated that the swans regularly use the fields and that the development will ration out the delicate ecosystem.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0185	One respondent stated the proposals of a strip between arrays constituting as skylark nesting plots is disingenuous.	Yes	The skylark plots are not provided for the purposes of supporting nesting skylark, per se (although some may do so). They are more provided to enhance the foraging opportunities for this and other species to support nesting in surrounding fields and the larger areas of open grassland within the Project site.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent asked what would happen when migratory birds in the area (geese, swans, ducks) mistake the panels for water.	Yes	The potential effect of migratory birds mistaking solar panels for water has not been demonstrated in practice with research by Natural England (NE 2016) finding that bird collision risk with solar panels was very low.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent asked how swans will be rescued if they crash into the panels. They stated that they would not hesitate to cut the fence and rescue any injured birds.	Yes	It is not anticipated that there would be any risk of bird strike on solar panels. Research by Natural England (NE 2016) found that bird collision risk with solar panels was very low, based on carcass searches at active solar sites.
BW2_PFF_0235	One respondent stated that the line in 6.4.12 in the PEIR which states "the majority of potential impacts resulting from the project on the majority of important ecological features were considered not significant" is misrepresentation.	Yes	The Project will has been assessed as having an overall net benefit for the majority of ecology receptors compared to the intensive agricultural baseline. This is demonstrated through the provision of over 70% habitat BNG, as set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0256	One respondent stated that they do doubt there will be successful mitigation for what the PEIR acknowledges as significant habitat losses for wintering bird assemblage due to habitat loss during construction	Yes	The impact of the Project on wintering birds is described in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . This acknowledges that there would be an overall loss of habitat for this receptor and that such a loss would be significant

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that all future documents, including the ES, must explicitly guarantee that any vegetation clearance will take place outside the bird nesting season (March 1st to September 1st) and that a nesting survey will be undertaken in addition outside those times if clearance is likely in proximity to unusual bird/ mammalian/ reptile species which might be disturbed. They stated that this has not been spelled out explicitly enough in the current documentation.	Yes	The commitment to vegetation clearance outside of the nesting season, other than where checked by the Project ECoW is set out in the oCoCP [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the potential effects of electro-magnetism in the Southern Site requires much greater analysis in the ES and going forward, due to the substation's proximity to Cumnor Primary School, Farmoor and Filchampstead (including a business park) and its potential effects on bird navigation and their reproduction at the important ecosystem of Farmoor Reservoir.	Yes	Section 16.9 of Volume 1, Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3] , sets out an understanding of risk in relation to EMF exposure. This also relates to the mental health effects associated with concern about EMF exposure, even when the actual risks are avoided through compliance with ICNIRP guidelines.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that it is a pity the project developers weren't able to ask the many birds in the West Oxfordshire countryside if they would like to nest in fences instead of standard hedges.	Yes	The Project will provide an additional 26.5km of hedgerow for birds to use for nesting compared to the existing baseline. As such, there will be a significant increase in nesting habitat.
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent stated that they were concerned that surveys such as Appendix 9.9 on breeding birds was not included.	Yes	ES Appendix 9.9 Breeding Bird Survey [EN010147/APP/6.5] is included within the application.
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent expressed that there is a need for detailed surveys including the bird nesting period and main meadow flowering time in May/June to set the baseline.	Yes	Surveys for both botany and birds are described in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent expressed that the LEMP will need to consider the timing of site operations to avoid bird nesting periods.	Yes	The oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] provides for site operations to consider the bird nesting season, where appropriate.
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent expressed that they welcome the provision of skylark plots and expect that these will be designed and located to maximise re-establishment of safe undisturbed nest sites and that these and other species	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	will be the subject of long term monitoring.		
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent expressed that hedgerow species such as yellowhammer thrive in well established hedgerows and the LEMP should ensure hedgerows are maintained and established as large wide hedgerows to support biodiversity with light touch management outside of nesting and fruiting periods, so that they continue to provide food and cover for wildlife.	Yes	The oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] sets out that hedgerows are to be managed in this manner to ensure they develop an 'A' type structure that will support nesting birds and other wildlife.
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent stated that fragmentation of wildlife is also a threat and suggests a more permeable layout, with wider interconnected corridors with ingress and egress for wildlife and humans, who might find long fenced corridors intimidating or threatening	Yes	The effect on habitat connectivity as a result of the fencing has been included in the final ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The provision of habitat permeability is a key feature of the ecology strategy for the Project, as set out in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0285	One respondent stated that they are concerned about winter birds gaining access to Farmoor Reservoir when the	Yes	The development of the Project on the Southern Site Area does not limit bird access to Farmoor Reservoir.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	project is under construction and functioning.		
BW2_PFF_0285	One respondent asked whether skylarks will be drowned out or scared away by the noise of the power convertors.	Yes	The noise outputs of the development, in particular the Power Converter Stations, and the relationship with tranquillity are considered in ES Chapter 13 Noise & Vibration [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Noise impacts on wildlife are considered within ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0295	Respondent stated that they would like to see proof that skylark plots are being widely used in other solar projects.	Yes	The skylark plots are not provided for the purposes of supporting nesting skylark, per se (although some may do so). They are more provided to enhance the foraging opportunities for this and other species to support nesting in surrounding fields and the larger areas of open grassland within the Project site.
Trees, Plants and Flora			
BW2_OFF_0490, BW2_PFF_0042	Respondents would like to see the use of native species of local provenance.	Yes	Noted. The Project will only use native species for landscaping proposals
BW2_OFF_0049	One respondent is unsure whether any trees will be cut down and would like	Yes	No trees will be removed to install the solar arrays. All gaps in hedgerows will be

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	this to be confirmed in order to make their decision to support the project.		designed to avoid tree removal where possible.
BW2_OFF_0190	One respondent would like to see a focus on bee-friendly wild flowers.	Yes	The inclusion of large areas of wildflower grassland across the Project site will ensure that, overall, there is an enhancement of the Project site for bees compared to the intensive agricultural baseline.
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent would like to know if larger trees will be planted, as they warn that smaller trees will do little to reduce the impact over the lifespan of the facility. They would hope that trees will be planted for long term benefits, as well as short term growth, as they believe this would benefit wildlife in the long run.	Yes	The approach to tree planting is set out in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent would like to know if natural die-off and subsequent thinning of trees was taken into consideration when assessing the planting schemes and will these areas be pro-actively managed in order to give them the best chance of survival.	Yes	The approach to habitat management is set out in the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent stated that as large parts of the area are farmed using modern regenerative methods, bee hives and wildflower seeds will not add or mitigate the impact on existing ancient hedgerows and dew ponds.	Yes	The change from commercial agriculture to conservation grazing over the majority of the Project site will ensure that the Project delivers a net gain for biodiversity, as set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0042	One respondent stated that the buffer zone, particularly for panels on fields, next to homes, and public amenities, are insufficient.	Yes	Buffer zones have been incorporated following best practice guidelines.
BW2_PFF_0048	One respondent stated that wild flowers will not grow between or under solar panels.	Yes	Noted. For this reason, it is assumed that all grassland under the panels themselves will be in 'poor' ecological condition when considered within the BNG Assessment, set out in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the ES and future documents must contain an absolute legal guarantee that no existing hedgerows will be lost, as these take decades, if not longer to fully mature. This must be made much clearer.	Yes	The Project will result in a number of gaps being created in hedgerows and some existing gaps being widened. However, no hedgerow will be removed in its entirety and the Project will plant an additional 26.5km of hedgerow to ensure that, overall, there is a significant gain in hedgerow on site post construction.
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent stated that there needs to be a close consultation with the	Yes	The Project has been redesigned to avoid both of these areas.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	owners on Long Mead and Swinford Meadow.		
BW2_PFF_0274	One respondent would like the assured that no hedgerows will be removed or damaged during the setup, running and decommissioning of the project.	Yes	The Project will result in a number of gaps being created in hedgerows and some existing gaps being widened. However, no hedgerow will be removed in its entirety and the Project will plant an additional 26.5km of hedgerow to ensure that, overall, there is a significant gain in hedgerow on site post construction.
Soil			
BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_OFF_0376	Respondents stated that grasslands, upon which the panels will cast a shadow, will reduce the overall biodiversity in those areas, but stated that some species will benefit.		The impact of shading under the panels on the grassland that will develop there is accounted for within ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The grassland is predicted to achieve no more than 'poor' condition in this location.
BW2_OFF_0051	One respondent believes that there are inadequate base line estimates of nature of soils in the fields affected and believes that inadequate treatment of what will happen underneath the panels.	Yes	The nature of the soils across the site has been surveyed and the results are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0174	One respondent believes that mitigation measures may not fully address the adverse effects on ground conditions.	Yes	The Outline Soil Management Plan, as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains measures to limit impacts to soil resources, wherever practicable through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management.
BW2_OFF_0280	One respondent expressed that soil quality may, overtime, degrade due to limited or no exposure to sunlight beneath the panels, with the accumulation of damp soil being unable to dry out, and leading to sterile growth conditions.	Yes	The potential for improvements in soil health including soil carbon and soils structural characteristics are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent states that experts during the webinars appeared naïve about soil grading, farmland ecosystems and management.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0376	One respondent stated that round the edges of the solar panels, a small range of grass species will go into that small area but this will not provide an alternative habitat for animals such as hares.	Yes	The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN 010147 APP 7/6/3] presents the outline planting proposals for the land within the DCO around the panels.
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent states that experts during the webinars appeared naïve	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	about soil grading, farmland ecosystems and management.		
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that they expect to see an additional explanation in the ES on how grass would be managed between the panels. They stated that this should include a guarantee that all land, including the cleaning of the solar panels, will not require any herbicides and will be managed through an entirely organic process.	Yes	The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN 010147 APP 7/6/3] presents the outline proposals for the planting and management of the land within the DCO boundary.
BW2_PFF_0285	<p>One respondent cites a study carried out in Italy which shows that after 7 years of panel coverage, soil fertility was modified, with a significant reduction in water-holding capacity and soil temperature, while electrical conductivity and pH increased. The study also shows that under the panels the soil organic matter was dramatically reduced, resulting in a parallel decrease in microbial activity.</p> <p>Soil properties changes after seven years of ground mounted photovoltaic</p>	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	panels in Central Italy coastal area, Maria Cristina Moscatelli, Rosita Marabottini, Luisa Massaccesi, Sara Marinari, Geoderma Regional, Volume 29, June 2022, e00500		
Landscape and visual			
BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0169, BW2_OFF_0179, BW2_OFF_0237, BW2_OFF_0240, BW2_OFF_0261, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0294, BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_OFF_0351, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0374, BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_OFF_0395, BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0440, BW2_OFF_0453,	Respondents were dissatisfied with the presentation of visualisations, as they were: difficult to view; were at the wrong angle; too small to read; didn't present a realistic impression of how the solar farm would appear in practice.; didn't show how water run off would be dealt with; not relevant to the area; only showed the PV panels from one level rather than rising areas; no detailed pictures of panels or fences; displayed in piles and not easy to access	Yes	<p>Photomontages have been produced in accordance with LI TGN 06/19. They are Type 3 visualisation and have been presented to the correct scale and format in line with guidance. Photomontages for the ES include 3 No. Representative Viewpoints at winter Year 1 and summer Year 15. All main Project elements have been modelled and included within the visualisations. The number of photomontages is considered to be proportionate to the Project and were selected and agreed as part of the consultation process with host authorities.</p> <p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0482, BW2_OFF_0497, BW2_OFF_0505, BW2_OFF_0535, BW2_PFF_0044, BW2_PFF_0056, BW2_PFF_0061, BW2_PFF_0064, BW2_PFF_0107, BW2_PFF_0118, BW2_PFF_0120, BW2_PFF_0128, BW2_PFF_0188, BW2_PFF_0224, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0247, BW2_PFF_0254, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0272, BW2_PFF_0288			
BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0065, BW2_OFF_0118,	Respondents expressed that the project will have a significant impact on the landscape.	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0184, BW2_OFF_0201, BW2_OFF_0203, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0302			<p>With the existing landscape structure and vegetation retained, so far as possible, and enhanced, it is anticipated that the Project would not have a significant adverse effect upon the physical landscape. However, it is acknowledged that there will be significant adverse visual effects from a number of locations as a result of the Project. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that there would be no residual adverse effects from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and none at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval).</p> <p>On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects. In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0179, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0453, BW2_PFF_0122	Respondents believe that the purpose of the visualisation was to minimise the scale of the actual panels both in height, extent, density and proximity to dwellings.	Yes	The photomontage have been completed in accordance with LI TGN 06/19. All main project elements have been accurately modelled and visualisations are of Type 3 visualisations.
BW2_OFF_0261, BW2_OFF_0453, BW2_PFF_0118	Respondents expressed that most locations were missing from the visualisations presented and believe that the missing visuals would show the "worst visual impact".	Yes	31 No. photomontages showing the Project in winter (Year 1 worst case) and summer (Year 15) have been complete as part of the ES. The final number and location of selected photomontages have been agreed with all host authorities.
BW2_OFF_0351, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0395	Respondents stated that the visualisations presented at the consultation events were selective and only chosen to give the impression that there will be visual impacts on the countryside.	Yes	18 No photomontages were produced for the consultation events. These were shown at winter Year 1 (worst case) and were selected as a representation of the three main Project sites. 31 no. photomontages (winter and summer) have been completed as part of the ES.
BW2_OFF_0062, BW2_OFF_0089	Respondents are impressed with the engagement at multiple levels to try to mitigate the visual impacts.	No	Noted. This support is welcomed.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_PFF_0294	Respondents stated that the proposals disregard elements of the Cumnor Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in regard to important views and greenbelt.	Yes	Important Views within the Cumnor Parish Neighbourhood Plan were reviewed as part of the Project baseline and in consultation on the Representative Viewpoints. Not all Important Views were appropriate for inclusion, so were discounted. A number of final Representative Viewpoints have been selected as being equivalent or as near to, from publicly accessible locations, the Important Views within the Neighbourhood Plan. All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host authorities, including Cumnor Parish. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8. [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_OFF_0506, BW2_PFF_0170	Respondents stated that the visual impact of the development has not been addressed.	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The LVIA was completed in accordance with an agreed methodology which has been guided by industry standard methodologies as set out in GLVIA3.
BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondents stated that they believe the sentence "there are no significant adverse effects either temporary and permanent effects on the local	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	landscape character arising from construction and operation of the project" is untrue.		
BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_PFF_0302	One respondent expressed that the statement: "In terms of landscape, effects would be limited" is untrue and disingenuous and should be corrected in all future documentation and the ES.	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The physical effects on the landscape would be limited. The Applicant will retain and enhance the existing landscape features. This will retain the essential landscape fabric.
BW2_OFF_0179	Respondents were dissatisfied with how the impact on landscape was conveyed in the PEIR.	Yes	Noted. The landscape and visual effects are now assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0280	One respondent expressed concern about how a 42-year project could benefit future generations and how this will affect the landscape.	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects. In addition, proposed planting

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p> <p>Once decommissioned, there will be a significant and beneficial landscape and BNG legacy left for future generations.</p>
BW2_OFF_0344	<p>One respondent stated that there will be loss of visual landscape, particularly in the Church Hanborough area.</p>	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Project would result in some major adverse visual effects from a number of locations throughout the Project. These are not significant in EIA terms. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that any adverse effects will diminish from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and then mainly only minor adverse effects at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval).</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0370	One respondent stated that the visual impact is appalling and will not be suffered by those profiting from the scheme.	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. It is acknowledged that the Project would result in some adverse visual effects from a number of locations throughout the Project. These are not significant in EIA terms. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that any adverse effects will diminish from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and then mainly only minor adverse effects at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval).
BW2_OFF_0389	One respondent stated that the visualisations used at the consultation events confirmed that the beautiful setting of, and views towards and from Blenheim will be compromised by the north east section of the proposed central site of the solar farm.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0451	One respondent stated that paragraph 6.3.13 is incorrect (that only very few people will be impacted by the visual adverse effects of the project). The respondent states that at the Oxford School of Drama over 150 people onsite daily will experience significant visual adverse effects.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0453	One respondent stated that the poor state of the visualisations presented in the PEIR and at the consultation events meant that there was little effort to inform local residents about the impact on the immediate landscape.	Yes	The photomontages have been completed in accordance with LI TGN 06/19. All main project elements have been accurately modelled and visualisations are of Type 3 visualisations. They were presented at the correct scale in accordance with guidance.
BW2_OFF_0465	Respondents stated that they do not want to see the countryside of Oxfordshire covered in solar panels, as this will be damaging to views.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0471	One respondent stated that the 1.8m to 2.5m sized panels are extremely large, and visually impactful.	Yes	Panels have been reduced in height to a maximum 2.3 m.
BW2_OFF_0471	Respondents stated that the infrastructure of the solar panel development (e.g. convertors, combiners (sic), security fencing,	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	lighting, CCTV and ancillary) are obstructive and cause visual impacts.		It is acknowledged that the Project would result in some adverse visual effects from a number of locations throughout the Project. These are not significant in EIA terms. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that any adverse effects will diminish from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and then mainly only minor adverse effects at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval).
BW2_OFF_0523	One respondent stated that there has been no consideration given to the existing Landscape Character Assessments within Local and Cumnor Neighbourhood Plan (CNP). For example, CNP Policy DBC4: Development in the Green Belt and particularly on the impacts on Landscape Character Areas LCA 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 & 11 in the Cumnor Neighbourhood Plan (adopted 2020) which describe the area as 'large open fields and stands of woodland'.	Yes	All local landscape character Assessments have been reviewed as part of the LVIA. Proposed landscape is in response to the local landscape and the need to mitigate the Project. With lengths of hedgerow, woodland blocks and individual trees to maintain, enhance and link existing habitats.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0523	One respondent stated that Hill End Outdoor Education Centre and residents on Tumbledown have not been considered as key visual receptors.	Yes	<p>Hill End is not a publicly accessible site so would not have been considered. The ZTV has also indicated that the intervisibility would be limited. Viewpoint 46 has been taken from PRoW at the edge of Eynsham Road, near to the Hill End Centre, so these views would be representative of the limited views available, possibly from the access road to Hill End near Eynsham Road.</p> <p>The LVIA has assessed effects from the 55 Representative Viewpoints. In addition, other visual receptors are considered and assessed.</p>
BW2_OFF_0523	One respondent stated that they have concerns about the Important Views Policy of the Cumnor Parish Neighbourhood Plan as visualisations are incomplete or an inaccurate representation of the visual impact the PV panels and associated infrastructure.	Yes	<p>Important Views within the Cumnor Parish Neighbourhood Plan were reviewed as part of the Project baseline and in consultation on the Representative Viewpoints. Not all Important Views were appropriate for inclusion, so were discounted. A number of final Representative Viewpoints have been selected as being equivalent or as near to, from publicly accessible locations, the Important Views within the Neighbourhood Plan. All Representative Viewpoints were consulted on and agreed with host</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			authorities, including Cumnor Parish. Ref. Table 8.5 of Chapter 8.
BW2_OFF_0523	One respondent stated that important views within Cumnor Parish have not been considered and refers to Important Views Policy CNP DBC7 which identifies Important Views on the Policies Maps (page 63 of CNP), table 5 and map 12 as contributing to the essential rural character of the Parish.	Yes	As above.
BW2_PFF_0026	One respondent stated that it is hypocritic of the developers to allow visual impacts of the countryside and for local residents, when the panels should be placed on the land of the main landowner - Blenheim Estates.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0048	One respondent asked, in response to this statement: "Make routes through the arrays appeal to people", "who wants to sit in the middle of solar panels?"	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0061	One respondent expressed that they were falsely told that panels would only be visible as "glimpses through hedgerows".	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. It is acknowledged that the Project would result in some adverse visual effects from a number of locations throughout the Project. These are not significant in EIA terms. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that any adverse effects will diminish from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and then mainly only minor adverse effects at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval).</p> <p>The design intention is to have either no view, or only filtered views, through landscaping, to the solar arrays and other infrastructure.</p> <p>On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects. In addition, proposed</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.
BW2_PFF_0065	One respondent stated that it is inappropriate to surround the area with solar farms.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0138	One respondent stated that solar infrastructure is currently very ugly and would like to know how the appearance of the development will be improved.	Yes	It is acknowledged that a scheme of this scale cannot be mitigated entirely. The landscape interventions have been put in place as part of an iterative design process and will, over time, reduce the visual effects of the Project. In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape. Once decommissioned, there will be a significant and beneficial landscape and BNG legacy left for future generations.
BW2_PFF_0153	One respondent stated that you cannot hide this monstrosity of a project with mitigation measures.	Yes	As above.
BW2_PFF_0170	One respondent stated that the impact of the solar would be disgusting and would radically alter the character of this beautiful area.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0185	One respondent stated that the extent of the yellow areas on the maps demonstrated the significant negative extent of visual impact.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that the security fencing around the solar arrays will be visually horrible.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) map shows a vast area over which the solar farm will constitute a visual nightmare.	Yes	Noted. It should be noted that the ZTV is theoretical and is not necessarily representative of the situation on the ground. Where the Project would be visible but not in its entirety from any one location.
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent asked what height the observer is assumed to be above the ground on the ZTV map and stated that there are houses (e.g. in Kidlington, Woodstock and Begbroke) where the solar farm will be easily visible from upper stories.	Yes	The ZTV is based on an observer height above ground level. It does not take account of user in properties.
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that from their first floor in their Begbroke house they can see at least 10 fields, yet no one consulted them if they mind the local view being potentially ruined.	Yes	The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>(Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p> <p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals.
BW2_PFF_0227	One respondent stated that there was not sufficient evidence that the power stations will not cause visual impacts.	Yes	Not all information was available or modelled the time of the consultation (PEIR). As part of the ES all main project elements have been modelled as part of the photomontages.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that they had not been consulted on the visual impact the project would have on their property and stated that their property is probably one of the most affected in the area (no. 2.28).	Yes	<p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p> <p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that they do not want their visual amenity impaired because of the plans to destroy the landscape and their unrestricted views across to Church Hanborough.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4]</p>
BW2_PFF_0233	One respondent stated that they are worried about the visual impact of the power converter stations (over 150, each 3m high and 12m long), the high voltage transformers and over 100km of 2m high "security" fencing.	Yes	<p>All main elements of the Project have been modelled and included within the photomontages. These have informed the LVIA, within which it is acknowledged that there would be some adverse visual effects from a number of locations throughout the Project. These are not significant in EIA terms. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that any adverse effects will</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			diminish from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and then mainly only minor adverse effects at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval).
BW2_PFF_0233	One respondent stated that they did not believe Mark Owen-Lloyd when he said that the power converter stations, transformers and fencing will not be visible in their landscape.	Yes	Noted. No detail of a specific location has been given so difficult to comment further. However, Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0233	One respondent stated that the PEIR fails to fully understand the landscape's value sensitivity to change, and in relation to this, the capacity of the landscape to absorb development or change	Yes	Noted. The ES is a more comprehensive assessment than at the PEIR stage. On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects. In addition, proposed

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.
BW2_PFF_0233	One respondent stated that the PEIR fails to correctly assess the e capacity of the landscape to absorb development or change	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. It is acknowledged that the Project would result in some adverse visual effects from a number of locations throughout the Project. These are not significant in EIA terms. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that any adverse effects will diminish from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and then mainly only minor adverse effects at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval).
BW2_PFF_0233	One respondent stated that the PEIR fails to correctly assess the intrinsic landscape value	Yes	As above. It should be noted that the LVIA process is very subjective, resulting in differing opinions.
BW2_PFF_0260	One respondent questioned how such a major construction over a vast area will not have a significant adverse effect.	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. It is acknowledged that the Project would result in some adverse visual effects from a number of locations throughout the Project. These are not significant in EIA terms. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that any adverse effects will diminish from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and then mainly only minor adverse effects at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval).</p>
BW2_PFF_0260	<p>One respondent stated that they have heard that the project will be visible from the moon.</p>	No	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>
BW2_PFF_0260	<p>One respondent stated that they do not need a "Zone of Theoretical Visibility" to let them know that they will be able to see 2.1m high panels, 3m high PCS and 18m high HVT from their house.</p>	Yes	<p>Noted. The ZTV is commonly used as a baseline guide for the theoretical visibility of a given project. This is then tested 'on the ground' and assessed accordingly.</p>
BW2_PFF_0263	<p>One respondent stated that they live next to field 2.60 and asked what will be done to not allow the solar panels from destroying their outlook.</p>	Yes	<p>There is a minimum 25m offset from residential properties. The masterplan details landscape interventions in this area which includes existing and retained vegetation managed to an appropriate</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			height. Reinforced and new hedgerow planting and individual trees.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the sentence "There is no potential for private views to be adversely affected over and above substantial" makes no sense. The respondent expressed that it seems to try to suggest that substantial adverse effects to views are acceptable (which they are not). They stated that it should be rewritten to be clearer and more honest.	Yes	It is considered that there would be no effect of 'substantial adverse' which would make it necessary to complete a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment and / or make any given property 'unliveable' to the point that would be a public interest in planning terms.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that the statement: "There are no significant adverse effects either temporary and permanent effects on the local landscape character arising from construction and operation of the Project" is untrue and disingenuous and should be corrected in all future documentation and the ES	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. LVIA completed in accordance with industry standard methodology (GLVIA3). Subjectivity and professional judgement will always differ to others.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that the difference between "local landscape character" and "views" used in statements in the PEIR should be explain in future documentation and the ES and/ or the first sentence should be corrected to reflect reality.	No	Unclear what this is referring to specifically. No further comment can be given.
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent stated the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment was incomplete, underplays impacts and does not seem to fully assess the effect in operation. The respondent suggests that the effects are more than minor adverse.	Yes	PEIR contained preliminary information, sufficient to allow views to be expressed by those who were consulted and to give the opportunity for the Applicant to respond to those views. The landscape and visual effects are now fully assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0272	<p>One respondent expressed that the viewpoints with high visual impact and no photomontage include:</p> <p>Viewpoint 9 near Grade II* Hordley House and historic landscape; a reverse of this view looking towards the house is also needed to establish the impact on setting.</p> <p>Viewpoint 25 from the high ground of Church Hanborough which has views as far as Oxford over the Garden Village site, Botley West and Evenlode valley towards Cassington. The reverse views toward the landmark of Grade I Church Hanborough church should also be illustrated. Views to the church were an important consideration in planning the garden village.</p> <p>Viewpoint 41 north of Cassington, also looking towards rising ground.</p>	Yes	These views have been selected for photomontage and have been completed (winter and summer) as part of the ES.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent stated that these viewpoints were missing: from footpath running north from Eynsham towards Freeland: wide open views to the east will show the wide extent of arrays. No viewpoints on Lower Road: as the land rises on both sides, the arrays will be visible. They stated that they have shared these concerns with WODC	Yes	There are several Representative Viewpoints along Lower Road. Including, 22, 30 and 31. With a number of other viewpoints in proximity to Lower Road and located along the PRow network north of Eynsham. Representative Viewpoints were selected and agreed with all host authorities.
BW2_PFF_0285	One respondent stated that the LVIA makes no reference to the tranquillity of the landscape	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0389	One respondent stated that the visualisations presented at the consultation events lacked clarity, especially the one that showed the proposed power station on the east side of Farmoor. They pointed to a looped dotted line that goes beyond the image of the power station itself and nothing explained what this dotted line related to.	yes	PEIR contained preliminary information, sufficient to allow views to be expressed by those who were consulted and to give the opportunity for the Applicant to respond to those views. The landscape and visual effects are now fully assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. All visualisations have been produced in accordance with LI TGN 06/19.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0423	One respondent stated that visualisation (image 40) is taken from the rear of the houses in the Cassington area and shows that panels will dominate the view.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0423	One respondent stated that they were disappointed that there was no visualisation presented for site 39, which is a regular viewpoint for walkers looking back towards the village.	Yes	All viewpoint locations and selected photomontage locations were agreed with all host authorities.
BW2_OFF_0440	One respondent stated that there were no visualisations of the lower road or the railway line showing the impact of the development on these views.	Yes	Representative Viewpoint 30 (also a photomontage location) is located along Lower Road. There are a number of other locations in proximity to Lower Road.
BW2_OFF_0482	One respondent stated that the visualisations did not assist their interpretation as they were represented in 2D.	Yes	Photomontages are in accordance with LI TGN 06/19 (Type 3 visualisation) and are modelled in 3D.
BW2_OFF_0505	One respondent stated that the visualisations do not show the vast area of panels that will fill the valley around the river Evenlode, affecting the footpaths from Spring Hill.	Yes	There are 7 No. photomontages within or orientated towards the Evenlode Valley, including 30, 37, 38 and 41.
BW2_PFF_0064	One respondent stated that the visualisation of viewpoint 39 (top of 'the track', the public footpath heading north	Yes	Included within ES.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	from Cassington), which is of great importance to residents of Cassington, was missing.		
BW2_PFF_0064	One respondent expressed that they were not provided with a timeframe of when missing visualisations would be available to view on the project website.	Yes	All 'missing' visualisations have been completed as part of the submitted ES.
BW2_PFF_0064	One respondent stated that it was disappointing that relevant visualisations of Cassington were not available at the Cassington consultation event.	Yes	Noted and as above.
BW2_PFF_0107	One respondent stated that a larger visualisation of Manor Farm Track was necessary as it would show the area will be surrounded by solar panels.	Yes	All viewpoint locations and selected photomontage locations were agreed with all host authorities.
BW2_PFF_0128	One respondent would like to see visualisations of the project when it is under construction/completed.	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. Visualisations are only produced for operation.
BW2_PFF_0188	One respondent stated that the visualisations need to be better signposted, especially in terms of the	Yes	Final visualisations are of winter Year 1 (worst case) and summer Year 15 illustrating growth of proposed planting.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	years of the project and why the trees have not grown yet.		
BW2_PFF_0260	One respondent stated that there did not appear to be photograph of the proposed 156 power converter stations or 6 HV transformers which they stated will blot the landscape and no mention of a possible mobilization of contaminants from a filled-in sand pit in the central region.	Yes	All main project elements have been modelled.
BW2_PFF_0270	One respondent stated that the visualisations presented at the consultation events failed to provide proper evidence, and instead presented a highly selective set of images, prepared in breach of professional guidelines, and supported by bland assertions such as that in the PEIR 6.3.13.	Yes	PEIR contained preliminary information, sufficient to allow views to be expressed by those who were consulted and to give the opportunity for the Applicant to respond to those views. The landscape and visual effects are now fully assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The images shown at PEIR stage were not 'highly selective' but actually showed a range of different views that were in fact a worst-case scenario in visual terms (winter Year 1) - the Applicant sought no advantage by consulting on the images produced.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			A summary of the effects is now contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. All visualisations have been produced in accordance with LI TGN 06/19.
BW2_PFF_0270	One respondent stated that the inadequacy of the visualisations is grounds alone for the consultation to be re-run.	Yes	See above
BW2_PFF_0270	One respondent stated that the visualisations selected for the consultation represented about 25% of the 55 viewpoints identified in early discussions with local authorities.	Yes	18 No photomontages were produced for the consultation events. These were shown at winter Year 1 (worst case) and were selected as a representation of the three main Project sites. 31 no. photomontages (winter and summer) have been completed as part of the ES.
BW2_PFF_0270	One respondent stated that the selection of visualisations was highly biased towards flat landscapes, omitting for example all of the wider views of the Evenlode valley. This is the largest single area of the whole project, and is characterised by sweeping views of the sloping valley sides, and it is probably where the panels would be most visible	No	18 No photomontages were produced for the consultation events. These were shown at winter Year 1 (worst case) and were selected as a representation of the three main Project sites. 31 no. photomontages (winter and summer) have been completed as part of the ES.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	to the most people. They also omitted any views of the proposed six 'Project Substations'.		
BW2_PFF_0270	One respondent stated that the visualisations were in breach of the standards set by the Landscape Institute e.g. Baseline photography should ... be based on good quality imagery, secured in good, clear weather conditions wherever reasonably possible' (Landscape Institute, Visual Representation of Development Proposals, 2019).	Yes	Photomontages have been completed in accordance with LI TGN 06/19. Variations in weather conditions hour to hour are to be expected with the best available weather selected at the time of surveys.
BW2_PFF_0270	One respondent stated that the visualisations were based on low resolution and low contrast images, so that dark blue solar panel graphics are rendered almost invisible against dull dark green fields.	Yes	Photomontages are in accordance with LI TGN 06/19 and have used RAW images files, taken with a full frame SLR camera as required by guidance.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent stated that there are only 18 photomontage visualisations so far and many of the most severe impacts are not illustrated; those that are illustrated emphasise the foreground in a way that the eye does not do, the eye being drawn to rising ground which will be clothed in pave panels (egg Viewpoint 40 at Cassington).	Yes	All photomontages (winter and summer) have been completed for the DCO application.
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent stated that viewpoint 42 photomontage dramatically illustrates the extent of panels on rising ground behind Grade I Cassington Church, although flooding on the Thames in the photograph distracts the eye.	No	Noted.
Screening and Buffer Zones			
BW2_OFF_0179, BW2_OFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0376, BW2_OFF_0470, BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_PFF_0023, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_OFF_0335	Respondents expressed that mitigation measures were underdeveloped and vague.	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Proposed mitigation is considered appropriate and proportionate to the Project and is consistent with others of a similar nature. It is also designed with the existing landscape character of the area in mind.
BW2_OFF_0049, BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0387, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_PFF_0201, BW2_PFF_0289	Respondents believe that there are no guarantees for mitigation measures	Yes	The management of the landscape is set out in the oLEMP, [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] which includes replacement requirements. Enforcement of the measures adopted by the Project is the responsibility of the local planning authorities.
BW2_OFF_0375, BW2_OFF_0428, BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_PFF_0221	Respondents stated that there would be no need for mitigation measures if the development doesn't go ahead.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0306, BW2_OFF_0490, BW2_OFF_0524	Respondents are satisfied with the proposed mitigation measures.	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes this endorsement.
BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_PFF_0105, BW2_PFF_0302	Respondents stated that they do not believe there will be no significant adverse effects from the mitigation measures.	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. It is acknowledged that the Project would result in some adverse visual effects from a number of locations throughout the Project.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			These are not significant in EIA terms. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that any adverse effects will diminish from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and then mainly only minor adverse effects at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval).
BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_OFF_0490, BW2_PFF_0023	Respondents would like to see an increase in mitigation measures e.g. to ensure the panels and screening are further from paths and that views can be enjoyed; to enhance previously arable areas for wildlife;	Yes	Minimum buffers and mitigation either side of PRoWs are considered appropriate.
BW2_PFF_0145, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0274	Respondents stated the 15m buffer zones needs to be at least doubled, especially around villages, woodland and footpaths.	No	All buffers are minimum. 25m buffer around all residential properties.
BW2_PFF_0153, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondents stated that there is little mitigation that can be done to off-set the massive negative impact this project will have on green land that is close to Oxford and surrounding villages and towns.	Yes	On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects. In addition, proposed

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p> <p>Once decommissioned, there will be a significant and beneficial landscape and BNG legacy left for future generations.</p>
BW2_OFF_0033	Respondents would like the panels to be moved further away from homes, as some residences are still within 60 feet of solar panels.	No	Minimum 25m buffer to residential properties is judged to be acceptable.
BW2_OFF_0241	One respondent is concerned about the use of concrete posts being inserted into the ground/security fencing and its impact on preventing animals from roaming between the land areas.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on Ecology and Nature Conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>All deer fencing will be designed to be permeable to smaller mammals such as badger and fox to ensure permeability of the Project site for these species will be retained.</p>
BW2_OFF_0248	Respondents would like to see the use of native hedging plants for mitigation measures in a high density.	Yes	All mitigation, including hedgerows, are proposed as native species.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0285	One respondent expressed that it cannot be claimed that hedges will cover the view of the panels as this is unlikely and will take many years.	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. It is acknowledged that the Project would result in some adverse visual effects from a number of locations throughout the Project. These are not significant in EIA terms. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that any adverse effects will diminish from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and then mainly only minor adverse effects at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval).
BW2_OFF_0309	One respondent stated that the PEIR makes contradictory statements about the impact of mitigation measures, especially in terms the adverse effects after 15 years.	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The methodology used is described including how levels of significance are attributed in landscape terms; this might be the source of the respondents claims of contradictory statements.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0314	Respondent stated that the mitigation measures benefit only a minority of residents.	Yes	Mitigation is considered appropriate and proportionate to the scale of the Project.
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent would like to see more planted corridors and that ancient woodlands are not just "buffered" but actively encouraged to increase in size.	Yes	Minimum buffer to Ancient Woodland as set by legislation. Proposed woodland planting will ensure linkages that existing habitats will remain.
BW2_OFF_0335	One respondent stated that although the PEIR is very detailed, it fails to provide any details on mitigation. They stated the proposed contribution to the local populace is derisory when compared to the amount of profit the project would generate, even at 11% "capacity factor".	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0368	One respondent stated that a landscape-scale corridor along the River Evenlode would be a good idea.	Yes	The Applicant is not proposing development within the Evenlode corridor although it is included in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to enhance it [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_OFF_0405	One respondents expressed that PV panels should not be placed within 100 metres of residential properties and private land.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant has imposed a minimum buffer of 25m to residential properties across Project. This is judged to be appropriate.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0418	One respondent stated that screening should be seen as a priority.	Yes	It has been. The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. It is acknowledged that the Project would result in some adverse visual effects from a number of locations throughout the Project. These are not significant in EIA terms. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that any adverse effects will diminish from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and then mainly only minor adverse effects at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval).
BW2_OFF_0423	One respondent stated that screening will be at the expense of the views from well-used footpaths.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant understands the balance between maintaining the route and mitigating the Project. The Applicant still considers that given the low level nature of solar arrays, themselves following the contours of the existing landscape, that attractive views will still be afforded. In addition, proposed planting would have a

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p> <p>Once decommissioned, there will be a significant and beneficial landscape and BNG legacy left for future generations.</p>
BW2_OFF_0490	One respondents expressed satisfaction with the retention of existing woodlands and the buffer width around it, and that waterways have been increased.	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes this support.
BW2_OFF_0523	One respondent stated that the current mitigation measures would not be sufficient from higher viewpoints and that measures at lower points would lead to loss of "the openness of the Green Belt" and loss of amenity of public footpaths.	Yes	On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond the adverse effects identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects. In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Once decommissioned, there will be a significant and beneficial landscape and BNG legacy left for future generations.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1]. At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.</p>
BW2_PFF_0048	One respondent stated that if trees are planted for mitigation measures they will need to be maintained as they are likely to die.	Yes	Maintenance and management is set out in oLEMP. [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_PFF_0126	One respondent stated that their concerns about adequate mitigation measures were not addressed, and that the mitigation measures are misleading	Yes	Mitigation considered appropriate and proportionate to the Project. 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up is proposed.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	and act as little more than window dressing.		Maintenance and management is set out in oLEMP. [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_PFF_0133	One respondent stated that the mitigations measures do not bring back to the level of environmental positives that residents currently enjoy.	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. It is acknowledged that the Project would result in some adverse visual effects from a number of locations throughout the Project. These are not significant in EIA terms. The effects have been identified and recorded as part of the LVIA. It is anticipated that any adverse effects will diminish from Year 5 where new planting is proposed to screen the Project, and then mainly only minor adverse effects at summer Year 15 (the normal LVIA assessed interval). In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p> <p>Once decommissioned, there will be a significant and beneficial landscape and BNG legacy left for future generations.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0172	One respondent stated that the amount of mitigation measures described seems to indicate a rather poor justification for the need of this project.	Yes	Noted. See above. Also, the Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm. The need for or justification for this development is urgent. [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_PFF_0178	One respondent stated that mitigation is impossible.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that the local Green Built would be ruined and no mitigation could correct this.	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that the proposal of extending the buffer zone to 25m is "pathetic and insulting".	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that the developers have missed a marketing opportunity as the fears of most people	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	are the claustrophobic effects of having the panels at close quarters.		
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that local people are worried about having the panels at close quarters and the distress of having to gaze into the bath of these hideous structures without adequate screening or buffer zones.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent recommended a zone of 100m from the boundary of any property which will not only see PVDP in a more sympathetic light but would also mitigate the real concerns of property values.	Yes	Noted. 25m buffer consistent across Project considered appropriate.
BW2_PFF_0251	One respondent stated that the distance between the development and residents is not enough.	No	As above
BW2_PFF_0256	One respondent stated that the buffers set up to protect hedgerows, trees and woodland etc are ugly themselves if they are to be wire fencing.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the mitigation measures only reduce the worst-case effects of the loss of the	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	green belt and arable farmland, instead of something that will result in NBG.		balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent asked why fencing is required? They stated that they were unimpressed with Mark Owen-Lloyd's answer that it was a requirement of the project's insurance policy, and not for the security concerns of the project itself.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that the project should commit to having no fencing (saving it a considerable amount of money and time) and/ or to conducting a publicly available cost/benefit analysis of installing fencing v the cost of projected isolated damage/ loss as a result of excluding these items from its insurance policy over 40 years	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that if the fencing is retained as part of the proposal, it must also supply scientific proof that deer proof fencing is a requirement in order to deter deer "throwing themselves at the solar panels," (what respondent states are Mark Owen-Lloyd's words) despite the fact that many solar farms choose not to use such fencing and do not appear to suffer significant damage or loss as a result.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that if the fencing is retained as part of the proposal, the developers should explicitly confirm in the ES that the proposed fencing will be no higher than 2.1m, not the 12 feet high (the figure provided by Mark Owen-Lloyd at the Botley consultation).	Yes	Noted. Maximum height is stated as 2.1m in Project Description chapter 6 [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the plans fail to appreciate that ordinary people go to the countryside because they want open aspects not continuous high fences - even though these may be	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	partially disguised at some parts of the year by planting.		
BW2_PFF_0274	One respondent enquired what is the standard buffer zone and has this increased since phase one.	Yes	Minimum buffer throughout Project is 5m. See the Mitigation Measures Schedule, Volume 3, Appendix 6.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5] and the Layout and Design Principles Document [EN010147/APP/7.7]
BW2_OFF_0022	Respondents believe that the need for mitigations means the project is not justified.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0120	One respondent believes replacing open vistas of countryside with 25m zones between people's homes and 5 square miles of metal and glass is inadequate as a mitigation.	No	Noted.
Glint and Glare			
BW2_OFF_0134	Respondents believe that this is an important consideration and needs continued attention.	Yes	Comment acknowledged. A Glint and Glare Study produce by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent stated that the visualisations used at the consultation events were pictured on a cloudy day, so they did not represent the extent of glint and glare that could be present on a sunny day.	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study including a Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . Reflections from solar panels are less intense than those from glass or steel because solar panels are designed in order to absorb light, rather than reflect it, as panels are more efficient when they reflect less light.
BW2_OFF_0542	One respondent is concerned about light pollution, especially at night and during construction. They state that this pollution would be intrusive to residents and detrimental to ecology.	Yes	Lighting will be installed but only within limited areas of the development, generally around the high voltage infrastructure for safety and security. No lights will be permanently switched on. Mitigation to avoid construction lighting effects are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] . Lighting will be designed in accordance with Institute of Lighting Professionals /Bat Conservation Trust guidelines.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0048	One respondent stated that lighting in the former Oxon countryside is a major light pollution problem.	Yes	Lighting will be installed but only within limited areas of the development, generally around the high voltage infrastructure for safety and security. No lights will be permanently switched on. Mitigation to avoid construction lighting effects are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] . Lighting will be designed in accordance with Institute of Lighting Professionals /Bat Conservation Trust guidelines.
BW2_PFF_0190	One respondent stated that there needs to be a thorough investigation into the risk of traffic/aviation crashes as a result of glint and glare	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study including a Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . Assessment of solar reflections on to the airfield's ATC Tower and toward aircraft on approaches to runways 01 and 19 conclude that a low impact is predicted towards Oxford Airport, and no mitigation is required.
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that the PEIR does not mention the dangers of glint and glare to pilots land and taking off.	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study produce by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . Assessment of solar reflections on to the

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			airfield's ATC Tower and toward aircraft on approaches to runways 01 and 19 conclude that a low impact is predicted towards Oxford Airport, and no mitigation is required.
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that Oxford Airport is safeguarded and should be protected from the impact of glint and glare.	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study produce by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . Assessment of solar reflections on to the airfield's ATC Tower and toward aircraft on approaches to runways 01 and 19 conclude that a low impact is predicted towards Oxford Airport, and no mitigation is required.
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that there is a major safety issue in that the fields to the south of Oxford Airport are presently available as emergency landing grounds in the event of engine failure on take off/landing - there is a risk of planes landing in the fields of solar panels.	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study including a Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The proposed areas for solar panels has evolved responding to environmental assessment and consultation feedback. A result of this has been to remove panels from beyond the southern edge of the Oxford Airport runway, to allow for extra margins of safety and the

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			opportunity for the airport to install further landing lights.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that they do not want to be subject to glare, not only during the day but also during full moon periods at night.	Yes	A Glint and Glare Study produce by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . Reflections from solar panels are less intense than those from glass or steel because solar panels are designed in order to absorb light. Disturbance from moonlight reflection was not a study of Pager Power's assessment which is focused on disability glare.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that they live in a "dark sky" area and do not want light pollution to affect them.	Yes	Lighting will be installed but only within limited areas of the development, generally around the high voltage infrastructure for safety and security. No lights will be permanently switched on. Mitigation to avoid construction lighting effects are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] . Lighting will be designed in accordance with Institute of

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Lighting Professionals /Bat Conservation Trust guidelines.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that, in addition to the further erosion of dark skies in the area, any lights from the security fencing/cameras would negatively impact local wildlife, especially the thriving bat population (which is attracted by the rich food source of the unique 'Farmoor Fly',	Yes	Lighting will be installed but only within limited areas of the development, generally around the high voltage infrastructure for safety and security. No lights will be permanently switched on. Mitigation to avoid construction lighting effects are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] . Lighting will be designed in accordance with Institute of Lighting Professionals /Bat Conservation Trust guidelines.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that clarification is needed about the number, position and type of lighting and CCTV cameras around the proposed Southern Site, in what represents an area that is still relatively unaffected by light pollution.	Yes	Lighting will be installed but only within limited areas of the development, generally around the high voltage infrastructure for safety and security. No lights will be permanently switched on. Mitigation to avoid construction lighting effects are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] . Lighting will be designed in accordance with Institute of

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Lighting Professionals /Bat Conservation Trust guidelines.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that if infra-red cameras are to be used (which they stated Mark Owen-Lloyd did suggest), and the compounds are unoccupied at night, there should presumably be no requirement for any security lights at all.	Yes	Lighting will be installed but only within limited areas of the development, generally around the high voltage infrastructure for safety and security. No lights will be permanently switched on. Mitigation to avoid construction lighting effects are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] . Lighting will be designed in accordance with Institute of Lighting Professionals /Bat Conservation Trust guidelines.
Archaeology and Local Heritage			
BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0535, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0227	Respondents expressed that there has been insufficient information about the impact on the UNESCO World Heritage status of Blenheim and whether this assessment has been completed.	Yes	Likely impacts and effects on the UNESCO World Heritage status of Blenheim have been assessed. The results of this assessment are presented within Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Assessment of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.5) .
BW2_OFF_0051, BW2_OFF_0528	Respondents believe that there has been inadequate treatment of archaeological and historical sites, both known and to be found.	Yes	An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets, including the historic landscape, is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The assessment of impacts and effects on buried archaeological remains is presented in Section 7.9 of this of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A total of 43 areas containing significant buried archaeological remains has been removed from the developable area and will be retained within the Project site as managed grassland.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_PFF_0221	Respondents expressed that the PEIR underestimates the impact on heritage assets and that the plans would significantly disrupt the historical landscape, causing harm to the setting of heritage sites.	Yes	<p>An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets, including the historic landscape, is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The assessment of effects resulting from change within the setting of heritage assets has been undertaken with reference to the accurate representative visualisations presented in Volume 2, Figures 8.12 - 8.127 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p>
BW2_OFF_0523, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondents stated that they are concerned about the impact on listed and non-designated heritage assets and states that the PEIR does not take into account the Cumnor Conservation area or the policy on historic assets as per the Cumnor Neighbourhood Plan Policy DBC6: Conserving and Enhancing Local Heritage Assets.	Yes	<p>The assessment of likely impacts and effects presented in respect of non-designated heritage assets is included in section 7.9 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>All relevant Conservation Area Appraisals and Neighbourhood Plans have been reviewed as part of the assessment. These are identified within Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment of the ES and further</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			discussed where appropriate within Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0271	One respondent expressed that there are gaps in the current heritage report.	Yes	An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0273	One respondent expressed that the Forever Fields art exhibition has not been taken into consideration as part of the chapter on local heritage value.	Yes	The Applicant is aware of the Forever Fields art exhibition and that people took time to express their understanding and appreciation of the landscape, including the historic landscape, through a variety of media.
BW2_OFF_0308	One respondent believes that this project will destroy hundreds of years of heritage.	Yes	An updated assessment of likely impacts on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . No heritage will be destroyed as a result of the construction,

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Project - all likely impacts and effects are fully reversible.
BW2_OFF_0313	One respondent stated that if cultural heritage had been taken into account for different areas of Oxfordshire, brownfield sites that are available would have been used.	Yes	The site selection process is explained in Volume 1, Chapter 5: Need and Alternatives of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent stated that there was no information on how the development will mitigate the impact on the world heritage site, which they believe will be significant, as the visualisations suggest the panels will be seen from miles either side.	Yes	The assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.5).
BW2_OFF_0451	One respondent stated that there had been no adequate assessment on the impact on historic environment (as mentioned in PEIR chapter 7).	Yes	An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on all aspects of the historic environment is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_OFF_0488	One respondent stated that the fields around St Martins church and the burial site of Winston Churchill will be negatively affected by the development.	Yes	The detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects arising from changes within the settings of designated heritage assets is presented within Volume 3, Appendix 7.5:

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This includes assessment of the effect on the Church of St Martin at Bladon.
BW2_OFF_0500	One respondent stated that the proposals have not taken into consideration the impact on listed and historic buildings in and around the areas of Wootton, Shipton Slade, Bladon, Lower Road, Church and Long Hanborough, Cassington and Eynsham.	Yes	The detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented within Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0528	One respondent stated that there need to be an extremely good reason why the wholesale destruction of ancient woodlands should happen. They state that this reason has not been given by the developer.	Yes	The Project has been designed to ensure that no ancient woodland is removed with all such habitat outside of the Project site. The impact of the Project on ancient woodland is fully assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The conclusion of this assessment is that there would be no significant adverse effect on this receptor.
BW2_OFF_0528	One respondent stated that Pinsley Wood, a fourth area of Ancient Woodland, has been omitted from Chapter 2 (2.4.1.4). They state that this area would be severely affected by having solar panel along its boundaries.	Yes	The presence of Pinsley Wood is considered within ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The conclusion of the assessment is that there would be no significant adverse effect on the woodland.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0054	One respondent stated that it was unclear how the PV panels and substation infrastructure will impact on ancient meadows and SSSI.	Yes	The impact of the Project on SSSIs is fully assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The conclusion of this assessment is that there would be no significant adverse effect on these receptors.
BW2_PFF_0138	One respondent stated that little concern has been shown towards cultural heritage, especially the heritage of open landscape.	Yes	An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets, including the historic landscape, is presented within Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent expressed that the statement: "No significant effects in respect of the historic environment have been identified" is untrue.	Yes	An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented within Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . No likely significant adverse effects have been identified.
BW2_PFF_0255	One respondent stated that the critically important impacts of the project on the setting of the World Heritage Site have not yet been defined and evaluated.	Yes	The assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0255	One respondent stated that the assessment of views within the NTS are incomplete, in one direction only and does not include many key view points of heritage assets or from PRowWs.	Yes	The detailed assessment of likely impacts and effects arising from changes within the settings of heritage assets is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . Where relevant, visualisations prepared for the Landscape and Visual Assessment of the Project have been examined and fully referenced. These visualisations have been prepared in accordance with the relevant technical guidance, Further visualisations are being prepared following consultation with Historic England and agreement of appropriate Viewpoints. These will be reviewed against the current detailed assessment of impacts and effects arising from changes within the settings of designated heritage assets which is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0255	One respondent stated that best practice would have included a full Heritage Impact Assessment to ensure an iterative process of project development and before critical site and	Yes	The process of site selection and project design was an iterative one which included consideration of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets. An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	design decisions were made, and this was also not undertaken.		assets is presented within Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0255	One respondent stated that they disagree that the eventual refinement of the project design will enable the magnitude of the impacts to be reduced and that the consequent level of effect would be insignificant.	Yes	An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented within Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . No likely significant effects have been identified.
BW2_PFF_0255	One respondent stated that once the assessment of the impact of the project on the setting of the World Heritage site is completed that a insignificant impact is highly unlikely.	Yes	The assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.5) . No likely significant effects have been identified.
BW2_PFF_0255	One respondent stated that despite available guidance the PEIR fails to adequately define, assess and give appropriate weight to the value of the setting and its contribution to the significance of designated assets.	Yes	The assessment of likely impacts and effects arising from changes within the settings of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the relevant guidance.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0255	One respondent stated that despite available guidance the PEIR fails to adequately define, assess and give appropriate weight to the WHS and RPG as advised by policy and other national guidance, relying primarily on visual criteria and ignoring the sensitivity and value of the wider landscape setting and the contribution this makes to the OUV (Outstanding Universal Value) of the WHS and other designated assets.	Yes	The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] , with additional information in Volume 3: Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] and Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the proposal would diminish the significance of the setting of the historic valley and heritage assets in the Southern Site, which has been settled and farmed since Roman times (evidenced by Roman remains having been found, including very close to the proposed site of the sub-station). This also includes, but is not limited to, the setting of the Cumnor Conservation Area and the internationally important Wytham Woods and ancient Denman's Copse.	Yes	The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] , with additional information in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent enquired why, given that a Heritage Impact Assessment must have been done for WHS Blenheim Palace, an assessment has not been done for every part of the land under consideration for the development.	Yes	The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets, including the historic landscape, is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Heritage Impact Assessment for the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is required through UNESCO guidance on such matters. The results of this assessment are presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent stated that, as a historic landscape professional, they feel the sensitivity of the landscape of the Project site is undervalued by the PEIR analysis (Ch 8 Table 8.9) and the LVIA. They stated that the claims in the PEIR underplays the degree of adverse impact that would occur.	Yes	The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets, including the historic landscape, is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent stated that the refinement of the project design would enable the magnitude of the impacts to be reduced and that the consequent level of effect would be insignificant - more work is needed to reduce the impact on heritage assets and their setting.	Yes	The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] , with additional information in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . No likely significant effects have been identified.
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent expressed that the PEIR fails to adequately define, assess, and give appropriate weight to the value of setting and its contribution to the significance of designated assets and in particular the Blenheim World Heritage Site (WHS) and Registered Park and Garden.	Yes	The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets, including the historic landscape, is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Heritage Impact Assessment for the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is required through UNESCO guidance on such matters. The results of this assessment are presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent expressed that the PEIR and the project does not adequately protect the elements of Blenheim's OUV identified in WHS Management Plan Appendix II: 'The character of the setting as traditional English countryside, dotted with picturesque villages mainly built using a uniform palate of materials'.	Yes	These points have been addressed within the assessment presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent expressed that the project area forms the setting for numerous designated heritage assets including the WHS, Conservation Areas and numerous undesignated heritage sites, historic routes, landscape features and patterns.	Yes	The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010141/APP/6.3] , with additional information in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented as Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent stated that a full Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) during the early design stages of the project, as would be expected by best practice to ensure an iterative process of project development and before critical site and design decisions were made, was not undertaken.	Yes	The process of site selection and project design was an iterative one which included consideration of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets. An updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented within Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent suggested that the buffer protecting the key views from the Palace toward Bladon Church and its backdrop and approaches to Blenheim should be extended, as well as buffers and views protection (both ways) around Cassington and Church Hanborough.	Yes	The updated assessment of likely impacts and effects on heritage assets is presented in Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] , with additional information in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . Suitable buffer areas have been established at Cassington and Church Hanborough such that likely impacts on heritage assets have been avoided or reduced.
BW2_PFF_0302	One respondent stated that the project will destroy historic hamlets and villages.	Yes	No historic hamlets or villages will be destroyed as a result of the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Project.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0500	One respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the assessment on the impact of ancient woodlands.	Yes	The impact of the Project on ancient woodland is fully assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The conclusion of this assessment is that there would be no significant adverse effect on this receptor.
Traffic, Access and Construction			
BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0258, BW2_OFF_0344	Respondents are concerned about the impact of construction causing for example disruption, noise, and light and air pollution.	Yes	During the construction phase, noise impacts will be controlled by measures within the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). The measures will be based on best practicable means to minimise noise disturbance from construction activities. The CoCP will also include measures to control dust emissions and disturbance from artificial lighting.
BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0474, BW2_PFF_0190	Respondents believes that no details of how construction will impact the community and surrounding areas , for example in terms of disruption, damage, heavy vehicles and increased traffic.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0535, BW2_OFF_0542, BW2_PFF_0238	Respondents stated that there was a failure to provide an construction traffic management plan.	Yes	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (EN010147/APP/7.6.2) has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_PFF_0048	Respondents referred to planned housing developments around the Eynsham, Woodstock and Witney which have not provided improvements to an already "failing infrastructure."	Yes	The cumulative effects of proposed large scale developments, and their in-combination impacts, are considered in each ES Chapter, and summarised in ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [EN010147/APP/6.3] The merits of other projects, that have been or are yet to be determined by the District Councils, in terms of their delivery of improved infrastructure is not a matter directly related to this Project. The growth of housing in Oxfordshire, and the need to address Oxford's unmet housing need, is one of the drivers for increased renewable energy generation.
BW2_OFF_0049, BW2_PFF_0190	Respondents stated that they do not believe two years is a feasible amount of time to install over 2 million solar panels, associated plugs, 156 power cables, substations, 6 cell transferers, etc.	Yes	The Applicant has carefully assessed the overall programme for construction, including the materials and phasing of work to build and commission the installations. These are considered in the ES Project Description Chapter 6 [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			and the outline Code of Construction Practice and its Appendices [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BW2_OFF_0051, BW2_OFF_0258	Respondent believes that the number of HGV movements on the A4095 has been underestimated.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) details the site-specific surveys undertaken to inform the base traffic flows of the ES. The location and results of the commissioned traffic surveys are presented in Appendix 12.2: Traffic Survey Data (EN010147/APP/6.5)
BW2_OFF_0045	One respondent believes that the project will have an impact on traffic during its construction, owing to road closures and existing Light Traffic Neighbour (LTN) measures.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3).
BW2_OFF_0106	One respondent believes that the carbon costs of constructing the project need to be quantified along with operating costs and cost of recycling at the end of the project.	Yes	The Climate Change and carbon costs of the Project are assessed in Chapter 14 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0145	One respondent expressed that the project is only mitigating the impact of the construction and not the overall	Yes	The Environmental Statement assesses the impacts of construction, operation and decommissioning of the Project.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	impact the plans would have on the environment.		
BW2_OFF_0158	One respondent would like to see improvements to the A40.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including any mitigation and enhancement measures required, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .
BW2_OFF_0271	One respondent expressed that the report has underestimated the increased traffic impact of any infrastructure built on the traffic network. The respondent highlights the A4095 and the A34 (divert route for traffic heading south).	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .
BW2_OFF_0283	One respondent asked whether solar panels can be manufactured in the UK rather than shipped from China.	Yes	Noted - the Applicant will continue to review the procurement sources for the panels.
BW2_OFF_0303	One respondent would like to know about the probability of aluminium piles and galvanised steel frames corroding over time and what measures will be implemented to deter corrosion.	Yes	The materials proposed for the piles are based on their very limited corrosion properties. The Applicant will continue to review the most suitable and cost-effective materials, but at this point these are the most suitable.
BW2_OFF_0309	One respondent stated that the statements made in the PEIR regarding the impact of traffic during and after construction are contradictory, and	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	results of these assessments have been made with little context.		
BW2_OFF_0310	One respondent stated that the scale of construction will have an impact on air quality, pedestrians and roads through Bladon, but this is not reflected in the PEIR's assessment.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including on roads through Bladon, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent stated that the construction phase will be catastrophic to biodiversity and wildlife.	Yes	The impacts of the Project on ecology receptors is assessed in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent stated that the impact of construction and decommissioning traffic will be significant, especially when the site area already suffer from congestion and bad road surfaces.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .
BW2_OFF_0330	One respondent would like to know why there has been no cumulative effects assessment regarding construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning.	Yes	An assessment of cumulative effects on traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .
BW2_OFF_0379	One respondent enquired about there being a more detailed assessment of the impact of waste during construction and through the life of the project	Yes	The environmental impacts of waste during the construction and operation of the Project are assessed in Chapter 18 - Waste and Resources [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0389	One respondent is concerned about the volume and weight of construction traffic on the B4044. They stated that this road is known to be dangerous.	Yes	An analysis of highway safety is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0389	One respondent stated that they are concerned about the volume and weight of construction traffic in regards to Swinford Bridge, an ancient landmark, which they state already carries too much traffic given its size and construction.	Yes	There are no HGV access routes over the Swinford Bridge, as confirmed in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] .
BW2_OFF_0389	One respondents would like to see collaboration with other projects in the area, so that the frequency of roadworks can be minimised. For example, they would like to see the construction of the B4044 Community Path at the same time of laying cables.	Yes	An assessment of cumulative effects on traffic and transport during the construction phase is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . However, the timing of roadworks and street works is the responsibility of Oxfordshire County Council and not the Applicant.
BW2_OFF_0409	One respondent stated that the level of construction and disturbance to the countryside will be overwhelming, especially combined with other developments in the area.	Yes	The environmental impacts of the construction process are considered across a range of chapters within the ES - including Traffic & Transport, Noise & Vibration, Air Quality, Ecology & Nature Conservation, Waste & Resources, and cumulatively with other large scale proposals in the area.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0528	One respondent stated that the map on page 13 of Volume 3 Appendix 12:1, L16 is incorrect as it is described in L18.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and Appendix 12.1: Description of network links and sensitivity [EN010147/APP/6.5] has been updated accordingly.
BW2_OFF_0542	One respondent stated that only A-roads should be used for access by construction vehicles.	Yes	The construction access routes utilise A classification roads with justification for these routes included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0006	One respondent stated that the development heightens the risk from traffic, especially during the construction phase.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0135	One respondent stated that they would like to see mitigation measures enacted to limit the number of construction HGV movements along the B4017 so that the effect would not be significant in EIA terms	Yes	Mitigation and enhancement measures adopted as part of the Project are set out in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0135	One respondent stated that there will be no significant effects arising from the project during the construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning phases.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0138	One respondent stated that the issue of traffic was not properly addressed during the consultation.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0190	One respondent stated that there are no emergency arrangements provided, e.g. for transfer oil spillage, or in the event of a fire.	Yes	A detailed Operational Management Plan will be carried out largely in line with the outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] submitted with the application, which will include dealing with emergency events and pollution control.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent asked who will monitor the traffic and construction disruption when PVDP have sold out (allowed another company to acquire the site).	Yes	The Applicant intends to develop and operate the Project. The operational obligations will run with the land, whoever is ultimate owner.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that planning enforcement officers are non-existent due to government funding.	Yes	A detailed Operational Management Plan will be carried out largely in line with the outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] submitted with the application, which will form the basis of an agreed series of controls and measures that the Local Planning Authorities will monitor, and enforce.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that they would guess that most of the heavy traffic will ignore the 7.5ft weight limit on Cassington Road - a single track road which is always suffering as a rat-run.	Yes	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (EN010147/APP/7.6.2) has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_PFF_0251	One respondent stated that the construction phase will damage existing	Yes	The impacts of the Project on ecology receptors is assessed and the approach to

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	ecosystems and this cannot be mitigated against.		mitigation provided in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .
BW2_PFF_0251	One respondent stated that the air pollution, noise pollution and disruption caused by construction 12 hours a day, 6 days a week, for 2 years will be horrendous.	Yes	During the construction phase, noise will be controlled and limited by the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) which will be substantially based on the outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (oCoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.
BW2_PFF_0256	One respondent stated that they are concerned about the significant residual effects during the construction, operation and decommissioning phase of the project makes for certain roads.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) . An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (EN010147/APP/7.6.2) has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_PFF_0260	One respondent asked, in relation to the sentence: "cumulative dust effects that are likely to only be significant for any sensitive receptors that are located within 350m of the construction activity", if this includes humans or other living beings?	Yes	The Air Quality and Dust Management effects of the Project are assessed in Chapter 19 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] and considers their effects on human health and on ecological receptors.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0263	One respondent stated that the fields 2.60, 2.57 and 2.58 can only be accessed by road via Cassington where there is a weight restriction.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_PFF_0263	One respondent stated they are concerned about construction access due to Burleigh Road and Yarnton Road having narrow railway bridges unsuitable for lorries. The Yarnton Road railway bridge has recently suffered a collapse.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that Landscaping and environmental enhancements appear to come last in the chronology of the construction process. This should be addressed so that planting and mitigation begins early on in the process, before being finalised again at the end (in reference to PEIR chapter 5.4.2)	Yes	The opportunity for early planting is being considered by the Applicant, and would form part of the detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, but is not currently a commitment.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that the B4017 Cumnor Road (marked as L21 on the transport appendices map) is the only road to have been omitted from the accompanying table which outlines the potential level of traffic disruption and its network links. They stated that given this is adjacent to the proposed site of the sub-station and presumably, the route BWS is proposing that all HGV construction lorries take, this seems sloppy at best and deliberate at worst. L21 and analysis of it must therefore be included in all future reports, as well being amended in the existing reports on the Botley West website as soon as possible.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment and Appendix 12.1: Description of network links and sensitivity [EN010147/APP/6.5] has been updated accordingly.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that should the B4017 form part of the construction/ decommissioning route, there would be a significant increase in traffic, nuisance and pollution (including noise and vibration) and a likely reduction in road safety, as articulated HGVs seek to navigate the very tight turning circle and partially unsighted Farmoor roundabout,	Yes	During the construction phase, noise will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times. A full assessment of traffic and transport,

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>which is directly adjacent to Farmoor Village Hall and two bus stops, and which is overshot by speeding motorists coming from the Botley direction countless times every day.</p>		<p>including highway safety, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3).</p>
<p>BW2_PFF_0269</p>	<p>One respondent expressed that the fact that the B4017 appears to be the project's chosen route means that it has either given no thought to safety, air quality, and disruption to the local community, or worse still, that the applicant has considered these and opted to ignore alternative routes despite claiming that it aims to "provide safe and optimal access to the site from the adjacent road network."</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A full assessment of traffic and transport, including highway safety, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	<p>One respondent stated that a far more logical and appropriate entrance/ route would be via a long 'shallow curve' off the B4044, away from residential properties, in a section with good sightlines. The obvious position for such an entrance (just to the west of the entrance to The Red House Farm Business Park) would allow HGVs coming from the east along the B4044 to effectively drive straight-on shortly after the Red House Farm Business Park entrance, before turning left onto a resurfaced Denman's Lane. This route would negate the requirement to pass by residential properties at Oakenholt and Farmoor at all. Furthermore, HGVs would need to travel less distance along the already dangerous B4044, and would no longer need to make the dangerous and very tight turn at the partially unsighted Farmoor roundabout. Such a route would also overcome your reports finding that "the effect on pedestrian amenity on the B4017 will be significant."</p>	Yes	<p>A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the project team had not considered an alternative entrance or discounted it for some unknown reasons. They state that this is even more surprising given the fact the relevant land related to this route is owned by the Barnett family, on whose land the Red House Farm Solar project is proposed, and whom are therefore, presumably, supporters of solar technology.	Yes	Noted. A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3). An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (EN010147/APP/7.6.2) has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that the project has stated that the core hours of construction will be 07:00 to 19:00 despite the legal hours of construction being limited to between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday, 8am to 1pm on Saturdays and banned on Sundays and Bank Holidays under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 statutory noise nuisance regulations. All future documentation must correct this and make a cast iron guarantee that no construction work will take place outside these hours, because all work will be	Yes	During the construction phase, noise will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (oCoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	monitored very closely and any transgressions reported.		
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that, if the developers wish to keep the community on side, it would be appreciated that it commits to no construction taking place on a Saturday. Should the timeframe of the construction process need to be revised as a result of this, we would expect this to be reflected in all future reports, including the ES.	Yes	Construction working hours are set out in the outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that the project should commit to implementing a 'no dig approach' and to using 'concrete shoes' for all solar panels across the entire site in the ES, as it has already for especially ecologically sensitive areas such as the Swinford water meadow region. To not commit to this would be	Yes	The impacts of the installation upon ecology are fully assessed in Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	seen as a purely commercial decision which goes against BWS' supposed biodiversity focus.		
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that the suggestion that thousands of HGV trips would have "no significant effects" on noise and vibration is disingenuous and clearly untrue. They stated that this sentence should be corrected and/ or clarified in the ES and all future documentation.	Yes	During the construction phase, noise impacts will be controlled by noise measures within the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). The measures will be based on best practicable means to minimise noise disturbance from construction activities.
BW2_PFF_0288	One respondent would like to know the number of lorry movements per day and what the route is for this. They appears to be no acknowledgement of the effect this will have on major routes and local roads which are already at breaking point e.g. A34.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan with access routes [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0294	One respondent expressed concern about the impact construction will have on their lives, especially their mental health.	Yes	Concerns about mental health impacts of construction are acknowledged. Section 16.9 of Volume 1, Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3] discusses mental health. It is concluded that appropriate mitigation is provided to avoid the potential for a significant population health effect.
Land Use and Agriculture			
BW2_OFF_0051, BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0182, BW2_OFF_0183, BW2_OFF_0242, BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_OFF_0272, BW2_OFF_0280, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0345, BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_OFF_0397, BW2_OFF_0400, BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_OFF_0460, BW2_OFF_0470,	Respondents do not believe the use of agricultural land is justified e.g. it is not good use of the land.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_PFF_0023, BW2_PFF_0040, BW2_PFF_0269			
BW2_OFF_0064, BW2_OFF_0065, BW2_OFF_0079, BW2_OFF_0213, BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_OFF_0297, BW2_OFF_0345, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_PFF_0139, BW2_PFF_0221	Respondents are concerned about food security.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] . Community food growing areas are also available.
BW2_OFF_0106, BW2_OFF_0132, BW2_OFF_0228, BW2_OFF_0241, BW2_OFF_0344, BW2_OFF_0397, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_PFF_0040,	Respondents are concerned about the loss of agricultural land.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0205, BW2_PFF_0221			
BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_PFF_0227	Respondents believe that land that is classified as 3a and 3b should not be taken out of agricultural production and that food insecurity should be taken into consideration.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land. The Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains an Outline Soil Management plan that includes measures to limit the impacts on soil resources, wherever practicable, through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0395, BW2_OFF_0470, BW2_OFF_0497, BW2_OFF_0523, BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_OFF_0535, BW2_PFF_0227	Respondents stated that they do not understand what the "extra special circumstances" are that allows the development to be built on the green belt.	Yes	Location within the Green Belt including a case for very special circumstances is considered within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) including Green Belt Case [EN010147/APP/7.1.]
BW2_OFF_0040, BW2_OFF_0127, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0285	Respondents believes that the potential impact on the countryside outweighs any mitigation measures.	Yes	The planning balance considers impacts on the countryside and information on this is included within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) ink Green Belt Case [EN010147/APP/7.1.]
BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0352, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondents do not believe that BMV land should be used for solar farm developments.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land. The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p> <p>The Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains an Outline Soil Management plan that includes measures to limit the impacts on soil resources, wherever practicable, through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management.</p> <p>A large proportion of BMV is taken by the NGET substation, the location of which is limited to a position close to the existing OHL, and another proportion taken by the water retention pond incorporated into the Project as a benefit to the residents of Cassington village who experience intermittent flooding. Most of the Project site avoids BMV.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0204, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_PFF_0103	Respondents would like to see the alternative use of brownfield sites rather than agricultural land.	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_OFF_0344, BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0523	Respondents stated that the project will impact the Oxford Green Belt.	Yes	Impacts on the Oxford Green Belt are considered within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) including Green Belt Case [EN010147/APP/7.1]
BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_PFF_0103	Respondents would like to know how the "major adverse" impact on BMV (which is stated in the PEIR) will be addressed and if there will be any further cumulative assessments regarding this.	Yes	The impacts of the Project on BMV are assessed in Chapter 17 Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN01047/APP/6.3] including comments on the overall significance of effects.
BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0470	Respondents were concerned with the use of best and most versatile land.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0058, BW2_PFF_0227	Respondents do not understand why green belt land has been selected.	Yes	Location within Green Belt land, and the overall need case, is considered within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) including Green Belt Case. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/7.1] . The Alternatives assessed are considered in Chapter 5 of the ES 'Alternatives Considered' [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0255, BW2_PFF_0302	Respondents stated that the proposals will compromise the context and values of the project site by failing to address the importance of open countryside and the Greenbelt in separating the relatively dense mosaic of historic hamlets, villages and Woodstock town from the City of Oxford which characterizes the area and prevents coalescence.	Yes	Location within Green Belt land is considered within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) including Green Belt Case. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_OFF_0183, BW2_OFF_0285	Respondents would like to see a map and table with the area of the different types of agricultural land by grade.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . This includes the assessment of the areas of ALC grades within the DCO boundary in Section 17.6.
BW2_OFF_0072	One respondent enquired about the average cost of power produced by the solar farm compared to the cost of importing food to replace what would have been grown on the agricultural land.	Yes	The Project site will continue to be used for agricultural purposes, including conservation level grazing across most of the area, and areas being made available for local community food growing. The overall planning balance, of the energy generating benefits as weighed against other impacts, is considered in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0093	One respondent believe that land will not be returned to agricultural use or nature after its 40 years of operation.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0127	One respondent believes it would be best to leave the countryside as it is.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0332	One respondent stated that they would like existing allotments and parks to remain.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0354	One respondent stated that the mitigation measures do not distract from the disproportionate scale of the development.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent stated that there is no reference to, or suggestion mitigation, for the loss of productive farmland and the adverse impact this will have on UK food security	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_OFF_0359	One respondent stated that the solar farm would cut through the countryside, forming a barrier to wildlife over a	Yes	The impact of habitat severance is assessed in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	distance of tens of miles (particularly relating to the central site).		
BW2_OFF_0370	One respondent stated that 11,000+ people will have their quality of life severely impaired by the loss of green belt and the vast size of the scheme, as well as being at risk of fires from huge power stations.	Yes	Impacts on local residents have been evaluated through out the EIA, and can be read in the "Summary of Significant Effects" [EN010147/APP/6.3] EIA Chapter 20.
BW2_OFF_0470	One respondent stated the proposals are inconsistent with the planning targets and options presented in the Environmental Change Institute of Oxford University's 'Pathways to a zero carbon Oxfordshire 2021' report, commissioned by WODC and other relevant local authorities. The respondent stated that the scale of the project will prejudice other zero carbon pathways by occupying too much of the green belt and best and most versatile land.	Yes	Planning policy including location within the Green Belt is considered within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) including Green Belt Case [EN010147/APP/7.1.]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0493	One respondent stated that the areas between Hordley and the drama school, A44 and B4027, Woodstock to Wootton should be excluded, as they believe that these areas are grade 2 agricultural land.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.
BW2_OFF_0521	One respondent stated that, as the land was intensively farmed, the biodiversity is very low.	No	Noted, and comparatively speaking the Applicant agrees
BW2_OFF_0523	One respondent stated that they are concerned about the method of calculation of BMV land in Cumnor Parish as it appears to be a different conclusion to that reached by DEFRA. They stated that north facing sloped land and flood risk land are the only areas that are not BMV land in the Cumnor Parish. They further stated that this will reduce the efficiency of any	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	solar array and will not deliver the output claimed by PDVP.		land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.
BW2_OFF_0523	One respondent stated that the loss of BMV agricultural land within the Vale is unacceptable and will impact on future food security.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_PFF_0046	One respondent stated that they are not sentimental about "the beautiful countryside" and welcomes that it is being put to good use through this project, for the sake of future generations.	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes this support

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0046	One respondent stated that they abhor local nimbyism, sentimentalism and selfishness of the locals who oppose this project on the grounds of agricultural land use.	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes this support
BW2_PFF_0053	One respondent stated that the minimal net gains produced by the solar panels will allow the loss of arable farmland.	Yes	The impacts of the Project are assessed in Volume 1 Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Agricultural use is retained.
BW2_PFF_0087	One respondent stated that the countryside should be protected for local residents, visitors and future generations.	Yes	Noted. Chapter 15 of the ES Socio Economics [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses the impacts of the Project upon local communities in terms of socio-economics, employment, skills and tourism, and Chapter 16 considers the Human Health effects [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0133	One respondent stated that the best mitigation would be no development on rural green-belt land.	Yes	Location within Green Belt land, and the overall need case, is considered within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) including Green Belt Case. Document Reference EN010147/APP/7.1. The Alternatives assessed are considered in Chapter 5 of the ES 'Alternatives Considered' [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0138	One respondent recognised that clean energy is important, but it must be balanced by the need to grow more food.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_PFF_0176	One respondent would like to know why the land on either side of Lower Road (which they believe is a mixture of grade 2 and grade 3a land) is being included in the proposals.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land. The proposal will lead to the permanent

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p> <p>The Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains an Outline Soil Management plan that includes measures to limit the impacts on soil resources, wherever practicable, through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management.</p>
BW2_PFF_0213	One respondent stated that the proposals have taken the worse example of contaminated farm land and expects to turn them into a field of huge biodiversity.	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes that insight and support.
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that the underdeveloped areas will be minimal compared to the damaged existing fields.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that agricultural land that has historically been used for growing high quality wheat, barley, oil-seed rape and other crops, will be lost.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposal

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that the implied suggestion that this is not good agricultural land is false.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.
BW2_PFF_0246	One respondent stated that the PEIR speaks for itself when it lists the "permanent loss of 'Best and Most Versatile" agricultural land as having a "major adverse effect".	Yes	The impacts of the Project on BMV are assessed in Chapter 17 Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN01047/APP/6.3] including comments on the overall significance of effects. The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p> <p>The Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains an Outline Soil Management plan that includes measures to limit the impacts on soil resources, wherever practicable, through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management.</p>
BW2_PFF_0246	<p>One respondent pointed to the sentence "38% of the land to be lost to solar panels is BMV and even the rest is still agricultural land, listed in 3B" in the Phase Two consultation leaflet that the remaining 62% should be protected in the light of climate change reducing food production and in the midst of world events such as war.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0254	One respondent stated that the claim that the area is of above average for mental and physical health, and therefore robust enough to be unaffected by the loss of the open farmland currently surrounding them is an unfounded assumption.	Yes	The human health baseline results indicate that due to mental and physical health indicators performing largely better in the study area than nationally, the general population is considered less sensitive to change. However, the health assessment uses the vulnerable population (i.e. those with specific vulnerabilities that make them more sensitive to change) for the actual assessment of health impacts. Therefore a higher sensitivity is taken into account for a conservative/ worst case scenario. Furthermore, additional work on vulnerable groups has been undertaken since PEIR. Please see Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0254	One respondent stated that there is no evidence or assessment on the loss of agricultural/green open land and the impact this will have on the health of the local community.	Yes	Health impacts as a result of changes to open space and agricultural land are assessed in Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . These are included within the diet and nutrition; and open space, leisure and play health determinants.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0254	One respondent stated that most people are anxious and unhappy about the loss of their open green spaces.	Yes	<p>Health response: Health impacts as a result of changes to open space are assessed in Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES, within the "Open space, leisure and play" health determinant. Furthermore, community concern is addressed under the "Community identity, culture, resilience and influence" determinant. The Project will be maintaining access to public rights of way during construction, and providing enhancements as well as new routes during operation.</p> <p>When considering landscape an visual effects, it is acknowledged that there would be a significant adverse visual effect from a number of locations as a result of the Project, particularly for PRow users. The mitigation proposed is considered to be appropriate for the Project and will enable PRowS to be retained in a green corridor, with a minimum width of 5m from PRow, with hedgerows and trees to either side (South side for trees).</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0254	One respondent stated that the loss of open, green spaces will probably have negative impacts on the mental and physical health of the population if the project is approved.	Yes	Health response: Health impacts as a result of changes to open space are assessed in Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES, within the "Open space, leisure and play" health determinant. Furthermore, community concern is addressed under the "Community identity, culture, resilience and influence" determinant. The Project will be maintaining access to public rights of way during construction, and providing enhancements as well as new routes during operation. As above for landscape and visual effects.
BW2_PFF_0254	One respondent stated that the PEIR fails to take proper account of the current and cumulative development pressures and threats that are changing the character of the emerging 'in between' landscapes.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project, including the cumulative assessment, on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0255	One respondent stated that the proposals will compromise the context and values by not assessing the importance of maintaining open agricultural land as a counterbalance to the intensity of ongoing suburbanisation,	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	traffic congestion and other urban developments.		
BW2_PFF_0260	One respondent stated that the project will have a major impact, changing a rural landscape capable of food production into an industrial one and affecting the lives of much of the population of West Oxfordshire.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] . The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the developers must strive to remove as	Yes	Location within the Green Belt is considered within the Planning Supporting

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	much green belt land from its proposal as possible.		Statement (PSS) including Green Belt Case [EN010147/APP/7.1.]
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the potential loss of BMV agricultural land during the construction of the project ("permanent adverse cumulative effect as a result of the permanent loss of Best and Most versatile agricultural land" PEIR 6.13.7) should be acknowledged to a greater degree in the ES and all future documentation summaries.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project, including the cumulative assessment, on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that if the visuals are to be believed, the power sub-station itself would be built on a mix of the highest Class 2 and 3a agricultural land at the bottom of a locally significant heritage site called Tumbledown Dick, where legend has it, Oliver Cromwell's son Richard (Dick) fell off his horse.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that, in reference to 6.11.6 PEIR, in statistical terms, especially in the aftermath of the UK's exit from the European Union's Single Market/ Customs Union and Common Agricultural Policy and its likely return to the CAP at some point in the next decade, a reduction of 6.4% in farming jobs across Oxfordshire since 2018, and a similar rise in construction jobs of 6.3%, should be seen as the statistical anomaly that it is, and not a reason to suggest that farming is somehow in terminal decline. The potential for this being a statistical anomaly should therefore be acknowledged in your socio-economic reporting.	Yes	The assessment of Socio-economic effects is set out in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN/010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that the alternative use of wind turbines would be far more suitable use of the land, allowing farming to continue underneath (assuming the turbines were sited far enough away from the landing sites of migrating water birds close to the reservoir).	Yes	Noted, but the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is also likely to be severely affected.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0284	One respondent stated that they are concerned about the possible destruction of Longmead by drilling operations in Eynsham.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0293	One respondent stated that the older generation of residents are upset because they will never see open fields in their lives if the project is approved.	No	Noted
Hydrology and flood risk			
BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0376, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_PFF_0278	Respondents are concerned with the flooding risk following altered run off/drainage for lower lying areas such as Cassington.	Yes	<p>Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5] The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus climate change event.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0013, BW2_PFF_0048	Respondents are concerned about the PEIR's information regarding flood risk and how it will affect those living near local receptors.	No	No response required
BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0405, BW2_OFF_0545	Respondents stated that the land is needed to absorb water and loss of this land will increase the severity of the flooding.	Yes	The design of the Solar PV ensures that any water that would have fallen on to the land in the pre-existing baseline will continue to do so during the Project. A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms effect runoff and mitigation measures used during the design are outlined in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_PFF_0278	Respondents referred to the floods in Cassington in January 2024 as a serious concern for households and that the project plans do not provide clear evidence of how flooding alleviation will be performed.	Yes	Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus climate change event.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy (EN010147/APP/6.5) . The implementation of the measures will provide additional benefits to water quality.
BW2_OFF_0127, BW2_OFF_0470	Respondents are uncertain about the specifics in terms of flood risk and modelling of how the panels might increase or decrease the risk of flooding,	Yes	A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms alter runoff is included in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BW2_OFF_0183, BW2_OFF_0508	Respondents would like to know what measures will be put in place to improve water quality and the reduction of water run-off into the Evenlode , Cassington and other surface waters.	Yes	Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5] The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus climate change event. Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] The implementation of the measures will provide additional benefits to water quality.
BW2_OFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0508	Respondents are dissatisfied with stated flood prevention measures.	No	No response required
BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_PFF_0278	Respondents stated that some of the land selected for the site is not suitable as it is on the Thames flood plain.	Yes	Proposed development within the Project has been steered to areas outside of the floodplain - Flood Zone 1 (low risk). This is detailed in the FRA prepared for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BW2_OFF_0545, BW2_PFF_0091	Respondents stated that they are concerned about areas of with watercourses and the increased risk of flooding.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] The approach

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.
BW2_OFF_0033	One respondent is particularly concerned about flood risk on Lower Road, between Eynsham and Hanborough Station.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0039	One respondent would like to see expanded mitigation measures, especially in terms of ground conditions and flood risk.	Yes	Mitigation measures are detailed in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] and Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0336	One respondent stated that they are very sceptical about the number of items which include the comment "no significant residual effect" including on hydrology, ecology and nature conservation.	No	No response required
BW2_OFF_0370	One respondent stated that the land is at risk of flooding, especially around Farmoor/Eynsham Road at the slip road from the A420.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1:

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The approach concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.
BW2_OFF_0379	One respondent requested more clarification in this statement in the NTS (6.5.1.5): "A drainage strategy to be incorporated into the preliminary substation, secondary substation, PCS Units and operation and maintenance facility design to attenuate any increase in surface water runoff, in turn increase in flood risk."	Yes	This appears to be a typo. The approach and wording has been updated within Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0405	One respondent stated that PV panels should not be based in areas prone to flooding.	Yes	Solar panels have been sequentially steered to areas of low risk of flooding (including Flood Zone 1)
BW2_OFF_0405	One respondent stated that increased flooding created by the development would result in the need for financial compensation to affected residents.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] The approach

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.
BW2_OFF_0508	One respondent expressed concerned about the increased risk of flooding during construction, especially in areas such as Cassington.	Yes	Temporary drainage measures would be implemented during construction. Outline CoCP [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] to be secured as DCO requirement. Detailed CoCP's to be developed in line with Outline CoCP and agreed with relevant stakeholders and will include details in regard to drainage such as filter strips and formal drainage upwards of Cassington.
BW2_OFF_0523,	One respondent stated that the PEIR does not take into account the Cumnor Neighbourhood Plan Flood Risk and Hydrology Report (Policy RNE2), which states that development proposals should be located and designed to take account of flood risk.	Yes	The Project has been prepared in accordance with Local Plans set out in the Legislation section of Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0545	One respondent stated that they do not believe sufficient consideration has been taken on the new developments in the Eynsham area, which are in flood risk areas e.g. the Park and Ride development, which has already flooded onto the A40.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The approach concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.
BW2_OFF_0545	One respondent highlighted that the northern edge of Eynsham runs along the edge of the A40 is on a slightly lower elevation and is at risk of flooding.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] The approach concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0545	One respondent stated they are concerned about the potential effect of drilling under the River Thames and alongside it to lay cables, which could increase the risk of flooding.	Yes	The approach to cabling beneath the River Thames will be using Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). HDD causes minimal surface disruption and soil contamination. It also helps preserve the ecological balance and natural landscape of affected areas. At detailed design stage prior to construction a hydrogeological risk assessment will be undertaken to inform a site-specific crossing method statement for the River Thames. This will be agreed with the relevant authorities and stakeholders (including Eynsham Prior Council) prior to construction.
BW2_PFF_0048	One respondent referred to the recent flooding in December 2023 and January 2024 and stated that the flood mitigation measures to do go far enough.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] The report concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
W2_PFF_0054	One respondent stated that they are unassured about any improvement to flood risk in the area.	Yes	<p>Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3]. An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5]. Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus climate change event.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The report concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.
W2_PFF_0054	On respondent stated that there was no acknowledgement of the substation being on flood land.	Yes	Substations have been sequentially steered to areas of low risk of flooding (including Flood Zone 1).
BW2_PFF_0098	One respondent stated that there is already a high flood risk in the area without solar panels.	Yes	No response required

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0098	One respondent stated that there is a huge risk that with ongoing climate change, mixed with excessive water levels, that the development will increase flooding and will effect local and living.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] . Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that the area on and surrounding Spring Hill in Begbroke is very prone to flooding and the solar panel arrays might impair the ability of the land to absorb flood water.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] . Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The report concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.</p>
BW2_PFF_0230	<p>One respondent stated that they doubt anyone has carried out a flood test on their adjacent field. They stated that this is a clay field with a run off into a ditch which they contracted to dig around 6 years ago.</p>	Yes	<p>Site visits have been undertaken at pertinent locations and underlying geology and soils considered in the assessment of flood risk. This is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] The report concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that the panels on their clay field will concentrate the increasingly heavy rains into rivulets	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .The report concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.
BW2_PFF_0230	One respondent stated that, if the plans are approved, they insist that a ditch be extended and maintained by PVDP or whoever takes over them.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010147/APP/6.5]. Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus climate change event.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] This includes ditch widening upstream of Cassington. The report concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0238	One respondent stated that flood maintenance plans were lightweight, not subject to serious scientific study/evidence and not credible	Yes	Outline CoCP [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] to be secured as DCO requirement. Detailed CoCP's to be developed in line with Outline CoCP and agreed with relevant stakeholders. An OMP is provided as part of application for development consent [EN010147/APP/7.6.5] Detailed OMP's to be developed in line with Outline OMP and agreed with relevant stakeholders. Detailed OMP's to be secured as DCO requirement. A DMP is provided as part of application for development consent [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] Detailed DMP's are to be developed in line with Outline Decommissioning Plan and agreed with relevant stakeholders. Detailed DMP's to be secured as DCO requirement
BW2_PFF_0263	One respondent enquired what measures will be used to prevent increased run off of water, exacerbating flood issues, considering the concrete that will be required for the solar panels.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk (EN010147/APP/6.3) . An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] The report concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.
BW2_PFF_0263	One respondent stated that their field, which is next to 2.60, is on an incline and the area suffers from flooding.	Yes	Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .The report concludes

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			that the development would not increase flood risk off-site.
BW2_PFF_0266	One respondent stated that crucial impact assessments were not available such as a flood risk assessment.	Yes	An FRA has been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5]
Noise Impact			
BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_OFF_0389	Respondents are not reassured that there will be no significant effects regarding the impact of noise.	Yes	A full noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] , with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4] , and ES Volume 3 (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This assessment has identified that the development will not cause any significant adverse effects on noise sensitive receptors.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0488, BW2_PFF_0251	Respondents stated that the proposed mitigation measures are insufficient in terms of lessening the impact of noise created by the development.	Yes	The noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES reference EN010147/APP/6.3, with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4], and ES Volume 3 (Appendices)[EN010147/APP/6.5]. This assessment has identified that the development will not cause any significant adverse effects on noise sensitive receptors.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0474	One respondent stated that no information was presented on any potential environmental impacts such as noise above the ambient (which is very low).	Yes	The noise impact assessment in Chapter 13 of the main ES reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] includes full details of any potential noise impacts. The operational noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with British Standard 4142:2014+A1:2019 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound (BS4142). BS4142 requires the assessment to compare the rating sound level against the existing background sound level. The rating sound level is the sound emissions from the development, with any additional noise penalties added. The background sound level is calculated as the sound level which is exceeded for 90% of the measurement period at receptors, and without the development. This background sound level has been measured and is lower than the ambient level. Therefore, the assessment is more robust than comparing the sound from the development against the ambient sound level. This assessment is shown in Appendix 13.3 [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0488	One respondent stated that the topography of some fields would create an amphitheatre affect, as the noise would not be absorbed, instead magnified and will travel down to the residences surrounding it.	Yes	As set-out in Volume 3: Appendix 13.3: Operational Phase Noise [EN010147/APP/6.5] , the existing site topography has been included into the computer noise model which has been used to establish noise emissions from the PCS units.
BW2_OFF_0528	One respondent stated that there will be continuous and additional sound caused by construction machinery and traffic, which will cover a huge area affecting a large population.	Yes	<p>During the construction phase, noise will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.</p> <p>Noise from the operational phase will be controlled and limited by the Outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.5] (OMP). This operational management plan will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0528	<p>One respondent expressed that the assessments into noise caused by the development exceeds the Control of Noise at Work Regulations 2005 (The level at which employers must provide hearing protection and hearing protection zones is 85 dB(A) (daily or weekly average exposure) and the level at which employers must assess the risk to workers' health and provide them with information and training is 80 dB(A).'</p> <p>The PEIR states that the 156 PCS units will each emit a 98 Db, with the side open, and the other noise emitting elements will give out sounds of over 84 Db. It is misleading to show evidence of noise levels using closed PCS units.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment includes a consideration of operational phase noise impacts, the assessment identifies that operational phase noise will cause a minor adverse impact at receptors, which is not significant. Since the preparation of the PEIR, details of the PCS units have been established more accurately. The noise emissions from these PCS units have been verified to be 92dB(A) Lw. This is a sound power level, which cannot be directly compared with noise levels stated in Control of Noise at Work Regulations 2005, which uses an 8 hour average level at the workers ear. Furthermore, the PCS units are not located adjacent to any receptors, are evenly distributed around the Project, and have been located and positioned to reduce any impact on receptors. Noise from the operation of the Project is considered fully within the technical information provided in Volume 3, Appendix 13.3: Operational Phase Noise [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0112	One respondent enquired about the audible study on all transmission cables and substations, and whether this has been estimated and the theory has been demonstrated.	Yes	The development utilises underground cabling and so noise from the operation of this has not been considered. Noise from substations associated with the Project are considered fully within the technical information provided in Volume 3, Appendix 13.3: Operational Phase Noise [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The assessment identifies that the development will not cause a significant adverse noise impact on sensitive receptors.
BW2_PFF_0285	One respondent expressed that noise generation will occur within the development site as each power convertor is rated at 67 dB at 10m distance, and there are 156 proposed converters across the site.	Yes	The assessment includes a consideration of operational phase noise impacts, the assessment identifies that operational phase noise will cause a minor adverse impact at receptors, which is not significant. Furthermore, the PCS units are evenly distributed around the Project, and have been located and positioned to reduce any impact on receptors. Noise from the operation of the Project is considered fully within the technical information provided in Volume 3, Appendix 13.3: Operational Phase Noise [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0285	One respondent stated that the expected noise generated by the power convertors does not take into account the noise created by large electricity substation on the southern part of the site.	Yes	Noise from the PCS units, and substations associated with the Project are considered fully within the technical information provided in Volume 3, Appendix 13.3: Operational Phase Noise [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The assessment identifies that the development will not cause a significant adverse noise impact on sensitive receptors.
Recreation and Amenity			
BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0251	Respondents expressed that the impact on access to PRoW might be more significant and lasting than stated.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_PFF_0221	Respondents expressed concerns about the impact mitigation measures will have on views while walking on PRow.	No	Comment acknowledged.
BW2_OFF_0035	One respondent enquired about access to footpaths during construction, and would like it to be confirmed that no PRow will have a greater impact than 500m during construction, and which PRow will be affected.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0043	One respondent would like a new circular walk created from Bladon through Bladon Heath, Burleigh Woods, crossing the Evenlode to Pinsley Wood and then connecting with the PRoW into Blenheim and back to Bladon.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0089	One respondent would like to see improvements to public access across the site.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Additional public access has been secured.
BW2_OFF_0104	One respondent believes the changes to the plans are "non-substantive" and gives the example of the small changes to the Wootton area with the suggested mitigation of the walks by the river.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0120	One respondent believes that turning footpaths into corridors between 2.5m fences is inadequate as a mitigation as there will be more planting to block people's views.	No	Minimum 5m width for PRoW corridors. Up to 9m in places. Hedgerow and tree planting either side of the PRoW is characteristic of existing situation along many of the PRoW routes. Some existing routes are narrower than what is proposed.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0125	One respondent believes that the planned footpaths do not appear to be usable and do not compensate for the loss of access to open countryside.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0134	One respondent expressed that popular walks from Cassington, including Purwell Farm and Spring Hill, will be affected by solar panels. Mitigation measures such as hedgerows, trees and fences may impact the panoramic views offered by on these walks.	No	Comment is acknowledged.
BW2_OFF_0150	One respondent would like to know how footpaths will be impacted.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_OFF_0161	One respondent expressed that the proposals for protecting the Oxfordshire Way are inadequate and believes that to "cut into it" would negate its aim.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_OFF_0342	One respondent stated that wide margins should be provided around public rights of way.	Yes	Minimum 5m width for PRow corridors. Up to 9m in places. Hedgerow and tree planting either side of the PRow is characteristic of existing situation along many of the PRow routes. Some existing routes are narrower than what is proposed.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent stated that upgrading the PRowS to cycle paths will not feel like an improvement to most walkers.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent stated that the PRow maps were inadequate and some national footpaths were unmarked.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0376	One respondent stated that the construction of high fences along the solar panels would destroy the view of the tracks along Cassington and Yarnton	No	Comment is acknowledged.
BW2_OFF_0482	One respondent stated that consultation materials did not provide clear statements on new access routes.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0482	One respondent stated that the mitigation measures on walking routes are insufficient and fail to fully mitigate, leading to the conclusion that the development is disproportionate, out of sale or in layman's terms "greedy".	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0482</p>	<p>One respondent stated that the mitigation measures on walking routes are in contradiction to VoWH Local Plan core policies 41 and 44 and the Neighbourhood Plan policies DBC7 and T13 (and similar WODC policies)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6]. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0482	One respondent stated that the proposal will have adverse impacts on existing users of cycle paths and fails the "agents of change" principle set out in the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) and would be contrary to the Vale of White Horse Local Plan policies LPP1 and CP33.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_PFF_0018	One respondent expressed that residents will not be able to use the fields and the footpaths during the construction phase of the development.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_PFF_0061	One respondent stated that the track in Cassington is completely surrounded by panels, which will ruin walks.	No	Comment is acknowledged.
BW2_PFF_0091	One respondent stated that recreational facilities have been white washed over.	Yes	The planning balance considers impacts on the countryside and information on this is included within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1.] The Socio-economic and Human Health impacts are considered in Chapters 15 and 16 of the ES respectively [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0091	One respondent stated that there is no definitive plan to address issues impacting recreational facilities.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_PFF_0138	One respondent stated that the importance of residents' health (physical and mental) has not been considered by these proposals as access to recreation and amenities will be impacted.	Yes	This is covered within Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES, which assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental health) as a result of the Project. Impacts to open space, recreation and amenities is covered in great detail under the "Open space, leisure and play" determinant of the health assessment.
BW2_PFF_0138	One respondent stated that it is important to take into consideration the impact of this project will have on present and future generations and their access to beauty and fresh air.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0218	One respondent stated that thorough investigation is required into the impact on health and wellbeing of residents.	Yes	Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. This includes detailed assessment of impacts on public rights of way, including

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			cycle and footpaths. Please see the "Open space, leisure and play" determinant of the health assessment.
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that bridleways and footpaths will be limited to narrow passageways between solar arrays.	Yes	Minimum 5m width for PRoW corridors. Up to 9m in places. Hedgerow and tree planting either side of the PRoW is characteristic of existing situation along many of the PRoW routes. Some existing routes are narrower than what is proposed.
BW2_PFF_0221	One respondent stated that the area around Spring Hill is widely used for recreation by local and other residents and enhances their mental/physical wellbeing - this could be lost if the project goes ahead.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_PFF_0227	One respondent stated that there was not sufficient evidence that footpaths will not be impacted by the power stations.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_PFF_0236	One respondent stated that the plans to use existing rights of way/cycle routes, surrounded by fences and security lights, will create a restricted tunnel through the fields of barley and wheat. They stated that this would create a "gulag in reverse".	Yes	Minimum 5m width for PRow corridors. Up to 9m in places. Hedgerow and tree planting either side of the PRow is characteristic of existing situation along many of the PRow routes. Some existing routes are narrower than what is proposed.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0236	One respondent pointed to a sentence in the PEIR that states "the percentage of the population with a clinical diagnosis of depression is slightly higher in W. Oxon, Cherwell and Vale districts compared to the national average" and states that this will only get worse if people do not have access to the countryside.	Yes	Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. Impacts on access to open green space is covered in great detail under the "Open space, leisure and play" determinant of the health assessment. It is also worth noting that the Project will maintain access to existing public rights of way and other recreational routes during construction, and provide enhancements and new routes during operation.
BW2_PFF_0256	One respondent stated that there will be significant residual effects on public rights of way and therefore access to the countryside - which currently supports the physical and mental health of many residents.	Yes	Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. Impacts on access to open green space is covered in great detail under the "Open space, leisure and play" determinant of the health assessment, which includes detailed assessment of health impacts as a result of changes to public rights of way. Overall, the conclusions in relation to PRowS are short-term moderate adverse impacts that will improve over time (as a result of mitigation put in place and

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			enhancements to affected routes), to minor beneficial in the long-term.
BW2_OFF_0120	One respondent expressed that the information presented about recreation and amenity was insufficient and vague.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0482	One respondent stated that they are concerned about the impact the proposals would have on the Green Belt way, as they state that they are not only a strategic route for the whole of Oxfordshire, but also represents a safe route into and across the countryside to the west for the 9,000 people living in the Botley Communities from Dean Court.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0178	One respondent stated that the route options between Eynsham and Farmoor must not disturb the fields between Thames and Botley Road.	Yes	The development of the detailed cable route design will take into account the location of access routes. The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent and will include any additional measures required in relation to the detailed design of the cable routes.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that three PRoW identified in chapter 6.3.14 of the PEIR as having adversely affected views, notably PRoW 1784/50/20 – the aptly named Green Belt Way, which is the sole pedestrian route between Farmoor and Cumnor where the local school is - stand in contradiction to the statement that there are no significant adverse effects either temporary and permanent effects on the local landscape character arising from construction and operation of the Project (PEIR 6.3.14)	Yes	Comment acknowledged. It is considered that when taking character areas as a whole the Project would not have a significant adverse effect.
BW2_OFF_0052	One respondent is unsure about how walking through the solar panels and high fences will be enhanced to "improve human health and well-being".	No	Comment acknowledged.
BW2_PFF_0236	One respondent stated that it is not the walk itself that is beneficial to their physical health but the scenery/environment that they experience as they exercise.	No	Comment acknowledged. Proposed planting and mitigation considered to be appropriate and proportionate to the Project. Not possible or necessarily appropriate to entirely screen from view.
BW2_PFF_0255	One respondent stated that the scale and magnitude of the proposal will not allow it to be easily absorbed into the high value intricate mosaic of	No	Comment acknowledged.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	landscapes and the amenity that these provide for the local communities.		
BW2_PFF_0255	One respondent stated that exceptional pressures for housing and infrastructure is creating a cumulative adverse impact on the landscapes, settlements, and communities east of and south of the WHS (some 1080 houses on sites approved or planned).	No	Comment acknowledged.
BW2_PFF_0256	One respondent stated that they are worried about the cumulative effects of the building of around 1000 new houses at West Eynsham and also the garden village across the A40 from Eynsham.	No	Comment acknowledged.
BW2_PFF_0256	One respondent stated that they are worried about the cumulative effects of the building of new houses and whether the solar farm impinges on the Garden Village Land.	No	Project is near to, but not within Garden Village land.
BW2_PFF_0256	One respondent stated that they are worried about the cumulative effects of the development of the project alongside the construction of housing	No	Comment acknowledged.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	developments in Cumnor/Farmoor Road area.		
Supply Chain and Employment Opportunities			
BW2_PFF_0114	One respondent stated that they will be available to conduct bird surveys for the BTO and would like to be kept informed if there are any opportunities for this.	No	Ecological surveys are undertaken by project appointed ecologists.
Project Description			
BW2_OFF_0071, BW2_OFF_0198, BW2_OFF_0226, BW2_OFF_0255, BW2_OFF_0329, BW2_OFF_0351, BW2_OFF_0387, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0453, BW2_OFF_0463, BW2_OFF_0470, BW2_OFF_0508	Respondents believes that the project is profit-driven e.g. with no care for the impact on those that live in the community; only to benefit PVDP and Blenheim Estates; greenwash to benefit profit motives.	Yes	The need case is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]
BW2_OFF_0178, BW2_OFF_0196, BW2_OFF_0214, BW2_OFF_0250,	Respondents do not believe there is a need for the project.	Yes	The need case is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement and the need is urgent [EN010147/APP/7.1] . This is recognised by the Government.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0276, BW2_OFF_0308, BW2_PFF_0126, BW2_PFF_0172, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0286			
BW2_OFF_0260, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0492, BW2_PFF_0018	Respondents believe that the project proposals ignore the needs of the community.	Yes	The need case is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]. Benefits accruing to the community are also set out.
BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0294, BW2_OFF_0387, BW2_OFF_0420	Respondents expressed that guarantees and warranties regarding the ownership of the solar farm have not been properly documented.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0052, BW2_OFF_0494, BW2_PFF_0107	Respondents are not assured by project statements and believes that they are aspirational rather than firm undertakings.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0468, BW2_OFF_0498	Respondents are dissatisfied with the revised proposals e.g. the changes to do go far enough; will still cause e.g. visual impact, loss of habitat, construction disruption, and high carbon footprint.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0072, W2_OFF_0280	Respondents would like to see analysis of how supply is balanced against	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes this insight and support.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	demand, especially during different seasons.		
BW2_OFF_0062	One respondent believes that the project is important and should go ahead in order to stop the use of fossil fuels.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0077	One respondent was impressed by the compassionate and pragmatic policies being developed.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0097	One respondent would like to be assured that the plans are implemented and promises are kept.	No	Noted. The consenting system is designed to achieve that.
BW2_OFF_0280	One respondent enquired whether the operating companies are receiving government subsidies for energy at times when it is not needed?	No	The Project is not funded by public money. The Project may sell some of its output via the Government's CfD scheme.
BW2_OFF_0289	One respondent expected the revised proposals to follow the HM Treasury's Green Book which applies to major projects involving changes to the use of existing public assets and resources. Relevant chapters to BWSF are chapters 4, 5, and 6, which appear to not have been followed.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0345	One respondent stated that the risk of embarking on such a large project all at once has not been addressed in the assessments and recommends that development should be started in one area at a time, proving the benefits to the community.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0345	One respondent stated that there is no evidence for the ability of the consortium to deliver on one of the biggest infrastructure projects in the UK.	No	The Applicant has extensive experience of developing solar farms dating back 15 years, and will employ an experienced EPC contractor to build the Project, should consent be granted.
BW2_OFF_0353	One respondent stated that more data is required to properly understand the true long term impact of the development, e.g. the impact on the mental health of local residents.	Yes	Please see ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Human Health - document ref [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0370	Respondents stated that solar farms are the least efficient way of generating electricity.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0451	One respondent stated that this development will affect 150 people per day on the site.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0528	One respondent stated that the Forever Fields exhibition drew in over 1,000 attendees over three days. They stated	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	that these attendees are concerned about the possibility that the environment will be destroyed.		
BW2_PFF_0015	One respondent stated a the logically opinions will be ignored.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0018	One respondent asked how long it will take to install the panels and infrastructure.	Yes	It will take 24 months to construct the solar farm.
BW2_PFF_0036	One respondent enquired about whether individuals working at Blenheim Estates will receive an enormous financial reward, stating that this would be unethical.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0036	One respondent stated that if very senior managers at Blenheim Estate received large financial awards, this should weigh on the approval judgement.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0036	One respondent stated that the funding for the scheme does in part involve finance from Russia, and in the view of the sanctions imposed on Russia following its invasion of Ukraine, this may well be an illegal involvement and against British law.	No	PVDP operates within all laws of the United Kingdom and no person involved with the project is on the UK's sanctioned persons list.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0042	One respondent stated that there was no information on the duties of the developer and what would happen if it was acquired, goes bust or if the asset was sold.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0062	One respondent stated that there needs to be more research into company funding.	No	There is a Funding Statement included as part of the DCO Application
BW2_PFF_0062	One respondent stated that the whole project, including the developer, is morally corrupt.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0128	One respondent stated that they would appreciate more information on the ongoing monitoring process.	Yes	<p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor landscaping and ecology issues during the operation of the Project.</p> <p>The local planning authorities will have the responsibility for enforcement.</p>
BW2_PFF_0156	One respondent stated that the claim of providing 50MW is false due to variable weather conditions.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0185	One respondent asked why Blenheim will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the site, citing that they have a poor history of maintaining woodland and footpaths, and actively seek to restrict access to any of their land wherever they can.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0213	One respondent stated that they will leave their answers to the numerous environmental groups lobbying against this massive project.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0222	One respondent stated that once the construction of the project starts, there will be no way of holding developers to account on their proposals.	Yes	All Requirements of the DCO consent will be enforced by the Local Planning Authorities.
BW2_PFF_0251	One respondent stated that the information presented has been economical with the truth and indulged in misinformation.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0258	One respondent stated that data can be manipulated to meet particular needs.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0285	One respondent stated that the proposed scheme design has ben led primarily by land availability and proximity to a grid connection point, rather than a comprehensive	Yes	Please see ES Volume 1 Chapter 5, Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] and the Planning Supporting Statement. [EN010147/APP/7.1]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	assessment of local environmental characteristics and constraints.		
BW2_PFF_0289	One respondent expressed that PVDP gave misleading and inaccurate statements concerning the financial backer of the project and about the past track record of their involvement in other projects.	No	PVDP have been entirely open about the source of their funds and about their successfully delivered solar PV projects in Japan.
Preliminary Environmental Information Report			
BW2_OFF_0279, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0392, BW2_OFF_0415, BW2_OFF_0416, BW2_OFF_0432, BW2_OFF_0434, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0464, BW2_OFF_0473, BW2_OFF_0503, BW2_OFF_0515,	Respondents believe that the PEIR/NTS are too technical to understand and too long.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_OFF_0539, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0024, BW2_PFF_0030, BW2_PFF_0055, BW2_PFF_0120, BW2_PFF_0135, BW2_PFF_0168, BW2_PFF_0213, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0235, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0256, BW2_PFF_0257, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_PFF_0284			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0016, BW2_OFF_0004, BW2_OFF_0031, BW2_OFF_0034, BW2_OFF_0068, BW2_OFF_0075, BW2_OFF_0122, BW2_OFF_0129, BW2_OFF_0200, BW2_OFF_0236, BW2_OFF_0254, BW2_OFF_0267, BW2_OFF_0290, BW2_OFF_0315, BW2_OFF_0348, BW2_OFF_0357, BW2_OFF_0409, BW2_OFF_0417, BW2_OFF_0425, BW2_OFF_0426, BW2_OFF_0433, BW2_OFF_0489, BW2_OFF_0555, BW2_PFF_0160	Respondents have no specific comments on the PEIR.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0020, BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0127, BW2_OFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0309, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0376, BW2_OFF_0381, BW2_OFF_0390, BW2_OFF_0407, BW2_OFF_0474, BW2_OFF_0482, BW2_OFF_0494, BW2_OFF_0515, BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_PFF_0091, BW2_PFF_0107, BW2_PFF_0115, BW2_PFF_0284	Respondent believes that the impact report in the PEIR is vague in terms of clarification, case studies and statistical information on biodiversity, carbon footprint, transporting energy , flooding risk, proposed infrastructure, etc.	Yes	These points are advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_OFF_0020, BW2_OFF_0061, BW2_OFF_0121, BW2_OFF_0156, BW2_OFF_0439, BW2_OFF_0499,	Respondents are unsatisfied with the PEIR	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0020, BW2_PFF_0104			
BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0096, BW2_OFF_0110, BW2_OFF_0223, BW2_OFF_0386, BW2_OFF_0439, BW2_OFF_0448, BW2_PFF_0273	Respondents disagree with information given in the PEIR.	Yes	Noted. The information provided at the PEIR stage was preliminary only. It has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_OFF_0026, BW2_OFF_0091, BW2_OFF_0121, BW2_OFF_0165, BW2_OFF_0233, BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_OFF_0276, BW2_OFF_0279, BW2_OFF_0308, BW2_OFF_0348, BW2_OFF_0400, BW2_OFF_0448, BW2_PFF_0032, BW2_PFF_0089	Respondents expressed disapproval/opposition of the project.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0038, BW2_OFF_0054, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0255, BW2_OFF_0274, BW2_OFF_0387, BW2_OFF_0462, BW2_OFF_0503, BW2_PFF_0023, BW2_PFF_0197, BW2_PFF_0302	Respondents are unsure whether the studies and surveys undertaken in the PEIR were performed by independent entities, with the report being deemed as untrustworthy.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0144, BW2_OFF_0145, BW2_OFF_0146, BW2_OFF_0383, BW2_OFF_0482, BW2_OFF_0509, BW2_OFF_0539, BW2_OFF_0546, BW2_PFF_0107, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_PFF_0278, BW2_PFF_0289	Respondents noted that the PEIR is "preliminary" and would like to know when the report will be finalised.	Yes	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_OFF_0182, BW2_OFF_0271, BW2_PFF_0070,	Respondents expressed that there was insufficient time to consider the PEIR	No	The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0120, BW2_PFF_0144, BW2_PFF_0213, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0256, BW2_PFF_0260	e.g. due to the consultation running over the Christmas/New Year period.		Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BW2_OFF_0506, BW2_OFF_0509, BW2_OFF_0526, BW2_PFF_0017, BW2_PFF_0088, BW2_PFF_0122, BW2_PFF_0177, BW2_PFF_0276	Respondents believe the PEIR is misleading, for example that the solar farm will allow for Oxford energy requirements for the future - one respondent stated that they is not true, as the energy from the project will be sent to national grid.	No	The energy will be sent to the National Grid, but largely consumed in the sub-region, including Oxfordshire.
BW2_OFF_0317, BW2_OFF_0431, BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_PFF_0108, BW2_PFF_0132, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_PFF_0298	Respondents stated that the PEIR did not persuade them that the project is a good idea.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0353, BW2_OFF_0395, BW2_OFF_0431, BW2_OFF_0462,	Respondents state the PEIR does not address all the issues and is not based on actual data on similar schemes in rural locations.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0497, BW2_PFF_0104, BW2_PFF_0161			was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_OFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0414, BW2_OFF_0434, BW2_OFF_0464, BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_OFF_0539	Respondents believe that the access to the PEIR was difficult due to e.g. not having a computer; getting to the library is difficult; printing costs are too high; no Wi-Fi connection at home; cannot afford broadband, a smartphone or computer.	No	The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BW2_OFF_0387, BW2_OFF_0392, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0453, BW2_OFF_0503	Respondents stated that the PIER read like a PR document rather than an independently-driven report	No	The PEIR was produced on behalf of the Applicant by their appointed consultants, and in line with legislation, guidance, methodology and good practice.
BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_OFF_0484, BW2_OFF_0529, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0256	Respondents stated that the PEIR had not been made available to them, so they could not comment e.g. no link provided; no obvious link on the project website.; not made available before the consultation events; only available in	No	The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	hardcopy form at the consultation events.		(Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BW2_OFF_0470, BW2_OFF_0497, BW2_OFF_0538, BW2_PFF_0161, BW2_PFF_0238	Respondents stated that there is critical evidence missing from the PEIR e.g. biodiversity net gain report, environmental management plan, traffic plan, justification of the special circumstances for long-term destruction of Oxford's green belt.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_OFF_0485, BW2_PFF_0023, BW2_PFF_0104, BW2_PFF_0201	Respondents stated that the findings in the PEIR are inadequate.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_OFF_0535, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0266	Respondents stated that that there was a failure to provide several assessment and management plans in the PEIR (e.g. environmental management plan, heritage impact assessment on Blenheim WHS).	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0012, BW2_OFF_0061, BW2_OFF_0116, BW2_OFF_0473	Respondents are satisfied with the PEIR	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes that acknowledgement.
BW2_OFF_0182, BW2_OFF_0273, BW2_PFF_0222	Respondents expressed that the Non-Technical Summary was insufficient, for example, it did not contain illustrations.	No	The Non-Technical Summary for the PEIR was produced in line with IEAMA guidance and the EIA Regulations.
BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0024, BW2_PFF_0238	Respondents enquired why there is no index for each section of the PEIR and why there is no master index, as they would help to navigate through the document.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0176, BW2_PFF_0185, BW2_PFF_0222	Respondents stated that nothing is fully worked at in the PEIR e.g. if asked about biodiversity, the project team will say that they will be 'exploring options' or 'we have many ideas'.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_PFF_0061, BW2_PFF_0133, BW2_PFF_0135	Respondents stated that the PEIR is all lies.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0339, BW2_PFF_0258	Respondents stated that the PEIR is not based in reality and that it has been commissioned with one idea in mind	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	which is to justify that this development would decimate the wildlife and nature.		was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_OFF_0474	Respondents expressed that the observations made in the PEIR seem to be 'desk based' and recommended that the authors should visit the area which would be affected by the project.	No	The work produced for the PEIR and for the subsequent detailed ES has been derived from extensive site survey work, as well as 'desk based' research.
BW2_OFF_0042, BW2_PFF_0030	Respondents are very satisfied with the PEIR, stating that it the Non-Technical Survey is very thorough and informative.	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes that acknowledgement
BW2_OFF_0307, BW2_OFF_0319	Respondents stated that many of the statements in the PEIR were unintelligible or false (for example 6.3.14., 6.3.15., 6.3.6., 6.3.10., 6.3.13., 6.3.12). They added that none of the representatives at the consultations knew what they meant.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0349, BW2_OFF_0431	Respondents stated that they are unconvinced the EIA provides any justification for the scale or location of this project.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0355, BW2_OFF_0389	Respondents would like to know who the authors of the PEIR are, and what are their qualifications and affiliations.	No	The application includes a Statement of Expertise at Appendix 1.1 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	They would also like to know if they have declared any potential conflicts of interest.		
BW2_OFF_0373, BW2_OFF_0395	Respondents stated that the PEIR is not comprehensive enough to mitigate valid concerns.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_OFF_0386, BW2_OFF_0429	Respondents stated that the PEIR and the NTS are biased pieces of work.	No	The PEIR was produced on behalf of the Applicant by their appointed consultants, and in line with legislation, guidance, methodology and good practice.
BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_PFF_0222	Respondents stated that the information provided in the PEIR is deliberately hard for local residents to engage with, making it difficult for people to oppose specific points.	No	The PEIR was supported by a Non Technical Summary produced in line with IEMA guidance and EIA legislation
BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0259	Respondents stated that the NTS is 50 pages with a lot of "jargon" - the writing is unclear and terms are not explained in context e.g. what are "receptors"; what does "not more than substantial" mean.	No	The PEIR was supported by a Non Technical Summary produced in line with IEMA guidance and EIA legislation

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0309	One respondent stated that many statements have been made in the PEIR without any backing or accurate data, including the GHG emissions calculations on which the whole scheme is based.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage. Chapter 14 of the ES provides information on Climate Change, and in particular Appendices 14.2 and 14.3 provide details on Green House Gas calculations and reduction strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BW2_OFF_0314	One respondent stated that the surveys (within the PEIR) do not address the problem that the site location is wrong and that the project is too big.	No	The Project size, location, and the overall need case, is considered within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) including Green Belt Case [EN010147/APP/7.1.] The Alternatives assessed are considered in Chapter 5 of the ES 'Alternatives Considered' [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0315	One respondent stated that they only examined the NTS.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent stated that the PEIR lays out details which are helpful for the reader and wished that more of this	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	information was highlighted during the consultation presentations.		
BW2_OFF_0342	One respondent stated that the PEIR was very long so they had to use the NTS instead.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0376	One respondent stated that diagram 5.3.2 in the NTS shows a lack of transparency about all the aspects in addition to the solar panels themselves that will be needed.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0388	One respondent stated that they were not convinced by the EIA.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0528	One respondent stated that the maps in the PEIR lack clarity, and could not identify the roads through the site clearly.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0533	One respondent stated that there was no information on human rights and modern slavery included in the PEIR. The respondent stated that as the PEIR considers global impacts such as CO2, they feel like it should also cover other global social impacts.	No	Socio-economic impacts are assessed in ES Chapter 15 [EN010147/APP/6.3] The interaction with Human Rights and modern slavery legislation was not scoped into the EIA.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0546	One respondent stated that they had not read the PEIR, only WODC's report on the project.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0012	One respondent stated that the PEIR was very comprehensive, but needs more appropriate photographs guided by local opinion.	No	Noted - more representative viewpoints, and developed photomontages, based on agreed representative views with the LPAs and Historic England, form part of Chapter 8 Appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BW2_PFF_0057	One respondent stated that the PEIR is not accurate and it is more based on propaganda.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0094	One respondent asked why the PEIR has been put out for consultation at the events if the appropriate consultants were not there to answer questions (e.g. ecologists, hydrologists, landscape).	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0111	One respondent stated that the PEIR failed to demonstrate any positive impact the development would have on the local areas impacted by the scheme and the use of those sites.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0135	One respondent stated that the PEIR includes layers of whitewash.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0147	One respondent stated that the authors of the PEIR have been very clever and non-committal with their wording.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0160	One respondent expressed they do not have sufficient information to comment on the information presented in the PEIR.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0182	One respondent stated that the PEIR second-guessed too much without honesty and integrity of substantial research.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_PFF_0184	One respondent stated that the statistics in the PEIR are not backed by a report, and therefore are not trusted.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_PFF_0235	One respondent stated that 6.3.13 of the PEIR: "There are likely to be very few people who would experience significant adverse effects as a result of the project" is an unsubstantiated assertion.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0235	One respondent enquired why the views of local residents and local authorities are not included in the PEIR.	No	They are included in the Consultation Summary Report, for submission with the DCO application [EN010147/APP/5.1] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0239	One respondent stated that the PEIR has an impressive focus on environmental strides.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0256	One respondent stated that many people do not know that the PEIR exists.	No	<p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals.</p>
BW2_PFF_0259	<p>One respondent stated that something that stood out in the NTS but did not during the community consultation displays was the number of large buildings.</p>	No	<p>Plans presented with the PEIR provided locations and size of the main substations, Power Converter Stations, and the proposed NGET substation, based on the design at that point.</p>
BW2_PFF_0259	<p>One respondent stated that there are far too many unjustified assertions and undefined times in the NTS and consultation materials.</p>	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0266	One respondent stated that the information in the PEIR was poorly presented, repetitive and made no attempt to make them understandable by a lay audience.	No	The PEIR was supported by a Non Technical Summary produced in line with IEMA guidance and EIA legislation
BW2_PFF_0274	One respondent stated that the PEIR is inadequate because it only indicates environmental impacts and only the proposed approach to assessing them - they stated that they need to know the results of these assessments to be able to comment on them and determine if the proposed mitigation measures will be appropriate and effective.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage, but still set out the approach to assessment and likely environmental effects. The ES being submitted with the application identifies mitigation and identifies requirements and management plans to deliver them.
BW2_PFF_0274	One respondent expressed that the NTS contains nothing of substance and the suggestion to follow up on key areas of interest by going to the full report does not give enough specifics.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0061	One respondent expressed that the PEIR does not contain environmental details.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_PFF_0174	One respondent stated that the PEIR was weak in the environmental impact section, particularly on biodiversity.	No	The information provided at the PEIR stage has been advanced through the production of the full Environmental Statement, and the Planning Supporting Statement. The PEIR was a preliminary level of assessment based on information at the Statutory Consultation stage.
BW2_PFF_0182	One respondent stated that they saw no reference to adequate modelling nor collaboration with UKCEH (UK Centre for Ecology and Hydrology) in the PEIR.	No	It is unclear what modelling this is referring to nor why collaboration with CEH would be necessary. CEH is a research institution rather than a planning consultee.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that, for a company which professes to be a supporter of biodiversity, there is a lack of vision and ambition in PEIR section 6.1 (just 5 points long, and which says nothing of any great consequence). They suggested partnering with BBOWT	No	The Project landscape design has been advanced since the PEIR. As set out in the oLEMP, the Ecology Strategy for the site is to provide landscape-scale enhancement, commensurate with the scale of the Project. It incorporates circa 100ha of restored floodplain meadow along the river Evenlode that will provide significant enhancement,

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	and let them plan the best use of the land from a biodiversity perspective.		improving linkages between the Blenheim Estate and associated ancient woodland in the north and the Wytham Woods and the River Thames to the south.
BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0294	One respondent enquired about how excess electricity will be stored during the lifetime of the project.	No	Output from Botley West Solar Farm will be stored by Battery Energy Storage Systems connected to the National Grid.
BW2_OFF_0333	One respondent enquired about battery storage.	No	Output from Botley West Solar Farm will be stored by Battery Energy Storage Systems connected to the National Grid
BW2_OFF_0342	One respondent stated that the height of the panels should be kept below head height.	No	Noted. They have been reduced in height. See Chapter 6 Project Description for details [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0342	One respondent would like energy storage facilities to be minimised as stored energy is inherently dangerous.	No	There is no BESS proposed as part of the Botley West Solar Farm project
BW2_OFF_0342	One respondent stated that invertors should not be audible from public areas or other property.	No	As set-out in Volume 3, Appendix 13.3 Operational Phase Noise, noise from the PCS units, and topography has been included into the computer noise model which has been used to establish operational noise emissions

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent expressed dissatisfaction that the panels will be transported from China.	No	The Applicant not yet chosen the supplier, but notes that the solar panel industry is primarily located in China.
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent stated that there is no information about how the life span of the panels has been calculated.	No	The lifespan of current solar panels is 25 years. The Outline Operational Management Plan in the ES sets out the Applicant's plans for maintenance and replacement of solar panels.
BW2_OFF_0374	One respondent stated that there was hardly any information on the cable infrastructure and that project team representatives couldn't explain what routes the cables would take and what this would do to local ecological systems.	Yes	The cable routes are described in the Environmental Statement. See Figures 5.1 to 5.5 [EN010147/APP/6.4] .
BW2_OFF_0379	One respondent stated that there was no information on the possible creation of "micro climates" from heat rising from the reflective panels and asked whether this will be assessed/addressed.	Yes	This is addressed in the Environmental Statement Volume 1, Chapter 11 Ground Conditions. [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0389	One respondent stated that from looking at the visualisations presented at the consultation events, the proposed power station is too big, very unsightly, too close to residential homes and will have visual impacts.	Yes	This is dealt with by ES Volume 1, Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0482	One respondent stated that the consultation documents do not provide sufficient information on the supporting infrastructure (sub-station, CCTV, scale and design of fencing etc.) and its impacts to inform an appropriate assessments.	Yes	This is dealt with by ES Volume 1, Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and Chapter 6 Project Description for more details [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0488	One respondent stated fig 2.2A shows that there are 3 PCS (power control system, seen in fig 2.2A) planned in close proximity to each other and will affect a significant number of residences in Bladon, on Church Road and Heath Lane, as well as the only recreational ground in Bladon.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0542	One respondent stated that the solar arrays need to be maintained properly throughout the life of the project.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0006	One respondent stated that the exhibition board regarding the PEIR did not provide information on the availability of power from the panels and that the project team, when asked, stated that there would be 25% availability. They enquired about where the required energy to	No	Solar PV panels are intermittent generation, needing the sun's radiation to produce energy.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0046	One respondent stated that they want Blenheim to be allowed to get on with this bold plan and that they admire their vision.	No	Noted. The Applicant is SolarFive Ltd. And they welcome that support.
BW2_PFF_0053	One respondent expressed that solar panels are only 10-15% efficient in converting sunlight into energy.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0053	One respondent stated that when solar panels overheat, their efficiency reduces further.	No	Noted
W2_PFF_0054	One respondent stated that no one could tell them how the scheme will join the sub-station.	Yes	Set out in the Grid Connection Statement [EN010147/APP/3.5] .
BW2_PFF_0113	One respondent asked why, after all the investment, the substation would only be used for 30 years.	Yes	NGET substation will remain in use after the decommissioning of the solar farm.
BW2_PFF_0114	One respondent enquired about the flexibility of the development once it has been installed. They would like to know if there is an opportunity to change the panels to new/smaller/better ones when available.	Yes	The solar arrays will be monitored and replaced if damaged or become degraded. At this stage there is no intention to change the overall size of the arrays - See Chapter 6, Project Description, for further details on sizing assumptions. [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0138	One respondent stated that the technology of solar panels are changing and improving, and this needs to be taken into consideration.	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0218	One respondent would like further research on whether solar is genuinely viable, and stated that the UK has a 4.8kwh system and nothing happens over winter.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0226	One respondent stated that the problem of oversupply was not addressed.	No	Output from the solar farm will be stored in Grid-connected BESS.
BW2_PFF_0226	One respondent expressed that if we continue to use the gas based system as the back up on extremely dark and cold days, with no wind, then electricity prices will rise.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0278	One respondent expressed that the continual reference in the PEIR to reports which would be in the future ES were - and could only be - taken as saying the developers have not done enough work to help the public understand what is it that is being said.	No	Noted. The Applicant produced the PEIR to a point where it was considered that it would be productive for interested parties to see what the Applicant had in mind for the Project and to comment on that preliminary information. At the same time the Applicant wanted to keep open the possibility of altering the Project in light of its consultation and not have settled all details at that point.
BW2_OFF_0401, BW2_OFF_0503, BW2_OFF_0517	Respondents stated that the project team were biased, did not have enough information at the consultations, that they were robotic in their responses,	No.	Specialists from across the disciplines attended the consultation events to help direct, guide and answer questions. Copies of the PEIR were available at the events

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	they did not understand the PEIR or answer questions about the PEIR.		and any unanswered questions were followed up by email.
BW2_OFF_0020, BW2_PFF_0289	Respondents believes that the statements on the funding of the project and the overall business plans are vague.	Yes	Funding for the Project is considered in the Funding Statement in the DCO Application. [EN010147/APP/4.2] .
BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0471	One respondent stated that PVDP, Blenheim and the Gee's Farm are the only financial beneficiaries of the project.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0250	One respondent is concerned to learn about the supposed Russian interest on PDVP's board.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0490	One respondent stated that RPS have done a good job with the PEIR.	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes that support.
BW2_OFF_0508	One respondent would like to know if what is funding the development i.e. venture capital sums or pension funds, and whether the UK government will bail out the project if it runs out of money.	Yes	Funding for the Project is considered in the Funding Statement in the DCO Application. [EN010147/APP/4.2]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0056, BW2_OFF_0093, BW2_OFF_0285	Respondents are concerned with the waste management of PV units at the end of their life cycle.	Yes	Waste management during decommissioning will be undertaken in accordance with the Decommissioning Plan; an Outline Decommissioning Plan is included in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] . The principles of the waste hierarchy will be applied to decommissioning wastes; PV panels will be recycled.
BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0508	Respondents believes that there is no guarantee that PVDP will decommission as promised, and states that this would entail a "commitment to retain their financial interest and responsibility".	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] Decommissioning is part of the DCO consent being sought.
BW2_OFF_0283, BW2_PFF_0112	One respondent would like to know whether solar panels can be recycled at the end of the project.	Yes	The PV panels will be recycled at the end of the project.
BW2_OFF_0482, BW2_PFF_0102	Respondents stated that the disposal of materials and the plant following decommissioning has not been adequately addressed.	Yes	Waste management during decommissioning will be undertaken in accordance with the final Decommissioning Plan; an Outline Decommissioning Plan is included in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] . The final Decommissioning Plan will include a Site Waste Management Plan that will set out the types and quantities of waste that will

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			be generated during the decommissioning and how these waste will be managed.
BW2_OFF_0523, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondents stated that the impact of the development is irreversible, even after decommissioning, and will lead to the industrialisation of the Greenbelt and permanent loss of the openness of the countryside.	Yes	Consent being sought for the Project is temporary with land within the Order Limit returning to agricultural use at the end of the consent. The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.
BW2_PFF_0036, BW2_PFF_0161	Respondents enquired about who will finance the decommissioning phase.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0179	One respondent believes that the statements about decommissioning were vague and offered little detail.	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.4]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Decommissioning is part of the DCO consent being sought.
BW2_OFF_0078	One respondent was disappointed by the PEIR not including a "cradle to grave Life Cycle Analysis".	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0285	One respondent believes that Blenheim will look into turning the decommissioned land into a housing development.	No	Any change of use at the end of the DCO consent would require planning approval.
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent stated that the benefits created by mitigation measures put in place during the operation of project will be removed at the decommissioning stage, as this will take at minimum 2 years to complete.	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] Decommissioning is part of the DCO consent being sought.
BW2_OFF_0336	One respondent stated that the use of the land after decommissioning needs to be given some legal protection in order to guarantee that it is returned to its original state.	No	Consent being sought for the Project is temporary with land within the Order Limit retained for agricultural use at the end of the consent. The DCO will be consented on that basis.
BW2_OFF_0336	One respondent recommended that the some profit from the project is used during the decommissioning process to support long-term restoration and rewilding.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent would like more information about what will happen to the development after 40 years.	No	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] Decommissioning is part of the DCO consent being sought. Once decommissioned, there will be a significant and beneficial landscape and BNG legacy left for future generations.
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent asked whether or not we will still need this source of electricity at the end of the project's lifespan.	No	Noted. That is difficult to predict.
BW2_OFF_0458	One respondent stated that, although the lifecycle of the project is to be around 35-42 years, they believe decommissioning will extend this by 30-50 years.	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] Decommissioning is part of the DCO consent being sought.
BW2_PFF_0034	One respondent expressed that recycling of solar panels is currently not viable in the UK and that the replacement of solar panels every 20-25 years seems silly.	Yes	The PV panels will be recycled at the end of the project. The replacement of the PV panels assumes a maximum design scenario for the purposes of the environmental impact assessment. See Climate Change Chapter 14 [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0035	One respondent enquired about the lifecycle of the PV panels and that many are found to be defective.	Yes	The PV panels will be recycled at the end of the project. The replacement of the PV panels assumes a maximum design

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			scenario for the purposes of the environmental impact assessment. See Climate Change Chapter 14 [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0036	One respondent enquired about what will happen during the decommissioning phase if the developers become insolvent.	No	Noted. Please also see Outline Decommissioning Plan in the DCO application EN010147/APP/7.6.4 Decommissioning is part of the DCO consent being sought.
BW2_PFF_0036	One respondent stated that all infrastructure during the decommissioning stage should be removed, including the substation near Cumnor.	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] Decommissioning is part of the DCO consent being sought.
BW2_PFF_0048	One respondent believes that the disposal of the scheme during the decommissioning stage will be an environmental nightmare.	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] Decommissioning is part of the DCO consent being sought.
BW2_PFF_0112	One respondent would like to know if there is a manufacturing guarantee on the service life of the panels.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0112	One respondent would like to know how often PV panels are expected to be replaced and if this has been verified.	Yes	The PV panels will be recycled at the end of the project. The replacement of the PV panels assumes a maximum design scenario for the purposes of the

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			environmental impact assessment. See Climate Change Chapter 14 [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that the suggestion that a 35 – 42 year lifespan makes this a temporary project is subjective at best and disingenuous at worst. The word temporary should therefore be removed or clarified in all future documents.	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] Decommissioning is part of the DCO consent being sought.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that no evidence or assertion has been offered that the sites will be properly reinstated after decommissioning, nor has any mechanism been suggested as to how this would be secured. Future documents and proposals must be very clear on these matters	Yes	Please see Outline Decommissioning Plan in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] Decommissioning is part of the DCO consent being sought.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that 42 years is not temporary - it is half a lifetime for most residents.	No	The Project in planning terms is temporary - lasting for a limited period of time, not permanent.
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent expressed that they would like to be assured that all equipment is recycled when decommissioned to reduce the carbon impact.	Yes	Waste management during decommissioning will be undertaken in accordance with the final Decommissioning Plan; an Outline Decommissioning Plan is included in the DCO application

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			[EN010147/APP/7.6.4]. The final Decommissioning Plan will include a Site Waste Management Plan that will set out the types and quantities of waste that will be generated during the decommissioning and how these waste will be managed.
The Consultation Process			
BW2_OFF_0307, BW2_OFF_0432, BW2_OFF_0503, BW2_OFF_0517, BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0247, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_PFF_0304	Respondents stated that they were dissatisfied with the project team and their ability to answer questions about the project.	No	<p>Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarizing the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.
BW2_OFF_0383, BW2_OFF_0509, BW2_OFF_0539, BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_PFF_0278, BW2_PFF_0094	Respondents stated that there were too many items that were incomplete or did not contain sufficient information for a proper consultation to take place e.g. environmental surveys	No	Noted. The nature of the PEIR stage is that should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.
BW2_OFF_0171, BW2_OFF_0237, BW2_OFF_0240, BW2_OFF_0280	Respondents stated that there were no experts at consultation events on flooding and ecology.	No	Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond. The Applicant's range of free-to-use contact details were operated throughout the consultation period.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0473, BW2_PFF_0295	Respondents stated that presentations were useful and helpful.	No	Noted. The Applicant welcomes that insight and support.
BW2_OFF_0261, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0503	Respondents expressed that the consultations were a PR exercise with an agenda to convince residents that there would be no impacts of the solar farm development.	No	Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BW2_PFF_0242, BW2_PFF_0247, BW2_PFF_0256	Respondents stated that the consultation events ended at 6pm meaning that most people of working age could not attend e.g. at the Long Hanborough event.	No	Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] . This included venues, days and opening times for consultee events.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The Applicant held a series of nine in-person and one online public information events across a range of dates and times, including events on weekends and events that remained open until 7:30pm on weekday evenings. The Applicant recorded over 1,000 attendees to this series of events, as presented in Section 7 of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BW2_OFF_0015, BW2_OFF_0137	Respondents expressed concerned about local misinformation and would like metrics to refute it.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_PFF_0304	Respondents stated that neither the consultation nor the PEIR has lessened their concerns.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0387, BW2_PFF_0104	Respondents stated that the consultation was inadequate because: the PEIR itself does not present a fair and honest picture of the impact of the project; there are significant gaps in the PEIR, such as the environmental management plan.	No	Noted. The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.
BW2_OFF_0432, BW2_OFF_0473	Respondents would like to have seen more in-person consultation events.	No	<p>Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>The Applicant held a series of nine in-person and one online public information events across a range of dates and times, including events on weekends and events that remained open until 7:30pm on weekday evenings. The Applicant recorded over 1,000 attendees to this series of events, as presented in Section 7 of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0053, BW2_PFF_0222	Respondents stated that the so-called 'consultation' paid lip-service to the word 'consultation' and was merely a box-ticking exercise.	No	Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BW2_PFF_0061, BW2_PFF_0124	Respondents stated that their comments from Phase One Consultation have been ignored.	No	Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] . The Applicant had addressed some comments from the earlier consultation stage but not all. This Consultation Report

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>explains how the Applicant has now responded.</p> <p>Following the review and consideration of feedback received to the phase one (non-statutory) consultation, the Applicant prepared a phase one consultation summary report to share details of the level engagement, themes of responses received, and updates regarding the Applicant's consideration of feedback and next steps for the Project.</p> <p>The phase one consultation summary report was circulated to key stakeholders on 30 June 2023. It was circulated to those who had registered to be kept informed, the Stop Botley West campaign group, and other identified organisations on 04 July 2023. The document provided an overview of the feedback that the Applicant had received.</p> <p>The phase one consultation summary report was published on the Project website and issued to over 22,000 properties within</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the vicinity of the Project, to help consultees understand how their feedback was being considered.</p> <p>This is described in Section 4 of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] and a copy of the phase one consultation summary report is provided as Appendix 5.1.3: Phase One Consultation Summary Report [EN010147/APP/5.1.3].</p>
<p>BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_PFF_0278</p>	<p>Respondents expressed how residents are supposed to engage in meaningful consultation if the PEIR is preliminary and is still being finalised.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0060</p>	<p>One respondent expressed dissatisfaction with the consultation process.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BW2_OFF_0120	One respondent expressed that the topic of construction was missing from the consultation materials.	No	Noted. The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.
BW2_OFF_0169	One respondent expressed that the information presented at Bladon Methodist Church was inaccurate and the project team could not provide accurate information.	No	Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p>
BW2_OFF_0179	One respondent would like another consultation on how the project will ensure monitoring and compliance on all	No	The Environmental Statement explains how the Project will be delivered and the commitments made secured.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	statements of mitigation and ongoing management of the project.		
BW2_OFF_0280	One respondent expressed that there was little publicity given about the solar initiative, and of this publicity, it has been one-sided (towards PVDP).	No	<p>Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p> <p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals.</p>
BW2_OFF_0313	One respondent stated that none of the project team at the consultation could answer their questions about how biodiversity was being measured and what data was being collected as the basis for the 70% increase.	No	Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p> <p>The effects of the Project on Ecology and Nature Conservation are now fully assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
BW2_OFF_0351	One respondent stated that they have read the Private Eye articles and did not believe anything that was presented at the consultation events. They stated that the project has very little to do with the	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	environment and a lot to do with "enriching the cooks who stand to make a fortune from this horrible situation".		
BW2_OFF_0376	One respondent stated that the consultation downplayed the environmental damage and upheaval the cables would cause.	No	<p>Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_PFF_0101, BW2_PFF_0094, BW2_OFF_0240, BW2_OFF_0242, BW2_OFF_0243, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_PFF_0155, BW2_PFF_0182, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_PFF_0288	Respondents commented on the availability of EIA topic leads at the series of public information events held by the Applicant, noting that experts from specific disciplines were not always present.	No	Noted. To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them, or was unclear, the consultee could submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.
BW2_OFF_0414	One respondent expressed that the opportunities to visit the consultation events was extremely limited.	No	Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>The Applicant held a series of nine in-person and one online public information events across a range of dates and times, including events on weekends and events that remained open until 7:30pm on weekday evenings. The Applicant recorded over 1,000 attendees to this series of events, as presented in Section 7 of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p>
BW2_OFF_0435	<p>One respondent stated that new residents have been neglected as they were not consulted in a way that was easy to follow and understand, meaning they had to do their own research.</p>	No	<p>Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p> <p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			maintaining a register of interested individuals.
BW2_OFF_0508	One respondent stated that the project team at the consultation events could not answer their question on the risks of the development losing funding/the project being incomplete.	No	To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.
BW2_OFF_0523	One respondent stated that if the developer had taken a more meaningful consultation approach, they would have visited locations and properties that could be considered potential visual receptors.	No	Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>This included the dates, venues, times and types of consultation to be undertaken.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0260</p>	<p>Respondents stated that the Bladon event was not accessible.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant held an event at Bladon Methodist Church specifically in response to feedback from the phase one (non-statutory) consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>This included the dates, venues, times and types of consultation to be undertaken.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0256</p>	<p>Respondents commented that information events were not held for the northern section of the Project.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>This included the dates, venues, times and types of consultation to be undertaken.</p> <p>The Applicant held events across the Project area, including two events at Woodstock Community Centre.</p>
BW2_OFF_0547	One respondent asked why not all households received the consultation leaflet.	No	<p>Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p> <p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals.
BW2_PFF_0056	One respondent stated that the consultation itself seemed to be characterised by staff from the promoters briefed to return objections rather than listen.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0068	One respondent stated that the Stage Two Consultation was even less convincing than Stage One.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0117	One respondent stated that the consultation did not highlight the risks of the project, it only focussed on what will be done to address concerns raised.	No	The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p>
BW2_PFF_0117	<p>One respondent stated that there is a need to highlight the risks of the project and to what extent they have been mitigated.</p>	No	<p>The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p> <p>If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p>
BW2_PFF_0126	<p>One respondent stated that the consultations were an impressive effort, but did fail to address their concerns in</p>	No	<p>Noted and the statement broadly welcomed. The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	certain areas such as the developers and their financing		<p>understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p> <p>If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p>
BW2_PFF_0126	One respondent stated that the consultations were an impressive effort, but the consultation did fail to address their concerns in certain areas such as the integrity of third party actors involved in the project.	No	<p>Noted and the statement broadly welcomed. The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p> <p>If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p>
BW2_PFF_0138	<p>One respondent stated that the information presented during the consultation marginalised issues that will be experienced during the lifetime of most residents.</p>	No	<p>Noted and the statement broadly welcomed. The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p> <p>If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0212	One respondent stated that referring to additional information like the PEIR and expecting residents to have assessed this, alongside the NTS and attendance at a consultation event is unrealistic and overwhelming. They stated that this is a classic case of creating consultation fatigue.	No	<p>Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p>
BW2_PFF_0215	One respondent stated that they felt the consultation event was not objective and that it was very partisan.		Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p>
BW2_PFF_0224	One respondent expressed that they very satisfied with the information presented during the consultation.	No	Noted and the Applicant welcomes that support.
BW2_PFF_0251	One respondent stated that staff at the consultation events could not provide the independent evidence that was used in the PEIR/NTS to substantiate	No	To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>the claims for environmental and ecological mitigations.</p>		<p>summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p> <p>The effects of the Project on Ecology and Nature Conservation are now fully assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
BW2_PFF_0260	One respondent stated that they disagreed with PVDP turning down requests to postpone the consultation events that were scheduled near Christmas.	No	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a comprehensive pre-application consultation on the Project, which is described and evidenced in a Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>The Applicant's approach to consultation has been informed by and complied with the requirements of the 2008 Act, and associated guidance and legislation. The Applicant's strategy of coordinating consultation activities across the Project has resulted in a high level of engagement and consultation responses, as described in</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the Consultation Report.</p> <p>The ten week consultation period exceeded the minimum eight week consultation period originally suggested in the draft SoCC, and the statutory minimum of 28 days. The Applicant increased the consultation period to account for the festive period overlapping with the consultation period. Accordingly, no public information events were held 10 days prior to Christmas Day or 10 days following New Year's Day. The Applicant considered the period of 10 weeks to be sufficient time to engage with the consultation materials provided.</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Project communications channels for enquiries.</p> <p>The Applicant is grateful to all residents, consultees and interested parties that have taken the time to engage with and respond to the consultation activities undertaken.</p>
BW2_PFF_0260	<p>One respondent stated that a postponement or delay in consultation events might have benefited the developers as the session was woefully inadequate due to lack of knowledge by those supposed to be supplying information to residents.</p>	No	<p>Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>This included number, type of consultation event, venues, dates and timings of those events.</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.
BW2_PFF_0260	One respondent stated that having struggled through the summary, they are even more depressed than they were after the so called consultations. They added that they cannot believe what the authors regard as significant	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0042	One respondent stated that the consultation offered no easily accessible information on the likely efficiency of the asset (i.e. what percentage of time it will be producing 840MW and what are the alternative clean energy options).	No	The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p> <p>If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p>
BW2_OFF_0141	One respondent expressed that local politicians should be dealing with project on behalf of local residents.	No	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Project falls to be considered under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) regime, in line with the 2008 Planning Act. The NSIP process takes account of local views, and the position of local authorities, in the decision making process.</p>
BW2_OFF_0478	One respondent stated that the project team has failed to honestly engage with local residents on the intention of the project, who is funding it, and who will benefit financially from it.	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0089	One respondent stated that there was no agricultural expert available to explain why building panels on the fields is better than leaving the countryside in its current state.	No	<p>The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p> <p>If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.</p>
BW2_PFF_0138	One respondent stated that they believe, as well as other residents, that the developers will not read the feedback received and do not understand why people bother to fill in the form. They cited the Post Office scandal and how those in power ignored their words.	No	The Consultation Report serves that purpose. [EN010147/APP/5.1] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0144	One respondent stated that the whole project and communication/consultation was very disingenuous.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0215	One respondent stated that the heritage expert was lacking understanding of the significance of heritage assets affected and their setting, relying on intervisibility as a measure of impact. They stated that this is seriously defective.	No	Noted. Heritage effects are now fully assessed within Chapter 7 [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0224	One respondent stated that the representatives answered all of their questions and listened to their comments.	No	Noted. The Applicant welcomes this endorsement of the effectiveness of their consultation.
BW2_PFF_0239	One respondent stated that the key for the success of this project is to align the focus on environmental strides with the views of local residents.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0247	One respondent stated the answers that the project team provided at the consultation events did not inspire confidence.	No	Noted. To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries. If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.
BW2_PFF_0280	One respondent stated that they appreciated the opportunity to talk to the land assessment expert, stating that he was knowledgeable, honest and very approachable.	No	Noted. The Applicant welcomes this endorsement of the consultation undertaken.
BW2_OFF_0159, BW2_OFF_0237, BW2_OFF_0464, BW2_PFF_0044, BW2_PFF_0064, BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0144, BW2_PFF_0293, BW2_PFF_0295	Respondents expressed that the maps were hard to understand e.g. written information was vague; too many similar colours included; inappropriate colours to represent ecological improvements; were irrelevant to the area; too technical; out of date; not to scale	No	The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The Applicant considers the materials provided were adequate and informative.
BW2_OFF_0240, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0547	Respondents expressed that the information in the leaflets was more marketing and PR than objective, verified data. One respondent added that they believe this breaches PINS requirements.	No	Noted. The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] . It was in accordance with PINs guidelines.
BW2_PFF_0122, BW2_PFF_0177	Respondents stated that materials presented at the consultation events were misleading.	No	The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p> <p>The Applicant does not accept the materials were misleading.</p>
BW2_OFF_0145, BW2_OFF_0435	Respondents asked why the consultations are taking place before the PEIR is finalised.	No	The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.
BW2_OFF_0141	One respondent expressed that there was too much information presented at the Woodstock event and it was also too technical.	No	Noted. The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.
BW2_OFF_0179	One respondent expressed that pages 4 and 5 in the community consultation leaflet regarding the need for the project are stated as "facts" rather than the opinions of the developer. They believe that the need for ground mounted solar should be qualified in the context of the wider renewables generation and efficiency, rather than in the context of the local authorities' climate targets.	No	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . Need for Critical National infrastructure such as the Botley West solar farm is supported by Government policy (see for example NPS EN-1 paragraphs 3.2.6 to 3.2.8).
BW2_OFF_0266	One respondent stated that the consultation leaflet was unclear about the expected functional life span of the project and did not state the construction period e.g. missing site visualisations near Long Hanborough.	No	<p>The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p> <p>If a member of the Project team was unable to answer a question put to them the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			consultee was invited to submit their question to the Applicant who would then subsequently respond.
BW2_OFF_0280	One respondent expressed that within question 2 in the feedback form , there is no opportunity to state that they agree with small-scale solar, and that by checking one of the other options (agree/disagree with the need to install solar) it would be misleading.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0281	One respondent claims that the claims of BNG in the consultation materials are misleading and amount to "mitigation tokenism".	No	The Applicant said its target was 70% biodiversity net gain. The Applicant can now confirm at least a 70% can be gained in BNG habitat.
BW2_OFF_0302	One respondent conducted a socio-linguistic analysis of the language used in the consultation materials and found that the language was neither accessible or proportionate. The respondent states that a combination of "polysyllabic vocabulary in clumps, together with unspecified comparatives, and future progressive tenses" make it difficult to extract concrete information."	No	The Applicant notes this comment. Their approach to consultation is described in the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	The respondent is intending to submit their analysis to WODC and has already sent it to PINS to enquire whether it is compatible with their own practices in preparing documentation.		
BW2_OFF_0427	One respondent stated that the online feedback form was difficult to follow.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0474	One respondent stated that the feedback form does not support "freedom of answers" and does not allow sufficient detail for information to be provided.	No	Noted. The Applicant prepared to feedback form comprising a combination of multiple choice and open-text questions to encourage responses. Feedback was available to submit in writing (not using the Applicant's feedback form) by email or Freepost.
BW2_PFF_0103	Respondents stated that information regarding key questions was missing e.g. impact on biodiversity and the effect on swans landing on Yarnton fields.	No	The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.
BW2_PFF_0120	One respondent stated that they were slightly frustrated at the complexity of the information provided at the consultation events.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0122	One respondent stated that the maps presented at the consultation events did not show a significant amount of new housing in Woodstock.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0251	One respondent stated that the consultation leaflet and the exhibition boards were highly selective, missing out important information.	No	The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0259	One respondent stated that the found the display at Bladon incomplete.	No	The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that, at the request of Cumnor Parish Council, (following consultation stage 1) the Red House Farm Solar application has now been included in Figure 19.3, but not in the wider region map, figure 19.1, nor in the appendices map, figure 1.1. This is also the case for the nearby Cumnor Hurst solar farm proposal. This must be corrected immediately in available documents and at the next stage in the ES.	No	Noted. At the time of writing this report the Red House solar proposal had been withdrawn.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0270	One respondent expressed that the consultation failed to meet the standards set out by the Landscape Institute website: 'The ability to represent the landscape or townscape that exists and any proposed changes to it is important for the landscape profession. Visual representations or 'visualisations' are a good means of doing this but they must fairly represent what people would perceive in the field. The sophistication of visualisation technique also needs to be proportionate to factors such as purpose, use, user, sensitivity of the situation and magnitude of potential effect.'	No	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.
BW2_PFF_0289	One respondent expressed that the leaflet was very amateurish.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0201	One respondent stated that the developers have produced a shiny document with certain promises with the full intention of changing the rules later.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Site Selection and Alternatives			
BW2_OFF_0015, BW2_OFF_0038, BW2_OFF_0066, BW2_OFF_0085, BW2_OFF_0090, BW2_OFF_0093, BW2_OFF_0110, BW2_OFF_0112, BW2_OFF_0250, BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_OFF_0353, BW2_OFF_0354, BW2_OFF_0380, BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_OFF_0470, BW2_PFF_0023, BW2_PFF_0110, BW2_PFF_0247, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondents believe that the scale of the site is too large.	Yes	Oxfordshire needs 4GW renewable generation: Botley West Solar Farm will deliver one fifth of this need. The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_PFF_0048, BW2_PFF_0017, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0435	Respondents stated that all the energy produced by this project will feed into the national grid, so it will not benefit Oxfordshire. The same effect could be achieved anywhere in the UK.	Yes	Electricity users in Oxfordshire are supplied with power from the National Grid via the DNO grid, so the solar farm's output will be consumed locally by domestic and business users.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0418, BW2_OFF_0470, BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_PFF_0247	Respondents stated that the development should be decreased in size.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant has a connection agreement with National Grid to export 840MW to the Grid. The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0189, BW2_OFF_0421, BW2_OFF_0508	Respondents expressed that it is a good idea with the right technology, but it is in the wrong place.	Yes	The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0397, BW2_OFF_0421	Respondents believe that this is the wrong area for such a large solar farm.	Yes	The Applicant understands that Oxfordshire needs 4GW renewables generation to meet net zero targets. Botley West is one fifth of that target. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0049	One respondent believes that this site has been selected due to the interests of landowners and not the wider community.	Yes	The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0289	One respondent would like to know what the procs through which the site as chosen and on what criteria, and refers to Chapter 5 of the HM Treasury's Green Book.	Yes	The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0380	One respondent stated that the development would not suite the nature of the area.	Yes	The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0387	One respondent stated that presentation of no alternative to this development is misrepresenting the situation and further evidence of the consultation process being inadequate	Yes	<p>Noted. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p> <p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0376	One respondent questioned why Blenheim Estates, a company that has a "well-established track record of delivering green projects" not put solar panels on the roofs of their new builds?	Yes	Noted. Solar panels on roofs are an important contributor, as recognised in the Government's British Energy Strategy, but will not in their own right provide sufficient energy generation, even if they can be connected to the grid or provide a local 'private wire' connection to a local off-taker. Solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet Government targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0376	One respondent stated that Blenheim Estates are a biased steward of the land and therefore they are concerned they will be responsible for environmental commitments.	Yes	The proposals are also supported by a variety of Management Plans including an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] . The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0400	One respondent stated that, despite the mitigation measures that have been proposed, the scheme is negative to the surrounding area and should not be supported.	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p> <p>In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p>
BW2_OFF_0458	One respondent stated that the second best option (aside from not going ahead) is the site being reduced significantly in size.	Yes	Noted. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_OFF_0468	One respondent commented that Bladon will become a total solar village.	Yes	Noted. The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p> <p>In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape</p>
BW2_OFF_0470	<p>One respondent stated that the site selection is inappropriate because the scheme borders: over 22,000 homes, a UNESCO World Heritage Site, large amounts of grade 1/2 listed churches, 3 ancient woodlands, 4 conservation areas, and multiple PRow including the Oxfordshire Green Belt Way and the Wychwood Way.</p>	Yes	<p>The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0500	One respondent stated that the site selection has not taken into consideration the impact on residential homes in and around Wootton, Shipton Slade, Bladon, Lower Road, Church and Long Hanborough, Cassington and Eynsham.	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p> <p>In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p>
BW2_OFF_0502	One respondent suggested the removal of fields listed previously from the proposal (sic.).	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0523	One respondent stated that the scheme as proposed in Cumnor Parish should be assessed alongside the cumulative impact of other developments in the	Yes	An updated review of relevant cumulative schemes was completed prior to submission of the ES. These schemes are considered in the individual technical chapters, and a summary is presented in

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	area such as Red House Farm and The Hurst in Cumnor.		Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects & Interrelationships [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 20 includes associated Figures at Appendix 20.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5] . These Figures are divided into three parts for ease of reference; West Oxfordshire (Fig. 20.1), Cherwell (Fig 20.2) and Vale and Oxford City (Fig 20.3). The Figure numbers have changed since the PEIR, as there is now an additional Chapter on Air Quality (Chapter 19). Notwithstanding this, Red House Farm has withdrawn its planning application.
BW2_PFF_0026	One respondent that it is ironic that Blenheim, as the main landowner, is protected from the impact of the solar farm and stated that the hypocrisy is irresponsible.	No	The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0110	One respondent stated that all villages need the same boundary that has been provided to Bladon.	Yes	The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Please also see ES Volume 1, Chapter 8, Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0187	One respondent asked why private land on Blenheim Park isn't been used, as this would not sacrifice some of the views in the park.	Yes	The park within the boundary wall is a UNESCO World Heritage Site. The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that the proposed site of the new sub-station is literally on a straight line drawn between the Cowley and Walham (Gloucs) substations. They stated that this suggests a complete lack of imagination on where it should be sited.	Yes	NGERT's preference was to cite the substation close to or adjacent to the 400kV OHL from Cowley to Walham. This is what the Applicant has shown within its Order Limits.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that a project of this size (which they state is the largest in the UK and allegedly the largest ground mounted solar farm outside a desert region anywhere on Earth), in one concentrated area, on green belt land, is wholly unsuitable	Yes	The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that if the developers are proud of its proposal, , as it professes, it should reference the project's size in comparison to other UK and global solar farms on page 1 of any documentation and let readers make their own minds up as to the suitability of its size and position.	Yes	The size of the proposal is clearly presented throughout the DCO submission.
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent expressed that to reach the solar generating capacity this country requires, solar farms would only need to cover 1% of land mass. There is therefore no logical case to place solar farms on protected green belt, which makes up just 12.6% of land in England	Yes	The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	One respondent stated that, in reference to PEIR paragraph 2.4.2, there has been no consideration of the project being adjacent to the Red House Solar Farm plans, and the cumulative effects of this.	YES	<p>An updated review of relevant cumulative schemes was completed prior to submission of the ES. These schemes are considered in the individual technical chapters, and a summary is presented in Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects & Interrelationships [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 20 includes associated Figures at Appendix 20.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5]. These Figures are divided into three parts for ease of reference; West Oxfordshire (Fig. 20.1), Cherwell (Fig 20.2) and Vale and Oxford City (Fig 20.3). The Figure numbers have changed since the PEIR, as there is now an additional Chapter on Air Quality (Chapter 19). Notwithstanding this, Red House Farm has withdrawn its planning application.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	<p>One respondent expressed that there is no analysis on the impact of Red House Farm's application, despite the fact it would be built in the same valley, on adjacent fields and is more progressed in its planning and consultation process than BWSF. . This must be addressed in the ES and in great detail in all future reporting, because the combined approval of both solar farms would result in the wholesale industrialisation of the Southern Site valley Green Belt. If nothing else, there are likely to be benefits to a close working relationship between the two proposals (e.g. sharing access routes), so we would expect to see reference to liaison with Red House Solar in the future (to-date BWS seems to have been fairly dismissive of the other proposal). Should close co-operation not be forthcoming, we would have to conclude that commercial considerations alone are the reason for the lack of co-operation.</p>	Yes	<p>An updated review of relevant cumulative schemes was completed prior to submission of the ES. These schemes are considered in the individual technical chapters, and a summary is presented in Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects & Interrelationships [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 20 includes associated Figures at Appendix 20.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5]. These Figures are divided into three parts for ease of reference; West Oxfordshire (Fig. 20.1), Cherwell (Fig 20.2) and Vale and Oxford City (Fig 20.3). The Figure numbers have changed since the PEIR, as there is now an additional Chapter on Air Quality (Chapter 19). Notwithstanding this, Red House Farm has withdrawn its planning application.</p>
BW2_PFF_0274	<p>One respondent stated that it should be made clear that solar farms of this size</p>	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	have only ever been located in uninhabited desert locations.		
BW2_OFF_0403	One respondent stated that choosing areas with the least environmental impact may make some of the proposals acceptable.	Yes	Noted. The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0074	One respondent would like to know whether the land will be connected to nearby nature reserves.	Yes	Connectivity has been considered in relation to ecology. The effects of the Project on ecology and habitat, are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3] . It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.
BW2_OFF_0280	One respondent expressed that at a consultation event they were informed that power to the grid facilities for the project will be based towards the bottom of a hill (Tumbledown Dick) leading down from Cumnor towards Farmoor Reservoir. They expressed that this		Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	area of land could be impacted by the installation of grid facilities.		
BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0098, BW2_OFF_0106, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0178, BW2_OFF_0204, W2_OFF_0205, BW2_OFF_0213, BW2_OFF_0241, BW2_OFF_0258, BW2_OFF_0280, BW2_OFF_0344, BW2_OFF_0375, BW2_OFF_0387, BW2_OFF_0400, BW2_OFF_0409, BW2_OFF_0460, BW2_OFF_0465, BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_PFF_0019, BW2_PFF_0040, BW2_PFF_0058, BW2_PFF_0087,	Respondents expressed desire for alternative locations, such as rooftops, carparks and brown field sites.	Yes	Noted. Solar panels on roofs are an important contributor, as recognised in the Governments British Energy Strategy, but will not in their own right provide sufficient energy generation, even if they can be connected to the grid or provide a local 'private wire' connection to a local off-taker. The target for solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0139, BW2_PFF_0260			
BW2_OFF_0178, BW2_OFF_0280, BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0294, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_PFF_0065, BW2_PFF_0221	Respondents expressed desire for alternative renewable energy sources, such as offshore/onshore wind, tidal, wave or nuclear power.	Yes	Noted. There are a range of alternative renewable energy source technologies. Solar ground-mounted energy will continue to constitute a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet Government targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0252, BW2_OFF_0280	Respondents believes that the UK has too much cloud cover, hence it is not sensible to build solar farm here.	Yes	Noted. Solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet Government targets towards a green energy transition. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0001	One respondent expressed that the project could and should be undertaken by Blenheim estates and does not require the addition of solar panels to precipitate this.	No	Noted. Blenheim Estates is one of the key landowners involved in the project.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0015	One respondent expressed that the notion that rooftop solar could be rolled out quickly on a large scale as absurd and would like to know if WODC are currently refusing planning permission for road-facing solar panels in conservation areas.		Noted
BW2_OFF_0107	One respondent believes that future solar farms should be on water reservoirs, where they would not use agricultural land	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0117	One respondent cannot support the project until an urgent need has been determined after all other means of obtaining solar energy has been developed.	Yes	Noted. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0213	One respondent would rather see the development of a community solar farm.	Yes	Noted, however this will not provide renewable energy generation at a sufficient scale. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Notwithstanding this, the Applicant intends to provide optional community benefits.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0250	One respondent would like to see the proposals scaled to the size of the solar farm that is in Yarnton.	No	Noted. The investment in the high voltage grid by NGET will enable more small renewables projects to connect in West Oxfordshire.
BW2_OFF_0258	One respondent asked why the housing development on Blenheim estate does not allow newbuilds to have rooftop solar panels.	Yes	Noted. Solar panels on roofs are an important contributor, as recognised in the Governments British Energy Strategy, but will not in their own right provide sufficient energy generation, even if they can be connected to the grid or provide a local 'private wire' connection to a local off-taker. The target for solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet Government targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0280	One respondent believes that the solar farm should be built on the Blenheim Estate instead.	Yes	The majority of the land for Botley West Solar Farm belongs to Blenheim Estate.
BW2_OFF_0344	One respondent stated that the government should introduce legislation that instructs all new building housing to have rooftop solar panels.	Yes	Noted. Solar panels on roofs are an important contributor, as recognised in the Governments British Energy Strategy, but will not in their own right provide sufficient energy generation, even if they can be

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			connected to the grid or provide a local 'private wire' connection to a local off-taker. The target for solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet Government targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0391	One respondent stated that the site would be better placed elsewhere, instead of an expanding town that would not benefit from the energy produced.	Yes	Noted. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0463	One respondent stated that there are better ways of generating green power with community engagement and support.	Yes	Noted. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0139	One respondent stated that they would prefer that the government paid for panels to go on houses and public buildings rather than on agricultural land.	Yes	Noted. Solar panels on roofs are an important contributor, as recognised in the Governments British Energy Strategy, but will not in their own right provide sufficient energy generation, even if they can be connected to the grid or provide a local 'private wire' connection to a local off-taker. The target for solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			renewable development mix in order to meet targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
Community Impact			
BW2_OFF_0020, BW2_OFF_0497, BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_OFF_0523, BW2_OFF_0547	Respondents believes that the statements regarding community funding and community benefits are vague.	Yes	<p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.
BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0372	Respondents believe that the £50,000pa in local community grants needs to be increased in order for it to be considered sufficient mitigation.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.
BW2_OFF_0260, BW2_OFF_0271	Respondents expressed that people bought houses in a green belt for a reason and that reason was not the development of a solar farm.	Yes	Noted. The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1]. At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt. The development pressures in the region are also a driver for renewable energy generation to meet existing and future needs. Solar panels on roofs are an important contributor, as recognised in the Governments British Energy Strategy, but will not in their own right provide sufficient energy generation, even if they can be connected to the grid or provide a local 'private wire' connection to a local off-taker. The target for solar ground-mounted energy

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0391, BW2_PFF_0226	Respondents are sceptical about the amount of reduced electricity costs to local residents.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0046	One respondent believes that residents and businesses will be affected by falling house prices.	No	An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it was agreed any impact would not be significant.
BW2_OFF_0097	One respondent would like to see the offer of community benefits implemented.	YES	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_OFF_0158	<p>One respondent is disappointed that there are no plans to improve public transport in the site area, besides the expansion of Park & Ride.</p>	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0174	<p>One respondent expressed that positive impacts on employment could be overstated, and the long-term economic effects on the local community are not adequately considered.</p>	No	<p>Noted. The Socio-economic impacts of the proposed development are considered at EIA Chapter 15 [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0218	One respondent would like to see the offer of energy bill discounts for households living in the vicinity of the site.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.
BW2_OFF_0223	One respondent expressed that offers of allotments and community orchards is unnecessary as these already exist	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0271	One respondent asked what is the plan for CCTV that is in the proximity to Bladon's recreation area, used by the local primary school and also as a holiday camp provision.	No	Precise details of type, number and location will be agreed with the local planning authorities
BW2_OFF_0289	One respondent would like to know why the updated proposal do not provide an estimate of the total value of depreciation of the over 10,000 houses affected by the development.	No	An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it was agreed any impact would not be significant.
BW2_OFF_0312	One respondent stated that they cannot see the project having any benefits to themselves as a resident of Eynsham.	Yes	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1]. The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO. Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum. Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years).</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_OFF_0321	One respondent stated that residents of Oxfordshire are already struggling to work and live, and this project will only add to these issues.	Yes	<p>In relation to Cumulative Effects, an updated review of relevant cumulative schemes was completed prior to submission of the ES. These schemes are considered in the individual technical chapters, and a summary is presented in Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects & Interrelationships [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Chapter 20 includes associated Figures at Appendix 20.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5] . These Figures are divided into three parts for ease of reference; West Oxfordshire (Fig. 20.1), Cherwell (Fig 20.2) and Vale and Oxford City (Fig 20.3). The Figure numbers have changed since the PEIR, as there is now an additional Chapter on Air Quality (Chapter 19).
BW2_OFF_0370	One respondent stated that Blenheim Estate is a WHS and may lose its status which is important for local employment and the local economy.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0372	One respondent stated that the community benefit cash fund should be at least £1m per year, index linked.	No	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_OFF_0372	<p>One respondent stated that the community benefit fund should go towards areas such as: recompensing for the impacts in the area, a significant contribution to local low carbon projects (e.g. CAPZero), discounted electricity and pave, local nature recovery projects, and active travel (B4044</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	community path and Lower Road cycle connections).		<p>Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1]. The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO. Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum. Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities. Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_OFF_0478	<p>One respondent stated that the project will offer no benefits to the local community and will impact negatively on resident's quality of life.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application,</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>£7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_OFF_0508	One respondent stated that, if the proposals are approved, the money for the community benefit fund should be handed over to the communities before construction starts, to ensure that the	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>communities will be paid in the event that PVDP goes into liquidation.</p>		<p>Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1]. The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO. Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum. Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>£200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities. Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_PFF_0048	One respondent stated that the project will impact the value of properties near to the site.	No	An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			was agreed any impact would not be significant.
W2_PFF_0054	One respondent expressed that solar farms of this scale are usually harmful to the mental health of the local community.	Yes	Concerns about mental health impacts of the Project are acknowledged. Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. This includes assessment of risk perception of the Project, and associated mental health impacts. It concluded that appropriate mitigation is provided to avoid the potential for a significant population health effect.
BW2_PFF_0130	One respondent stated that much will depend on the involvement of local people in different aspects and possibilities.	No	No response required
BW2_PFF_0185	One respondent stated that no reports were presented that assessed the loss of value of properties in nearby areas.	No	An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it was agreed any impact would not be significant.
BW2_PFF_0217	One respondent stated that it is not fair that one area and group of communities are impacted so disproportionately.	Yes	Noted. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0190	One respondent stated that there needs to be more research into whether local initiatives, new building policy, etc. would be more impacted at the net level.	No	Noted. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0226	One respondent stated that they expect electricity prices to rise rather than become cheaper if this project goes ahead.	No	No response required
BW2_PFF_0236	One respondent stated that the information presented in the PEIR glossed over the health and mental health impact to having such a vast solar panel installation on our doorstep	Yes	Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. This includes assessment of a wide range of determinants that have the potential to impact human health. The assessment has been informed by engagement with local public health stakeholders, and takes local context into account. Wider determinants assessed includes risk perception of the Project, and associated mental health impacts. Appropriate mitigation and enhancement is provided to avoid the potential for long-term significant adverse population health effects.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0236	One respondent stated that the restricted access to the countryside and their view of nature will not be benefited by the project.	Yes	<p>Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. This includes detailed assessment of impacts on access to open green space, and the impact of visual change on community identity and the uptake of physical activity. The effects of the Project upon the desire for users to use the network of paths and bridleways, and their overall recreational experience, is assessed in Chapter 16 Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>Details of typical footpaths and cycle paths, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]</p> <p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are set out in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]. and a Public Rights of Way Management Strategy forms part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0236	One respondent stated that this project has already caused suffering and anxiety.	Yes	Concerns about mental health impacts of the Project are acknowledged. Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. This includes assessment of risk perception of the Project, and associated mental health impacts. It concluded that appropriate mitigation is provided to avoid the potential for a significant population health effect.
BW2_PFF_0236	One respondent points to the sentence in 16.8.5.2 that states that individuals matter and argues that this is not true.	Yes	Noted. While the human health assessment (Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]) has regard for individual vulnerabilities and impacts, it takes a population level approach (as is best practice) to its conclusions.
BW2_PFF_0254	One respondent stated that the claim that the area is of above average for mental and physical health, and therefore robust enough to be unaffected by the solar development is an unfounded assumption.	Yes	The human health baseline results indicate that due to mental and physical health indicators performing largely better in the study area than nationally, the general population is considered less sensitive to change. However, the health assessment uses the vulnerable population (i.e. those with specific vulnerabilities that make them more sensitive to change) for the actual

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>assessment of health impacts. Therefore a higher sensitivity is taken into account for a conservative/ worst case scenario. Furthermore, additional work on vulnerable groups has been undertaken since PEIR. Please see Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
BW2_OFF_0083	<p>One respondent would like to see more funding being available to benefit the local community affected by the project.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities. Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
.	<p>One respondent recommends using the Hedonic pricing approach (information can be found in the HM Treasury's Green Book, Chapter 6, Para 6.18), which sees the relationship between house prices and levels of environmental amenity, which are analysed in order to assign monetary value to the environmental benefit.</p>	YES	<p>An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it was agreed any impact would not be significant.</p>
Socio-economic and Tourism			
BW2_OFF_0528	<p>One respondent stated that tourism, which is a major industry in Oxfordshire, will be impacted by the development.</p>	YES	<p>Tourism impacts have been evaluated in the EIA Chapter 15 [EN010147/APP/6.3 Section 15.9.5]</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0255	One respondent stated that the proposals will compromise the context and values of the project site by not assessing the rural character of the project site that is part of the gateway, tourist route and strategic for visitors approaching internationally significant destinations of the historic City of Oxford, Blenheim Palace WHS, the historic town of Woodstock, and the Cotswolds AONB.	YES	Tourism impacts have been evaluated in the EIA Chapter 15 [EN010147/APP/6.3 Section 15.9.5]
Climate Change			
BW2_OFF_0009, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0219, BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0294, BW2_PFF_0289	Respondents are concerned about the carbon footprint of the project, especially in terms of its construction and maintenance	YES	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3], including an assessment of whole life effects. An Outline GHG reduction strategy has been prepared for the application and considers how the project could reduce GHG emissions as the design evolves.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0056, BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0219, BW2_OFF_0435	Respondents are concerned about the carbon footprint of the project in terms of materials used and its life cycle carbon creation, and how many years of use are required to offset the carbon created during manufacturing and installation.	Yes	An assessment of greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects, alongside commentary on carbon payback period (years of operation required for the project to become carbon neutral).
BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0470	Respondents stated that building a solar farm is not going to achieve climate goals and make the world a better place. Instead, it will harm the local ecology, wildlife, and natural all of which are crucial.	Yes	The Government recognises the importance of renewable energy generation to meet existing and future needs. Solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The effects of the Project on ecology and habitat are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0465, BW2_OFF_0508</p>	<p>Respondents stated that the project is an unreliable form of renewable energy that for around half of the year would not produce enough energy, it would just be an eyesore.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Government recognises the importance of renewable energy generation to meet existing and future needs. Solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0358	One respondent stated that there are no commitments to using clean energy for production.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0370	One respondent expressed that the carbon debt will never be repaid.	Yes	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects, alongside commentary on carbon payback period (years of operation required for the project to become carbon neutral).
BW2_OFF_0458	One respondent stated that the best environmental outcome would be to not build the solar farm.	No	The DCO submission is made in the context of significant national and local planning policy support for renewable energy development towards a green energy transition. The planning policy context is detailed further in the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1]
BW2_PFF_0042	One respondent stated that the net carbon emissions savings are not clear, with the 1.8 million tonnes CO2 upfront	Yes	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1,

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	cost being mitigated by a very wide range of the rest of the project life.		Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects, alongside commentary on carbon payback period (years of operation required for the project to become carbon neutral).
BW2_PFF_0112	One respondent would like to know more about the end-to-end carbon calculations and whether this includes recycling the panels during the decommissioning stage.	Yes	Decommissioning effects have been assessed within Volume 1, chapter 14: Climate Change [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Additionally, the scoping report confirmed that The Inspectorate would expect to see a Decommissioning Plan, agreed with the Local Authority, secured through the inclusion of an Outline Decommissioning Plan or similar with the Application. This has been submitted in support of the ES [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .
BW2_PFF_0138	One respondent stated that the need to address climate change and use clean, non-carbon energy must not be exploited for profit and financial greed.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0151	One respondent asked whether this project will reduce emissions.	Yes	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1,

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects, alongside commentary on carbon payback period (years of operation required for the project to become carbon neutral).
BW2_PFF_0170	One respondent stated that they fully support renewables where they do not negatively impact the local area.	Yes	The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent expressed that the stated 10 year period to achieve carbon payback seems very long and has seen elsewhere that it usually takes 2-6 years.	Yes	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects, alongside commentary on carbon payback period (years of operation required for the project to become carbon neutral). For the purpose of this assessment, the Applicant has assumed a maximum design scenario which assumes the highest emissions possible for the project and as such a potentially larger payback period than that which the respondent is referring to.
BW2_PFF_0272	One respondent would like to see a full calculation and comparison with other large installations on carbon payback.	Yes	The assessment of carbon emissions associated with the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects, alongside commentary on carbon payback period (years of operation required for the project to become carbon neutral). This has sought

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			to calculate the GHG emissions from the project and contextualise those emissions with National budgets and policy in accordance with the IEMA GHG in EIA Guidance.
BW2_PFF_0054	One respondent expressed that large-scale solar farms are usually polluting.	Yes	The assessment of carbon emissions associated with the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects, alongside commentary on carbon payback period (years of operation required for the project to become carbon neutral). This has sought to calculate the GHG emissions from the project and contextualise those emissions with National budgets and policy in accordance with the IEMA GHG in EIA Guidance.
DCO Process			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0280, BW2_PFF_0221	Respondents stated that the NSIP and DCO process bypasses the normal democratic voting system of local government, as it allows developers to go directly to the Secretary of State.	Yes	The Project falls to be considered under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) regime, in line with the 2008 Planning Act. The NSIP process takes account of local views, and the position of local authorities, in the decision-making process.
BW2_OFF_0370	One respondent stated that local democracy has been deliberately avoided due to the scale of the project and that it is fundamentally undemocratic.	Yes	<p>The Project falls to be considered under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) regime, in line with the 2008 Planning Act. The NSIP process takes account of local views, and the position of local authorities, in the decision-making process.</p> <p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1]. To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p> <p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0370	One respondent stated that the DCO process does nothing to stop the developers from selling the project on to another company as often happens in this situation.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0258	One respondent enquired who the experts will be that will help the government interrogate the application.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0274	One respondent expressed that they are worried that the environmental statement won't be available for relevant bodies/individuals or the public to view and comment on prior to the DCO application	Yes	The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .

Table 4: Question 7 – Do you have any specific comments on our cable routes for the project?

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Cable Route Location Options			
BW2_OFF_0001, BW2_OFF_0009, BW2_OFF_0082, BW2_OFF_0092, BW2_OFF_0098	Respondents expressed that they do not want any cable routes as they do not want the project to go ahead.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_OFF_0002	A respondent expressed preference for whichever option allows the solar farm to be up and running the fastest.	No	The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable.
BW2_OFF_0060	A respondent has expressed they do not know where the routes are.	No	An indicative cable route was shown in consultation material. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0104	A respondent has expressed that existing structures should be used as much as possible	No	The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable.
BW2_OFF_0157	A respondent has expressed that National Grid should put cabling underground in areas such as Thames Valley, which already has pylons and cables.	No	All of the electrical cables for the project will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology, and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge. The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of being suspended underneath the farm bridge.
BW2_OFF_0229, BW2_PFF_0242	Respondents have expressed that they do not want the cable route to run through Swinford Lock area.	Yes	The route of the cable is designed to avoid the areas of Eynsham Bridge and Lock and instead passes to the east and south of Swinford. A number of cable route options have been considered for this location all involving Horizontal Directional Drilling under the River Thames. Details of this is provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0298	A respondent has expressed that it was not clear to them whether the cables will be above or below ground.	Yes	<p>All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge. The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspending underneath the farm bridge.</p> <p>Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>
BW2_OFF_0306	A respondent has expressed that cabling over the Thames is preferable.	No	The cable will be laid under the River Thames utilising Horizontal Directional Drilling. This is to ensure environmental effects are minimised.
BW2_OFF_0352	A respondent has expressed that the route down Botley Road should be avoided; this road should be left alone for at least 5 years.	Yes	The Project will not run any cable down the Botley Road.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	A respondent has expressed that should permission be required to dig along the eastern verge of Cumnor Road, we would most likely oppose this.	No	The cable route would pass along Cumnor Road. The exact positioning would be based on environmental and technical assessments
BW2_OFF_0362	A respondent has expressed that the cable route should not cross the river at the toll bridge.	Yes	The cable route does not cross the toll bridge.
BW2_OFF_0389	A respondent has expressed that a project this large should be situated further away from human habitation not least because of the risks of having such large voltages being generated and carried around the areas in question.	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this comment.</p> <p>The Project will play an important part in the UK's Net Zero commitment for energy generation. The location of the project is selected in part on its proximity to connect into the National Grid transmission lines. Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The Project will result in improved wider societal infrastructure and resources associated with renewable energy generation and energy security</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>during operation. The Project would have continuous public health benefits to energy security. Consideration of Electromagnetic Fields has been made in Chapter 16 Human Health' [EN010147/APP.6.3] and in in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0404, BW2_OFF_0465, BW2_PFF_0072</p>	<p>Respondents have expressed putting the cables underground.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology, and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge. The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspension underneath the farm bridge.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0415</p>	<p>A respondent has expressed that the cable routes are in the wrong location and will cause too much damage.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0466	A respondent has expressed their concern about the safety of the cable routes, especially along the B4044 which runs close to housing.	No	The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable.
BW2_PFF_0110	A respondent has expressed that they are not in support of routes directly through the village.	No	The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable.
BW2_PFF_0219	A respondent has expressed that the cable route as shown on the Central site map seems the most satisfactory.	No	Comment acknowledged.
BW2_PFF_0232	A respondent has expressed that the cable routes should be anywhere but Wootton-by-Woodstock.	Yes	The cable route would not pass through Wootton. The project area is located to the east of Wotton, largely in the area east of the B4027.
BW2_PFF_0256	A respondent has expressed support for the use of Horizontal Directional Drilling to safeguard the meadow.	No	Comment acknowledged.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0302	A respondent has expressed the most disgraceful factor is that the cables lead to huge industrial scale power station next to Farmoor Reservoir in greenbelt land.	Yes	The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8. [EN010147/APP/7.1.]
BW2_OFF_0194	A respondent has requested that there is no overground cable around Swinford.	Yes	All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge. The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspension underneath the farm bridge.
BW2_PFF_0290	A respondent has expressed that they do not support the cable route near Eynsham.	Yes	The cable route will pass along the B4449 on the east side of Eynsham. Route option are considered for the route then either passing along Cassington Road east of Eynsham or continuing southwards along the B4449 and then east on Wharf Road

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			around the north of the Siemens factory. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0269	A respondent has expressed that a far more efficient route to Swinford would be across the fields/ along Denman's Lane to the B4044 Eynsham Road and then west along the length of that road.	No	The cable route will pass southwards along the B4044 before passing down Cumnor Road (B4017). The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable.
BW2_PFF_0283	A respondent has expressed that the proposed cable route east of the Swinford Toll Bridge should be underneath the river and as far as possible to the east of the Bridge.	Yes	The cable will be laid under the River Thames to the east of Swinford Toll Bridge utilising Horizontal Directional Drilling. This is to ensure environmental effects are minimised.
BW2_OFF_0269, BW2_OFF_0497, BW2_OFF_0503	Respondents have expressed that they do not support access through Long Mead.	Yes	Construction HGVs would not pass by Long Mead or over the Swinford Bridge. Construction staff utilising private vehicles may, however, use this route.
BW2_OFF_0022	Respondent expressed that the cables shouldn't be built and the alternative cable routes are of no consequence.	No	Comment acknowledged. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0049, BW2_OFF_0050, BW2_OFF_0403, BW2_OFF_0472	Respondents have expressed that the proposed easterly cable route is a more suitable option as it keeps the route away from housing estates.	Yes	The preferred route to the east of Woodstock does now track to the east, along Shipton Road, rather than to the west - closer to Park View housing. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0127	A respondent expressed that the cables should be underground.	Yes	All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology, and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge. The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspension underneath the farm bridge.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0261	A respondent has expressed that the cabling route should not go through the ancient flood plain meadow.	Yes	Cables will be passed via trenchless techniques (e.g. Horizontal Directional Drilling) which limits disruption at the above ground. The impact of the cable route on flood risk and water quality including any required mitigation is set out in Volume 1:, Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk.
BW2_OFF_0182, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_OFF_0343	Respondents have expressed their concern about having cables across the wildflower meadow west of Swinford Bridge.	Yes	The cable route avoids the area west of Swinford Bridge. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0190	A respondent has expressed that the cables should not go under managed fields.	Yes	Cable routes once installed would not interfere with the arable operation of managed field where no other development is proposed by the Project.
BW2_OFF_0334	A respondent has expressed that the cabling for the project should be placed at further distance from inhabited areas of east Woodstock rather than the closer option.	Yes	The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0389	A respondent has expressed that alternatives to running cabling through and around both Eynsham and Farmoor should be found.	Yes	The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0550	A respondent has expressed their support as long as the cable route is far away enough from residential plots and does not cause any problems during installation.	No	Comment acknowledged. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0006	A respondent has expressed that it would be preferable to move route away from main routes and populated areas to the east of Woodstock.	Yes	The preferred route to the east of Woodstock does now track to the east, along Shipton Road, rather than to the west - closer to Park View housing. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0009	A respondent has expressed that solar panels should be placed on vast distribution warehouses where infrastructure already exists.	Yes	<p>The Applicant recognises respondents' requests for solar to be sited on alternative locations. The Applicant agrees that solar should also be sited on these sites.</p> <p>The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The need case for the project and the overall planning balance of benefits and harm are set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p>
BW2_PFF_0042	A respondent has expressed that the cable routes should follow roads and not across fields.	No	<p>The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0048	A respondent has expressed avoid Woodstock.	Yes	Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0101	A respondent has requested the cable route avoids Long Mead entirely.	Yes	Construction HGVs would not pass by Long Mead or over the Swinford Bridge. Construction staff utilising private vehicles may however use this route.
BW2_PFF_0251	A respondent has expressed that the Applicant should not be building a split site that requires such cabling.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0294	Respondents have expressed that high power cables should be installed at least one mile away from residential property to minimise electro magnetic radiation and other unknown effects.	Yes	Consideration of Electromagnetic Fields has been made in Chapter 16 Human Health' [EN010147/APP.6.3]
BW2_PFF_0112	A respondent expressed that building over the Thames should not be an option, and the routes should depend on local residents' views.	Yes	The cable route would not pass over the River Thames and instead be Horizontally Directional Drilling underneath. Details of where Horizontal Directional Drilling is to be used is provided in Appendix 6.2 of

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the ES 'Cable Laying Methodology and Indicative Horizontal Directional Drilling Crossing Locations' [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0139	A respondent has expressed that they were horrified to see the size of the tunnel to go through/ under the Thames.	Yes	The Cable would be horizontally drilled under the River Thames so as to avoid impact to this sensitive watercourse. Details of this drilling method is provided in Appendix 6.2 of the ES 'Cable Laying Methodology and Indicative Horizontal Directional Drilling Crossing Locations' [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0154, BW2_PFF_0228, BW2_PFF_0273	Respondents have expressed concern that the cable routes run along residential areas, which could be a risk to people's health.	Yes	Consideration of Electromagnetic Fields has been made in Chapter 16 'Human Health' [EN010147/APP.6.3]
BW2_PFF_0155	A respondent has expressed that drilling under the Thames sounds highly dubious.	Yes	The Cable would be horizontally drilled under the River Thames so as to avoid impact to this sensitive watercourse. Details of this drilling method is provided in Appendix 6.2 of the ES 'Cable Laying Methodology and Indicative Horizontal Directional

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Drilling Crossing Locations' [EN010147/APP/6.5].
BW2_PFF_0178	A respondent has expressed that the route options between Eynsham and Farmoor must not disturb the fields between Thames and Botley Road.	No	It is unclear what area the respondent is referring to. Botley Road is to the east of the Project and is unaffected by the cable route options.
BW2_PFF_0269	A respondent has expressed that commercial considerations should have no place in this decision and the proposed cable route must therefore be re-routed to the north of Swinford Bridge.	Yes	The route of the cable is designed to avoid the areas of Swinford Bridge and instead passes to the east and south of Swinford.
Cable Route General Comments			
BW2_OFF_0011	A respondent has expressed support provided the cables are underground or use existing infrastructure.	Yes	All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology, and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge. The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspension underneath the farm bridge.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0014	A respondent has expressed that the cable route and project as a whole is inappropriate.	No	Comment acknowledged.
BW2_OFF_0039	A respondent has expressed proposed routes are outside their immediate neighbourhood, so they are unlikely to be the most appropriate source of opinion.	No	Comment acknowledged.
BW2_OFF_0074	A respondent has expressed that they had no concerns about the cable routes.	No	Comment acknowledged.
BW2_OFF_0310	A respondent has expressed their concern around the legality of carrying high voltage through built up areas.	Yes	All cable construction and operation will be conducted in full compliance with legal requirements. Consideration of Electromagnetic Fields has been made in Chapter 16 Human Health' [EN010147/APP.6.3] . Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0355	A respondent has expressed that the cable routes should be the most direct, environmentally friendly, and economical routes possible, if ultimately necessary.	Yes	The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0427	A respondent has expressed concern that a lot of cabling is required to join the three separate sites and connect to the grid.	Yes	The cable route from the first 33/275kV transformer in the Northern Site Area to the main transformer in the Southern Site Area is approximately 24.6km in length. Further details are provided in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0427	A respondent has stated that there is going to be miles of cabling regardless of the chosen cable route option, which is unlikely to be removed in forty years.	Yes	The cable route from the first 33/275kV transformer in the Northern Site Area to the main transformer in the Southern Site Area is approximately 24.6km in length. All infrastructure including underground cables will be removed from the site. The only exception to this maybe in the Highways. Further

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			details are provided in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0453	A respondent has expressed that the electromagnetic effects of these cable have not been taken into account.	Yes	Consideration of Electromagnetic Fields has been made in Chapter 16 Human Health' [EN010147/APP.6.3]
BW2_OFF_0516	A respondent has expressed that separating the three areas with independent links to the National Grid would be preferable.	No	The Project will connect to a new National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) 400kV substation, to be located close to the existing National Grid 400kV line that runs between Cowley in Oxford, westwards to Walham, in Gloucestershire. The NGET substation is located in the Southern site area. The Northern and Central site areas therefore necessitate connection to this.
BW2_PFF_0163	A respondent has expressed that it is ridiculous to join up different pockets of land.	Yes	It is necessary for the Northern, Central and Southern site area to be connected to allow connection to the NGET substation.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0547	A respondent has expressed that it is not clear what has been considered with regard to the siting of the Power Converter stations.	Yes	Power Converter Stations (PCS) contain current inverters, transformer and supporting equipment). The Project necessitates the use of 156 PCS units and their locations are shown on the Masterplan drawings provided in the Environmental Statement [EN01047/APP/6.4] . A description of the PCS is provided in Chapter 6 of the ES [EN01047/APP/6.3] . The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable.
BW2_PFF_0006	A respondent has expressed that they are more concerned about the actual impact from cabling than the panels and substations themselves.	Yes	Assessment of the impact and effect from cable laying is made in the Environmental Statement. With mitigation, the effects of these works are considered acceptable. Effects are temporary occurring only during construction. All cable construction and operation will be conducted in full compliance

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			with legal requirements. The burial depth of DC cables is between approximately 0.4 and 0.8m within the PV installation areas. Depths of AC cables are between 0.7m and 1.2m. Details are given in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement [EN01047/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0067	A respondent has expressed that all cable routes must be invisible.	Yes	All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge. The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspension underneath the farm bridge.
BW2_PFF_0107	A respondent has expressed that it needs to be ensured the cables are buried deep enough.	Yes	All cable construction and operation will be conducted in full compliance with legal requirements. The burial depth of DC cables is between approximately 0.4 and 0.8m within the PV installation areas. Depths of

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			AC cables are between 0.7m and 1.2m. Details are given in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement [EN01047/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0123	A respondent has expressed that they live next to a field designated as a potential cable route, and they are very concerned that if the cables were above ground, adjacent to battery stations or transformers.	Yes	All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge.
BW2_PFF_0128	A respondent has expressed that underground cabling under the river is expensive but worth it.	Yes	All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspension underneath the farm bridge.
BW2_PFF_0129	A respondent has expressed that they are happy with the cable route	No	Comment acknowledged.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	proposals to install cables under the meadows without disturbing the land.		
BW2_PFF_0130	A respondent commented on whether the cable routes should involve pylons or be underground. The respondent notes that pylons would create a more ugly intrusion into the landscape than the panels themselves and would be vulnerable to storms (which they comment should be expected, due to climate change).	Yes	All of the electrical cables will be laid underground. The Project does not require pylons but does require a new National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) transformer station to connect to. The area of the NGET, to be constructed by National Grid, is located in the Southern Site close to the existing overhead 400kV transmission lines.
BW2_PFF_0139	A respondent has expressed that walks through the fields, where the cable routes would be, will no longer be calming with all the panels, high fencing, and buzzing generators.	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p> <p>In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p>
BW2_PFF_0171	A respondent has expressed that the cable route needs more research.	No	Comment acknowledged.
BW2_PFF_0171	A respondent has expressed the less intrusive and more direct the better.	Yes	<p>All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge. The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspension underneath the farm bridge.</p>
BW2_PFF_0182	A respondent has expressed that the cabling options around Eynsham have no substance nor details.	Yes	The Cable route around Eynsham is optioned by routing to the East along the Cassington Road. The cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0228	A respondent has asked if the developers have done proper research on how to plan for the farm?	Yes	The Applicant has undertaken a thorough Environmental Impact Assessment and pre-application consultation process to inform the proposals for the Project. The results of this process are presented in the Applicant's DCO application. The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_PFF_0251	A respondent has expressed that it is ridiculous that most of the energy will be generated miles from the substation and need to cross two major roads and a major river.	Yes	Comment acknowledged. The cable needs to cross the River Thames and major roads so as to connect to the new National Grid Electricity Transmission substation located in

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the Southern Site and located beside NGET's own existing 400kV transmission lines. Disruption of construction activities will be minimised as far as reasonably possible.</p> <p>Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>
BW2_PFF_0256	<p>A respondent has asked how far away can the Horizontal Directional Drilling equipment be from the other side of the river?</p>	Yes	<p>Horizontal Directional Drilling will be used to drill and lay cabling under the River Thames. The location of the Horizontal Directional Drilling compounds is shown in the Horizontal Directional Drilling report provided as Appendix 6.2 [EN010147/APP/6.5] of the Environmental Statement. Horizontal Directional Drilling compounds are located within open arable fields and set back from the bank of the river by approximately 75m. There will be no work activity on the riverbank.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0258	A respondent has asked does the wording, 'intended', when referring to Horizontal Directional Drilling, mean there are options to use more disruptive means of crossing the river, e.g. digging into valuable meadow / wildflower areas?	Yes	Horizontal Directional Drilling is commonly used to avoid open excavation works in and around sensitive areas. Considerable effort has been made to avoid such impacts and Horizontal Directional Drilling will be used to drill and lay cables under meadow land and under the River Thames. The location of the Horizontal Directional Drilling compounds is shown in the Horizontal Directional Drilling report provided as Appendix 6.2 [EN010147/APP/6.5] of the Environmental Statement.
BW2_PFF_0257	A respondent has expressed that they do not support other disruptive forms of digging apart from Horizontal Directional Drilling.	Yes	Horizontal Directional Drilling is to be used to avoid open excavation within and near to sensitive environmental receptors and under main roads and other infrastructure. Open trenching will be used for other sections of the cable route. Details of trenching is provided in Chapter 11 (Ground Conditions) of the ES [EN01047/APP/6.3] . The effects of open trenching are temporary

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			occurring only during the period of construction works.
BW2_PFF_0299	A respondent has expressed that Horizontal Directional Drilling is time consuming, challenging, and very expensive method.	Yes	Horizontal Directional Drilling/pipe ramming is to be used to pass under sensitive receptors including the River Thames, other watercourses and ecological areas. Horizontal Directional Drilling is commonly used to avoid open excavation works in and around sensitive areas. Considerable effort has been made to avoid such impacts and Horizontal Directional Drilling will be used to drill and lay cables under meadow land and under the River Thames. The location of the Horizontal Directional Drilling compounds is shown in the Horizontal Directional Drilling report provided as Appendix 6.2 [EN010147/APP/6.5] of the Environmental Statement.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0300	A respondent has expressed that they are worried that the Horizontal Directional Drilling could have an impact on the Thames water as one cable route is alongside Farmoor, especially as there has already been over a year's disruption due to damage to a main water pipe in the Thames which hasn't been replaced yet.	Yes	Comment acknowledged. Care will be taken to ensure the construction of the Project will not interfere with Thames Water supply.
BW2_PFF_0012	A respondent asked how will Horizontal Directional Drilling be done across some of the meadows adjacent to the Thames?	Yes	Horizontal Directional Drilling is commonly used to avoid open excavation works in and around sensitive areas. Detail of the Horizontal Directional Drilling method is provided in Appendix 6.2 [EN010147/APP/6.5] of the Environmental Statement.
BW2_PFF_0274	A respondent has expressed that the PEIR is not reassuring.	Yes	The design of the Project has been modified since the PEIR to ensure that the Horizontal Directional Drilling process under the River Thames avoids the Swinford Crossing and Long Mead sites as well as passing underneath all of the flood meadows alongside the river. It now launches from existing arable

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			land and rises in existing arable. Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_PFF_0294	A respondent has expressed that the upheaval caused by the installation will be disruptive for their therapy clients to get to their house where they practice.	Yes	Comment acknowledged. Disruption to traffic and pedestrians will be minimised so far as reasonably possible. Mitigation measure are set out within the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan which forms an inclusion of the wider outline Code of Construction Practice [EN01047/APP/7.6.1] .
BW2_PFF_0299	A respondent has expressed that they do not like the idea of large cable crossing at the Thames.	Yes	Horizontal Directional Drilling will be used to drill and lay cabling under the River Thames. The location of the Horizontal Directional Drilling compounds is shown in the Horizontal Directional Drilling report provided as Appendix 6.2 [EN010147/APP/6.5] of the Environmental Statement. The location of the Horizontal Directional Drilling compounds are located within open arable field land and set

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			back from the bank of the river by approximately 75m. There will be no work activity on the river bank.
BW2_OFF_0121	A respondent has asked how much power would be lost in the transmission from the sites to the new sub station and then around the grid?	Yes	Average annual energy loss under different loads for the 275 kV cables connecting the three sites with the main substation is 1.5 %.
BW2_OFF_0127	A respondent has asked if a calculation has been done of how much power is lost by transporting such a long way to Botley West to upload to the National Grid?	Yes	Average annual energy loss under different loads for the 275 kV cables connecting the three sites with the main substation is 1.5 %.
BW2_OFF_0183	A respondent has asked what are the exact cabling options for the part of the route not yet finalised in the plans?	Yes	<p>A number of cable corridor options are been considered. Details of these are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated Figures 5.1 to 5.5 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0330	Respondents have asked what will happen to the 'farm' when it is removed in 40 years?	Yes	All above ground development (solar panel, PCS, and primary/secondary substations) will be removed during decommissioning. To avoid unnecessary disruption, and/or for possible future use by the local network operator, it is intended to leave all 33kV and 275 kV cables where they have been laid in the public highway and where cables have been laid using Horizontal Directional Drilling – either under rivers, road, rail crossings, or existing landscape features. The NGET will remain in place with operation and maintenance continued by National Grid. The Project commits to minimising waste through design and the efficient use of resources and to implement a waste and resources management plan that would follow the waste hierarchy principle in the management of wastes. An Outline Site Resources and Waste Management Plan, forming an annex

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			to the Outline Code of Construction Practice, is submitted with the DCO [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .
BW2_OFF_0347	A respondent has asked if a phone mast to increase signal in this region would be more warmly received?	n/a	The comment is not understood.
BW2_PFF_0073	A respondent asked how the cables were going to be buried in the ground and how deep.	Yes	All cable construction and operation will be conducted in full compliance with legal requirements. Cables will be placed in open trenches or installed using well established horizontal drilling or other trenchless techniques. The burial depth of DC cables is between approximately 0.4 and 0.8m within the Installation areas. Depth of AC cables are between 0.7m and 1.2m. Details are given in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement [EN01047/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0073	A respondent asked what disruption will there be to install the cables?	Yes	<p>Disruption will be minimised so far as reasonably possible. The consideration of impacts to residents and site users, i.e. footpath users, are made in the Environmental Statement Chapters [EN01047/APP/6.3]. Mitigation measures to minimise and avoid effects are set out in respective topic chapters of the ES and carried through into the outline Code of Construction Practice [EN01047/APP/7.6.1]. All highway works will be carried out under OCC Highways control and comply to Highways England approved code of practice</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0073	A respondent asked will footpaths be dug up and made into muddy quagmires?	Yes	Measures with respect to the maintenance of existing routes will be implemented as part of the Outline PRoW Management Strategy, which will be prepared in general accordance with the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] , which has been submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g. NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction and operation of the Project.
BW2_PFF_0169	Respondent suggests the Applicant doesn't know where the cable will be routed.	No	Please refer to the Illustrative Masterplan drawings Figures 2.1A to 2.4D [EN01047/APP/6.4] . These plans show the illustrative location of the cable route that link to the six Project substations.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0171	A respondent has asked what would be linked with Red House farm cables?	No	The Application for Red House Farm solar farm was withdrawn in summer 2024.
BW2_PFF_0064	A respondent has expressed that they are pleased that all cables will be underground.	Yes	All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology second exception, and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath the a farm bridge. The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspending underneath the farm bridge.
Local Ecology & Wildlife			
BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_PFF_0213, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0239, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0301,	Respondents have expressed concern regarding the ecological impact to the Long Mead water meadows either side of the Thames. They have stated that the water meadows are high in ecological value and contain wildflowers and house habitats. Some respondents have stated that Long Mead should be preserved as a SSSI.	Yes	Please refer to the Illustrative Masterplan drawings Figures 2.1A to 2.4D [EN01047/APP/6.4]. The design of the Project has been modified since the PEIR to ensure that the Horizontal Directional Drilling process under the River Thames avoids the Swinford Crossing and Long Mead sites as well as passing underneath all of the

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0303, BW2_OFF_0033, BW2_OFF_0324, BW2_OFF_0511, BW2_OFF_0042, BW2_OFF_0052, BW2_OFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0395, BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_OFF_0183, BW2_OFF_0297, BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0388, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_PFF_0003, BW2_PFF_0118, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0414, BW2_OFF_0411, BW2_OFF_0512, BW2_OFF_0535, BW2_OFF_0546, BW2_PFF_0024, BW2_OFF_0020,	<p>Some respondents have expressed concern that they will be dug up for cabling, and other believe that the Horizontal Directional Drilling will disrupt them.</p> <p>Many respondents have requested that the water meadows are left alone and not touched by the project in any way.</p>		<p>flood meadows alongside the river. It now launches from existing arable land and rises in existing arable.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0027, BW2_OFF_0353, BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_OFF_0266, BW2_OFF_0277			
BW2_OFF_0229, BW2_OFF_0291, BW2_PFF_0026, BW2_PFF_0054	Respondents have expressed that Swinford Lock is a rare and sensitive site ecologically that should be left alone.	Yes	Please refer to the Illustrative Masterplan drawings Figures 2.1A to 2.4D [EN01047/APP/6.4]. The design of the Project has been modified since the PEIR to ensure that the Horizontal Directional Drilling process under the River Thames avoids the Swinford Crossing and Long Mead sites as well as passing underneath all of the flood meadows alongside the river. It now launches from existing arable land and rises in existing arable.
BW2_OFF_0272, BW2_PFF_0027	Respondents have expressed the preservation of the wetland hay meadows should be upheld.	Yes	Please refer to the Illustrative Masterplan drawings Figures 2.1A to 2.4D [EN01047/APP/6.4]. The design of the Project has been modified since the PEIR to ensure that the Horizontal Directional Drilling process under the River

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Thames avoids the Swinford Crossing and Long Mead sites as well as passing underneath all of the flood meadows alongside the river. It now launches from existing arable land and rises in existing arable.
BW2_OFF_0233, BW2_OFF_0352, BW2_PFF_0256	Respondents have expressed that the cabling should not run across the wildflower meadows as it will damage the area.	Yes	Please refer to the Illustrative Masterplan drawings Figures 2.1A to 2.4D [EN01047/APP/6.4]. The design of the Project has been modified since the PEIR to ensure that the Horizontal Directional Drilling process under the River Thames avoids the Swinford Crossing and Long Mead sites as well as passing underneath all of the flood meadows alongside the river. It now launches from existing arable land and rises in existing arable.
BW2_OFF_0300	A respondent has expressed that the ditch between their field and the road is an essential watercourse and the verge between it and the road is very narrow (particularly near the bridge over the stream Battimer Brook). It would not be possible to ensure that	Yes	The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. Where a cable is to be installed in the road where possible the cable

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	the ditch was not compromised whilst a cabling trench was attempted in the verge and all of the drainage around Jericho Farm Barns relied on the constant free working of that ditch.		trench will be located under the road surface and not in the verge to ensure that there are no impacts to surrounding environment.
BW2_PFF_0135	A respondent has expressed that they know boring would be used but by the time a hundred trucks have churned them up it would take a hundred years for the diversity to recover. This must not happen.	Yes	<p>Suitable HGV routes will be identified. This selection process is detailed in the Construction Traffic Management Plan is set out in the Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1].</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan will set out that road condition surveys will be undertaken before the start of works and after the substantial completion of works on minor road links and new junctions used by HGVs to access the Project. Damage to the highway that has been demonstrably caused by construction traffic will be repaired.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0173	A respondent has expressed that the cable route should be on the east side not across the wildflower meadow which is of historic interest and should not be disturbed.	Yes	<p>The Cable Route options around Swinford Toll Bridge are to the East of the Bridge and do not cross the wildflower meadow.</p> <p>Please refer to the Illustrative Masterplan drawings Figures 2.1A to 2.4D [EN01047/APP/6.4]. The design of the Project has been modified since the PEIR to ensure that the Horizontal Directional Drilling process under the River Thames avoids the Swinford Crossing and Long Mead sites as well as passing underneath all of the flood meadows alongside the river. It now launches from existing arable land and rises in existing arable.</p>
BW2_PFF_0177	A respondent has expressed the cable route around Eynsham, especially the part from the A40 to Cassington Road goes through a small woodland on the w. side of the road, which has bats, owls (nesting) and very many hedgehogs (which are so endangered). They will all be disturbed	Yes	The majority of the cable corridors between the three areas will be in the public highways. Where possible cable trenching within the highway limits will be located under the road surface and not the verge to limit environmental impacts

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	and probably evicted by the digging and laying of the cable.		The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. As set out in the outline Code of Construction Practice [EN01047/APP/7.6.1] , trenchless techniques would be used to cross areas of woodland to ensure no impacts to such features.
BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0248	Respondents have expressed that both options east of Eynsham are problematic as they will damage ecologically valuable sites, whatever mitigation put in place.	Yes	The majority of the cable corridors between the three areas will be in the public highways. Where possible cable trenching within the highway limits will be located under the road surface and not the verge to limit environmental impacts The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. As set out in the outline Code of Construction Practice [EN01047/APP/7.6.1] , trenchless

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			techniques would be used to cross areas of woodland to ensure no impacts to such features.
BW2_OFF_0107, BW2_OFF_0332	Respondents have expressed that the cable routes should not impinge upon or planned Nature Recovery projects.	Yes	<p>The majority of the cable corridors between the three areas will be in the public highways. Where possible cable trenching within the highway limits will be located under the road surface and not the verge to limit environmental impacts</p> <p>The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. As set out in the outline Code of Construction Practice [EN01047/APP/7.6.1], trenchless techniques would be used to cross areas of woodland to ensure no impacts to such features.</p> <p>Please refer to the Illustrative Masterplan drawings Figures 2.1A to 2.4D [EN01047/APP/6.4]. The design of the Project has been</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			modified since the PEIR to ensure that the Horizontal Directional Drilling process under the River Thames avoids the Swinford Crossing and Long Mead sites as well as passing underneath all of the flood meadows alongside the river.
BW2_PFF_0251	A respondent has expressed following hedgerows will disrupt and damage (if not kill) them.	Yes	The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. The impact of the Project on hedgerows is fully assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN01047/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0255	A respondent has expressed that it is essential that detailed engagement with land owners and managers is carried out about the conservation of the ancient meadow before decisions are taken.	Yes	The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. When an area of land is included in a Cable corridor the landowner will be consulted.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Please refer to the Illustrative Masterplan drawings Figures 2.1A to 2.4D [EN01047/APP/6.4]. The design of the Project has been modified since the PEIR to ensure that the Horizontal Directional Drilling process under the River Thames avoids the Swinford Crossing and Long Mead sites as well as passing underneath all of the flood meadows alongside the river.
BW2_PFF_0255	A respondent requested for details to be provided about the depths and location of compounds which must be outside these meadows, as well as method statements and risk assessments to ensure that impacts on irreplaceable habitats are avoided. This should apply to any of the meadows along the Thames.	Yes	The Horizontal Directional Drilling compounds will be sited in a larger area to ensure that the final location is based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. Please refer to the Illustrative Masterplan drawings Figures 2.1A to 2.4D [EN01047/APP/6.4]. The design of the Project has been modified since the PEIR to ensure that the Horizontal Directional Drilling process under the River Thames avoids the Swinford

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Crossing and Long Mead sites as well as passing underneath all of the flood meadows alongside the river. It now launches from existing arable land and rises in existing arable. The outline Code of Construction Practice [EN01047/APP/7.6.1], will ensure appropriate measures are adopted to minimise environmental impact.</p>
BW2_PFF_0258	<p>A respondent has expressed that some of the trees where the cable route might run, could be very old that have a great ability to sequester carbon, that younger trees do not have. The older trees should be protected in order to perform this valuable service.</p>	Yes	<p>The buffer zone to Ancient woodlands is 15m. A veteran tree survey has been undertaken to map the location of such trees (ES Appendix 9.15 Veteran Tree Survey [EN01047/APP/6.5]). The buffer to a Veteran tree is dependent on a number of factors including the diameter of the tree canopy. The cable route and overall site layout have been designed to avoid an appropriate buffer around such features.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0269	<p>A respondent has expressed that should the proposed cabling route pass along the B4017 Cumnor Road (as the current plans seem to suggest), it will negatively impact the ecology of our small parcel of organic woodland (approximately one acre of untouched for generations land north of Oakes Lane), which acts as an important wildlife corridor between Wytham Woods, the Farmoor valley fields on which the southern site is proposed to be built, and the Farmoor nature reserves.</p>	Yes	<p>The majority of the cable corridors between the three areas will be in the public highways. Where possible cable trenching within the highway limits will be located under the road surface and not the verge to limit environmental impacts</p> <p>The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable. As set out in the outline Code of Construction Practice [EN01047/APP/7.6.1], trenchless techniques would be used to cross areas of woodland to ensure no impacts to such features</p> <p>The proposed cable route in Cumnor Road, (between Farmoor and Cumnor) will be laid within the highway limits to ensure no impact on the surrounding woodland, including Wytham Woods SSSI. Where possible cable trenching</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			within the highway limits will be located under the road surface and not the verge to limit environmental impacts
BW2_PFF_0293	A respondent has expressed that it will be impossible to return the land to its current state after the 40 year period.	Yes	<p>Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] provides the Project description, and the parameters used for assessment purposes, including removal of equipment.</p> <p>The Applicant has also produced an outline Decommissioning Plan which will provide the means by which the detail can be agreed and secured [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p>
BW2_PFF_0295	A respondent has asked will access to work for panels and cables affect the few fields not within the proposed site?	Yes	All land used for construction (temporarily) and or maintenance will be illustrated on the masterplans. Please refer to the Illustrative Masterplan drawings Figures 2.1A to 2.4D [EN01047/APP/6.4] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0295	Respondent has asked what use is planned for the red lines around fields in the northern site not covered in panels?	Yes	Please refer to the Illustrative Masterplan drawings Figures 2.1A to 2.4D [EN01047/APP/6.4]. Any land not in use for panels within the Project site will be used for ecological enhancement.
BW2_PFF_0295	A respondent has asked will you need access to cabling work etc across fields you are not leasing?	Yes	If the Applicant is not leasing a field and requires access for cabling, they intend to request an appropriate Easement from the landowner.
BW2_OFF_0471	A respondent has expressed that current woodlands must not be damaged.	Yes	Noted. All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge. The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspension underneath the farm bridge

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The approach to mitigation is presented within the ES Volume 1 Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0150	A respondent has asked how much of the environment will be impacted on the installation of the cables?	Yes	The ecology effects of the installation of the cable route are described in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN01047/APP/6.3]
BW2_OFF_0150	A respondent has asked if hedges and trees can be planted over the cables once installed or will it impact farmers on the use of their land?	Yes	Any gaps created in hedgerows will be filled in using an appropriate hedgerow mix, as set out in the oLEMP [EN01047/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_OFF_0222	A respondent has asked will there be funds set aside in sufficient amounts to remove the materials and restore the land to its previous state?	Yes	The Applicant notes that the consent being sought is temporary and will require all panels, cables (other than those beneath highways, rivers and railway) and all associated equipment to be removed at the end of the term of the consent. The application is supported by an Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0013	A respondent expressed that the cable routes are too close to the Wytham Woods SSSI and Blenheim Park SSSI - both are high value, high vulnerability and a low recoverability.	Yes	The impact of the Project on both SSSIs is fully assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN01047/APP/6.3] . The conclusion of that assessment is that there would be no significant adverse effect on the SSSIs.
BW2_PFF_0206	A respondent has expressed that it is not clear what impact the cable routes will have on the existing environment.	Yes	The environmental impact and effect from cable laying is minimal. Effects are temporary occurring only during construction. The impact of the cable routes on ecology receptors is fully assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN01047/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0242	A respondent has expressed that the fields are visited annually by swans and geese.	Yes	New SkyLark plots to be delivered within the solar arrays. The impact of the Project on birds is fully assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN01047/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Landscape and Visual			
BW2_OFF_0001, BW2_OFF_0203, BW2_OFF_0255, BW2_OFF_0329, BW2_OFF_0344	Respondents have expressed that the project will be a blot on the landscape.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The chapter acknowledges that the Project would occupy a large area within the local landscape but be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p> <p>The northern, central and southern sections of the Project would be generally visually separated from one another. Although in combination views of more than one section would be possible.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0014	Respondent has expressed that the farm is too large in an area that already has solar farms.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_OFF_0017	Respondent expressed the cable route will spoil the scenery, especially around the Thames.	Yes	All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge. The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspension underneath the farm bridge
BW2_OFF_0027	A respondent has expressed they do not want to see the cables.	Yes	All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspension underneath the farm bridge
BW2_OFF_0154	A respondent has expressed that it is very good there is a local grid access point that prevents large overhead cables across the landscape.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0317	A respondent has expressed that electricity pylons would be an eyesore.	Yes	<p>All of the electrical cables will be laid underground but with two exceptions; (i) where they cross areas of sensitive archaeology and (ii) where cabling crosses the Evenlode where cables will be laid in ducting underneath a farm bridge.</p> <p>The latter option may utilise Horizontal Directional Drilling to pass under the Evenlode instead of suspension underneath the farm bridge.</p> <p>The Project connects into existing National Grid pylons.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0139	A respondent has expressed that the solar farm should not be vast like this.	No	Noted.
Archaeology and Local Heritage			
BW2_OFF_0174	A respondent has expressed that the cable routing across the Thames near Swinford Bridge holds significant historical significance and there is a lack of clarity about the visual impact on the area.	Yes	An assessment of the likely impacts and effects relating to the change within the setting of the Grade II* listed Swinford Bridge is presented within Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010145/APP/6.5] .
Hydrology and Flood Risk			
BW2_OFF_0370	A respondent has expressed that they objects to the cable route by Swinford Toll Bridge as it regularly floods.	Yes	All watercourses to have a minimum 8 m buffer, as per Environment Agency guidelines for protection of such features. A buffer of up to 10m will be maintained from the banks of ordinary watercourses, in line with local bye-laws, where applicable. An 8 m buffer will be maintained from the banks of Main River or landward toe of a flood defence structure for permanent development associated with the Project.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0242	A respondent has expressed that the fields flood annually.	Yes	<p>The Project has been designed, as far as possible, to avoid and minimise adverse impacts and effects on the water environment through the process of design development, and by embedded design measures into the design. As an example, Solar PV modules are waterproof and will be raised by the nature of the design at least 800mm above ground levels at the lower edge.</p> <p>Hydraulic modelling was undertaken to steer Solar PV arrays towards the lowest area of flood risk (outside the 100 year plus climate change extent).</p> <p>In line with the wider Project, a Surface Water Drainage Strategy for the Project has been prepared and details how runoff will be managed throughout the Project, this is included in Volume 3, Appendix 10.2</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].
BW2_OFF_0513	A respondent has expressed that these proposals must include natural flood management techniques to ensure that any risk of flooding as a result of this scheme is reduced.	Yes	In line with the wider Project, a Surface Water Drainage Strategy for the Project has been prepared and details how runoff will be managed throughout the Project, this is included in Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].
BW2_OFF_0306	A respondent has expressed that provided it does not impact water ecology in the area, they support the cabling routes.	Yes	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0294, BW2_OFF_0339	Respondents have expressed high power cables should be installed at least one mile away from residential property and not installed under land that is known to flood could be very dangerous.	Yes	Consideration of Electromagnetic Fields has been made in Chapter 16 Human Health' [EN010147/APP.6.3]
BW2_OFF_0222	A respondent has asked how will the developments avoid fracturing the field's underground drainage system which will lead to flooding of the fields?	Yes	Temporary drainage measures would be implemented during construction INCLUDING DEWATERING. Outline CoCP (EN010145/APP/7.6.1) to be secured as DCO requirement.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Detailed CoCP's to be developed in line with Outline CoCP and agreed with relevant stakeholders and will include details in regard to temporary drainage for the cable routes.</p> <p>The Project has been designed, as far as possible, to avoid and minimise adverse impacts and effects on the water environment through the process of design development, and by embedded design measures into the design. As an example, Solar PV modules are waterproof and will be raised by the nature of the design at least 800mm above ground levels at the lower edge.</p> <p>Hydraulic modelling was undertaken to steer Solar PV arrays towards the lowest area of flood risk (outside the 100 year plus climate change extent).</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>In line with the wider Project, a Surface Water Drainage Strategy for the Project has been prepared and details how runoff will be managed throughout the Project, this is included in Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_OFF_0545</p>	<p>Respondents have expressed that digging up the flood plain will move flooding into other areas.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Temporary drainage measures would be implemented during construction, including dewatering.</p> <p>The outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [EN010145/APP/7.6.1] is to be secured as DCO requirement. Detailed CoCP's to be developed in line with Outline CoCP and agreed with relevant stakeholders and will include details in regard to temporary drainage for the cable routes.</p> <p>The Project has been designed, as far as possible, to avoid and minimise adverse impacts and</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>effects on the water environment through the process of design development, and by embedded design measures into the design. As an example, Solar PV modules are waterproof and will be raised by the nature of the design at least 800mm above ground levels at the lower edge.</p> <p>Hydraulic modelling was undertaken to steer Solar PV arrays towards the lowest area of flood risk (outside the 100 year plus climate change extent).</p> <p>In line with the wider Project, a Surface Water Drainage Strategy for the Project has been prepared and details how runoff will be managed throughout the Project, this is included in Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Traffic, Access and Construction			
BW2_OFF_0053, BW2_OFF_0312, BW2_OFF_0333, BW2_OFF_0449, BW2_OFF_0466, BW2_OFF_0476, BW2_PFF_0035, BW2_PFF_0147, BW2_PFF_0154, BW2_PFF_0162, BW2_PFF_0228, BW2_PFF_0230, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_OFF_0170, BW2_OFF_0462, BW2_PFF_0274	<p>Respondents expressed the works will be very disruptive to a very busy commuter area.</p> <p>Respondents have expressed that it will cause huge disruptions to roads and traffic.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3].</p>
BW2_OFF_0035, BW2_OFF_0125, BW2_OFF_0545, BW2_OFF_0271, BW2_OFF_0271, BW2_OFF_0455	<p>Respondents have expressed that Eynsham Toll Bridge is usually congested and congestion will get worse by construction traffic.</p> <p>Some respondents have expressed concern that the bridge could be at risk</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>There are no HGV access routes over the Swinford Bridge, as confirmed in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010145/APP/7.6.2].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	of damage or collapse with increased heavy goods traffic.		
BW2_PFF_0250	A respondent has expressed concern for safety, air quality impact, noise, health and safety, and disruption to every day life by eleven weeks of digging up to B4044, Eynsham Road, Botley Road.	Yes	During the construction phase, noise will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction (CoCP)Practice [EN010145/APP/7.6.1] . This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times. A full assessment of traffic and transport, including highway safety, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010145/APP/6.3).
BW2_OFF_0054	Respondent expressed that traffic in these areas is already crippling, building works and future maintenance will make it completely unmanageable for those getting to school and commuters	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0335	A respondent has expressed that crossing that the river Thames should be over the river on a new bridge	No	Noted.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	which would also carry one lane of traffic thereby relieving congestion on the toll bridge.		
BW2_PFF_0091	A respondent has expressed that the cable routes are going to cause more disruption while being built, maintained and repaired as needed across agricultural land and under flood plain and rivers	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0107	A respondent has expressed that the cable routes are of little importance, as long as there is minimal disruption during the cable's installation.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0122	A respondent has expressed that the location of the cable routes in Woodstock will result in considerable disruption to local residents.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0212	A respondent has asked what disruption will occur when overhead cabling will be installed along Farmoor to Eynsham Road, and how long will it be for?	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0212	A respondent has asked how can disruption be mitigated given the substantial traffic on the road with	Yes	There are no HGV access routes over the Swinford Bridge, as confirmed in the Outline

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	delays in the morning and evening rush hours due to the toll bridge?		<p>Construction Traffic Management Plan (EN010145/APP/7.6.2).</p> <p>A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010145/APP/6.3).</p>
BW2_PFF_0219	A respondent has expressed that the effects on the land needed to bury the cables could cause more disruption than they can understand at this time.	No	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3].
BW2_PFF_0230	A respondent has asked if these works will take at least 2 years to complete how can you justify disruption for this length of time?	No	<p>The Project occupies a large site, and the scale of the development will necessitate two years of construction overall. This work will be structured in three main phases; i) site preparation including accesses, ii) cables and electrical equipment, and iii) solar panels. There will not be a continued presence in all locations at all times for 2 years, as the work will be phased.</p> <p>The transport Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/6.5] and the Outline Construction Traffic Management</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] explains in more detail the approach to managing and routing traffic.
BW2_PFF_0248	A respondent has expressed that the route through Farmoor village is likely to cause major disruption during cable laying since it acts as a major detour from the A40, especially from early morning and mid-afternoon.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0248	A respondent has expressed that the junction for lorries turning up to the access near the reservoir is narrow and the installation work for cable and panels will cause many months of severe congestion on two busy, narrow roads which already are hampered by long queues morning and late afternoon / evening.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0298	A respondent has expressed that any further proposals to dig up roads and install cables at this time is unacceptable because ongoing work on the Botley Road (for the station) and the Botley interchange as would the road change towards Yarnton or	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Kidlington and along the Woodstock Road.		
BW2_OFF_0266	A respondent has expressed support for routes to the west of Eynsham and south of Woodstock as it would cause less disruption to Oxfordshire's infrastructure.	N/A	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0053	A respondent has expressed the works will be very disruptive to a very busy commuter area.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0136	A respondent has expressed construction will cause chaos if implemented.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0033, BW2_OFF_0426	A respondent has expressed their concern for the impact on already overcrowded roads and local bus services during the consultation phase.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0100	A respondent has expressed that the cable route along Shipton Road would cause too much disruption to local residents, which has been subject to road works on and off for the last 2-3 years.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [EN010145/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0136	A respondent expressed local roads are the only alternative to the A34.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010145/APP/6.3] . The construction access routes are included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010145/APP/6.3] .
Noise Impact			
BW2_OFF_0547	A respondent has asked, has noise pollution and other impact of PCSs been considered in the siting?	Yes	Noise from the PCS units, and substations associated with the Project are considered fully within the technical information provided in Volume 3, Appendix 13.3: Operational Phase Noise [EN010145/APP/6.5] .
Footpaths			
BW2_OFF_0229	A respondent has expressed their concern about footpath access between Eynsham and Swinford lock and beyond to Wytham/Thames path may be compromised.	Yes	The development of the detailed cable route design will take into account the location of access routes. The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Management Strategy [EN010145/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project.</p> <p>The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent and will include any additional measures required in relation to the detailed design of the cable routes.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0547	A respondent has expressed that cable routes should not impact on public rights of way.	Yes	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010145/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project.</p> <p>This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.</p>
BW2_PFF_0224	A respondent has expressed to accommodate the Thames Path National Trail.	Yes	The Thames Path has been taken into account in the design of the scheme and an Horizontal Directional Drilling is proposed beneath the River Thames which will

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			ensure that the cable route can be accommodated without physical impact on the Thames Path.
BW2_OFF_0182	A respondent has asked why do the routes east of Swinford Bridge follow closely to public footpaths and if these can be avoided?	Yes	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010145/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.</p>
BW2_OFF_0486	A respondent has asked how does the cable route south of Eynsham interact with a future pedestrian path between Eynsham and Botley?	Yes	The cable route corridor runs to the east and south east of Eynsham. The development of the detailed cable route design will take into

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>account the location of PRow and access routes. The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010145/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent and will include any additional measures required in relation to the detailed design of the cable routes.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_OFF_0173, BW2_OFF_0276, BW2_OFF_0482, BW2_OFF_0486, BW2_PFF_0129</p>	<p>Respondents have suggested that a cycle path between Eynsham and Farmoor, part of the B4044 Community Path, should be formed once the construction is complete.</p> <p>A respondent has asked why there weren't aren't any details included on how transport impacts would be mitigated and how the proposals would integrate with the planned Botley to Eynsham cycle route given the site will be developing along much of its route?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This has been discussed with OCC Highways. The Applicant would support this but does not control OCC Highways land so a decision rests with OCC Highways.</p> <p>The opportunity for other active travel routes and suggested cycle paths has been identified Bladon and Campsfield and Wootton and Sansom's Farm, and the Applicant has been in liaison with OCC's highways, PRow and Public Health teams to develop illustrative sections for routes – which can be seen in Figure 7.6.3.2 [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]</p> <p>Suitable HGV routes will be identified. This selection process is detailed in the Construction Traffic Management Plan is set out in the Code of Construction Practice (EN010147/APP/7.6.1)</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0335</p>	<p>A respondent has expressed that PVDP should commit to creating a</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This has been discussed with OCC Highways and the Applicant would</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	legacy cycle track above the buried cable.		support this but does not control OCC Highways land so a decision rests with OCC Highways.
BW2_OFF_0370	A respondent has expressed that Eynsham Road is already a death trap for cyclists.	No	Comment Acknowledged
BW2_PFF_0100	A respondent expressed when putting in cables to substation in Farmoor to put a cycle / pedestrian lane from Eynsham to Farmoor (permission from OCC) to mitigate your works' disturbance to traffic.	Yes	Suitable HGV routes will be identified. This selection process is detailed in the Construction Traffic Management Plan is set out in the Code of Construction Practice (EN010147/APP/7.6.1)
BW2_PFF_0151	A respondent has expressed that the project should join up in policy with the Eynsham-Botley cycle path campaign.	Yes	This has been discussed with OCC Highways and the Applicant would support this but does not control OCC Highways land so a decision rests with OCC Highways.
General Project			
BW2_OFF_0001, BW2_OFF_0027, BW2_OFF_0075, BW2_OFF_0117, BW2_OFF_0131, BW2_OFF_0148, BW2_OFF_0156,	Respondents expressed that they do not support the project.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0165, BW2_OFF_0169, BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0208, BW2_OFF_0213, BW2_OFF_0223, BW2_OFF_0226, BW2_OFF_0230, BW2_OFF_0250, BW2_OFF_0254, BW2_OFF_0256, BW2_OFF_0275, BW2_OFF_0299, BW2_OFF_0314, BW2_OFF_0349, BW2_OFF_0351, BW2_OFF_0354, BW2_OFF_0372, BW2_OFF_0383, BW2_OFF_0385, BW2_OFF_0386, BW2_OFF_0390, BW2_OFF_0397, BW2_OFF_0398, BW2_OFF_0402, BW2_OFF_0406,			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0413, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_OFF_0429, BW2_OFF_0433, BW2_OFF_0442, BW2_OFF_0448, BW2_OFF_0452, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_OFF_0463, BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_OFF_0492, BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_PFF_0019, BW2_PFF_0028, BW2_PFF_0055, BW2_PFF_0068, BW2_PFF_0088, BW2_PFF_0098, BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0108, BW2_PFF_0134, BW2_PFF_0181, BW2_PFF_0182, BW2_PFF_0204, BW2_PFF_0215,			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0218, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0226, BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_OFF_0031			
BW2_OFF_0011, BW2_OFF_0166, BW2_OFF_0258	Respondents expressed that they support the project.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0027	A respondent has expressed that it is not a British company supporting the project.	No	Noted. The Applicant is a limited company registered in England and Wales.
BW2_PFF_0117	A respondent has expressed that the presentation refers to the 'likely location' of the substation and asked what if that is not the agreed location?	No	Consent is being sought for the NGET substation within the Project site. The Applicant also expects NGET to make a planning application for the substation on land they have leased adjacent to the Project site.
BW2_OFF_0045	A respondent has expressed the project should be scrapped.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0046	A respondent has expressed that the project should be cancelled.	No	Noted

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0103	A respondent expressed that introducing cables on Yarnton Road will reduce the value of their property.	Yes	All cables will be buried and not visible after installation
Site Selection and Alternatives			
BW2_OFF_0045, BW2_OFF_0467, BW2_PFF_0044, BW2_OFF_0110, BW2_PFF_0244	Respondents suggested non-specific alternative locations for the Project, including a desert, rooftops, brownfield land, and a site closer to Didcot.	Yes	<p>The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
The Consultation Process			
BW2_OFF_0035, BW2_OFF_0171, BW2_OFF_0274, BW2_OFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0374, BW2_OFF_0425, BW2_OFF_0525, BW2_OFF_0323,	Respondents commented on the level and format of details provided regarding cable routes during consultation.	No	The nature of the PEIR stage is that it should allow for interested parties to understand the likely scope of the Project and its likely environmental effects, but the information is 'preliminary' by its nature. It should be sufficiently detailed to invite comment and response, but not too detailed so as not to allow scope for

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0394, BW2_OFF_0473, BW2_OFF_0515, BW2_OFF_0405, BW2_OFF_0428, BW2_OFF_0434, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0447, BW2_OFF_0551, BW2_PFF_0051, BW2_PFF_0016, BW2_OFF_0273, BW2_PFF_0144, BW2_PFF_0176, BW2_PFF_0212, BW2_PFF_0212, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_PFF_0278, BW2_OFF_0015, BW2_PFF_0284			<p>alteration and improvement. The Applicant believes it struck that balance.</p> <p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.
BW2_OFF_0140	A respondent expressed that it was not clear from the illustrative drawing what the cable will look like.	No	The application is supported by a Technical Glossary indicating cable types.
BW2_PFF_0104	A respondent expressed that they had no comment until an intended route was made clear.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Climate Change			
BW2_OFF_0098, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_OFF_0110, BW2_OFF_0479, BW2_PFF_0126, BW2_PFF_0228, BW2_PFF_0184	Respondents commented on the environmental credentials of the Project. expressed that the project is an environmental disaster.	No	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects. Chapter 14 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , considers the lifetime Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions resulting from the Project.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The chapter concludes that despite the GHG emissions resulting from the construction-stage of the Project, the magnitude of avoided emissions resulting from the operational and decommissioning stages of the development allows the Project to enable avoided emissions from year 6 of operation (carbon payback period).</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0490, BW2_OFF_0512, BW2_OFF_0540, BW2_PFF_0004, BW2_PFF_0115, BW2_PFF_0304</p>	<p>Respondents have expressed that they prefer whichever route causes the least harm to the environment.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The adopted cable route will be based on the outcome of environmental and technical assessment to ensure effects are minimised so far as is reasonable.</p>
<p>BW2_PFF_0093</p>	<p>A respondent expressed that after they understand the cables will stay in place after thirty years and will carry on to damage the environment.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>To avoid unnecessary disruption, and/or for possible future use by the local network operator, it is intended to leave all 33kV and 275 kV cables where they have been laid in the public highway and where cables have been laid using Horizontal Directional Drilling – either under</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			rivers, road, rail crossings, or existing landscape features. All other cabling, inverters and transformers will be removed from the Site and managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy
BW2_PFF_0302	A respondent has expressed that the farm is totally unacceptable wanton destruction of our cherished greenbelt countryside.	Yes	<p>Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The impacts of the Project upon the Green Belt, and the Very Special Circumstances in support of it are considered within the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p>

Table 5: Question 8 – Please provide any preferences for where you would like areas for community food growing to be placed.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Community Food Growing Locations			
BW2_OFF_0044, BW2_OFF_0077, BW2_OFF_0079, BW2_OFF_0094, BW2_OFF_0097, BW2_OFF_0107, BW2_OFF_0241, BW2_OFF_0268, BW2_OFF_0325, BW2_OFF_0424, BW2_OFF_0467, BW2_OFF_0490, BW2_OFF_0514, BW2_PFF_0091, BW2_PFF_0129, BW2_PFF_0172, BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_OFF_0321,	Respondents suggested locations close to residential areas to allow more volunteers, school engagement, and ease of distribution and access.	Yes	30 hectares have been set aside in accessible locations for community growers. Locations will be accessible on foot and by bicycle. Engagement with schools is proposed. Proximity to settlements was a factor in selecting the food growing areas.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0524, BW2_PFF_0224,			
BW2_OFF_0103, BW2_OFF_0125, BW2_OFF_0144, BW2_OFF_0145, BW2_OFF_0182, BW2_OFF_0394, BW2_OFF_0434, BW2_OFF_0447, BW2_OFF_0498, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_PFF_0091	Respondents suggested growing food should be location to provide a 'buffer' between villages and panels, rather than locating food growing areas in between fields of panels.	Yes	30 hectares have been set aside for community food growing. Growers will be allocated dedicated sites with easy access; these will not be in the panel areas but in the areas set aside for mitigation.
BW2_OFF_0023, BW2_OFF_0317, BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_OFF_0332, BW2_OFF_0403, BW2_OFF_0489, BW2_OFF_0471,	Respondents stated that the community food growing locations would have to be near residential areas and have access to water.	Yes	They will be easily accessible by foot and bicycle and will have a water supply.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0235, BW2_PFF_0256			
BW2_OFF_0152, BW2_OFF_0160, BW2_OFF_0240, BW2_OFF_0266, BW2_OFF_0392, BW2_OFF_0500,	Respondents suggested that food could be grown on the Blenheim estate.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0178, BW2_OFF_0300, BW2_PFF_0128, BW2_PFF_0129	Respondents suggested a location near to Cassington. Respondent suggested grade 2 land north of Cassington for community food growing.	Yes	There is a site for food growing on fields 2.111 and 2.112 on the Site Location Plan. This is to the west of Cassington adjacent to Eynsham Mill.
BW2_OFF_0037, BW2_OFF_0049, BW2_OFF_0050, BW2_PFF_0211	Respondents suggested that Woodstock would be a good area for this initiative. One respondent suggested locations near to Hensington residential areas or Woodstock.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0232, BW2_OFF_0251, BW2_OFF_0301	Respondents suggested Eynsham and Church Hanborough.	Yes	There are food growing sites near Eynsham and Church Hanborough. On the Site Location Plan, fields 2.20, 2.116 and 2.117

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0294, BW2_PFF_0073	Respondent suggested that community food growing should be at least one mile away from residential areas and available to the local communities.	Yes	30 hectares have been set aside in accessible locations for community growers.
BW2_OFF_0290, BW2_OFF_0313	Respondents suggested locations that are ecologically viable and reduce food milage involved in getting it to market.	Yes	Community food growers will participate in the Oxford Farm to Fork scheme, supplying Oxford colleges directly. The fields to be used are all on Blenheim Estate.
BW2_OFF_0146, BW2_OFF_0159	Respondents suggested that it should only be near areas that want to participate.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0548, BW2_PFF_0091	Respondents questioned if there would be a meaningful difference between those and allotments.	Yes	The Applicant us open to applications from proposed allotments and from larger-scale food growers. Cutteslowe Larder proposed sufficient output to supply those in West Oxfordshire suffering from food insecurity.
BW2_PFF_0152, BW2_PFF_0271	Respondents suggested a consultation with local people to decide on where areas for community food growing should be placed.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0042, BW2_OFF_0078	Respondents suggested Bladon, near the allotments by the church.	Yes	There are food growing sites at Bladon – fields 2.1, 2.5 and 2.8 on the Site Location Plan.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0342	Respondent suggested planting fruit trees as screening in the wide margins, like a public orchard.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0037	Respondent requested further discussions on the location of an organic farm in Woodstock.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0424	Respondent suggested good quality access to projects via bicycle on segregated or off-road routes and bike stands at the entrance that are suitable for cargo bikes.	Yes	The Applicant's preference is for access to be on foot or by bicycle.
BW2_OFF_0002	Respondent stated that they would prefer community food growing to be accessible by car with parking.	Yes	The Applicant's preference is for access to be on foot or by bicycle.
BW2_OFF_0025	Respondent stated that they should be 'in the central site somewhere'	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0131	Respondent suggested Henley 'where Peter Gerstmann lives'.	Yes	The sites for food growing need to be on land that the Project controls with the Order Limits.
BW2_OFF_0166	Respondent suggested between Kidlington and Deddington.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0313	Respondent suggested fields either side of the track from Cassington up to Purwell farm. The fields nearer to the	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	residences of Cassington would be best.		
BW2_OFF_0324	Respondent suggested areas without large, preexisting allotment schemes so areas that are not served as well.	Yes	The Applicant notes that existing allotment schemes have waiting lists and therefore anticipates demand for growing space to be strong.
BW2_OFF_0454	Respondent suggested locations close to Hanborough.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0047	Respondent specified the community food growing should be within 25 minutes walking distance of the co-op.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0150	Respondent suggested community food growing wherever possible.	Yes	30 hectares have been set aside in accessible locations for community growers.
BW2_PFF_0231	Respondent noted there may be a limited pool of potential allotment holders to expand the existing allotments into fields adjacent to footpath 361.1 (referring to the Oxfordshire County Council Access Map).	Yes	The Applicant would like to hear from all members of the local community that are interested in growing food on the site.
BW2_OFF_0357	Respondent suggested on the land adjoining communities. Furthermore, in larger communities this should be split	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	around the community e.g. North, South, and East of Woodstock.		
BW2_OFF_0414	Respondent suggested an area with no visual or auditory impact of the solar installation.	N	Noted
BW2_OFF_0370	Respondent stated that community food should be grown on Gee's Farm where it has always been grown.	Yes	There are no community food growing sites in the Southern site area, but Gee's Farm will continue to grow food on land not leased to the Project.
BW2_PFF_0263	Respondent suggested food growing could be accommodated near Worton, there is already a farm shop with the facilities to sell local produce at the Worton Kitchen Garden. The land in field 2.60 is 3A, high grade agricultural.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0356	Respondent stated they would like to see allotments created between Long Hanborough and Bladon, with vehicle access from the A4095.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0318	Respondent suggested any currently working fields.	Yes	Community growing areas are on fields currently in use by Blenheim Estate.
BW2_PFF_0254	Respondent stated that if the Bladon fields were spared, the community	Yes	There are community food growing areas adjacent to Bladon – fields 2.1, 2.5. 2.8 on the Site Location Plan.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	would be happy to cultivate the remaining areas for food.		
BW2_PFF_0222	Respondent suggested allotments and community food growing in villages where there is less access to them when compared with the area.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0078	Respondent suggested as many areas as possible.	Yes	30 hectares have been set aside in accessible locations for community growers.
BW2_PFF_0118	Respondent suggested community food growing should be in Grade 3A land.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0290	Respondent noted that there was little space around Eynsham for spare land, they also referred to the impact of the proposed Garden Village.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0083	Respondent suggested close to new communities to reduce food miles.	Yes	Growers will sell to Oxford colleges through the Farm to Fork initiative.
BW2_PFF_0004	Respondent is unsure about whether people will enjoy the activity surrounded by solar panels.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0113	Respondent stated that any locations need to be agreed in conjunction with the local community involved in the scheme.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0113	Respondent enquired whether there is existing infrastructure which could be used for community food growing.	Yes	Fields to be used for community growing are currently in use by Blenheim Estate.
BW2_PFF_0113	Respondent enquired whether there will be a dedicated community officer for the projects or will existing community organisations be used.	Yes	The Applicant will establish a community liaison committee should consent for the Project be granted.
BW2_OFF_0134	Respondent questioned whether this question/proposal would meet any local needs due to allotments and community food projects already existing near to Cassington.	Yes	The proposals received from the Cherwell Collective and Cutteslowe Larder indicate potential demand for food growing sites.
BW2_PFF_0219	Respondent suggested consulting with local farmers who are best positioned to identify areas for community food growing.	Yes	Areas to be used have been chosen in consultation with the landowner, Blenheim Estate.
Community Food Growing General Comments			
BW2_OFF_0016, BW2_OFF_0020, BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0027, BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0045, BW2_OFF_0046, BW2_OFF_0060, BW2_OFF_0066,	Respondents stated that the whole area should remain for growing food.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0088, BW2_OFF_0090, BW2_OFF_0091, BW2_OFF_0092, BW2_OFF_0093, BW2_OFF_0096, BW2_OFF_0098, BW2_OFF_0118, BW2_OFF_0121, BW2_OFF_0127, BW2_OFF_0141, BW2_OFF_0156, BW2_OFF_0157, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0169, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0196, BW2_OFF_0203, BW2_OFF_0213, BW2_OFF_0216, BW2_OFF_0226, BW2_OFF_0228, BW2_OFF_0231, BW2_OFF_0233, BW2_OFF_0243,			infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0250, BW2_OFF_0260, BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0294, BW2_OFF_0299, BW2_OFF_0312, BW2_OFF_0317, BW2_OFF_0329, BW2_OFF_0335, BW2_OFF_0339, BW2_OFF_0347, BW2_OFF_0351, BW2_OFF_0373, BW2_OFF_0375, BW2_OFF_0386, BW2_OFF_0388, BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_OFF_0390, BW2_OFF_0397, BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_OFF_0407, BW2_OFF_0419, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0457, BW2_OFF_0463, BW2_OFF_0476,			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0480, BW2_OFF_0485, BW2_OFF_0541, BW2_OFF_0555, BW2_PFF_0019, BW2_PFF_0020, BW2_PFF_0028, BW2_PFF_0032, BW2_PFF_0040, BW2_PFF_0055, BW2_PFF_0058, BW2_PFF_0061, BW2_PFF_0070, BW2_PFF_0076, BW2_PFF_0088, BW2_PFF_0089, BW2_PFF_0102, BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0112, BW2_PFF_0141, BW2_PFF_0161, BW2_PFF_0163, BW2_PFF_0164, BW2_PFF_0182, BW2_PFF_0193, BW2_PFF_0197,			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0210, BW2_PFF_0232, BW2_PFF_0233, BW2_PFF_0243, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0267, BW2_PFF_0283, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0286, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0302			
BW2_OFF_0219, BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_OFF_0450, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_OFF_0465, BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_OFF_0476, BW2_OFF_0478, BW2_OFF_0483, BW2_OFF_0492, BW2_OFF_0503, BW2_OFF_0515, BW2_OFF_0523, BW2_PFF_0012,	Respondents noted that community food projects would do little to offset the damage of the proposal.	Yes	The Applicant believes that the output from the community food growing areas will do significant good, alongside the generation of low-cost, green electricity from the Project. Food will be provided to those suffering from food insecurity; produce may also be sold via the Farm to Fork scheme, supplying Oxford colleges with fresh food from nearby farms and fields, thereby reducing transport carbon emissions.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0535, BW2_OFF_0541, BW2_PFF_0042, BW2_PFF_0043, BW2_PFF_0098, BW2_PFF_0111, BW2_PFF_0116, BW2_PFF_0119, BW2_PFF_0165, BW2_PFF_0196, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0236, BW2_PFF_0255, BW2_PFF_0264			
BW2_OFF_0011, BW2_OFF_0040, BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0052, BW2_OFF_0054, BW2_OFF_0117, BW2_OFF_0149, BW2_OFF_0223, BW2_OFF_0437, BW2_PFF_0070, BW2_PFF_0091, BW2_PFF_0108,	Respondents expressed that they do not want community food growing as part of the project.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0273			
BW2_OFF_0033, BW2_OFF_0095, BW2_OFF_0254, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0353	Respondents stated that they did not believe themselves qualified to answer the question.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0305, BW2_OFF_0496, BW2_PFF_0051, BW2_PFF_0070, BW2_PFF_0181, BW2_PFF_0192, BW2_PFF_0213, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_PFF_0298, BW2_PFF_0301	Respondents noted that their village already has allotments. Specifically, respondents mentioned that there are allotments in Bladon, Cumnor and Botley that are currently underused.	Yes	Discussions with growers and with Good Food Oxford suggest to the Applicant that there is demand for food growing areas, particularly from those who do not live in Cumnor or Botley.
BW2_PFF_0035, BW2_PFF_0126, BW2_PFF_0187,	Respondents asked if 'community food growing' is an allotment-style use of land.	Yes	The Project is flexible in its approach to food growers and invites applications for land and proposals for growing schemes.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0242, BW2_PFF_0253			Large or small scale growing can be accommodated.
BW2_PFF_0177, BW2_PFF_0230, BW2_PFF_0236, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0295	Respondents noted that it would take extensive work for the local community to manage allotments, many would not want to work it, particularly those who already have allotments.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0465, BW2_OFF_0473, BW2_PFF_0004	Respondents expressed that they are concerned about the security issues of accessing sites within large-scale solar installations.	Yes	Food growing areas are set outside panel array areas.
BW2_OFF_0154, BW2_OFF_0249	Respondents questioned whether residents would suddenly take up gardening if requested.	Yes	The Project encourages applications from all who wish to grow food on the site.
BW2_OFF_0303, BW2_OFF_0306	Respondents suggested these projects should maximise benefits to those closest to the proposed sites.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0121, BW2_PFF_0272	Respondents stated community food growing is a good idea for the local residents to access local food.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0319, BW2_OFF_0422	Respondents stated that the proposals will contribute nothing to food requirements.	Yes	Both Cherwell Collective and Cutteslowe Larder will increase their output of fresh food by operating on the site.
BW2_PFF_0146, BW2_PFF_0244	Respondents asked how food can grow under solar panels.	Yes	Areas for community growing are adjacent to arrays not beneath them.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0022, BW2_PFF_0238	Respondents expressed that questions regarding community food growing was 'Fiddling round the edges'.	Yes	The Applicant notes the potential for community food growing schemes to support members of the community suffering from food insecurity through the provision of fresh produce, and therefore making a notable impact.
BW2_PFF_0015	Respondent suggested that the solar panels may damage land open to community food growing.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0499	Respondent specified that it should be a decision made by local parish councils alongside the main bodies who many be involved with the introduction of new allotments.	Yes	The Applicant will continue to work with Parish Councils.
BW2_OFF_0331	Respondent asked how can villages without the means to sell locally produced food could benefit from the initiative.	Yes	Growers can sell food via the Oxford Farm to Fork initiative or vis farmers' markets.
BW2_OFF_0334	Respondent suggested that the involvement of local people was essential and not to allow people from other locations use of the sites.	Yes	Applications for access to food growing sites is open to all local residents.
BW2_OFF_0074	Respondent suggested that produce could be sourced from the new sites	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	for the local markets like Gloucester Greens.		
BW2_OFF_0302	Respondent questioned if allotments can be grown within large solar installations.	Yes	Food growing areas are sited in mitigation areas outside the areas of panel arrays..
BW2_OFF_0273	Respondent stated that the developers would have to provide the agricultural equipment to sustain the food growing.	Yes	The Applicant proposes a community fund as part of a Community Benefit Agreement.
BW2_OFF_0273	Respondent suggested that locals are offered to volunteer on the projects and plant new woodland to keep existing viewpoints open.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0292	Respondent asked if the proposed allotments would be available for rent.	Yes	30 hectares have been set aside for food growing and the Project does not intend to charge rent.
BW2_PFF_0087	Respondent asked why would they want to grow food on the site.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0114	Respondent liked the idea of community food growing but had no firm opinion on the location.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0117	Respondent stated regenerative agriculture would be a better option to providing allotment sites or sites for regenerative market gardening for commercial food production.	Yes	Regenerative practices will be used by Cherwell Collective.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0129	Respondent noted they like the idea of local food growing groups which was mentioned in the leaflet.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0219	Respondent stated generally that community food growing is a good idea and the more the better.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0298	Respondent suggested using the whole site for community food growing facilities.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0535	Respondent stated that giving back the allotments taken for housing at Cassington is a cynical 'grab some green headlines' move which does not convince anyone.	Yes	The Project has not taken any allotments at Cassington, that area is outside the Order Limits. 30 hectares of the site have been set aside for community growers.
BW2_OFF_0049	Respondent expressed that it is important that the food growing initiative does not impact on land left for nature to use (i.e. it must not necessitate the removal of any trees, hedgerows, bodies of water, or wild meadow).	Yes	Community growing areas are sited on existing farmland.
BW2_PFF_0012	Respondent stated negligible impact of community food growing on this scale.	Yes	The Project will ensure the delivery of over 70% Biodiversity Net Gain, as set out in ES Appendix 9.15 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This is in part driven by the conversion of the site

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			from intensive agriculture to conservation grazing and the associated uplift in ecological value.
BW2_OFF_0546	Respondent stated that there is a need for hubs, warehouses etc to support local supply chains.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0546	Respondent stated that they do not mind where but it should be as much land as can be spared.	Yes	30 hectares of the site have been set aside for community food growing
BW2_OFF_0376	Respondent said they were unable to comment as it is not clear what could be grown and how within a power station with surrounding high fences.	Yes	Community food growing areas are separate from areas of panel arrays.
BW2_PFF_0073	Respondent suggested establishing community orchards instead.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0026	Respondent noted they have been told about the poor quality of agricultural land planned to be built on. They asked if it is suitable for community growing areas and further stated it would require intense gardening from volunteers.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 (Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way) of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey, which considers the agricultural land and soil resources within the Project shows that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p>
BW2_PFF_0139	Respondent noted that community food growing would not help to encourage people to grow food.	Yes	Both groups already committed to the Project will be encouraging members of the community to get involved in growing food for their own consumption.
BW2_PFF_0205	Respondent suggested using the areas as commercial market gardens instead of allotments.	Yes	The Project wants to involve the community, not commercial operators, as well as support those suffering from food insecurity,
BW2_OFF_0383	Respondent stated that it is not a viable option as little will grow under the solar panels.	Yes	Food growing areas are adjacent to panels not beneath them

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0115	Respondent stated that local communities must decide on community food growing locations not the PDVP.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0124	Respondent expressed that community good growing initiatives do not exist.	Yes	Cherwell Collective have been operating one for four years.
BW2_OFF_0173	Responded noted they are the non-Executive director of Global Food Oxfordshire, which acts as a hub for food resources across the country. They requested contacting on the details previously provided.	Yes	The project has been working with Good Food Oxford for over a year, they have put the Applicant in contact with potential growers for the site.
BW2_PFF_0221	Respondent noted that Blenheim has not bothered to offer community food growing facilities previously, making them reluctant to believe the prospect can materialise	Yes	SolarFive Ltd will offer the growing areas on land controlled by the Applicant should DCO consent be granted
BW2_OFF_0400	Respondent stated that the existing community areas within Woodstock are open to poor maintenance and that any new ones are unlikely to be looked after.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0535	Respondent state that the Cutteslowe Larder have confirmed that this is a	Yes	The Applicant is working with Cutteslowe Larder to provide them with a suitable site for them to install polytunnels.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	completely unworkable project for them.		
BW2_PFF_0011	Respondent asked who is going to grow the food.	Yes	Food growing is open to all who wish to become involved.
Land Use and Agriculture			
BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0090	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the projects impact on food security.</p> <p>One respondent stated they were concerned about increased food imports and national food security.</p> <p>One respondent stated food production is more important than solar panels.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>
BW2_PFF_0034	Respondent expressed concern about putting solar panels on grade 3a farming land.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p>
BW2_PFF_0219	<p>Respondent asked if there would be any animal/ sheep grazing in the designated areas for food growing.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>
BW2_OFF_0528	<p>Respondent stated that food security is an important topic and that food production should be managed by experts, not amateur hobby producers.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>
BW2_OFF_0345	<p>Respondent noted that there is no way to replace the scale of agricultural land lost.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>A total of only 5.5ha of agricultural land would be permanently lost as a result of the Project where the substations and PCS units would be located.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0068	Respondent suggested solar panels should only be installed where food cannot grow.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>
BW2_PFF_0011	Respondent asked where displaced farmers will go.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The landholdings within the operational areas of the Project comprise three substantial arable landholdings, where the long term temporary change in the proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The three landholdings within the operational areas of the Project comprise substantial arable landholdings, where the proposed change in land use would not compromise the overall viability and operation of these large farming enterprises.</p>
Local Ecology & Wildlife			
BW2_PFF_0170	Respondent stated the idea for community food growing is an appeasement which will not address the loss of habitats to many species.	Yes	The Project will ensure the delivery of over 70% Biodiversity Net Gain, as set out in ES Appendix 9.15 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [EN010147/APP/6.5]. This is primarily driven by the conversion of the site from intensive agriculture to conservation grazing and associated uplift in ecological value.
BW2_PFF_0235	Respondent is concerned about local deer disturbing the community food growing and suggested fencing against them.	Yes	The design of any community food growing area would be subject to appropriate detailed design post consent. Such detailed design could include the use of deer fencing, if considered necessary.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0258	Respondent noted the importance of community food growing areas supporting biodiversity. They stated that these areas should provide good conditions for growing food in a beneficial, safe environment that also can play its role in supporting biodiversity.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent was asking whether there will be soil tests to measure the degradation from dust particles on soil from the installation process.	Yes	This is addressed in the Outline Dust Management Plan in the ES. Document Reference [EN01047/APP/7.6.1] .
BW2_OFF_0498	Respondent questioned that if the soil was not suitable for agriculture, why is it being offered as community food growing.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey, which considers the agricultural land and soil resources within the Project shows that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.
BW2_PFF_0121	Respondent would like to see trees planted as well on the same land.	No	Noted
Landscape and Visual			
BW2_OFF_0488	Respondent noted that community food growing projects would not offset the visual damage done.	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p>
BW2_PFF_0228	Respondent voiced concern about the damaging nature of the proposal on the environment and landscape.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0110	Respondent disagreed with the scheme and suggested the planned project was 'destroying the environment'.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0112	Respondent requested the proposed project be scaled down by 95%	N	Noted. The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_OFF_0427	Respondent argued against the use of the countryside.	N	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0282	Respondent suggested much wider buffer zones, at least 2km.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0482	Respondent suggested that the loss of access to open countryside arising from the proposal needs to be mitigated, specifically along the only route west from Dean Court.	Yes	There would be no loss of access. All existing PRow would be retained on current locations. With proposed cycleway created. Acknowledged that the Project would result in a loss of perceived open countryside.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0370	Respondent stated that Cumnor is on a green belt and it should remain so.	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Project [EN010147/APP/7.1] . At appendix 8 to the PSS is the very special circumstances case in respect of the Project.
Archaeology and Local Heritage			
BW2_OFF_0474	Respondent suggested relocating the farm away from a historic rural place that is also considered a world heritage site.	Yes	The impacts of the Project upon the World Heritage Site are considered in Appendix 7.4 [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
Hydrology and Flood Risk			
BW2_PFF_0224	Respondent suggested collecting water runoff from the arrays and using it to water the community food growing land to reduce risk of flooding.	Yes	There will be so significant increase in runoff as a result of the project. Collection and re-use of the water will alter the natural flow regime and downstream catchment. Therefore, in line with planning guidance this is not a requirement and has not been implemented.
Recreation and Amenity			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0047	Respondent specified the need for public pathways.	Yes	Information on public pathways is available within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0353	Respondent stated that current provisions should not be taken away for the sake of local resident mental health	Yes	Information on current provisions are available within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0086	Respondent stated they should complement recreational provisions of the project as far as possible.	Yes	Information on recreational provisions are available within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
Project Description			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0255, BW2_OFF_0256, BW2_OFF_0261, BW2_OFF_0275, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0307, BW2_OFF_0308, BW2_OFF_0344, BW2_OFF_0349, BW2_OFF_0352, BW2_OFF_0354, BW2_OFF_0358, BW2_OFF_0372, BW2_OFF_0374, BW2_OFF_0395, BW2_OFF_0398, BW2_OFF_0410, BW2_OFF_0411, BW2_OFF_0415, BW2_OFF_0428, BW2_OFF_0440, BW2_OFF_0453, BW2_OFF_0488, BW2_OFF_0497, BW2_OFF_0498, BW2_OFF_0528,	Respondents stated that the premise of the question was wrong as they disagreed with the entire project.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0540, BW2_PFF_0057, BW2_PFF_0122, BW2_PFF_0149, BW2_PFF_0184, BW2_PFF_0215, BW2_PFF_0217, BW2_PFF_0218, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0230, BW2_PFF_0294			
BW2_OFF_0381	Respondent stated they were generally against the project.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0228	Respondent rejected the question as they believed it made the proposals seem settled/ completed.	No	Noted
Traffic, Access and Construction			
BW2_PFF_0100	Respondent stated that there would be accessibility problems travelling and operating land in fields of electric/ solar installations.	No	Noted
Socioeconomics			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0001	Respondent stated that the need for housing removes the viability for community food growing.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0414	Respondent asked what finances are being offered to support this project.	No	Noted
Consultation Process			
BW2_OFF_0537, BW2_OFF_0539, BW2_PFF_0124, BW2_PFF_0275, BW2_PFF_0274	<p>Respondents stated this question should not be part of that proposal.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that they found the question unhelpful and unrealistic.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that they couldn't assess the relative importance of community food growing because they did not have access to the relevant information.</p>	No	Information can be found in the assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land which are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey, which considers the agricultural land and soil resources within the Project shows that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The Applicant notes that respondents were not obliged to complete this question, but is grateful to those that have provided suggestions for consideration.
BW2_OFF_0540, BW2_PFF_0278, BW2_PFF_0276	<p>Respondents expressed that little to no information has been provided about the community food growing initiatives.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that no detail has gone into location or amount of land committed in the community food growing proposal.</p>	Yes	Information can be found in the assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land which are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey, which considers the agricultural land and soil resources within the Project shows that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land
BW2_OFF_0013, BW2_OFF_0212, BW2_OFF_0222	Respondents stated that they do not believe that the community is not being listened to.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0013, BW2_OFF_0132, BW2_OFF_0416	Respondents asked why this question on community food growing initiatives is necessary.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0548	Respondent stated that Cherwell Collective and Cutteslowe Community Larder do not serve the communities who are the most impacted and should not be involved in the programme.		Cherwell Collective supports those suffering from food insecurity across the whole of West Oxfordshire. Applications from growers from across Oxfordshire are encouraged.
Community Benefit Concerns			
BW2_OFF_0548, BW2_PFF_0091, BW2_OFF_0331	Respondents questioned how the schemes would be managed.	Yes	An Agricultural License agreement with food growing groups is proposed.
BW2_OFF_0230	Respondent stated that the community benefit proposals are 'dribble'.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_OFF_0540	Respondent expressed that there is not an adequate need for these types of initiative.	No	The Applicant notes that existing allotment schemes have waiting lists and therefore anticipates demand for growing space to be strong.
BW2_OFF_0523	Respondent believes there is a high degree of greenwashing on the project as the land is currently growing food.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0508, BW2_OFF_0391	Respondents expressed doubt that the Project will be delivered.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0075	Respondent queried use of the word 'community' and pointed out that existing projects were poorly maintained/ funded.	No	Noted
Local Community Suggestions			
BW2_OFF_0512, BW2_OFF_0546, BW2_OFF_0548	Respondents suggested asking interested parties such as Cherwell Collective.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0546, BW2_OFF_0548	Respondents noted that they believe Cherwell Collective to be excited about the opportunity.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0212	Respondents would like to see a clear statement of working with relevant local groups on the topic of community food growing, such as Green Tea in Eynsham.	Yes	The Applicant is working with Good Food Oxford to engage with potential growers, and will contact Green Tea.
BW2_PFF_0239	Respondent stated they are campaigning for community food growing in Salt Cross Gardens and asked for project support.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0334	Respondent suggested linking the project's community food growing	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	initiative with other local community food sharing initiatives.		
Site Selection and Alternatives			
BW2_OFF_0016, BW2_OFF_0373, BW2_PFF_0065, BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_OFF_0205	Respondents stated that solar should be installed on rooftops.	Yes	Alternatives assessed are provided in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0299, BW2_PFF_0274	Respondents suggested the whole facility should be built on non-arable or brownfield land.	Yes	Alternatives assessed are provided in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

Table 6: Question 9 – Please provide any feedback on our approach to delivering opportunities beyond solar.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Community Benefit General Comments			
BW2_OFF_0220, BW2_OFF_0214, BW2_OFF_0335, BW2_OFF_0371, BW2_OFF_0329, BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0396, BW2_OFF_0394, BW2_OFF_0395, BW2_OFF_0396, BW2_OFF_0404, BW2_OFF_0414, BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_OFF_0432, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0490, BW2_OFF_0499, BW2_OFF_0512, BW2_OFF_0514, BW2_OFF_0528, BW2_OFF_0529, BW2_OFF_0538, BW2_OFF_0540,	<p>Respondents stated that £50k is inadequate for various reasons, including that the fund is unsubstantial in comparison to potential profits, the fund should be equal to the profits made by the development, it should be index-linked, should provide compensation to all residents who live near the site, should be between £1 - 5 million per year, the fund should come from the electricity sales from the project.</p> <p>Respondents also stated that the fund should be protected if the development is sold to another company.</p> <p>One respondent stated that Low Carbon Hub advised that the Project should be offering around £4.2m instead of £50k.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0547, BW2_PFF_0024, BW2_PFF_0212, BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0239, BW2_OFF_0268, BW2_OFF_0330, BW2_OFF_0357, BW2_OFF_0411, BW2_OFF_0497, BW2_OFF_0507, BW2_OFF_0512, BW2_OFF_0332, BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_PFF_0186, BW2_PFF_0190, BW2_PFF_0201, BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_PFF_0278, BW2_OFF_0283, BW2_OFF_0020, BW2_PFF_0051, BW2_OFF_0299, BW2_OFF_0537, BW2_PFF_0012, BW2_PFF_0278,			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0288, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0040, BW2_PFF_0238, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_OFF_0271, BW2_OFF_0183, BW2_OFF_0056, BW2_OFF_0465, BW2_PFF_0126, BW2_OFF_0535, BW2_OFF_0514, BW2_PFF_0030, BW2_PFF_0071, BW2_PFF_0083, BW2_PFF_0148, BW2_PFF_0177, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_OFF_0007, BW2_OFF_0182, BW2_PFF_0115, BW2_PFF_0210, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0230, BW2_PFF_0242, BW2_PFF_0251, BW2_PFF_0258,			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0272, BW2_PFF_0301, BW2_PFF_0278, BW2_OFF_0172, BW2_PFF_0207, BW2_PFF_0222, BW2_PFF_0260, BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_PFF_0272			
BW2_OFF_0022, BW2_OFF_0054, BW2_OFF_0066, BW2_OFF_0078, BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_OFF_0144, BW2_OFF_0146, BW2_OFF_0172, BW2_OFF_0174, BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0179, BW2_OFF_0180, BW2_OFF_0243, BW2_OFF_0244, BW2_OFF_0275, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0291,	Respondents stated that the impact of the project is too big to be mitigated by community benefits proposed.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0307, BW2_OFF_0314, BW2_OFF_0317, BW2_OFF_0319, BW2_OFF_0321, BW2_OFF_0329, BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0344, BW2_OFF_0349, BW2_OFF_0353, BW2_OFF_0361, BW2_OFF_0358, BW2_OFF_0372, BW2_OFF_0376, BW2_OFF_0397, BW2_OFF_0409, BW2_OFF_0416, BW2_OFF_0422, BW2_OFF_0441, BW2_OFF_0453, BW2_OFF_0457, BW2_OFF_0462, BW2_OFF_0466, BW2_OFF_0468, BW2_OFF_0474,			energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0478, BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_OFF_0483, BW2_OFF_0496, BW2_OFF_0503, BW2_OFF_0549, BW2_PFF_0075, BW2_PFF_0197, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0255, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0265, BW2_PFF_0266, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0271, BW2_PFF_0285, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_PFF_0303			
BW2_OFF_0014, BW2_OFF_0017, BW2_OFF_0045, BW2_OFF_0046, BW2_OFF_0057, BW2_OFF_0065, BW2_OFF_0085, BW2_OFF_0092, BW2_OFF_0093,	Respondents expressed they would rather not have the development in the first place	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0098, BW2_OFF_0106, BW2_OFF_0110, BW2_OFF_0118, BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0121, BW2_OFF_0131, BW2_OFF_0134, BW2_OFF_0141, BW2_OFF_0164, BW2_OFF_0165, BW2_OFF_0217, BW2_OFF_0223, BW2_OFF_0250, BW2_OFF_0314, BW2_OFF_0317, BW2_OFF_0338, BW2_OFF_0351, BW2_OFF_0353, BW2_OFF_0386, BW2_OFF_0398, BW2_OFF_0415, BW2_OFF_0421, BW2_OFF_0425, BW2_OFF_0458, BW2_OFF_0474, BW2_OFF_0476,			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0103, BW2_PFF_0122, BW2_PFF_0204, BW2_PFF_0215, BW2_PFF_0228, BW2_PFF_0228, BW2_PFF_0302, BW2_OFF_0381, BW2_OFF_0392			
BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0055, BW2_OFF_0071, BW2_OFF_0075, BW2_OFF_0079, BW2_OFF_0158, BW2_OFF_0191, BW2_OFF_0208, BW2_OFF_0226, BW2_OFF_0237, BW2_OFF_0240, BW2_OFF_0249, BW2_OFF_0310, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_OFF_0339, BW2_OFF_0353, BW2_OFF_0370, BW2_OFF_0383,	Respondents referred to the Project as bribery in an attempt by developers to buy support.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0390, BW2_OFF_0411, BW2_OFF_0439, BW2_OFF_0440, BW2_OFF_0462, BW2_OFF_0529, BW2_PFF_0089, BW2_PFF_0091, BW2_PFF_0104, BW2_PFF_0107, BW2_PFF_0108, BW2_PFF_0139, BW2_PFF_0147, BW2_PFF_0187, BW2_PFF_0218, BW2_PFF_0221, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0281, BW2_PFF_0294, BW2_PFF_0304, BW2_OFF_0539, BW2_OFF_0013, BW2_OFF_0007			
BW2_OFF_0145, BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0253, BW2_OFF_0298,	Respondents stated that £50k pa is minor in value compared with what the developers and landowners will receive for the installation.	Yes	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0309, BW2_OFF_0314, BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_OFF_0476, BW2_PFF_0259, BW2_PFF_0270, BW2_PFF_0253, BW2_PFF_0260			<p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>
BW2_OFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0331, BW2_OFF_0447, BW2_PFF_0054, BW2_PFF_0227, BW2_PFF_0258	Respondents suggested using the fund to compensate residents to the decrease in house value.	No	An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it was agreed any impact would not be significant.
BW2_OFF_0286, BW2_OFF_0285, BW2_OFF_0423,	Respondents stated that £50K is negligible considering the damage to house value.	No	An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0277, BW2_PFF_0118 BW2_PFF_0222			was agreed any impact would not be significant.
BW2_OFF_0336, BW2_OFF_0424, BW2_OFF_0512	<p>Respondents believe that the community benefit should be have a fair and administered by an independent foundation.</p> <p>One respondent stated that the fund should be managed by an independent body of local representatives.</p> <p>One respondent would like an independent fund to govern the community benefit, not town or parish councils.</p>	No	The Applicant notes these suggestions, and is continuing to develop the specific mechanisms of how community benefits will be delivered.
BW2_OFF_0212, BW2_OFF_0240	Respondents referred to the scheme as a gimmick.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0388,B W2_OFF_0405	Respondents stated they do not believe any of the promises will be delivered.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0464, BW2_PFF_0260	Respondents stated that the proposal is insulting.	N/o	Noted
BW2_OFF_0056, BW2_PFF_0128	Respondents stated that the community benefit fund is encouraging but is inappropriate in size relative to the development.	Yes	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>
BW2_OFF_0548, BW2_OFF_0514	The respondent stated that the community benefit fund is completely inadequate and that the amount proposed is much smaller compared to similar renewable projects. The respondent stated further that this would impact a significant number of villages/towns and a lot of people. The respondent followed this by stating that the sum of £50k is negligible and it will	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>not provide real noticeable benefit to the community.</p> <p>One respondent stated that the £50,000 comparison with Blenheim Bursary is incongruous as the context is very different. They added that research shows that other UK projects offer fairer and more generous community benefit funding. Furthermore, they stated that the level of community benefit should reflect current values at comparable installations.</p>		<p>benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0481, BW2_PFF_0042</p>	<p>Respondent has stated that the proposals are unclear on the matter. The responded elaborated by stating that the community has to be informed what is included before they are asked to comment.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>BW2_OFF_0020, BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_PFF_0153, BW2_PFF_0154, BW2_PFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0183, BW2_PFF_0117,</p>	<p>Respondent stated that the proposed benefits are vague.</p> <p>One respondent stated that much more detail is required on the "potential mechanisms' and availability of "discounted rates".</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Noted</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0258			
BW2_OFF_0097	Respondent noted that the community benefit fund is welcome.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0123	Respondent stated they were happy that non-fossil fuel methods are finally being taken seriously.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0179	Respondent stated that the project would have a negative impact on mental health.	No	Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. This includes assessment of risk perception and associated effects on mental health.
BW2_OFF_0065	Respondent stated that the offer is appreciated but feels like an attempt to buy support and distract from the impact on the land for the next 40+ years.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0185	Respondent stated there is no need for community funding and it feels like small charity.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0196	Respondent stated that the community does not appear to benefit from this development, the community suffers.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0248	Respondent stated that benefits should only extend to existing homes.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0265	Respondent believes these types of funds will be derived from income gained by selling energy, raising the overall price to the consumer.	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project directly to reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - [EN010147/APP/6.3] EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0403	Respondent suggested community funding to compensate the damage to local communities.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0419	Respondent asked how far £50k would go.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0424	Respondent stated that the fund would have to be protected legally against inflation and the selling of the farm.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0425	Respondent stated they would leave this to be decided by younger members of the community.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0428	Respondent stated that if there are opportunities, you are the wrong company for a variety of reasons both commercially and ethically.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0433	Respondent suggested clear negative effects on the communities affected.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0450	Respondent stated that looking at opportunities is premature before the scale of the development has been justified.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0470	Respondent stated 'think again, please'.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0490	The respondent stated it is essential that the community benefits fund is structured so it is protected if the developer sells to another company in the future.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0490	Respondent stated that there should be an annual structure for community benefits.	No	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.
BW2_OFF_0493	Respondent believes all the surrounding areas would benefit in using this solar power, not just Wootton and Woodstock but surrounding villages.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0498	Respondent stated there was no information on a net gain for local employment, then stating it seemed like local contractors will just be bused in.	Yes	This is covered within [EN010147/APP/6.3] EIA Chapter 15 appendix 15.2 Employment & Skills Plan
BW2_OFF_0500	Respondent stated that the offer is miserly and questioned who will guarantee the benefits for the next 40 years.	Yes	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>
BW2_OFF_0508	Respondent does not believe they will benefit from the project.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0515	Respondent stated there are no opportunities.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0527	Respondent stated that the idea is a fig leaf to hide the embarrassing truth that the entire project is absurd.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0530	Respondent stated that they applaud all opportunities for renewable energy of suitable scales.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0536	Respondent asked who would hold you accountable to any promised made to benefit the community . They stated further that benefits are easy to	Yes	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	promise, not so easy to deliver and easily forgotten.		<p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>
BW2_OFF_0539	Respondent stated that supporting local communities with sustainability offers shrouded as meeting their interests is disingenuous when the entire project destroys the heart of the community at its inception.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0540	Respondent recommended reviewing a published International Finance Corporation Discussion Paper on local	No	The applicant thanks the respondent for sharing this document.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>benefit sharing from large-scale wind and solar projects.</p> <p>The respondent considers this document as a more comprehensive suggestion of possible community benefits. The respondent stated that all of the options summarised on pages 20&21 and outlined in more detail later would be appropriate to this project.</p>		
BW2_OFF_0514	<p>Respondent suggested that an appropriate proper fund, carefully managed and delivered could have a positive impact on local people. They added that PVDP will rightly deliver rewards to their investors but there should be appropriate, just, and fair community benefits for the duration of the project. They believe that this is a very large solar development that impacts many local communities, and the developer and landowner should understand and appreciate that it deserves a more significant level of community benefit.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.
BW2_OFF_0514	<p>Respondent expressed that whatever sum is agreed, it must be index linked or otherwise linked to the revenues of the solar farm, so that it does not lose its value over time. They provided these reasons below for a higher figure include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The high percentage of this project sited on green belt (72%) - The percentage of project on grade 1-3a agricultural land (38%) - The size of the project 840MW - The land is adjacent to a UNESCO World Heritage Site - The impact on the local amenity - as the solar farm surrounds local green spaces 	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1]. At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.
BW2_OFF_0514	Respondent expressed that the agreement must be protected and passed on if the developer sells the farm to another company to run and remains index linked.	Yes	The conditions of the DCO consent remain in force if ownership of the solar farm changes.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0514	Respondent expressed that whatever sum is agreed, it must be index linked or otherwise linked to the revenues of the solar farm, so that it does not lose its value over time.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0514	Respondent stated that they understand that the developer has ruled out the opportunity to explore any form of community ownership, citing technical and financial requirements for this to succeed. The Respondent added that it has been mentioned often by community members as an opportunity that would be very much valued. They asked that the developer explore options with the community to see if there is any that could fit the bill. Respondent expressed added that Low Carbon Hub have considered ways in which this may be implemented and may be found soon on their website.	Yes	The Applicant is in contact with Low Carbon Hub to discuss their suggestions for community involvement in Project.
BW2_PFF_0015	Respondent stated that the vast majority of local residents believe that the biggest community benefit would be not making the farm at all. The respondent then stated that a community benefit fund is just a sop to	Yes	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	the community which feels that this is the right project in the wrong place.		<p>when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>
BW2_PFF_0018	Respondent stated that they are an electrician and install solar panels but the proposed installation is obscene! The respondent then noted that the project is more about Blenheim making money than it is about saving the planet.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0019	Respondent stated that they do not believe the community benefit will ever happen.	No	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>
BW2_PFF_0039	Respondent stated that they do not believe in this type of approach. They stated that the word 'legacy' is used time and time again by businesses trying to push large schemes through, trying to convince the local population and improvements will result from the project.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0042	The respondent noted that the bursary fund equates to a very small sum per resident impacted by the project. The respondent stated that the bursary should be more generous given the profits to be made by the developer and land owners and loss of value suffered by local residents (amenity, wellbeing and house prices).	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0042	The respondent stated that more detail and a true proposal is required before they can move from opposing the project, in its current form, to supporting it.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0043	Respondent asked how easy it would be to apply to the fund. The respondent also asked what hoops people would have to jump through. The respondent also noted that these policies look good on paper but when it comes to the crunch they are a nightmare to apply for. The respondent finally noted that the proposal is 'weasel words' to make you look good to government and planning.	Yes	<p>Details of the fund will be agreed with the local planning authorities, but the Applicant intends to target communities close to the Project and make it simple to apply for funding.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>
BW2_PFF_0046	Respondent stated that £50k would not go far in pacifying uproar from local opposition.	No	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant is increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>
BW2_PFF_0048	Respondent stated that if it goes ahead, every local resident should receive a significant discount on	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	electricity to reflect the desecration of the local countryside.		reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity [EN010147/APP/6.3] EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_PFF_0057, BW2_PFF_0100	Respondent stated that nothing benefits from this proposal other than landowners.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0068	Respondent stated that they disagree with the proposal as a whole so cannot agree to accepting any payoff from it.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0070	Respondent stated that it is hard to understand how you are "committed to working with the community" when the community clearly is opposed to the project.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0083	Respondent noted that we need to think further ahead for the next generation's sake.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0091	Respondent stated that the proposals would be beneficial if they had to have the solar farm.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0101	Respondent stated that all too often with major developments, the community benefits do not materialise. The respondent then asked if it is a binding commitment or just a sweetener that will never be obtained, then expressing concern that it will be watered down until it is not really worth anything.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO. Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum. Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer Project electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0103	Respondent stated that the value of their property will be significantly hit if the project goes ahead. The respondent further stated that they are squeezed from all sides and the token offers are negligible, stating that the project is a zero sum gain and if it goes ahead, everyone will lose financially and in terms of quality of life through not being able to walk in local fields.	Yes	The respondent is urged to read the Environmental Statement to answer these concerns. The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Applicant has also produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.
BW2_PFF_0132	Respondent stated that the project is 'another red herring' and that finishing the project with the word 'legacy' is trying to prove that it is giving the community something it wants/needs. The respondent also stated that token promises do not mitigate the vast impacts on the diverse ways in which	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	people want to enjoy the environment they have chosen to live in. The respondent stated that nobody has ever moved to an area because it has vast solar arrays.		
BW2_PFF_0141	Respondent said this is not worth commenting on as they cannot imagine any of this happening given the total lack of regard for local residents so far.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0270	Respondent stated that genuine community benefit would mean developing a series of solar installations which are owned and run by the community.	Yes	<p>There is a role in the transformation of the UK's energy system for community owned solar farms like Southill Community Energy near Charlbury. The government's target of 70GW solar generation by 2035 requires utility-scale solar farms as well as solar panels on rooves.</p> <p>The Applicant is in discussions with Low Carbon Hub in Oxford about their involvement in their project.</p>
BW2_OFF_0424	Respondent suggested providing a fund rather than specified benefits for the following reasons: (1) The community needs will change over time so it is more adaptable. (2) Since it is regular every year it will allow genuinely	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	sustainable projects to be carried out. (3) It is far easier to explain to communities what they are getting. (4) Avoids ideas being approved at the time but abandoned only a few years later.		when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO. Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.
BW2_PFF_0170	Respondent stated that this is another appeasement that they are not interested in.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0211	Respondent suggested a financial contribution to the community of the neighbouring villages would be important in acknowledging the damage the project will have done to the local environment.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0110	Respondent believes the community is being gaslit with the offering of legacy opportunities.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0373	Respondent suggested benefits being put to a vote of the people living closest to the sites.	Yes	The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_PFF_0208	Respondent stated that they do not believe the energy price reduction will happen or at least be of worth and is just a headline to grab approval. The respondent noted that discussions at the consultation events have not convinced them otherwise.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_PFF_0274	Respondent asked how the four local groups were selected to engage in community benefits.	No	The Applicant has identified these organisations through their ongoing engagement with local stakeholders. Both organisations are active in supporting local residents who are suffering from food insecurity. Cherwell Collective supports clients in all the villages adjacent to the Project and also operates a cafe in Witney. Access to Project land will enable them to

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			raise production, and therefore support, significantly.
Providing Cheaper Energy and Supporting Community Energy Projects			
BW2_OFF_0002, BW2_OFF_0021, BW2_OFF_0049, BW2_OFF_0050, BW2_OFF_0052, BW2_OFF_0097, BW2_OFF_0311, BW2_OFF_0356, BW2_OFF_0454, BW2_OFF_0222, BW2_OFF_0306, BW2_PFF_0178, BW2_PFF_0177, BW2_PFF_0208, BW2_PFF_0211, BW2_PFF_0258, BW2_PFF_0264, BW2_PFF_0276, BW2_OFF_0248, BW2_OFF_0525	<p>Respondents noted the importance of the project helping reduce local energy bills.</p> <p>Respondents stated the most important community benefit is that local residents and businesses should be compensated with significantly cheaper or subsidised energy.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project directly to reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - [EN010147/APP/6.3] EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25</p>
BW2_OFF_0056, BW2_OFF_0194, BW2_OFF_0194,	<p>Respondents suggested grants for energy efficiency methods for residential homes and commercial</p>	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0490, BW2_PFF_0117, BW2_PFF_0224, BW2_PFF_0284, BW2_OFF_0490	buildings, such as insulation, low carbon heating, heating pumps, installation of roof-mounted solar panels, etc.		
BW2_OFF_0182, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_OFF_0434, BW2_OFF_0423, BW2_OFF_0262, BW2_OFF_0052	<p>Respondents would like clarification on the community energy suggestion.</p> <p>Respondents noted that the offer of community energy is too vague at present.</p> <p>One respondent stated that proposed reduced energy bills sound attractive, but the proposal is vague and is too little to compensate for the effect on the lives of communities.</p>	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0012, BW2_OFF_0103, BW2_OFF_0246, BW2_OFF_0503	<p>Respondents would like to see further discounts on energy for those who live locally.</p> <p>One respondent believes everyone within 300 metres of the project should have their bills reduced through the community energy scheme.</p> <p>One respondent suggested reduced</p>	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	energy bills for those within 5 km of the sites.		rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0091, BW2_PFF_0134	Respondents believe the offer of reduced bills is a lie.	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0293, BW2_OFF_0294	Respondents stated that cheap electricity for the whole community at 7p per Kilowatt hour 24 hours a day should be offered.	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0118, BW2_PFF_0176	Respondents stated that a community benefit would be heavily discounted energy to the 7 villages and 11,000 residents affected.	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0449, BW2_OFF_0285	Respondents stated they cannot understand how locals will get any benefit as all of the energy produced is proposed to go to the national grid.	No	Local residents are supplied with their electricity via the Distribution Network Operator, which is itself supplied by the National Grid. Electricity from Botley West Solar Farm will be consumed locally.
BW2_OFF_0478, BW2_OFF_0480	Respondents stated that no option has been offered to reduce energy bills.	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0053	Respondent stated any energy discount should be far more extensive than 10% due to the deterioration of their quality of life.	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0075	Respondent stated that lowering local energy costs is a powerful incentive and would encourage other areas to develop similar projects.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0097	Respondent wants to see the fund used to create local renewable energy projects.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0116	Respondent stated they would be interested in investing a limited amount in the project if it would give them a reduced energy price.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0170	Respondent suggested reducing energy tariffs for people impacted negatively impacted by the scheme.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0473	Respondent stated that the community energy benefit should extend to the whole of Oxford and Oxfordshire.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0248	Respondent stated that sharing profit from the electricity output needs to include all residents effected including those who live in Eynsham who commute beside the impacted land on a daily basis.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0248	Respondent stated that the total amount given to each household to reduce their energy bills needs to be defined and linked to every house that already exists in the impacted area.	Yes	<p>The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project.</p> <p>For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers.</p> <p>All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0270	Respondent suggested supporting low energy projects for low income families or civic buildings with insulation, grants and installing renewable technology.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0290	Respondent suggested money being spent encouraging local companies and homes to install solar panels.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0303	Respondent stated that local energy tariffs are very much welcomed and need to be fully explored. If the scheme is to provide energy for 330,000 homes, all of the homes in Oxfordshire, including those in Witney should be offered discounted energy rates. As a fallback option, and very much a second choice, community ownership options could be made available.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0309	Respondent stated that an energy bill discount of 20% should be offered.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0312	Respondent suggested free energy for residents of Eynsham and other villages.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0321	Respondent stated that the fund should be run alongside reduced energy bills for all local households and reduced in comparison to general market rates. The respondent also voiced concern	Yes	The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	that the offer of cheaper energy will be a high start point with a % reduction, meaning no net cheaper energy to households.		<p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000 to £200,000 per annum.</p>
BW2_OFF_0371	Respondent would like to see contributions to local low energy projects in the area like CAPZero (Community Action Plan for Zero Carbon Energy)	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0467	Respondent suggested adding solar panels to all housing being constructed by Pye/Blenheim.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0471	Respondent suggested free energy for all homes affected over 35-42 year period.	No	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0504	Respondent stated that they believed such promises on reduced energy bills to only come from legislation.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0512	Respondent stated they are in favour of locally supplied energy provided that the developer does not make profit from it and is flexible.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0513	Respondent stated that Oxfordshire has excellent examples of community-owned solar installations including Westmill Soar Co-op, which in 2012 was the UK's first community-owned solar co-operative. The respondent stated that the level of community benefit should reflect the current values	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	at comparable installations. The respondent proposed community-focused principles such as public share offers.		
BW2_OFF_0524	Respondent stated that they hope the local community will benefit in terms of reduced energy bills to encourage them to be positive about the project.	No	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0535	The respondent stated that offering to "help to reduce energy bills" by setting up your own supply company is another cynical move. The respondent stated further that another way to make money with over exaggerated claims of discounts which are unlikely to apply to many (no boundary limits mentioned) and the derisory offer of a 10% discount may be not much better than shopping around among other suppliers	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0514	<p>Respondent expressed that they would like to see more details, and keen to find out how subsidised electricity for the local community might work in practice. They expressed that if the developer is to supply local communities with electricity this must be done at cost (no profit) for the developer to make it a true benefit to the community. It cannot be regarded as a benefit if the developer is making money from it. It should also be offered in a way that is flexible and easy to understand for the local communities, for example some companies offer different tariffs at night when wind generated electricity is in surplus.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1]. The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum. Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year.</p> <p>That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company, and that company will offer PROJECT electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0514	Respondent would support the suggestion that you are "Exploring Community Energy Opportunities". They welcome that the project is "actively exploring potential mechanisms through which the project could directly supply electricity locally at a discounted rate.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0042	Respondent stated that the consultation suggests a 10% discount on energy bills for local residents (verbally by a rep of the developer). The respondent stated that this figure needs to be 50% to compensate for the losses of amenity, wellbeing and house prices.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum. Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year.</p> <p>That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			DCO application, with relevant local authorities. Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company, and that company will offer PROJECT electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.
BW2_PFF_0046	Respondent noted that reduced price solar panels could be offered to local residents.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0046	Respondent noted that reduced price energy for local residents would be great. The respondent suggested further the opportunity to buy bonds/ shares.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0064	Respondent suggested reducing energy costs for local people whose amenity and house prices will be impacted negatively by Botley West.	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_PFF_0086	Respondent suggested funding solar installations on council houses to supply users instead of exporting to the grid, as a contribution to affected communities and supporting more vulnerable members of society.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0102	Respondent suggested using community benefits to fund nuclear power.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0112	Respondent would like the area where reduced energy will be offered to be defined, the respondent added that it should not be included unless defined.	Yes	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_PFF_0114	Respondent stated that they would like to see support for projects that focus on community involvement and	Yes	The Applicant shares the respondent's desire to help those in fuel poverty or suffering from food insecurity, hence the

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	sustainability but also focus on those members of society who struggle with energy bills. The respondent noted that villages around Woodstock seem popular but hide rural poverty.		initiatives around community food growing and the proposals for a retail energy company and a community benefit fund. The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_PFF_0117	Respondent stated that any offer to help fund roof-mounted solar panels on residential homes should be accompanied with a proper plan to ensure comprehensive roof solar generation of electricity.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0212	Respondent pointed out 'low carbon hub' which suggests compensators have provided £1-4.2 million as examples.	Yes	The Applicant is in discussions with Low Carbon Hub about their involvement in the Project.
BW2_PFF_0222	The respondent stated that they are puzzled by the aim to supply local discounted energy as the whole output of the project is delivered to the national grid. The respondent further noted that there seems to be no	Yes	Electricity is supplied to homes via the National Grid and Distribution Network Operator. Electricity from the Project will be consumed locally.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	obvious means to directly supply to affected communities and the consultation document is very vague. The respondent concluded by stating that at first glance, reduced energy might seem to be an attractive reason to support the scheme but they would need more detailed information before they could be persuaded.		
BW2_PFF_0224	Respondent suggested community charging points for electric vehicles.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0227	Respondent asked on what basis PVDP is able to reduce energy bills as the power generated goes into the national grid.	Yes	Electricity is supplied to homes from the National Grid by a Distribution Network Operator. The output of Botley West will be consumed locally.
BW2_PFF_0230	Respondent stated that energy bills could be reduced but this could be difficult as any electricity generated from the solar complex will go directly into the main grid.	Yes	Electricity is supplied to homes from the National Grid by a Distribution Network Operator. The output of Botley West will be consumed locally.
BW2_PFF_0238	Respondent stated that 10% off energy bills will not compensate for the disturbance and damage caused by the scheme.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0251	Respondent asked why discounted energy is only being explored as it is not a new idea, and continued to ask		The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>where are the proposals and guarantees that the rate reductions would continue if new owners took control of the plant.</p>		<p>the vicinity of the project. For example, a potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25. Any condition securing this benefit would be unchanged by a change of ownership as it would be a condition of DCO consent.</p>
<p>BW2_PFF_0254</p>	<p>Respondent stated that the community benefit fund size will not go far and that most people want cheaper electricity as a benefit not small pots of money for community projects.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>In terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company, and that company will offer Project electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_PFF_0264	Respondent suggested looking at providing free electricity to the primary schools in the area, including pre-school provisions. The respondent also suggested free electricity to old people's homes and churches.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0272	Respondent suggested funds going towards projects such as CAPZero (our Community Action Plan for Zero Carbon Energy which is part of the larger Project Leo (Local Energy Oxfordshire) and covers 13% of Botley West and overlaps with their project area of the Eynsham Primary	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Substation; their local nature recovery projects such as Eynsham NRN and active travel.		
BW2_PFF_0304	Respondent stated that there is no evidence to suggest anymore is being done regarding energy bill reduction than the possibility being 'explored'.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum. Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years).</p> <p>The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company, and that company will offer PROJECT electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.
BW2_OFF_0156	Respondent has stated that electricity is free from the ether but you choose not to reveal that.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0237	Respondent stated that no amount of discounted electricity or bursary would change the damage of the project to the countryside.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0540	The respondent added that community (minority) ownership would be a far more effective and appropriate mechanism and could then be used as a basis to fund e.g. rooftop solar, improved insulation, reductions in electricity tariffs, further investment in new community-owned renewable generation etc. The respondent believes this should be explicitly considered as either part of the design or at least an alternative.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0313	The respondent stated that there is no evidence anything more is happening in that direction other than it being	No	The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities for the Project to directly reduce the energy bills of residents living in the vicinity of the project. For example, a

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	explored in regard to the offer of reduced energy bills for the community.		potential mechanism could be to establish a retail electricity supply company to sell Botley West's output to consumers. All power would be from renewable sources, and those living within the vicinity of the project the solar arrays would pay a reduced rate for electricity - EN010147/APP/6.3 EIA Chapter 15 Table 15.25
BW2_OFF_0540	The respondent stated that the project representative's response to this issue of community ownership and community owned renewable generation -during consultation was misleading/inaccurate, as it is completely feasible for a project of this scale.	No	Noted
Supporting Community Projects and Initiatives			
BW2_OFF_0039, BW2_PFF_0188, BW2_OFF_0077	<p>Respondent suggested food growing for poorer members of the community distributed via foodbanks/charities, churches.</p> <p>One respondent stated that childhood food insecurity is a growing problem in Oxford and foodbanks are low on fresh produce - so facilities for the community</p>	Yes	<p>The community growing scheme is designed to address this problem. Further applications for land are being sought.</p> <p>Both groups so far involved provide fresh food to those members of the community that are suffering from food insecurity.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	to grow fresh produce would be essential.		
BW2_OFF_0037	Respondent would like the provision of land for an organic farm and funding from the bursary.	Yes	30 hectares has been set aside for community food growing
BW2_OFF_0531	Respondent suggested community funding for local projects to enhance biodiversity.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on ecology and habitat are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>
BW2_PFF_0224	Respondent suggested an electric bike purchase scheme and the purchase and management of more community sites associated with nature recovery programmes.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0258	Respondent stated that increasing connectivity to improve opportunities to move around in sustainable ways to improve the environment and health.	Yes	<p>The full list of mitigation measures, across a range of topics, is presented within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1: Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule [EN010147/APP/6.5.].</p> <p>The effects of the Project upon the desire for users to use the network of paths and bridleways, and their overall recreational experience, is assessed in Chapter 16 Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Details of typical footpaths and cycle paths, and how they will mature over time are provided in Appendix 7.6.3.2 of the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]</p>
BW2_OFF_0069	Respondent suggested including funding to help affected farmers and community growers to sell their produce to the Oxford colleges and/ or local foodbanks to reduce carbon footprint.	Yes	The Project is working with Oxford Farm to Fork, which supplies Oxford colleges directly, as well as with Cherwell Collective and Cutteslowe Larder
BW2_PFF_0258	Respondent stated that community food production is a welcome opportunity but unfortunately has no details.	Yes	The details will be in the Community Benefit Agreement.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0356	Respondent would like to access allotments between Long Hanborough and Bladon, with vehicle access from the A4095.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0528	Respondent expressed that there are many community organisations that would benefit from funding.		The community fund would be open for all to apply.
Funding for Local Organisations and Buildings			
BW2_OFF_0246, BW2_OFF_0325	Respondents suggested grants for local community organisations.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0493, BW2_PFF_0046, BW2_OFF_0491	<p>Respondents stated there should be help in supporting the area with GP services.</p> <p>One respondent stated that they think more than £50k is needed with a significant amount going into building state-of-the-art GP surgeries for places such as Woodstock.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The effect of the Project on local health services is addressed in Chapter 16 (Human Health) of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] and appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_OFF_0033	Respondent stated that First and Last Mile is a non-profit Community Interest Company which exists to provide bus services for communities which are unable to sustain a commercial bus service. They serve the central area of Botley West and are keen to expand the service. They stated that funding is	Yes	The Applicant met a representative of First and Last Mile at the statutory consultation event at Bladon and encouraged them to apply to the community benefit fund when established.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	a challenge so any funding from a community benefit would be welcome.		
BW2_OFF_0049	Respondent strongly supports the local bursary fund.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0127	Respondent suggested a new Scout hut for Yarnton.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0146	Respondent stated their village really needs a village hall and car park.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0153	Respondent suggested putting the money towards proper council housing rather than 'affordable housing'.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0248	Respondent would like a community fund which will be available for charities within the impacted areas.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0342	Respondent noted that their local football club presently can't afford its electricity bill. The respondent followed this by stating that the project should support grass-root sporting facilities would be a benefit.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0128	Respondent suggested working with the charity FarmAbility to help them establish a permanent base. The respondent also stated that they work with Blenheim already.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0239	Respondent stated that a fund similar to the National Landfill Trusts should be set up for solar farms.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0070	Respondent stated that community benefits require in the area are affordable housing, a new surgery and schools, not an inappropriately huge solar farm.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0219	Respondent stated that the offer is like granting planning permission to build houses as long as you also build a school.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0525	Respondent stated that community benefit could entail building houses at affordable rents.	No	Noted
Working with Local Communities			
BW2_OFF_0042	Respondent stated that the magical island field could become a local nature reserve and using groups such as WASP (Windrush Against Sewage Pollution) to test and evaluate biodiversity and water quality.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0140	Respondent suggested the installation of electric vehicle charging points in Hanborough.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0176	Respondent stated that the project actively supporting the proposed	Yes	The Applicant has expressed support for this footpath but the decision rests with

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	footpath along the B4044 from Botley to Eynsham would win support from the local communities of Botley, Farmoor, and Eynsham, for all of whom the path is a priority. The respondent suggested financial support for the footpath.		Oxfordshire County Council. An application for funding could be made to the community benefit fund when established.
BW2_OFF_0248	Respondent stated that local employment should be guaranteed with a specific number of employees within the impacted area defined under the planning consent.	Yes	Chapter 15 (Socio-Economics) of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] and the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan, Appendix 15.2 [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0324	Respondent stated that asking local groups what would benefit them is a good start.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0343	Respondent stated that serious involvement with communities, relevant special interest groups etc which could/would involve serious proposals for rescaling and adapting the project would show real commitment to working with them.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0482	Respondent stated that any community benefit schemes should be targeted towards groups impacted. The respondent proceeded to give an example of those living in the Dean Court area of Botley who will have their	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	sole safe, direct access to open countryside westwards fettered by the proposals.		
BW2_OFF_0547	The respondent asked which groups have been approached for input into possible community projects. They further asked what the outcomes of those contacts were. For example have local allotment groups or parish council be contacted to see if there is a demand for more allotments in their areas? The respondent asked why are Cherwell Collective and Cutteslowe Community Larder involved in the plans. They do not serve communities who are the most impacted by the solar farm plans	Yes	<p>Applications for land on the 30 hectares of community growing area are welcome from all.</p> <p>Agreement has been reached with two groups that serve local residents who are suffering from food insecurity.</p> <p>Should the Project receive DCO consent further approaches to food growers will be made. The Applicant is working with parish councils, Blenheim Estate and Good Food Oxford to identify potential growers on the site.</p>
BW2_OFF_0547	The respondent asked why are Cherwell Collective and Cutteslowe Community Larder involved in your plans and followed that by stating they do not serve communities who are the most impacted by the solar farm plans.	Yes	Both organisations are active in supporting local residents who are suffering from food insecurity. Cherwell Collective supports clients in all the villages adjacent to the Project and also operates a cafe in Witney. Access to Project land will enable them to raise production, and therefore support, significantly.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0150	Respondent suggested support for environmental work such as improving our waterways i.e. sewage in the Thames.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0166	Respondent stated that a community allotment would be wonderful, if £50k investment is required.	Yes	Access to community growing does not require payment.
BW2_PFF_0178	Respondent would like to see community projects to reduce social barriers and help tackle mental health issues such as loneliness and depression specifically for older people living on their own.	Yes	The Project will result in improved public amenities such as new and enhanced recreational routes offering safer and better connectivity between communities, an educational area, and provisions for community food growing schemes. While these will have indirect positive impacts on the community, specific provisions to help tackle mental health issues is outside the scope of this application.
BW2_OFF_0554	Respondent stated that a retail discount company sounds potentially promising.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0525	Respondent stated that community benefit could helping with local jobs and employment.	No	Noted
Education and Youth			
BW2_OFF_0100, BW2_OFF_0146, BW2_OFF_0550, BW2_OFF_0214,	Respondents suggested a range of initiatives that could benefit from community funding.	Yes	The Applicant notes these suggestions and is grateful to respondents for providing them.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0214, BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_PFF_0077, BW2_PFF_0304, BW2_OFF_0490, BW2_OFF_0077, BW2_OFF_0127, BW2_OFF_0175, BW2_OFF_0248, BW2_OFF_0490, BW2_PFF_0046, BW2_PFF_0113, BW2_PFF_0129, BW2_PFF_0219, BW2_PFF_0224, BW2_PFF_0256, BW2_PFF_0264	Initiatives included: new playground and youth facilities; supporting youth workers to run a club; upkeep of venues for young people to meet; new equipment for the play area in Cassington; educational support to local schools; colleges and universities; Scouts; food for schools, apprenticeships; a renewable energy educational centre or information display; school engagement and outreach; bursary fund for further education; community café; and school trips.		<p>The Applicant notes that these initiatives could be eligible for community funding.</p> <p>The Project's approach to local employment is set out in Chapter 15 (Socio-Economics) of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] and the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan, provided in Appendix 15.2 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>There is land onsite allocated for a school visits centre and the Outline Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan details how the Applicant will work with schools to promote STEM [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
Sport and Leisure			
BW2_OFF_0127	Respondent suggested sponsoring Yarnton FC.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0258	Respondent suggested a park and ride scheme to reduce the amount of traffic going to Blenheim, this would be a major benefit for local people.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0256	Respondent suggested a swimming pool especially if summers continue to get hotter due to climate change.	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0100	Respondent wants to see recreational sports facilities for Woodstock, their current playgrounds are old and the outdoor pool could do with refurbishment.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0100	Respondent noted Woodstock has no local gym or other community sports facilities.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0046	The respondent suggested solar heating for the open-air swimming pool in Woodstock.	Yes	An application could be made to the community benefit fund for a scheme like this.
Working with Councils			
BW2_PFF_0192	Respondents stated that the project was not working enough with other aspects of renewable energy or local housing	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0298	Respondent stated that this is a question for our elected local representatives. They also stated the implication of the question is that the community will be negatively affected.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0215	The respondent would prefer allowing local authorities to decide what is most appropriate for the land.	No	Noted
Recreation and Amenity			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0224, BW2_OFF_0309, BW2_OFF_0181, BW2_OFF_0039, BW2_OFF_0089, BW2_OFF_0454	Respondent suggested improving or creating new public rights of way, cycle paths and pavements in the area.	Yes	<p>This is addressed by the contribution of the Project in securing new recreational routes, including permissive paths, cycleways and Green Ways, to mitigate potential adverse effects on public health associated with changes in the use of the PRoW network.</p> <p>The opportunity for other active travel routes and suggested cycle paths has been identified elsewhere within the Project, between Bladon and Campsfield and Wootton and Sansom's Farm, and the Applicant has been in liaison with OCC's highways, PRoW and Public Health teams to develop illustrative sections for routes – which can be seen in Figure 7.6.3.2 [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]</p>
BW2_OFF_0303	Respondent stated that Witney Town Council acknowledged the community offers such as the £50k annual grants, the cycle and walking paths to ensure the countryside remains accessible through development areas.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0137	Respondent stated it was important to provide the local community with access (where possible) to walking,	Yes	This is addressed by the contribution of the Project in securing new recreational routes, including permissive paths, cycleways and

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	jogging and other forms of recreational access.		<p>Green Ways, to mitigate potential adverse effects on public health associated with changes in the use of the PRoW network.</p> <p>The opportunity for other active travel routes and suggested cycle paths has been identified elsewhere within the Project, between Bladon and Campsfield and Wootton and Sansom's Farm, and the Applicant has been in liaison with OCC's highways, PRoW and Public Health teams to develop illustrative sections for routes – which can be seen in Figure 7.6.3.2 [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]</p>
BW2_OFF_0305	Respondent suggested further interconnectivity between villages, such as footpaths and cycle paths.	Yes	<p>This is addressed by the contribution of the Project in securing new recreational routes, including permissive paths, cycleways and Green Ways, to mitigate potential adverse effects on public health associated with changes in the use of the PRoW network.</p> <p>The opportunity for other active travel routes and suggested cycle paths has been identified elsewhere within the Project, between Bladon and Campsfield and Wootton and Sansom's Farm, and the</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Applicant has been in liaison with OCC's highways, PRow and Public Health teams to develop illustrative sections for routes – which can be seen in Figure 7.6.3.2 [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_OFF_0473	Respondent stated there were good ideas in the consultation leaflet on pages 14/15 including the Cutteslowe Community larder and improving recreational use/ footpaths.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0072	Respondent suggested providing funding to maintain and extend the provision of footpaths and cycle paths to access the open areas along the river.	Yes	<p>This is addressed by the contribution of the Project in securing new recreational routes, including permissive paths, cycleways and Green Ways, to mitigate potential adverse effects on public health associated with changes in the use of the PRow network.</p> <p>The opportunity for other active travel routes and suggested cycle paths has been identified elsewhere within the Project, between Bladon and Campsfield and Wootton and Sansom's Farm, and the Applicant has been in liaison with OCC's highways, PRow and Public Health teams to develop illustrative sections for routes –</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			which can be seen in Figure 7.6.3.2 [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]
BW2_OFF_0124	Respondent suggested creating new traffic-free cycling and walking routes connecting towns, villages and railway stations.	Yes	<p>This is addressed by the contribution of the Project in securing new recreational routes, including permissive paths, cycleways and Green Ways, to mitigate potential adverse effects on public health associated with changes in the use of the PRoW network.</p> <p>The opportunity for other active travel routes and suggested cycle paths has been identified elsewhere within the Project, between Bladon and Campsfield and Wootton and Sansom's Farm, and the Applicant has been in liaison with OCC's highways, PRoW and Public Health teams to develop illustrative sections for routes – which can be seen in Figure 7.6.3.2 [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]</p>
BW2_PFF_0276	Respondent stated that the additional footpaths and cycleways will not be popular when situated between solar 'fields' as most of the routes are. The respondent continued to state that if the panels were removed from the fields	Yes	The issue of behavioural change as a result of visual impacts and the uptake of physical activity in the new routes is assessed in detail in Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES. [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	adjacent to the footpaths, people would be happy to use them.		<p>Visual mitigation such as hedgerow and tree planting has been carefully developed with the aim of long-term improvements that will incentivise their use. The design of footpaths and cycleways have been informed by discussions with local public health stakeholders. taking local needs into account.</p> <p>From a landscape and visual point of view, it is considered that mitigation proposals as part of the Project is appropriate. New hedgerow and tree planting to either side of PRow routes, with a minimum width of 5 m for the PRow, would retain routes in a landscape setting equivalent, and often wider than the existing situation. It is acknowledged that the Project would cause a significant effect from a number of places.</p>
BW2_OFF_0187	Respondent would like to see a pedestrian crossing over the river between Cassington and Eynsham (or the new Salt Cross development)	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0104	Respondent stated that the current community projects are rather vague, the community at this point already	Yes	The present network of PRow will be maintained through the construction and operation of the Project. The outline management measures proposed for

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	benefits in terms of footpaths that are planned to be built over.		affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BW2_PFF_0111	The respondent noted that foot/cycle paths do not compensate for the loss of farming/ green land as it is effectively turned into a brownfield site.	Yes	Landscape strategy is to retain all routes and enhance them with hedgerow and tree planting to either side. A minimum width for PRow routes is to be used. This approach is considered appropriate and is similar to the existing situation in many places. It is acknowledged that the Project would cause a significant effect from a number of places.
BW2_PFF_0222	The respondent noted that whilst the proposed benefits to local communities sound good in theory and the figure is particularly emphasised, they do not feel it compensates in any way for the	Yes	The Project has considered this in ES Chapter 16 Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>upheaval and destruction of the project overall. The respondent added that the benefit of the countryside that the local community has been elected to live in cannot be counted in cash but in terms of wellbeing, stress relief, fresh air, and immersion in nature and peace which is in increasingly short supply. The respondent concluded that quality of life has been absent from community benefit considerations.</p>		
BW2_OFF_0498	<p>The respondent noted that beyond the proposed cycle lanes and footpaths there was nothing tangible.</p>	No	Noted
Footpaths			
BW2_OFF_0042	<p>Respondent suggested a local nature reserve where the magical island field currently is accessible by a new footpath along the Evenlode.</p>	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0182	<p>Respondent would like a massive extension of the footpaths, including compensatory access to the ancient woodland, owned by Blenheim but inaccessible to the public, in particular, the respondent stated they should include Bladon Heath.</p>	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0064	Respondent suggested a riverside walk along the Evenlode.	Yes	The Applicant notes that the proposed permissive footpath route linking Church Hanborough to Cassington follows a section of the waterway.
BW2_PFF_0073	Respondent suggested supporting Hinksey Height Nature Trails, which is making areas of rare alkali fen on the edge of Oxford more affordable.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0175	Respondent suggested a new footbridge over the Thames or Babllock Hythe.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0272	The respondent suggested that more hedgerows including either side of wide new footpaths/bike routes with meadow wildflower strips (not just narrow paths between tall fences).	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0274	Respondent asked how the Cassington to Church Hanborough footpath going to work and if there will be a crossing over the waterway.	Yes	The Applicant notes that the proposed permissive footpath route includes a crossing of the waterway.
Cycle Routes and Benefits			

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0204, BW2_OFF_0074, BW2_OFF_0176, BW2_OFF_0378, BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_OFF_0516, BW2_PFF_0137, BW2_PFF_0175, BW2_PFF_0248, BW2_PFF_0257, BW2_PFF_0269, BW2_PFF_0272, BW2_OFF_0371	<p>Respondent suggested the B4044 Botley Eynsham cycle path is a community project that has been running for around 10 years to support cyclists on a busy road. The path would run through Farmoor where the Botley West substation is to be situated.</p> <p>One respondent stated that there are no safe ways to cycle to Eynsham from Woodstock, Bladon, Hanborough or Freeland. They suggested a cycle/footpath free from flood, mud and road traffic being created to avoid Lower Road and link to the cycle path on the A40.</p> <p>One respondent noted that the B4044 Community Path campaign has not been discussed as it is ready to be implemented after 10 years of campaigning for cycle/ pedestrian access to the dangerous road</p>	Yes	The Applicant has discussed supporting this scheme but the decision on implementation rests with Oxfordshire County Council.
BW2_OFF_0389, BW2_PFF_0269	Respondents noted that the Project would require digging up the road to install cables, and suggested a cycle path between Eynsham and Botley	Yes	The Applicant has discussed supporting this scheme but the decision on implementation rests with Oxfordshire County Council.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	could be installed during the completion of the Project cable installation.		
BW2_PFF_0274	Respondent stated that the idea of new cycle paths are laughable and at present, cyclists are currently able to cycle in the area along country roads, enjoy the views across the fields. The respondent also noted that destroying these vistas will reduce cycle use for leisure in the area. The respondent used an example of a 500m stretch of track that has been proposed in the northern site and asked how in any way that is proportionate to the amount of land being consumed by the farm.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0248	Respondent stated that the cycle route needs to make a link from Eynsham at the lower road roundabout and Cassington to the A4095. The current route is not extensive enough to provide a safe route for cyclists.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0292	Respondent would like significant funding for a cycle path from Cassington to Yarnton.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0378	Respondent suggested a cycle route into the new development called Salt Cross.	Yes	The Applicant has made allowance for the incorporation of the Salt Cross to Hanborough Station active travel route,

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			which was a pre-existing requirement of the Salt Cross AAP – and would be delivered by the Salt Cross developer.
BW2_PFF_0026	Respondent stated that an absolute commitment to a cycle track down Lower Road would be one improvement and benefit the area if the scheme goes ahead. The respondent also noted that cycle tracks along other roads e.g. A4095 would be excellent too.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0207	Respondent suggested constructing cycle routes all around (but not within) the areas of panels.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0224	Respondent suggested funding the cycleway to Oxford.	No	Noted
Public Transport & Roads			
BW2_OFF_0140	Respondent noted support for public transport, such as link buses to the train station is important.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0140	Respondent noted the importance of supporting schemes already in place, such as late night buses to avoid villagers driving cars.	No	Noted
Local Ecology & Wildlife			
BW2_OFF_0011, BW2_OFF_0164	Respondent would like wildflowers to be grown underneath the panels.	Yes	Grasslands under panels will be managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] . They will be multipurpose operational areas but also being managed for biodiversity and livestock.
BW2_OFF_0251, BW2_OFF_0011	Respondents suggest introducing beehives to provide honey to the community. One respondent would like dedicated beekeeping under the panels, with the honey sold going to local charities like Mind (mental health) or a food bank.	Yes	Beehives are provided in the masterplan as set out under the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] . However, these will be managed for biodiversity.
BW2_OFF_0029, BW2_PFF_0251	Respondent stated that no amount of money will compensate for the damage to the local environment.	Yes	The Project is aiming to achieve at least 70% Habitat Biodiversity Net Gain, all of which is being delivered on site. The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is provided in Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5] Appendix 9.13 and implemented under the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_OFF_0009	Respondent noted that the project would lead to the spoiling of the cherished natural environment.	Yes	The Project boundary includes primarily arable land with higher value habitats protected within the masterplan. Furthermore, the Project is aiming to achieve at least 70% Habitat Biodiversity Net Gain. The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is provided in Environmental Statement Volume 3 Appendix 9.13

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			[EN010147/APP/6.5] and implemented under the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6].
BW2_OFF_0039	Respondent stated they are strongly in favour of measures to increase biodiversity, which is a major opportunity for an area shifting from agriculture.	Yes	Noted, the Project is aiming to achieve at least 70% Habitat Biodiversity Net Gain, all of which is being delivered on site. The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is provided in Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5] Appendix 9.13 and implemented under the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6].
BW2_OFF_0042	Respondent suggested a new local nature reserve to act as 'ground zero' for measuring net biodiversity increases, inviting groups to test the water supply.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0097	Respondent noted the fund could enable other biodiversity and wildlife habitat restoration/ creation.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0187	Respondent stated they would like to see a wildlife corridor connecting Pinsley and Burleigh woods with Witham wood.	Yes	It is anticipated that the implementation of the masterplan will increase connectivity between these sites, most notably through the River Evenlode landscape scale corridor.
BW2_OFF_0251	Respondent would like to see the fund help transform ecologically sanitised grassland and ploughed land into areas that promote diversity particularly	Yes	The biodiversity areas of the project will be managed to increase habitat for invertebrates. Mostly notably for invertebrates, large areas of meadow

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	insects which seem to be lacking recently.		grasslands will be created, these areas will include beehives, tussocky grasslands and log piles. Furthermore, grasslands underlying panels will be managed to provide additional habitat for invertebrates. More detail is provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_OFF_0434	Respondent asked where is the evidence to suggest biodiversity net gain. Respondent then cited a study by the University of Bristol on bats and solar farms that proves a 40% reduction of activity at the edges of solar farms and an 86% reduction in the centre.	Yes	The calculation of BNG is set out in The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, provided in Environmental Statement Volume 3 Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5] . BNG for the Project was agreed with Natural England during pre-submission discussions. The impacts of solar panels to local bat assemblages is considered in Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 9 [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0490	Respondent suggested development and support for natural capital including grants for nature conservation.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0035	The respondent stated that long-term wildlife support is of great concern.	Yes	Long term impacts of the project on biodiversity receptors are considered in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0144	Respondent asked how biodiversity could be calculated.	Yes	The calculation of BNG is set out in The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, provided in Volume 3 (EN010147/APP/6.5) Appendix 9.13.
BW2_PFF_0213	Respondent stated that they hope signs will be put up for skylarks to nest under the panels and the 70% biodiversity net gain will be a reality.	Yes	Skylark plots are included in the masterplan, these are within panelled areas but are dedicated spaces and are not under panels. Skylark plots are included in the masterplan in order to provide skylarks with suitable access to additional foraging habitats throughout their breeding season. BNG is set out in The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is provided in Volume 3 (EN010147/APP/6.5) Appendix 9.13, targeting at least 70% habitat BNG.
BW2_PFF_0228	Respondent stated that the project will come at great cost to humans, wildlife and ecology.	Yes	Project impacts to human health and wildlife and ecology receptors are considered in Volume 1, Chapters 16 and 9 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .
BW2_PFF_0272	Respondent stated that BNG should not be considered a benefit. They added that long-term maintenance and monitoring in a transparent way, with community representation, to ensure that energy, carbon, landscape and biodiversity benefits are delivered in the	Yes	The approach to long-term maintenance and monitoring is set out in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	long term that could also inform interpretation and education projects.		
BW2_PFF_0139	Respondent expressed concern about the project's impact on flora and fauna.	Yes	Impacts to flora and fauna are assessed in Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0034	Respondent suggested rewilding the land after the removal of solar panels.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0224	Respondent suggested providing trees for planting at schools and elsewhere.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0272	Respondent suggested reinforcing the rural landscape character by adding substantial hedgerows outside new fence lines, managed for wildlife and amenity.	Yes	The masterplan includes 26.5km of new hedgerows and 22km of enhancement to existing hedgerows. These will be managed for biodiversity in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_OFF_0035	Respondent stated they would like to see more legally enforced commitments in terms of environmental mitigation and less vague language when describing the strategy.	Yes	How project mitigation will be secured for ecology and nature conservation is set out in Volume 1, Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0356	Respondent also asked how value has been assigned to the loss of the habitat in balance with the nominal community benefit arising from the project.	Yes	The overall 'planning balance' is considered in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_OFF_0435	Respondent would like to see the research and detail to support the 70% biodiversity net gain. The respondent also asked if there was evidence that	Yes	The approach to the calculation of BNG is set out in The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is provided in Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5] Appendix 9.13. Skylark

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	skylark plots are going to work. The respondent also asked why the overwintering swans near Cassington have been ignored.		plots are included in the masterplan in order to provide skylarks with suitable access to additional foraging habitats throughout their breeding season. The provision of Skylark plots at a ratio of two plots provided for each potential lost territory is an accepted and widely used mitigation strategy for developments that will result in the loss of Skylark territories. Skylark plots also benefit other farmland bird species. Impacts to wintering birds are considered in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES. The ES was also informed by wintering bird surveys provided in Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5] Appendix 9.10.
BW2_OFF_0539	Respondent stated that the proposals are effectively a bribe to counter the destruction of biodiverse land, visible green places which support mental health and well-being of today's community and those of the future. The respondent further added that the land is more valuable as a community asset	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0213	Respondent noted that the proposal has good ideas but they voiced concern about the money running out before the	Yes	Commitments to landscape enhancements will be secured by a requirement of the DCO.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	commitments to hedges, wood piles, the bee hives and other wildlife assets are put in place.		
BW2_PFF_0144	Respondent stated that consultation could not answer questions on how the biodiversity will increase, stating that the important questions have been avoided or 'fudged over'.	Yes	The calculation of BNG is set out in The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, provided in the Environmental Statement Volume 3 Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_PFF_0288	Respondent stated that nobody at the consultation could say where the 70% increase in biodiversity figure came from and how it would be monitored.	Yes	<p>The calculation of BNG is set out in The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is provided in Environmental Statement Volume 3 Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The maintenance and monitoring of landscape elements of the site is set out in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p>
Landscape and Visual			
BW2_OFF_0132, BW2_OFF_0141, BW2_OFF_0144, BW2_OFF_0028, BW2_OFF_0317, BW2_PFF_0139, BW2_PFF_0177, BW2_PFF_0228,	Respondents expressed concern about the project's visual impact e.g. being a blot on the landscape, ruining countryside views, etc.	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0273, BW2_PFF_0055			resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects. In addition, proposed planting would have a longer-term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.
BW2_PFF_0087, BW2_PFF_0253, BW2_PFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0356, BW2_OFF_0406, BW2_OFF_0203, BW2_OFF_0040, BW2_PFF_0111	Respondent stated that to leave the countryside as it is and the quintessentially British landscape is their longstanding legacy.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0139, BW2_PFF_0255, BW2_PFF_0272, BW2_PFF_0232	Respondents expressed that the size of the project should be reduced. One respondent stated that the reduction in the scale and density of the scheme would help to reduce the impact on the landscape in character, increase opportunities for nature and	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	mitigate damage to the landscape's role in setting.		The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_PFF_0288, BW2_OFF_0164	Respondents expressed that many residents do not want to live in close proximity to transformed, industrialised landscape.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0021	Respondent suggested that subsidies would be essential to compensate for the project taking over the landscape.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0190	Respondent stated that a local grid is important and it should be underground if possible.	Yes	All cables will be buried.
BW2_PFF_0185	Respondent stated that they are pleased to note the planned removal of most security lighting and no new pylons being constructed alongside no hedgerows being removed.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0258	Respondent stated that the onsite benefits would be reduced by the damage to the environment that a large-scale solar installation would do.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0276	Respondent stated that the focus of the bursary should be on re-introducing so much greenery into the local area,	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	specifically around the solar farm and screening so much as possible from the view of the local people.		
BW2_OFF_0356	Respondent stated that the green belt already provides a longstanding legacy and its value is priceless.	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.
BW2_OFF_0283	Respondent asked how the value of the loss of the Green belt to the local community has been assessed.	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . At Appendix 8 to the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.
BW2_OFF_0370	Respondent stated that there is no community benefit, only the destruction of a much valued environment.	No	Noted.
BW2_OFF_0375	Respondent stated that they felt the beautiful countryside already there is a community benefit.	No	Noted.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0334	Respondent stated that community funding and reducing energy bills would be acceptable ways of compensating local people for the loss of rural nature.	No	Noted.
BW2_PFF_0232	Respondent stated that they do not see any community benefits from anything that is being suggested, stating that the project is going to ruin acres of countryside and that a windfarm would be better on virtually every count.	No	Noted.
Land Use and Agriculture			
BW2_OFF_0011, BW2_OFF_0035	<p>Respondents would like sheep to be able to graze under the panels.</p> <p>One respondent strongly supports sheep grazing around the solar panels, stating that it can mitigate issues around food security and agricultural productivity.</p>	Yes	The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0309	Respondent would like the commitment that the land will not be built on once the panels are decommissioned.	Yes	The DCO consent being sought is temporary; at the end of the consent period the land reverts to agricultural use. Any further change of use would be subject to planning consent.
BW2_PFF_0086	The respondent stated that using the fund to support the regeneration of low-grade farmland over the course of the	Yes	The effects of the Project on ecology and habitat are assessed in ES Chapter 9:

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	project so the land can be returned to food production following the conclusion of the project would be a major legacy of the scheme.		<p>Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>
BW2_PFF_0253	Respondent stated that this land should be used for agriculture to provide much needed food for the country.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation sheep grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0419	Respondent suggested allowing farmers to use their land and increase any bursary fund for farming.	Yes	Noted
BW2_PFF_0104	The respondent noted that the ideas concerning agricultural areas seemed bizarre as the panels overlay a lot of the most high quality fertile land.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.
BW2_PFF_0304	Respondent stated that it seems ironic to remove large areas of arable farmland and then suggest community benefit by initiating local agricultural groups with areas for arable farming.	Yes	The land will continue in agricultural use, for conservation grazing. The opportunity to make areas available for local food growers, to support local communities and food banks, has been supported by the Applicant as an additional benefit.
BW2_OFF_0313	Respondent stated that it is ironic to remove large areas of farmland for such a project.	Yes	Noted
BW2_OFF_0313	Respondent suggested using the community benefit fund to create local	Yes	An application for this purpose would be considered by the community benefit fund.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	agricultural groups with areas for arable farming.		
Traffic, Access and Construction			
BW2_OFF_0146	Respondent stated there needs to be a way to reduce traffic in their village rather than making it worse with construction vehicles.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0176	Respondent feels very strongly that development should not develop extra traffic on the B4044 road from Botley to Eynsham.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area and construction access routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0309	Respondent stated that they want investment in traffic calming for Bladon.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment in terms of potential source of community funding. In terms of the Project, a full assessment of traffic and transport, including through Bladon, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Mitigation and enhancement measures adopted as part of the Project are set out in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0177	Respondent stated that the road system in the area, particularly the A40 is atrocious.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including a review of the baseline environment conditions, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0177	The respondent stated that the local country roads are now often used heavily during rush hour traffic and the surfaces are in bad condition.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including a review of the baseline environment conditions, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .
BW2_PFF_0248	Respondent stated that if the coble route is trenched through the hedgerows in Farmoor, it will help mitigate the disruption along the busy Eynsham to Oxford Road.	No	Noted.
Archaeology and Local Heritage			
BW2_PFF_0237	Respondent noted the importance of archaeological findings are published in accessible media (e.g. Oxoniensia). The respondent stated that this will boost the public image of the project and strongly added that the results should not disappear into 'Grey Literature'.	Yes	The reports on the results of archaeological fieldwork within the Project site will be published in appropriate formats. The archives will be collated and deposited with the Oxfordshire Museum Service where they will be publicly accessible.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0272	Respondent suggested wider buffer strips and corridors for nature and to reduce impact of setting on heritage assets and conservation areas.	Yes	Suitable buffer zones have been established where necessary for the avoidance and/or reduction of impacts on heritage assets (including Conservation Areas) as a result of change within their settings. This is indicated on the Illustrative Masterplan [EN010147/APP/6.4]
BW2_OFF_0240	Respondent objects to an unaccountable foreign business invading the landscape that the Churchill family has spent centuries nurturing and protecting as a world class visitor attraction.	Yes	The Socio Economic impacts of the Project, including tourism, are assessed in Chapter 15 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] and the impacts upon the World Heritage Site are assessed in Appendix 7.4 [EN010147/APP/6.5].
Hydrology and Flood Risk			
BW2_OFF_0555	Respondent suggested any projects that involve cleaning the rivers.	Yes	The impact of solar panels on water quality including any required mitigation is set out in Volume 1:, Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk. An Operational Management Plan has been provided as part of application for development consent [EN010147/APP/7.6.5]. Detailed OMPs will be developed in line with Outline OMP and agreed with relevant stakeholders. Detailed OMPs to be secured as DCO requirement and will include Pollution Prevention Plans.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0466	Respondent stated that the development presents a risk to the environment, specifically the risk of increased flooding.	Yes	The design of the Solar PV ensures that any water that would have fallen on to the land in the pre-existing baseline will continue to do so during the Project. A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms affect runoff and mitigation measures used during the design are outlined in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_OFF_0271	Respondent stated that much of Bladon is at risk of flooding and mitigation must be provided if a solar farm increases this risk.	Yes	Bladon is located upstream of the site layout. The assessment of flood risk and environmental impact has been considered with a 1km buffer zone around the solar farm and appropriate mitigation has been put in place to ensure no significant increase in flood risk off-site. The design of the Solar PV ensures that any water that would have fallen on to the land in the pre-existing baseline will continue to do so during the Project. A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms effect runoff and mitigation measures used during the design are outlined in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0071	Respondent stated that some of the community benefit fund could be used to improve Woodstock water meadows with installing river walkways above flood level. The respondent further suggested vehicle access to the meadows and even a hydro installation in the future.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0127	Respondent suggested funding for Yarnton Flood defences.	No	Noted
Noise			
BW2_OFF_0508	Respondent believes the project will cause a lot of disruption and noise.	No	<p>A full noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3], with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4], and ES Volume 3 (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>This assessment has identified that the development will not cause any significant adverse effects on noise sensitive receptors.</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>During the construction phase, noise will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.</p> <p>Noise from the operational phase will be controlled and limited by the Outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.5] (OMP). This operational management plan will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect.</p>
Project Description			
BW2_OFF_0048, BW2_OFF_0090, BW2_OFF_0312, BW2_OFF_0471, BW2_OFF_0526, BW2_PFF_0068, BW2_PFF_0295, BW2_OFF_0020	Respondents voiced concern about the Russian connections pertaining to the finance of the project.	Yes	The Applicant has prepared a Funding Statement as part of the DCO Application [EN010147/APP/4.2] .
BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_OFF_0313,	Respondents enquired about the role of environmental stewards on the	Yes	The effects of the Project on ecology and habitat are assessed in ES Chapter 9:

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_PFF_0304, BW2_OFF_0434, BW2_PFF_0212</p>	<p>Blenheim Estate. One respondent asked about the financial incentives these stewards will be offered.</p> <p>One respondent asked if they are responsible for ensuring biodiversity. The respondent further enquired who will oversee Blenheim in this role as they are benefitting from it financially.</p> <p>The respondent questioned if Blenheim estate has a well established track record of delivering green projects, why have they not got solar panels on the roofs of any of their new builds. The respondent also added that as a stakeholder, Blenheim are not an unbiased steward of the land.</p> <p>One respondent stated that as Blenheim estate are stakeholders in this project and supplying the land, they are not an unbiased steward of the land and therefore the respondent concluded they are not certain Blenheim will be responsible for the environmental commitments.</p>		<p>Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3]. It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0313, BW2_PFF_0212, BW2_PFF_0274, BW2_PFF_0304	<p>Respondents expressed that it is hard to comment on the proposals due to the use of terms such as "expected" and exploring. They requested more concrete language when speaking about the plans.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that the use of this language was at least misleading if not deliberately a marketing ploy.</p>	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0209, BW2_OFF_0301, BW2_PFF_0232	<p>Respondents expressed that the only purpose of the project is to make money for the developers and landowners.</p> <p>One respondent asked about the ethics of setting up an electricity company that is part of the project apart from seeking to extract even more profit.</p>	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0144, BW2_OFF_0489	<p>Respondents asked what is the lifespan of the solar panels? The respondent stated that this was a question that could not be answered and equally - how would they be disposed of. The respondent also noted that it appears the project is primarily focused on</p>	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	making money and the "ecofriendly/renewable energy is secondary - rather than have it is being monetized.		
BW2_OFF_0001	Respondent stated the project is an attempt to soften the impact of a profit making scheme masked as an eco - alternative.	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_OFF_0016	Respondent stated the need to clarify who is benefiting from the project.	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_OFF_0031	Respondent believes solar farms are the wrong technology for the UK.	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_OFF_0060	Respondent wants clarification on which communities are being referred to. - Botley, Eynsham, Cassington, Bladon?	Yes	The consultation zone is set 2km from the Project's red line boundary.
BW2_OFF_0248	Respondent stated that the geography of who would benefit from the fund	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	should have been provided before the question was asked.		
BW2_OFF_0255	Respondent stated that donations in the range of 10% are considered serious commitments and asked what percentage of net does £50k per year represent.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders.</p> <p>It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company, and that company will offer PROJECT electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.
BW2_OFF_0281	Respondent would like the amount offered for the community benefit fund to be proportional to energy generated as for other similar sites.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0327	Respondent stated it is a ridiculous project to even consider as the panels are coming from China (A country with hideous human rights abuses, aligned with Russia and with a high carbon footprint in getting there)	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0333	Respondent stated that the project should not be called Botley West as it is not based in, nor will it affect Botley.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0407	Respondent noted a distinct lack of providing the whole picture of the project's impact.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0435	Respondent questioned certain wording such as Blenheim estate being referred to as an "environmental steward" when they are agreeing to build on greenbelt land.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0042	The respondent noted that they oppose Blenheim Estate becoming the	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	environmental steward on its own land. An individual third party, paid for by the developer, should be		
BW2_PFF_0172	Respondent stated that they were surprised in the long term that it is planned to remove the site, the respondent then asked what is envisaged afterwards.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has produced an outline Decommissioning Plan which will provide the means by which the detail can be agreed and secured [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p> <p>The Project, whilst for a lengthy period of time, is not permanent, and so does not fall within the definition of 'Previously Developed Land' in terms of the Glossary at Annex 2 to the NPPF.</p> <p>The DCO Consent will be bound by Requirements, including in relation to decommissioning requiring that the land returns to its prior use at end of project life.</p>
BW2_PFF_0185	Respondent stated that the community benefit fund is welcome but the amount to be contributed has to reflect the major impact of the development for 42 years on nearby communities.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant. The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project</p>

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>(expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders.</p> <p>It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company, and that company will offer PROJECT electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_PFF_0228	Respondent stated that the proposals sound rosey and benevolent and are not convinced at all.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0257	Respondent commented on the intention for the Blenheim Estate to provide stewardship for the Project.	Yes	The Applicant is of the opinion that Blenheim Estate's knowledge of this land makes it the ideal steward during the Project's operation.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Details can be found in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].
BW2_PFF_0272	Respondent challenged the idea that biodiversity net gain or retail energy company opportunities should be seen as part of the community benefit offer. The respondent substantiated this by stating that there are both either required or open new economic incentives which would increase the economic returns of the solar farm, even if discounts were offered to local residents.	No	Noted
BW2_PFF_0272	Respondent would like the project to be governed by a combination of landowners, developers, local authorities, and community members to ensure that the agreed benefits were given/ implemented over time.	Yes	Compliance with the DCO consent and any conditions will be enforced by the Local Planning Authorities.
BW2_PFF_0274	Respondent noted that commitment to exploring is not the same as commitment to actually producing and they cannot see how any of the onsite benefits or community projects will mitigate the loss of habitat and	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	recreational areas that the proposals involve.		
BW2_PFF_0274,	Respondent asked why did Merton college decide to withdraw from the project and asked why this was not explained anywhere.	No	The Applicant recognises the decision of Merton College to use the small amount of land they had offered to the Project for a regenerative agriculture scheme alongside their housing development at Yarnton.
BW2_PFF_0293	Respondent asked what faith can they have in these processes when the government inspector lowers the standards agreed locally between WODC and Eynsham for the future planned garden village.	Yes	The legislation covering this Application is set out in the opening paragraphs of the draft Development Consent Order contained in the Application.
BW2_PFF_0243	Respondent suggested a way of producing solar panels in the UK which would provide local communities with jobs and help in our fight against climate change while not just benefiting China's industry.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0245	Respondent referred to the project as a smoke screen.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0448	Respondent enquired about the process of removing the solar panels after 25-30 years.	Yes	This can be found in the Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .
BW2_OFF_0199	Respondent stated that the whole project is out of their control, this is just a paper tick box exercise, and there is	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	a fear that they can do nothing about the project anyway.		
BW2_OFF_0313	Respondent enquired that given PVDP claim they have a good track record of delivery green projects, why had they not completed any roof-mounted solar panel projects.	No	The Applicant is a developer of ground mounted solar farms.
BW2_PFF_0274	Respondent asked why representatives from local communities have not been offered the chance of touring the solar farms to understand their impact better.		Local community members have visited Southill Community Energy at Charlbury.
Site Selection and Alternatives			
BW2_OFF_0017, BW2_OFF_0027, BW2_OFF_0125, BW2_OFF_0166, BW2_OFF_0178, BW2_OFF_0223, BW2_OFF_0338, BW2_OFF_0203, BW2_OFF_0255, BW2_OFF_0435, BW2_OFF_0549, BW2_PFF_0034, BW2_PFF_0065, BW2_PFF_0243, BW2_PFF_0273,	Respondents expressed that they would rather see solar panels on rooftops of commercial buildings, barns, houses and industrial estates.	Yes	The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_OFF_0171, BW2_OFF_0318, BW2_PFF_0032			
BW2_OFF_0014, BW2_OFF_0094, BW2_OFF_0088, BW2_OFF_0203, BW2_PFF_0065, BW2_PFF_0080, BW2_PFF_0088, BW2_PFF_0290, BW2_PFF_0273, BW2_OFF_0254, BW2_OFF_0159, BW2_PFF_0098, BW2_PFF_0177, BW2_OFF_0352, BW2_OFF_0496, BW2_OFF_0549, BW2_PFF_0014, BW2_PFF_0065, BW2_OFF_0120	Respondents expressed the use of alternative low-carbon and renewable energy sources e.g. hydrogen, nuclear, wind power (onshore and offshore), tidal, etc.	Yes	The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_OFF_0014, BW2_OFF_0121, BW2_OFF_0261, BW2_PFF_0243	Respondents expressed that they would rather see the solar farm developed on brownfield land.	Yes	The development pressures in the region are also a driver for renewable energy generation to meet existing and future needs. Solar panels on roofs are an

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			important contributor, as recognised in the Governments British Energy Strategy, but will not in their own right provide sufficient energy generation, even if they can be connected to the grid or provide a local 'private wire' connection to a local off-taker. The target for solar ground-mounted energy will continue to be a significant part of the renewable development mix in order to meet targets. The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_PFF_0034, BW2_PFF_0065, BW2_PFF_0290	Respondent suggested pushing government to make solar panels on houses mandatory.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0001	Respondent stated there is ample land on the Blenheim estate which could be used for the solar venture.	Yes	The majority of the Project is on land owned by Blenheim Estate.
BW2_OFF_0031	Respondent stated that solar generated electricity is fine but only for remote sunny places.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0046	Respondent believed the ideal site should be a desert not a historic town.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0120, BW2_PFF_0089	Respondents stated that the Blenheim Estate could advance their	No	Noted

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	environmental credentials by actively promoting solar panels on roofs.		
BW2_OFF_0121	Respondent suggested using smaller local locations to provide power on a local level not a national one.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0402	Respondent would like details of the account that will pay for the removal of the panels at the end of their lifecycle.	No	Details of this are in the Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .
Climate Change			
BW2_OFF_0122	Respondent stated this is more of a money making project than a climate concern issue.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0233	Respondent believes the project will leave a long-standing environmental legacy but not a positive one.	No	Noted
BW2_OFF_0498	The respondent voiced concern about the panels being produced in China and their track record of emissions and environmental policy.	Yes	The project has sought to consider environmental performance of the panels and other components through the use of Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs). An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects.

ID code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_PFF_0144	The respondent stated that 1000s of panels would come from China which they stated was not very ecofriendly and delivered via lorries stating further that this is not green.	Yes	The project has sought to consider environmental performance of the panels and other components through the use of Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs). An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects.

Table 7: Applicant response to feedback received by email

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Local Ecology			
BW2_EF_0003, BW2_EF_0030, BW2_EF_0031, BW2_EF_0113, BW2_EF_0120, BW2_EF_0021, BW2_EF_0100, BW2_EF_0117, BW2_EF_0130, BW2_EF_0138, BW2_EF_0151, BW2_EF_0116, BW2_EF_0153, BW2_EF_0082, BW2_EF_0091	<p>Respondents expressed concern that the project will have an ecological impact on ecology and wildlife.</p> <p>Respondents have stated that not enough is being done to protect the environment and the ecology.</p> <p>Respondents would like more information and detail on how these impacts will be mitigated.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of impacts to ecology and wildlife receptors and the approach to mitigation are presented in Chapters 9 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Mitigation will be implemented under various management plans, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p>
BW2_EF_0006, BW2_EF_0007, BW2_EF_0011, BW2_EF_0022, BW2_EF_0093, BW2_EF_0101, BW2_EF_0144, BW2_EF_0141,	<p>Respondents commented that the 70% biodiversity net gain figure appears unsubstantiated, and the measures proposed will not achieve this.</p> <p>Respondents would like more information on how these measures will achieve this net gain, and</p>	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on ecology and nature conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9 [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_EF_0130, BW2_EF_0022, BW2_EF_0078, BW2_EF_0030, BW2_EF_0024, BW2_EF_0131</p>	<p>how this gain will be maintained throughout the operation of the solar farm.</p>		<p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>
<p>BW2_EF_0136, BW2_EF_0139, BW2_EF_0128</p>	<p>Respondents stated that they would like the biodiversity net gain target set to 100% as opposed to 70%.</p> <p>One respondent stated that the 70% increase in biodiversity should be a minimum.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5] The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The maintenance and monitoring of landscape elements of the site is set out in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed that the planting of trees and hedges will be totally overlooked from above.	Yes	The planting of trees and hedges under the masterplan will be secured by a requirement of the DCO and set out in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_EF_0093	Respondent recommended engaging Parish Councils, Nature Recovery Networks, and wildlife charities in the planning and stewardship phase.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0093	Respondent suggested replicating successful local initiatives such as the Eynsham Abbey Fishponds restoration to enhance biodiversity and community involvement throughout the project's lifespan.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent criticises the ecological impact assessment in the PEIR for Botley West, particularly noting the subjective assessment of adverse effects versus beneficial ones in Tables 9.1.21 and 9.1.22. They advocate for transparency through a neutral table listing all potential effects to allow stakeholders and the Planning Inspector to independently evaluate the project's ecological impacts. Given the ecological crisis and insufficient research on solar farms' biodiversity impacts, Respondent argues for applying the precautionary principle rather than relying on an overly optimistic outlook.	Yes	The methodology for the assessment criteria and assignment of significance, and full impact assessments for each receptor for each project impact is detailed in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The tables mentioned are a summary of the information above.
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent raised concerns about unequal mitigation and enhancement efforts across the site, noting that while approximately 30% of the southern and central sections are designated for these purposes, the northern section appears to lack similar provisions. They sought clarification on whether the northern section would miss out on mitigation and enhancement measures altogether.	Yes	The northern site area will benefit from, meadow grasslands, new and enhanced hedgerows, tree planting, new woodland and skylark plots. More details on landscape element's management is provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6]. Project mitigation is detailed in Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0144	Respondent stated that the suggested cable routing near Swinford Toll Bridge is through ancient meadow land, disregarding its ecological and wildlife importance.	Yes	Long Mead Meadow has been removed from within the Project site with the works now to the north of the Swinford Crossing in order to ensure no impacts to the Local Wildlife Site near Swinford Toll Bridge.
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent would like to see Carbon Sequestration with further tree and shrub planting provided with particular emphasis on carbon removal.	Yes	The Project includes the provision of over 15ha of new woodland. It also involves the reversion from arable to grassland over the majority of the site.
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent would like to see additional native tree planting including hedges.	Yes	26.5km of new hedgerows, 22km of enhanced hedgerow, 15ha of woodland, grasslands and a large contribution of tree planting is included within the landscape masterplan. More details on landscape schemes scale and elements are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent would like to see the establishment of species rich grassland.	Yes	Large areas of meadow grassland are included in the landscape masterplan. These areas will be managed to maintain higher wildflower diversity. More details on landscape schemes

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			scale and elements are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_EF_0153, BW2_EF_0062	Respondents emphasised the potential impact on flora and fauna as a result of the solar panels.	Yes	The impacts of solar panels on flora and fauna are assessed in Chapter 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0009	Respondent stated that they were particularly impressed with the proposals for ancillary developments aiming to achieve a biodiversity net gain, specifically analysing the compatibility of the solar farm installation with continuing opportunities for sheep to graze the land.	Yes	The landscape elements of the Project will be managed to ensure they meet the habitats and conditions outlined in The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5] while providing grazing opportunities. More details on landscape elements and how grazing will be managed are provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0141	Respondent expressed that there is no mitigation for ecological isolation, wildlife corridor destruction, or evidence of successfully delivering wildflowers under the panels.	Yes	<p>Impacts on connectivity are assessed in Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. Buffers will protect the majority of the connective features of the site for use by wildlife.</p> <p>Grasslands under panels will be managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]. They will be multipurpose, being operational areas but also being managed for biodiversity and livestock. This approach has been welcomed by Natural England.</p>
BW2_EF_0093	Respondent believes the project could be improved to better promote human, ecological, and environmental flourishing.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed that the planned substation near Cumnor and Farmoor Reservoir will be an environmental disaster.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The project impact pathways are assessed in Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent supports meadow grassland but would also add a wildflower mix where suitable.	Yes	Meadow grassland will be managed to provide a higher species diversity. More details are provided in the outline

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_EF_0085	Respondent asked whether the hedgerow presented in Fig 2.1B of the Northern Site 2/2 in the PEIR is to be replaced by undefined "woodland" with species, growth rate, survival rate and maintenance ignored.	Yes	<p>Existing hedgerows are not proposed to be replaced with woodland. Furthermore, due the archaeological interest features identified in this area, woodland planting has been relocated east.</p> <p>The maintenance and monitoring of landscape elements of the site is set out in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p>
Wildlife			
BW2_EF_0042, BW2_EF_0056, BW2_EF_0124, BW2_EF_0118	<p>Respondents raised concerns about the impact of security fencing on wildlife.</p> <p>One respondent raised concerns about the proposed 51 miles of 8-foot-high animal-proof fencing for the Botley West Solar Farm, fearing devastating effects on local wildlife, particularly the declining deer population.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that claims of</p>	Yes	The impact of habitat severance is assessed in in Chapters 9 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Security fencing will be designed to be permeable to small mammals including badgers and fox. As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that changes in deer movements will be brought about by perimeter fencing.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	ecological benefit are severely limited by the fencing requirement which will obstruct any creatures that do not fly.		
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed that the Farmoor Reservoir Conservation Group have created an oasis for bird life, wildlife, uplifting experiences for walkers, sailors and the substations would totally destroy this area.	Yes	Please refer to the Environmental Statement, Vol 1 Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0007	Respondent stated that offsetting ecological impact with bee hives was suggested and ask how this creates 'a substantial biodiversity gain of at least 70% as has been claimed.	Yes	<p>Beehives have been included to enhance the site for invertebrates but provide no contribution to BNG.</p> <p>The effects of the Project on ornithology and invertebrates are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>
BW2_EF_0011	<p>Respondent noted the impact of wildlife in The Vale which includes: The Great Crested Newts (see ponds), Barn Owls, Tawny Owls, Bats, Kites, Sparrow Hawks, Kestrels, Hobby Hawks, Skylarks, Yellow Hammers, Fieldfares, Swallows. Swifts. Geese, Swans, Badgers, and Deer. The respondent then stated they are not convinced that paving over the vale with solar panels will be of any benefit to those creatures and may negatively impact them.</p>	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on wildlife are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>Mitigation will be implemented under various management plans, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p>
BW2_EF_0042	<p>Respondent requested an impact assessment on wildlife.</p>	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on wildlife are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p>
BW2_EF_0062, BW2_EF_0071, BW2_EF_0101, BW2_EF_0102, BW2_EF_0108	<p>Respondents criticised the emphasis on skylark plots in the PEIR, suggesting it may reflect a defensive stance rather than robust mitigation efforts. Some respondents believe they are not suitable within a solar farm.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. Skylark plots are included in the masterplan in order to provide skylarks with suitable access to additional foraging habitats throughout their breeding season.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>One respondent expressed that the proposed 5 sqm plots might not sufficiently replicate the open, spacious environments skylarks require for breeding, citing the bird's conservation status and local population trends.</p> <p>One respondent referred to maps on pages 8-13 on the Consultation Leaflet and questioned the feasibility of implementing "hundreds of skylark plots" within the proposed solar farm, highlighting concerns raised by RSPB and BTO.</p>		<p>The provision of Skylark plots at a ratio of two plots provided for each potential lost territory is an accepted and widely used mitigation strategy for developments that will result in the loss of Skylark territories. Skylark plots also benefit other farmland bird species.</p> <p>Skylark plots will be implemented and managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p>
BW2_EF_0062	Respondent enquired about the project's measures to prevent waterfowl, like swans, from mistaking the solar panels for water, highlighting past experiences of delayed journeys due to similar occurrences.	Yes	Impacts due to the 'lake effect' on ecology receptors have been considered within the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent asserted that the PEIR fails to account for the large population of swans and geese that rest in these fields during winter migration.	Yes	The Wintering Bird Survey Report (Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5] Appendix 9.10) followed methodology as outlined in Bibby et al. (2000) and Gilbert et al. (1998). All species of conservation concern are considered as part of this survey methodology.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent wondered how developers will accommodate the large population of swans that winter in the fields around Cassington.	No	Mute swans were recorded using fields in Area 14 near Cassington and were previously included as a species of conservation concern. However, they have recently been downgraded to a Green Listed species. As such, they are not considered an ecological receptor.
BW2_EF_0117	Respondent emphasized the need to preserve habitats for deer, foxes, badgers, and owls, which will lose foraging areas.	Yes	<p>Impacts to all such species except deer are assessed in ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation. Furthermore, the habitats within the site will be enhanced and these species will benefit.</p> <p>Security fencing will be designed to be permeable to small mammals including badgers and fox.</p> <p>As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not considered that changes in deer movements will be brought about by perimeter fencing.</p>
BW2_EF_0127	Respondent stated that they are very concerned about the impact on sheep if they are put to graze	No	A full grazing strategy that will set out the necessary livestock management infrastructure such as pens, fencing and

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	and asked what work had been done on the health and welfare of grazing sheep.		water sources will be produced post consent.
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent stated that they would support providing log piles and other animal refuges on the site.	Yes	Log piles and refugia are included within the landscape masterplan and managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent suggested that scrapes could be added in marshy areas to encourage wildfowl.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent stated that they would support bird and bat boxes.	Yes	Bird and bat boxes are included within the landscape masterplan and managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_EF_0141	Respondent stated that the proposed site is rich in diverse natural habitats interconnected by river valleys. The development would degrade these habitats, with the cable route under ancient Long Mead and other sensitive areas being particularly concerning.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The cable route has been rerouted to the northeast of Long Mead Meadow, to ensure no indirect impacts to the local wildlife site.
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent stated that field 2.60 is home to diverse wildlife, including deer and migratory birds, which would be disrupted by the solar panel installation.	Yes	Impacts to migratory birds of conservation concern are assessed in the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation. As deer are wide-ranging in their habits and movements, it is not

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			considered that changes in deer movements will be brought about by perimeter fencing.
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent stated that they would support a new landscape-scale corridor along the river Evenlode.	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. This will be managed in accordance with the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent stated that they would support establishing bee hives on site but only after consulting a relevant expert such as Filipe Salbany of Blenheim for the siting of hives and the type of bee hives.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent, in reference to paragraph 6.4.7 of the PEIR, criticises the surveying of ponds for Great Crested Newts, pointing out significant oversights by RPS ecologists. They noted several large ponds south of Field No. 2.120 near City Farm, a water-filled scrape by Field No. 2.114, and five ponds near Fields 2.113 and 2.114, with only one surveyed despite being reliably watered. The respondent shared their experience of unreliable eDNA testing for newts in their garden ponds, implying similar shortcomings in RPS' ecological surveys.	Yes	During the PEIR stage ponds were only surveyed for GCN within the ownership boundary or where existing access arrangements were in place. Surveys outside of the ownership boundary were conducted to identified accessible ponds during GCN surveys for the ES (Appendix 9.5, Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5]). Whilst every effort was made to identify all ponds within 500 m of the site via

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			satellite imagery, ponds are sometimes missed in satellite imagery due to factors such as image quality and shading. Additional ponds in this area will be investigated during surveys in 2025. The methodology followed for the collection and analysis of eDNA is detailed in the GCN Survey Report (Appendix 9.5, Volume 3 [EN010147/APP/6.5]) and follows best practice.
BW2_EF_0024	Respondent enquired measures that will be taken to mitigate against any impacts to wildlife.	Yes	Mitigation is presented in the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
BW2_EF_0092	Respondent expressed the impact of solar farms on wildlife habitats is well-documented and indisputable, yet the project seems to dismiss these concerns.	Yes	Impacts to wildlife habitats are assessed in the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
BW2_EF_0138	Respondent expressed concern about the project leading to loss of habitat.	Yes	The impact of habitat loss is assessed in the ES Volume 1 [EN010147/APP/6.3] Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Soil			
<p>BW2_EF_0017, BW2_EF_0102</p>	<p>Respondent asked what the potential effects (positive and negative) on soils during the active phase of the site are.</p> <p>A respondent emphasised the need for clearer information in the Environmental Statement regarding soil management strategies.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on agricultural land are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>This includes the preparation of a Soil Management Plan in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6], which has been submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction of the Project. Reinstatement would be undertaken in accordance with procedures set out in the Soil Management Plan.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0017	Respondent stated that claimed benefits are topsoil carbon content increases and soil structure improvements and asked whether these claims are realistic.	Yes	<p>Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on agricultural land are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>This includes the preparation of a Soil Management Plan in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6], which has been submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction of the Project. Reinstatement would be undertaken in accordance with procedures set out in the Soil Management Plan.</p>
BW2_EF_0017	Respondent claimed that soil structure improvements will likely only be short term while the project is in operation.	No	The Applicant notes this comment

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0017	<p>Respondent asked what the effects of shading and changes in soil microbial activity and microclimates under the panels are. The respondent also provided background to this with a link https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/11/7/074016</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The cable route has been rerouted to the northeast of Long Mead Meadow, to ensure no indirect impacts to the local wildlife site.</p>
<p>BW2_EF_0017 BW2_EF_0031, BW2_EF_0021, BW2_EF_0088, BW2_EF_0100, BW2_EF_0144</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the potential degradation of soil.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that the PEIR neglects research on the negative effects of large-scale solar developments on soil, such as the Temple University report on revegetation impacts.</p> <p>One respondent requested further detail on how the soil will be protected from the damage of installation.</p> <p>Respondents expressed that the presence of toxic chemicals in solar panels could lead to long-term environmental impact, including zinc contamination.</p>	Yes	<p>Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on agricultural land are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>This includes the preparation of a Soil Management Plan in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6], which has been submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	One respondent expressed that significant equipment and work would have to go into relieving the long-term compacted soil challenge the project may present.		<p>construction of the Project. Reinstatement would be undertaken in accordance with procedures set out in the Soil Management Plan.</p> <p>The Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains an Outline Soil Management plan that includes measures to limit the impacts on soil resources, wherever practicable, through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management.</p>
BW2_EF_0088	Respondent criticises the omission of soil impact in the PEIR tables on cumulative environmental effects (Tables 7.17 and 7.18), citing the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, which mandates soil protection for preserving monuments.	Yes	ES Vol 1 Chapter 7, Historic Environment [EN010147/APP/7.3] considers the relationship between the Project and Historic Assets, including the approach taken to the avoidance of Scheduled Monuments and areas that, through detailed geophysical survey, have also been excluded from the development area.
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent expressed PVDP personnel lacked knowledge at the consultation events on the site's soil composition and existing agricultural use,	No	The Applicant notes this comment

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	leading the Respondent to suggest excluding it from the project.		
BW2_EF_0017	Respondent expressed that the potential for the site to return to agricultural use depends on the land use and soil properties existing before any construction phase starts.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent requested details of the grade of soil for each field affected by your proposal and specifically an analysis of the central site.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p> <p>The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units. In terms of EIA, the assessment is based on the impact of the entire proposal on agricultural land quality and is not therefore split within specific areas of the proposal.</p> <p>All of the technical ALC data is available within Volume 3 Appendix 17.1: Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Survey Report [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0017	<p>Respondent asked what effect 'drilling' has on soil loss/erosion, accelerated run-off and in creating differential areas of soil wetness.</p> <p>Respondent stated that a discussion of short-term changes in soil properties vs long term physical limitations is needed.</p> <p>Respondent noted gaps in the evidence, knowledge and experience on solar PV sites and their impact on the soil and land. Key gaps are found in recovery times of soil characteristics following compaction, the extent and depth of soil compaction on solar PV sites, interactions between the soil and piles/beams, corrosion of the piles/beams and insufficient knowledge about soil contamination from galvanised piles/ beams in the soil for 40 years.</p> <p>Respondent stated that a summary of the benefits claimed and proven for soil quality by previous solar farm installations is needed.</p> <p>Respondent asked which factors influence reversibility of the land after solar PV is removed e.g. soil handling conditions, management of monitoring, soil types and climate.</p>	Yes	<p>Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on agricultural land are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>This includes the preparation of a Soil Management Plan in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6], which has been submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction of the Project. Reinstatement would be undertaken in accordance with procedures set out in the Soil Management Plan.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>Respondent asked if there are comparable parallels between restoration of other sites (such as mineral sites, golf courses and similar type developments) and solar PV sites, or do significant differences exist?</p> <p>Respondent asked if the planning process can be used to ensure proper management and monitoring of the soil handling conditions and might this mitigate or remove any threats to soil and land.</p>		
Community Benefit			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_EF_0032, BW2_EF_0033, BW2_EF_0034, BW2_EF_0035, BW2_EF_0036, BW2_EF_0037, BW2_EF_0038, BW2_EF_0039, BW2_EF_0040, BW2_EF_0041, BW2_EF_0043, BW2_EF_0044, BW2_EF_0045, BW2_EF_0046, BW2_EF_0047, BW2_EF_0048, BW2_EF_0051, BW2_EF_0052, BW2_EF_0053, BW2_EF_0054, BW2_EF_0057, BW2_EF_0027, BW2_EF_0060, BW2_EF_0061, BW2_EF_0064, BW2_EF_0065,</p>	<p>Respondents sent the following:</p> <p>Dear PVDP (proposers of Botley West Solar Farm),</p> <p>I am writing to specifically address the community benefits fund proposed as part of the project.</p> <p>The principle of Community Benefit Funding is well established for renewable energy projects, and we believe that the BWSF project should be an exemplar in this regard. An annual structure gives it flexibility over time and allows the community around the solar farm to make choices every year about where it might best be spent.</p> <p>However, £50,000 is not nearly enough. It seems clear when comparisons are made with other projects, the community fund should be proportionate and should provide a more appropriate sum of around £3 million per annum.</p> <p>In addition, it is essential that the fund is structured such that it is protected if the developer chooses to sell it to another company at some point in the future.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR,</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0066, BW2_EF_0068, BW2_EF_0072, BW2_EF_0074, BW2_EF_0077, BW2_EF_0075, BW2_EF_0081, BW2_EF_0145, BW2_EF_0121, BW2_EF_0121, BW2_EF_0110, BW2_EF_0104, BW2_EF_0094, BW2_EF_0095, BW2_EF_0096, BW2_EF_0097, BW2_EF_0098, BW2_EF_0079, BW2_EF_0050, BW2_EF_0059, BW2_EF_0111, BW2_EF_0147, BW2_EF_0150			<p>the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations.</p> <p>The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant's intention is to establish a new retail electricity company and for that</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>company to offer Project electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone could be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
<p>BW2_EF_0028, BW2_EF_0071, BW2_EF_0076, BW2_EF_0091, BW2_EF_0093, BW2_EF_0115, BW2_EF_0128, BW2_EF_0137, BW2_EF_0156,</p>	<p>Respondents requested an increase in the annual community fund to £1 million to better compensate affected communities.</p> <p>One respondent stated that given the size of the proposed solar farm, £50k is a very low contribution.</p> <p>One respondent suggested it should be at least</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_EF_0027, BW2_EF_0078, BW2_EF_0141</p>	<p>£2000 per MW per year, amounting to approximately £1.68 million annually for the life of the solar farm.</p> <p>One respondent stated that the figure of £3m a year would be more acceptable, mirroring the compensation offered to larger Scottish renewable energy projects or the one being offered by Great North Road Solar Park's developers Elements Green.</p> <p>A respondent called for concrete commitments to significant community benefits.</p>		<p>application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations.</p> <p>The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant's intention is to establish a new retail electricity company and for that company to offer Project electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone could be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_EF_0042	Respondent expressed that they cannot support the project without stronger assurances given its substantial impact on the community.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0091	Respondent expressed that community energy opportunities were vague.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0091	Respondent requested more of a concrete plan for providing financial benefits to residents, such as reducing energy bills.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0093	Respondent recommended the use of a comprehensive community energy service.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0093	Respondent requested the long-term monitoring of human outcomes to inform future projects and to ensure the green revolution's success.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0156	Respondent expressed that the community benefits must include an independent-managed community fund.	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>grants will be made to local causes and organisations.</p> <p>The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant's intention is to establish a new retail electricity company and for that company to offer Project electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone could be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_EF_0030, BW2_EF_0085, BW2_EF_0111, BW2_EF_0118, BW2_EF_0128, BW2_EF_0130, BW2_EF_0123, BW2_EF_0156	<p>Respondents expressed that local residents should be compensated for the impact of the project through reduced energy prices, citing potential visual impacts, the use of agricultural land, devaluation of homes, limited access to green or open spaces, the potential threat to food security, and impact on the environment.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>A respondent expressed that the offer for discounted energy bills does not compensate for the potential impacts of the project.</p> <p>A respondent stated that all cheap energy from existing windfarms and solar farms has not reduced every prices to the consumer and stated that they do not see BWSF reducing it either.</p> <p>A respondent wants further clarification on the proposed retail energy company.</p> <p>A respondent expressed scepticism about the purported low-cost energy generated by the project, as the landowner, developer, and manager would seek to recoup their investments and make profits.</p> <p>A respondent enquired about the guarantee that discounted energy would be made available to the local community.</p> <p>A respondent stated that any energy provided to the community must be done at cost to demonstrate a true benefit to the community. Respondent stated that energy should be offered</p>		<p>application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO. Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>in a flexible and understandable way to the local community, noting an example of lower tariffs when energy is in surplus.</p>		<p>lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and organisations.</p> <p>The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant's intention is to establish a new retail electricity company and for that company to offer Project electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone could be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_EF_0156	<p>Respondent suggested the community benefit fund should be used to enhance local connectivity.</p>	N/A	<p>The Applicant notes this comment</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent argued against the feasibility of community benefits offered.	N/A	A community benefit fund is not a requirement, it is a optional benefit provided by the applicant. The chapter has not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent voiced support for allocating areas of the site for community farming and allotments.	Yes	The Project Description at Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] sets out the status of discussions with local food growing groups, and the ambition to offer land for their use under a lease agreement, and the illustrative Masterplan [EN010147/APP/6.4] identifies areas where community food growing could take place.
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent supports the involvement of the Cherwell Collective.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent supports the involvement of the Cutteslowe Community Larder.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment
Landscape and Visual			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0003, BW2_EF_0006, BW2_EF_0026, BW2_EF_0030, BW2_EF_0151, BW2_EF_0089, BW2_EF_0115, BW2_EF_0100, BW2_EF_0031, BW2_EF_0144, BW2_EF_0152, BW2_EF_0092, BW2_EF_0078, BW2_EF_0022, BW2_EF_0113, BW2_EF_0138, BW2_EF_0049, BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0091, BW2_EF_0138	Respondent expressed concern about the use of greenbelt land.	Yes	The case for development in the Green Belt is made within the Planning Supporting Statement (PSS), including the case for Very Special Circumstances, which is included within Appendix 8. [EN010147/APP/7.1.]
BW2_EF_0003, BW2_EF_0016, BW2_EF_0031, BW2_EF_0141, BW2_EF_0030, BW2_EF_0118,	Respondent expressed concern about the visual impact, with some respondents stating that the area becoming industrialised or destroying the local environment. Respondents have stated that not enough is	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0129, BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0106, BW2_EF_0078, BW2_EF_0071, BW2_EF_0138, BW2_EF_0091, BW2_EF_0140, BW2_EF_0117, BW2_EF_0113, BW2_EF_0120, BW2_EF_0113, BW2_EF_0130	being done to mitigate the visual impact of the project.		mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0007, BW2_EF_0022, BW2_EF_0025, BW2_EF_0026, BW2_EF_0049, BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0113, BW2_EF_0138, BW2_EF_0130, BW2_EF_0082, BW2_EF_0135, BW2_EF_0124	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the size and scale of the project.</p> <p>Some respondents have suggested that they would support the scheme if it was smaller.</p> <p>Respondents advocated for smaller solar farms, spread across the country, stating that this would be far more efficient.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that a smaller project would contribute significantly to the grid, and</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The case for need, including the scale of the proposal to meet energy demands, is presented within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>locals would support it more than a large-scale solar project.</p>		<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.</p> <p>On balance, it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p> <p>In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p>
BW2_EF_0115	<p>Respondent expressed concern about the project's impact on existing land.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land. The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p>
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed concern about the potential visual impacts when using overhead lines.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. No new or additional pylons are proposed as part of the Project.
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed that the loss of access to land will exacerbate the poor mental health of the community.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0004	Respondent expressed concerns about the potential visual impact of the grid connection station near Cumnor.	Yes	Landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. A summary of the effects is contained in Tables 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.
BW2_EF_0026	Respondent suggested the use of alternative locations to minimise the visual impact of the project.	No	The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_EF_0071, BW2_EF_0141	<p>A respondent argued that the solar arrays will be visually intrusive along Lower Road and Burleigh Road.</p> <p>A respondent stated that the solar farm would cause major destruction of landscapes, especially in the Lower Evenlode Valley and north of Cassington.</p>	Yes	<p>Landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.</p> <p>On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.
BW2_EF_0093	Respondent stated that human health and well-being are closely linked to landscape and visual aspects.	Yes	<p>Human health effects arising from the Project are assessed in Chapter 16 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Table 16.29 in the chapter presents a summary of the potential impacts, measures adopted as part of the Project and residual effects in respect to human health.</p> <p>Overall, it is concluded that there will be no likely significant adverse effects on human health during the construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning phases of the Project.</p> <p>This is supported by the contribution of the Project in securing new recreational routes, including permissive paths, cycleways and Green Ways, to mitigate potential adverse effects on public</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			health associated with changes in the use of the PRoW network.
BW2_EF_0093	Respondent suggested reducing the scale of the panels near villages and ancient woodland as this would foster a deeper connection to the land.	Yes	Landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.
BW2_EF_0114	Respondent objects to the fact that the view looking north west over the reservoir (view 3 in the Cumnor Neighbourhood Plan) will be affected.	Yes	Landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent stated that the visual outlook from their home will be adversely affected by solar panels on fields 2.57, 2.58, and 2.59. These panels would be directly in view from their kitchen window and above the treeline. They found no evidence in maps or photomontages of measures to mitigate this impact and were concerned about the potential decrease in property value, with PVDP avoiding discussions on compensation.	Yes	A minimum 25 m offset has been included from all residential properties. Landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent stated that they sought information on maintenance responsibilities for field 2.60 and	Yes	The maintenance and monitoring of landscape elements of the site, including ditches, is set out in the outline

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	adjacent ditches if solar panels are installed, but PVDP representatives could not provide answers.		Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in [EN010147/APP/7.6] .
BW2_EF_0117	Respondent stated that the view from their home will be ruined by solar panels on fields 2.57, 2.58, 2.59, and 2.60, close to Jericho Farm Barns. They requested a 30-meter buffer from the boundary.	Yes	A minimum 25 m offset has been included from all residential properties. Landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0156	Respondent stated that no solar arrays should be located in specific field numbers 1.12, 1.13, and the southern section of 1.11, requiring relocation northwards to ensure they are further from footpaths.		Landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0123	Respondent asked for an accurate photomontage visualisation of what the view will be on the ground for a property bordered by a field of solar panels.	Yes	The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4] . The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.
BW2_EF_0123	Respondent stated that the drama school studios have large windows so that the students can enjoy the view and light. The respondent then asked how the 3m high fence and the fields covered in black solar PV modules affect this view and the light from entering the space.	Yes	Landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.
BW2_EF_0123	Respondent asked how high the solar PV modules would be next to OX20 1ER.	No	Solar panels are a maximum 2.3 m in height.
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent stated that they support the creation of woodland belts.	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3] Management is delivered via the oLEMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] See also the Landscape Ecology and Amenities Area Plan [EN010147/APP/7.3.3].

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0091, BW2_EF_0140	Respondent asked what analysis has been given to the Eynsham Vale Area of Landscape Character and the West Oxfordshire Local Development Plan, particularly and demonstrably taking account of the additional housing developments and the large park and ride facility currently under construction.	Yes	Planning Policy, including the relationship with the Eynsham Vale Area of Landscape Character, is considered within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS). [EN010147/APP/7.1] .
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent would like verified views from every public road and footway, particularly those around Goose Eye Farm. Respondent would like to see what the views of the project will look like in the different seasons.	Yes	The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4] . The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_EF_0071, BW2_EF_0091, BW2_EF_0141, BW2_EF_0142, BW2_EF_0144</p>	<p>Respondent stated that the solar farm would cause major destruction of landscapes, especially near villages and in the Lower Evenlode Valley and north of Cassington.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the solar arrays within the Project will not always be fully screened.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Project will be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p> <p>A Glint and Glare Study is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
<p>BW2_EF_0116, BW2_EF_0141</p>	<p>Respondent expressed concern about the visual impact of associated infrastructure such as converter stations, transformers, CCTV cameras and substations.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>This includes assessment of Project in full, not just solar arrays.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the ES notes that the effects of the Project upon the Landscape Character Areas would be fully reversible, but there would be direct operational effects with the introduction of solar panels which would occupy much of the Project Site, along with associated structures such as invertors, substation, access tracks, security perimeter fencing and CCTV.</p> <p>The Project would occupy a large area within the local landscape but be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The northern, central and southern sections of the Project would be generally visually separated from one another. Although in combination views of more than one section would be possible.
BW2_EF_0020, BW2_EF_0144	Respondents expressed that the visualisations presented were misleading, taken from particular angles and lacked clear reference points.	N	<p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p>
BW2_EF_0091	Respondent expressed that solar panels in fields 2.100, 2.101, 2.102, 2.103, 2.104, and 2.110 be removed to protect the village's visual character.	N	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Respondent expressed that the development will span numerous fields near the village of Cassington, significantly altering its landscape and environment.		<p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p> <p>In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p>
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent advocated for the protection of key views and blocking of unwanted views; informed by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0093	Respondent stated that as a health professional and climate activist, they are a strong supporter of green solar energy and welcomed the Aurora Solar Farm in principle. However, they are conflicted due to the project's density and scale.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0100	Respondent expressed that the land used by the project will inevitably become a "dormitory suburb of Oxford".	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0031	Respondent emphasised Oxford Airport's status as a "safe-guarded airport," highlighting concerns over potential electrical radio interference and inadequate consideration of these risks. They stress the critical need to preserve open fields along and beside flight paths to mitigate dangers to aircraft, particularly during emergency situations and pilot training exercises like engine failure tests near Spring Hill. Maintaining these fields is essential for ensuring safe flight operations and the ability to conduct necessary training manoeuvres without compromising safety.	Yes	The application is supported by a Glint & Glare Study, with an aviation annex [EN010147/APP/6.4]. The Applicant has also been in discussions with Oxford Airport and has made amendments to areas of solar panel installation and equipment in proximity to the Oxford Airport runway.
BW2_EF_0118, BW2_EF_0140	<p>Respondent stated that without attending the consultations, they found that the Botley West Solar Farm lacks transparency about the 2-meter high fencing and structures.</p> <p>Respondent wants details of the security fencing that were planning on being used alongside details of the security cameras and signage.</p>	N	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. Fencing has been considered. [EN010147/APP/6.3]

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Chapter 8 of the ES notes that the effects of the Project upon the Landscape Character Areas would be fully reversible, but there would be direct operational effects with the introduction of solar panels which would occupy much of the Project Site, along with associated structures such as invertors, substation, access tracks, security perimeter fencing and CCTV.</p>
BW2_EF_0091	<p>Respondent stated that the fields next to the village are on a hill, and there is insufficient explanation on how mitigations (such as hedges) will ensure that solar panels are not visible from the village.</p>	Yes	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the solar arrays within the Project will not always be fully screened.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Project will be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.
BW2_EF_0106, BW2_EF_0128	<p>Respondent expressed concern about the project's ability to sustain Woodstock's cherished landscapes like fields, meadows, and countryside views.</p> <p>A respondent stated that WODC have emphasised the visual impacts from developing the higher ground along the Evenlode Valley.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the solar arrays within the Project will not always be fully screened.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Project will be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p>
BW2_EF_0011, BW2_EF_0049, BW2_EF_0073,	Respondents have questioned the quality of the visualisations displayed at Phase Two consultation.	Yes	The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages,

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0082, BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0101, BW2_EF_0102, BW2_EF_0103, BW2_EF_0112, BW2_EF_0113, BW2_EF_0130, BW2_EF_0132, BW2_EF_0152, BW2_EF_0153			<p>for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p>
BW2_EF_0102	<p>Respondent questioned Paragraph 6.3.6 of the PEIR regarding the assessment of solar development impacts on views, the statement that "Due to the low level of the solar development and proposed mitigation, there is no potential for any private views to be adversely affected over and above substantial" was critiqued as subjective, potentially differing from affected residents' perspectives. They raised concerns about the omission of public views and sought clarification on the term "substantial," not included in assessment matrices. They argued</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	that "substantial" typically denotes high impact, questioning whether anything beyond "substantial" equates to a very high impact and whether this aligns with an adverse effect.		
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent challenges the leaflet's portrayal of mitigation efforts, particularly regarding visual impacts. They argue that temporary measures like growing hedges do not truly mitigate the permanent visual disruption caused by solar panels and infrastructure, which they believe will irreversibly alter cherished landscapes and heritage settings.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0132	Respondent stated that significant and critical reports from the PEIR were unavailable, including information regarding the greenbelt and the VSC report which was specifically requested by PINS following the scoping report.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent asked if Natural England and CPRE have been consulted with respect to the AONB's and loss of open countryside. The respondent would like the details of these consultations.	No	Natural England and CPRE have been consulted. A full list of Section 42 consultees can be seen in Appendix 5.1.6: Section 42 Consultation Materials [EN010147/APP/5.1.6] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0020	Respondent highlighted their property at 3 Hall Farm Paddocks, Spring Hill Road, Begbroke OX5 1FW, renowned for its scenic farmland and woodland views. The respondent opposed a nearby housing expansion plan that will erase village boundaries and transforming the area into a sprawling mass. The respondent also stated they were unhappy about this project being done to power new housing developments.	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_EF_0073	Respondent requested a new visualization to reflect the impact of the project on Bladon.	Yes	<p>The Applicant has continued to prepare further visualisations to support the ES, which are presented as photomontages, for winter and summer, at agreed representative viewpoints, for Years 1 and 15. These are provided in Figures 8.248 to 8.371 [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and photomontages have been produced in accordance with current best practice guidance. Including the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition) (GLVIA3) and LI TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0123	Respondent asked if there would be motion sensitive lighting on site, stating that this would profoundly affect both classes at the school in the winter months and evening performances throughout the year.	Yes	<p>A lighting strategy, to minimise the impacts of lighting in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals / Bat Conservation Trust guidelines, will be implemented, as set out under the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1].</p> <p>Furthermore, no lighting will be permanently switched on. Emergency lighting will only be used, and operated manually.</p>
BW2_EF_0124	Respondent stated that is not acceptable to impose on local inhabitants and wildlife over 100km of 2m high fencing, let alone the 156 power converter stations and 6 high voltage transformers	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Screening and Buffer Zones			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_EF_0031, BW2_EF_0082, BW2_EF_0085, BW2_EF_0091, BW2_EF_0125, BW2_EF_0156, BW2_EF_0116, BW2_EF_0128, BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0123, BW2_EF_0093, BW2_EF_0078</p>	<p>Respondents expressed that the current buffer zone is inadequate.</p> <p>One respondent stated that the minimum buffer zone of 25m between the solar arrays and buildings is insufficient.</p> <p>One respondent believes that there must be wider buffer zones around residential areas and sensitive locations like Conservation areas, with a minimum 20% increase over current proposals and at least 25 meters where buffers are currently absent.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that the claim of a buffer zone of at least 25m between solar panel fencing and buildings conflicts with a previous promise of at least 30m for residential houses.</p> <p>One respondent stated that they would support a further increase of buffer zones from 25m to 50m between solar arrays and buildings.</p> <p>A respondent expressed that the proposed hedging along Lower Road and Burleigh road will</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p> <p>In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>not provide adequate screening in winter due to its deciduous nature.</p> <p>Respondents requested that buffer zones be increased , including around Cassington, Sansom's Farm Studios and the Farm House.</p>		
<p>BW2_EF_0071, BW2_EF_0117</p>	<p>Respondent queried how hedgerow screening will work in winter and if there will be a large-scale hedge layering scheme.</p> <p>One respondent expressed concerns about the long growth time for proposed saplings, doubting that they will be effective visual screening.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p> <p>In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0006	Respondent stated that they have spent the last 3 winters trying to reestablish a hedge along fields in Bladon and would love to be involved in planting and maintaining hedges and trees in the site.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0062	Respondent criticised the developer's claim that planted hedging would make the solar panels unnoticeable.	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the solar arrays within the Project will not always be fully screened.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Project will be largely enclosed by retained hedgerow vegetation and woodland planting. Over time, proposed mitigation would further enclose the Project within the landscape.</p>
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent asked whether the developers understand hedge layering.	Yes	Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Respondent enquired about the benefits for hedgerow value.		<p>the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Full details of biodiversity net gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain, including assessing hedgerow value.</p>
BW2_EF_0093, BW2_EF_0128	Respondents stated that public paths, cycle ways, and bridleways within the project should be bordered by hedgerows and wildflower strips. This would obscure the solar panels from view and enhance the natural landscape, creating wider buffer strips and corridors for nature.	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.</p>
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent referenced Capability Brown from Blenheim Palace to use perimeter planting and woodland to block and/or frame views. The respondent added that he used woodland clumps to increase the apparent changes in topography and to exaggerate the apparent size of the lake.	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.</p>
BW2_EF_0156	Respondent expressed that there should be long-term maintenance commitments to hedgerows and other natural buffer zone measures.	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.
BW2_EF_0116	<p>Respondent expressed that the details of fencing and panels being 30m from the boundary field of 2.60 and around 200m from Cassington-Yarnton Road were not on maps and have not been confirmed by PVDP staff.</p> <p>Respondent expressed that promises of planting hedgerows for visual screening are vague, with no specific information on the type of plants or their growth timeline.</p>	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.</p>
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent requested further clarification on the actual buffer distance to residential homes.	Yes	A minimum 25 m offset has been included from all residential properties.
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent requested further clarification on whether buffer zones refers to fencing or panels.	No	A minimum 25 m offset has been included from all residential properties.
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent expressed that the proposed hedging along Lower Road and Burleigh road will not provide adequate screening in winter due to its deciduous nature.	Yes	<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter.</p>
Glint and Glare			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0102, BW2_EF_0141	Respondents expressed concern whether glint and glare issues have been coordinated with RAF Brize Norton, RAF Benson, and SAS HQ Hereford, given their frequent low-altitude flights over the Project site by heavy transport planes, Chinooks, and other helicopters.	N	<p>A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6]</p> <p>A Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>
BW2_EF_0091	Respondent stated that the glint and glare from the solar panels, especially given their location on a hill facing Cassington, have not been adequately addressed.	N	<p>A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6]</p> <p>A Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent questions the assertion that no significant glint and glare will arise from the Botley West site, suggesting this omission could be due to its exclusion from Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation.	N	A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6]

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			A Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent expressed that the impact of glint and glare on birds and insets, noting the Planning Inspectorate's decision to overlook these concerns.	Yes	<p>A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6]</p> <p>A Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>
BW2_EF_0123	Respondent asked how the glint and glare from the PV modules will affect those 150 people at the drama school.	N	<p>A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6]</p> <p>A Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0127	Respondent stated that the glint and glare are going to be horrific everywhere over this huge site.	N	<p>A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6]</p> <p>A Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>
BW2_EF_0141	Respondent expressed concerned about the potential safety concerns for nearby residents and military security due to glint and glare affecting pilots.	N	<p>A Glint and Glare Study was provided at PEIR stage and has been updated to reflect changes to the solar array layout and provided at Volume 3, Appendix 4.4 [EN010147/APP/6.6]</p> <p>A Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Report produced by Pager Power is provided as Appendix 4.4 in Volume 3 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>
Land Use & Agriculture			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0049, BW2_EF_0082, BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0092, BW2_EF_0142, BW2_EF_0144, BW2_EF_0025, BW2_EF_0088, BW2_EF_0102, BW2_EF_0103, BW2_EF_0120, BW2_EF_0089, BW2_EF_0113, BW2_EF_0029, BW2_EF_0031, BW2_EF_0049, BW2_EF_0123, BW2_EF_0152, BW2_EF_0082, BW2_EF_0089, BW2_EF_0030, BW2_EF_0127, BW2_EF_0129, BW2_EF_0130, BW2_EF_0116, BW2_EF_0015	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the use and loss of greenfield and agricultural land.</p> <p>Respondents have expressed concern that the land being proposed is high-quality agricultural land.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about the project's impact on food security.</p> <p>Respondents criticise the level of information regarding agricultural land made public to date.</p> <p>A respondent stated that some of the land surrounding OX20 1ER, as well as Field 2.60, which will be used in the development Grade 2 and Grade 3a agricultural land will be taken out of food production.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land. The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0030	Respondent believes that the panel arrays would hinder agricultural use by depriving the earth of light and moisture, impacting a significant area of currently productive farmland.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>
BW2_EF_0031, BW2_EF_0078, BW2_EF_0103	Respondents stated that sheep farming beneath the panels is certainly not practical. The respondent added that sheep behave in a way unsuitable for the panels and what assurances would there be that the sheep would be properly tended to.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The proposal includes the retention of agricultural use of the land within the area of the solar panel infrastructure, using conservation grazing as outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Blenheim Estate already apply conservation grazing locally within other areas of land and the capability and experience is therefore already available to apply this type of management with the Project.
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent believes that the West Oxfordshire Local Plan's policy EH6, regarding renewable energy development and agricultural land, should be more rigorously addressed in the consultation. The current documentation lacks clear justification for using BMV land for solar panel installation.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent would like to see encouragement of diverse land use and management.	No	The proposal for the land use and management within the Project which includes the retention of agricultural use of areas of land using conservation grazing is outlined in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent requested details of the new woodland referred to on the website with the location and types of trees proposed as well as scientific support for selecting specific species in this soil type.	Yes	The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/6.3] contains proposals for planting palettes for trees, hedges and woodland, as well as maintenance schedules, and has

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			been informed by landscape architects, ecologists and specialists working in the solar farm business.
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent requested full details and maps of the community gardens and allotments being proposed to include access details and hours of use and by whom.	Yes	The Project Description at Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] sets out the status of discussions with local food growing groups, and the ambition to offer land for their use under a lease agreement, and the illustrative Masterplan [EN010147/APP/6.4] identifies areas where community food growing could take place.
BW2_EF_0017	Respondent expressed that the reversion to agricultural land is a complex process and not guaranteed following the end of the project.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. The application is supported by an outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .
BW2_EF_0021, BW2_EF_0029, BW2_EF_0078	Respondent expressed that the project could disrupt the local agricultural economy. A respondent voiced concerns for the Tenant farmers working the land regarding their families and livelihoods following the implementation of the	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has worked collaboratively with Project landowners and their respective interests throughout the development of the Project. The Applicant is committed to continued engagement in this way.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Details of Socio-economic effects are identified and assessed within Chapter 15 [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent expressed concerns about the long-term effect of the project on farmland after decommissioning.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The application is supported by an outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .
BW2_EF_0024	Respondent cited DEFRA reports on threats to land from global warming and expressed scepticism about restoring greenbelt land after 40 years of solar farm use. They stressed the importance of preserving farmland as a carbon sink and food production area amid global supply chain vulnerabilities.	No	The great majority of the land used for the Project is currently used for intensive agriculture which, by its nature, removes the biomass from the soil every time the crops are harvested. The change to permanent grassland will ensure that there is a greater degree of carbon storage within the soil compared to the current baseline.
BW2_EF_0024	Respondent advocated for rational land use decisions based on scientific efficiency.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0029	Respondent stated that the PV can use non-farmable land instead of agricultural land.		The Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0083	Respondent believes national policy should balance the climate emergency, food security, and greenbelt preservation, and criticizes the	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	current approach as favouring large solar farms at the expense of other critical needs.		
BW2_EF_0103	Respondent referenced agricultural diversity's importance for resilience, echoing James Rebanks' views in <i>English Pastoral</i> .	No	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0103	Respondent suggested Blenheim explore diverse farming approaches for optimal land use amidst climate and economic uncertainties, cautioning against reliance on singular solutions.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment. The intention is to continue to use the land for conservation grazing in the main part and provide for community food growing areas. The approach therefore is a mixed one, to generate energy and retain agricultural and provide new horticultural uses.
BW2_EF_0029	The respondent added that one benefit of the scheme would be that the land with PV panels does not need fertilising.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0129	Respondent stated that Fig.17.2 is erroneous and misleading as most of the planned development is on land that should be coloured mauve. The respondent added that they do not understand the basis for the predictive data in table 17.9 which states that 59% of the land proposed for solar is less than 20% does not support their calculations or the calculations provided in table 17.11	No	The Applicant notes this comment

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0017	Respondent would like a summary of the evidence that supports the argument that solar PV sites are physically reversible to agriculture in the BMV and the non-BMV context is needed.	Yes	<p>Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on agricultural land are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>This includes the preparation of Soil Management Plans in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6], which has been submitted with the application for development consent.</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction of the Project. Reinstatement would be undertaken in accordance with procedures set out in the Soil Management Plan.</p>
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent questioned why valuable grade 2 and 3a farmland is not excluded from the solar proposal.	Yes	Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on agricultural land are set out in Volume 3,

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>This includes the preparation of Soil Management Plans in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6], which has been submitted with the application for development consent.</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction of the Project. Reinstatement would be undertaken in accordance with procedures set out in the Soil Management Plan.</p>
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent supports opportunities for sheep to graze the land.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0029	Respondent voiced concerns about the issue of agricultural sterilisation which would make the land untenable.	No.	<p>Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on agricultural land are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>This includes the preparation of Soil Management Plans in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6], which has been submitted with the application for development consent.</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction of the Project. Reinstatement would be undertaken in accordance with procedures set out in the Soil Management Plan.</p>
Hydrology and Flood Risk			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_EF_0024, BW2_EF_0091, BW2_EF_0078, BW2_EF_0113, BW2_EF_0071, BW2_EF_0117, BW2_EF_0116, BW2_EF_0126</p>	<p>Respondents have stated that the solar farm will increase flood risk, including increasing run off from the panels.</p> <p>Respondents have asked for more detail on how flood risks will be mitigated.</p> <p>Respondents stated that solar panel installation could worsen flooding risks in Cassington and Worton and around Field 2.60, affecting local ditches and properties.</p> <p>Respondents enquired measures that will be taken to mitigate against any impacts to increased flooding risk.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Compared to agricultural (arable and livestock) use, solar PV modules are likely to create an overall betterment in surface water drainage than a continuation of the existing use.</p> <p>The primary reason for this is the significant advantage from full year-round organically managed vegetated ground cover within solar PV module.</p> <p>A second environmental benefit of solar PV modules are soil quality improvement from cessation of intensive arable use and organic management of the land. It is expected that soil health will be improved through the Project.</p> <p>As part of the Project, solar arrays are to be each placed with a 1.5 m to 3 m gap to provide adequate spacing to prevent the concentration of surface water dripping from the solar arrays. Vegetation will be placed beneath the panels to allow for infiltration at the lowest leading edge of panels. These</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>measures ensure there is no significant increase in runoff or gully erosion.</p> <p>The FRA concludes that as a result of the solar Project there is no increase flood risk on-site and off-site in line with the NPPF and NPS [EN010147/APP/6].</p>
BW2_EF_0010	Respondent asked how "establishing temporary haul roads" will help with the flood risk.	Yes	The effects of the construction phase, including the use of temporary haul roads, upon surface water drainage and flood risk are assessed in Chapter 10 of the ES; Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] and the Flood Risk Assessment, Appendix 10.1 [EN101047/APP/6.5]
BW2_EF_0029	Respondent stated that they do not think that the panels will alter the flood risk at all.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0049	Respondent underscores the importance of Chapter 10's Hydrology and Flood Risk assessment, highlighting concerns over flood protection systems for critical infrastructure like HV cables and transformers, particularly in flood-prone areas.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent questioned whether developers are aware of flooding on Elms Road and the playing	No	Information is taken based on readily available mapping provided by the

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	fields, and why this is not reflected in flood risk maps.		Environment Agency. The Applicant notes the area mentioned.
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent asked how the cable route is designed to prevent increased rainwater runoff into the village.	Yes	<p>Temporary drainage measures would be implemented during construction. Outline CoCP [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] to be secured as DCO requirement.</p> <p>Detailed CoCP's to be developed in line with Outline CoCP and agreed with relevant stakeholders and will include details in regard to drainage such as filter strips and formal drainage upwards of Cassington.</p>
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent asked for examples of similar solar installations in areas with similar rainfall, demonstrating effective mitigation measures.	Yes	<p>The design of the Solar PV ensures that any water that would have fallen on to the land in the pre-existing baseline will continue to do so during the Project. A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms effect runoff and mitigation measures used during the design are outlined in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0091	Respondent stated that the increase in water runoff due to the solar panels could exacerbate flooding risks in Cassington.	Yes	<p>Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus climate change event.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent critiques RPS/PVDP's approach to hydrology and flood risk for Botley West, highlighting outdated Environment Agency (EA) data and recent flood alerts along the Evenlode and its tributaries.	Yes	The most up to date flood data has been used for the assessment, including models which have been obtained from the EA and verified as the most recent available data. This is detailed in the FRA prepared for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent expressed concern over the project's siting of a sub-station and solar panels between a flood-prone section of Lower Road and the confluence of City Farm/Hanborough brook with the Evenlode, identified unexpectedly as a "main river."	Yes	Solar panels have been sequentially steered to areas of low risk of flooding (including Flood Zone 1).
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent stated that the discrepancy between initial reassurances of minimal surface run-off and extensive mitigation measures listed in paragraph 6.5.15 of the NTS raises doubts about the project's preparedness for managing flood risks and environmental impacts effectively.	No	<p>Impact to runoff is considered in Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The approach concludes that the development would not increase flood risk off-site. The design of the Solar PV ensures that any water that would have fallen on to the land in the pre-existing baseline will continue to do so during the Project. A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms effect runoff and mitigation measures used during the design are outlined in the</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent stated PVDP representatives assured them at the Cassington second consultation that there was no added flood risk, despite their house's documented history of flooding recognized by local councils.	No	<p>Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus climate change event.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent stated PVDP's plans for hydrological risk assessments, mentioned in phase 2	No	Further details regarding project phases and timescales are included in Volume 1

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	consultations, lacked specific details on coverage and timing, leaving uncertainties about potential flood impacts unresolved.		Chapter 6 Project Description [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0117	Respondent questioned PVDP's lack of clear responsibility for ditch maintenance and raised concerns about potential land degradation after the panels' estimated 41-year lifespan, urging that valuable agricultural land remain untouched.	No	An Outline OMP is provided as part of application for development consent [EN010147/APP/7.6.5] . Detailed OMP's to be developed in line with Outline OMP and agreed with relevant stakeholders. Detailed OMP's to be secured as DCO requirement. This includes maintenance of existing field ditches and drainage systems at the Project.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0134	<p>Respondent stated that the land to the North East of Jericho Farm (plots 2.53-2.60) will have the most impact on them. The respondent stated that many buildings there were flooded in the winter 2002-3, with water rising through the floors. Respondent further added that this flood risk would be reckless to proceed with any development. The respondent stated that no concrete reassurance was given to the respondent at the consultation events.</p>	No	<p>The Project is not the existing flow pathway existing at Jericho Farm which appears to correlate to runoff from adjacent fields.</p> <p>In line with the wider Project a Surface Water Drainage Strategy for the Project has been prepared and details how runoff will be managed throughout the Project, this is included in Volume 3, Appendix 10.2 Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>Compared to agricultural (arable and livestock) use, solar PV modules are likely to create an overall betterment in surface water drainage than a continuation of the existing use.</p> <p>The primary reason for this is the significant advantage from full year-round organically managed vegetated ground cover within solar PV module. A second environmental benefit of solar PV modules are soil quality improvement from cessation of intensive</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>arable use and organic management of the land. It is expected that soil health will be improved through the Project.</p> <p>As part of the Project, solar arrays are to be each placed with a 1.5 m to 3 m gap to provide adequate spacing to prevent the concentration of surface water dripping from the solar arrays. Vegetation will be placed beneath the panels to allow for infiltration at the lowest leading edge of panels. These measures ensure there is no significant increase in runoff or gully erosion.</p> <p>The FRA concludes that as a result of the solar Project there is no increase flood risk on site and off-site in line with the NPPF and NPS [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_EF_0134	Respondent stated that the proposal should not continue without a concrete flooding and traffic plan.	No	An FRA has also been prepared which discussed the existing flood risk and in the context of the development; Volume 3 Appendix 10.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			A Construction Traffic Management Plan has also been prepared and details how traffic will be managed during construction [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] .
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent stated that they do not see the claim regarding flood risk assessment as being at all accurate or sufficient, the respondent requested full details of the source of the flood risk position.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0144	Respondent stated that some proposed land is liable to flooding, questioning the safety and viability of using solar panels in such areas.	No	The development has been sequentially steered towards Flood Zone 1 and therefore no development has been placed within Flood Zone 3a and 3b. This is apart from the exception of HDD compounds, which are considered temporary development. These will be restricted to Flood Zone 3a with appropriate mitigation. Details of which are presented in Volume 3 Appendix 10.1 Flood Risk Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0144	Respondent raised concerns about the project's impact reduced food production during floods.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent expressed that the area is flood-prone.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0021	Respondent expressed concern about local flooding.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0017	Respondent stated that PVDP solar sites may be caused by compaction leading to reduced permeability to water and air as well as increased surface runoff and erosion.	No	The impact of construction, operation and decommissioning of the scheme on 'The impact of deterioration of water quality within surface and ground waterbody receptors' and 'increased flooding arising from additional surface water runoff' is considered within is discussed within Section 10.9 of ES Volume 1 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0049	Respondent criticizes the lack of transparency regarding water consumption for panel cleaning, the use of additives, and plans for effluent discharge, all crucial for assessing environmental impacts and sustainability.	No	The impact of construction, operation and decommissioning of the scheme on water quality is considered within Section 10.6 of Volume 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Information regarding water quality is included within formal WFD Assessment details are provided within Volume 3, Appendix 10.5: Water Framework Directive Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0126	Respondent stated that the consultation for Cassington was incomplete as it has failed to include Hydrologist reports. The respondent added that the Hydrology and Flood Risk section in the yellow book is a generic document that fails to realise the consequence of rapid run off from your panels to this fragile situation.	No	<p>Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus climate change event.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
Traffic, Access and Construction			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0030, BW2_EF_0049	<p>Respondent expressed concern about the timescale of the construction phase.</p> <p>One respondent expressed that the project's construction is likely to take over 24 months and doubts that it will be able to meet installation targets for solar panels, converter stations, and other infrastructure elements given the proposed working hours and potential traffic implications.</p> <p>One respondent suggested that the installation of the Botley West Solar Farm would likely take a long time, even starting in 2025, due to the need for infrastructure for connection to the National Grid at a new substation and potential delays in grid connection.</p>	Yes	Construction will be contracted to an experienced Engineering, Procurement and Construction company (EPC) that will be required to deliver the solar farm in 24 months.
BW2_EF_0116, BW2_EF_0130	Respondents expressed disappointment that the traffic management plan would only be available after the DCO application submission.	Yes	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_EF_0021	Respondent stated that the developers, Photovolt Development Partners Ltd and SolarFive Ltd, are expected to cover construction costs, allowing landlords to collect rent for 40 years.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0010	Respondent asked how many miles will the trucks carrying the building material travel.	Yes	The construction access routes and justification for these routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . All HGVs will enter the traffic and transport study area from the A34.
BW2_EF_0010	Respondent asked what about the ongoing annual maintenance costs.	Yes	Please see the Outline Landscape and Ecology Maintenance Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent expressed serious concerns about the disruption from increased industrial traffic, noise, and dust pollution during construction.	Yes	During the construction phase noise will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent has asked where the accesses from the highway and tracks be.	Yes	The locations of construction accesses are shown within Volume 2: Figures of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4] .
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent expressed that Cassington should not be used as a route for construction traffic.	Yes	The construction access routes and justification for these routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent asked how long the public right of way from Cassington to Purwell Farm will be restricted during construction.	Yes	Please see the Outline Code of Construction Practice, and its associated Outline Rights of Way Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] The precise timings of closures will be developed in the detailed management plans and phasing for the Project.
BW2_EF_0078	Respondent seeks assurances that construction traffic associated with the solar farm will not disrupt local villages.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0083	Respondent raises concerns about traffic congestion on Burleigh and Yarnton Roads due to the proposed expansion of the A40 for a bus lane.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0083	Respondent expressed that they had received assurances from Mark Own-Lloyd assured that only designated A roads would be used for transportation associated with the solar farm, but Respondent seeks guarantees, especially regarding the Cassington track closure.	Yes	The construction access routes and justification for these routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0099	Respondent stated concerns about traffic assessments related to the project. They highlighted issues with potential increases in traffic on the A4095, A40, and B4044, especially during construction and major events at Blenheim Palace.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport on the A4095, A40 and B4044 is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0099	Respondent expressed that local roads are too narrow for construction traffic.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including baseline environment conditions, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] and within Appendix 12.1: Description of network links and sensitivity [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0099	Respondent enquired whether the project had account for current traffic problems, particularly around the Toll Bridge on the A4044, where heavy goods vehicles are restricted.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Site-specific surveys have been undertaken to inform the base traffic flows of the ES. The location and results of the commissioned traffic surveys are presented in Appendix 12.2: Traffic Survey Data [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent criticised Paragraph 6.1.4 of the NTS concerning traffic and transport, expressing shock at the absence of a cumulative assessment. They questioned whether this omission reflected difficulty or embarrassment, suggesting it might be deferred for resolution later.	Yes	An assessment of cumulative effects on traffic and transport during the construction phase is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent advocated for an independent assessment of inter-related effects on traffic and	Yes	An assessment of cumulative effects and inter-related effects on traffic and transport during the construction phase

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	all other cumulative issues, asserting a need for objectivity beyond RPS/PVDP's involvement.		is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent questioned the dismissal of potential cumulative dust impacts on residents within 700 meters of the Botley West site boundary along Lower Road.	Yes	Outline Dust Management Plan is part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent highlighted concerns over concurrent construction activities from Salt Cross Garden Village, A40 improvements, and O'Malley's aggregate recycling facility, suggesting these combined activities could lead to significant dust emissions affecting nearby communities.	No	Construction of Botley West Solar Farm will be complete before Salt Cross construction commences.
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent questions the GHG impact during Botley West's construction phase, citing emissions of about 1,903,605 tCO ₂ e as significant. They note potential GHG reductions of -617,826 to -5,655,662 tCO ₂ e, emphasising uncertainty and the need for higher reductions for substantial benefits. They express concern over the 10-year carbon payback period and seek transparency on PVDP's financial payback timeframe.	Yes	GHG emissions are covered in ES Vol 1 Chapter 14 Climate Change [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent stated PVDP representatives informed them of plans to install cabling along the Cassington-Yarnton road, yet were vague about the exact route, citing ongoing consultations with Highways. Respondent states that PVDP personnel confirmed that the cabling would run alongside the highway, approximately 0.85 meters deep and 1.5 meters wide. However, there was no clarity on connectivity to the inverters in field 2.60 until negotiations with Thames Water concluded for access rights at the Worton turnoff.	No	The Project will have access to all land required in order to connect the panels to the NGET substation via the cable route corridors.
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent stated they were informed by PVDP that there would be four main temporary construction sites spread across the proposed Botley West Solar Farm site, with the closest site approximately 3 miles away at Oxford Airport. However, there was no update on access to field 2.60, which remains under consideration.	Yes	<p>The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area and construction access routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent expressed that specifics on access routes to construction sites and logistical details such as vehicle numbers, weight limits, and parking arrangements during construction has not been provided, especially around the areas of Cassington village and Yarnton.	Yes	<p>The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area and construction access routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.</p>
BW2_EF_0123	Respondent asked about noise pollution during and after construction phase.	Yes	<p>During the construction phase noise will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP).</p> <p>This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.</p>
BW2_EF_0123	The respondent stated that it should be made clear where the temporary construction sites will be situated.	Yes	<p>The location of the temporary construction compounds are shown within Volume 2: Figures of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0123	Respondent stated that it should be specified where the traffic access routes will be situated for the Northern site one it should be made clear what is happening to public footpaths that are in the grey areas of the map.	Yes	<p>The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area and construction access routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.</p>
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent stated that the noise from the inverters that will be used should be reduced from 74dB to 40dB at 1m.	Yes	<p>A full noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES [EN010147/APP/6.3], with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4], and ES Volume 3 (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>This assessment has identified that the development will not cause any</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			significant adverse effects on noise sensitive receptors. Therefore, noise from the PCS units does not need to be limited to 40dB at 1m.
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent emphasizes that Temporary Compounds will cause significant disruption during construction and maintenance phases of the project, affecting local areas for years. They argue that	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent expressed that inadequate information has been provided about these compounds and their impacts.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent expressed concern that mitigating the impacts of extensive construction activities without a detailed plan or consultation with Highway Authorities is insufficiently addressed in the consultation materials.	Yes	Mitigation and enhancement measures adopted as part of the Project are set out in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent expressed concerns over the suitability of access roads and the absence of clear site locations or size details, which they	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The locations of the temporary construction compounds

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	believe are crucial for public understanding and assessment of environmental impacts.		are shown within Volume 2: Figures of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.4] . The construction access routes and justification for these routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent believes that the early stage of surveying for the Thames crossing does not justify the statutory consultation. They stated that until the method and location of the crossing are fully detailed, the public cannot make an informed decision on potential environmental impacts.	No	All cable routes including the Thames crossing are set out in the Works Plans
BW2_EF_0131	Respondent was told that the cables connecting the northern and central areas to the grid connection near Cumnor will pass under the Thames to the north or south of Swinford Bridge.	Yes	Long Mead Meadow has been removed from within the Project site with the works now to the north of the Swinford Crossing in order to ensure no impacts to the Local Wildlife Site near Swinford Toll Bridge.
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent would like details of the access points being used for the fields for location and maintenance.	Yes	The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area and construction access routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent requested specifics of where the cable routes will run, including details of depth in ground and mapping of routes with clear details of proximity to existing gas pipes, water supply routes and existing cabling.	No	All cable routes are set out in the Works Plans [EN010147/APP/2.3] .
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent would like an instalment management plan showing how the panels will be installed including the types of vehicles to be used and precisely when with both date ranges and any other existing underground cabling.	No	Please refer Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent requested the method of fixing solar panels to the ground.	No	Please refer ES Vol 1 Chapter 6 Project Description [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The metal legs of the array tables are pushed into the ground using piling techniques, and the Project Description confirms that the depth range is between 1m to 3m depending on the circumstances.
BW2_EF_0151	Respondent stated that digging up a huge trench for the cables will release billions of tonnes of carbon.	No	The Applicant notes this comment

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0153	Respondent stated that they anticipate huge traffic disruptions in smaller villages and narrow roads due to construction activities associated with the solar farm development.	No	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0123	Respondent stated that the view into their drama studio will be available to construction workers which compromises the privacy of the drama students there.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0031	Respondent seems odd that the study considered any adverse effects to road safety but has not considered the implications on aviation safety specifically considering the proximity with Oxford Airport.	N/A	The Project will not have an adverse impact on aviation safety.
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent criticises the vague mitigation proposals for limiting construction HGV movements on the B4017 Cumnor Road, highlighting potential significant impacts on pedestrian amenity. They express concern over a proposal in Chapter 12 to route HGVs via Swinford Toll Bridge as an alternative, noting its current congestion issues and the economic and logistical challenges posed by increased HGV traffic. The prospect of a nearby construction compound exacerbates these concerns, questioning the feasibility and implications of such	No	<p>The construction access routes and justification for these routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Mitigation and enhancement measures adopted as part of the Project are set out in Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	a plan on local infrastructure and community well-being.		prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_EF_0082	Respondent raises concerns about traffic congestion on Burleigh and Yarnton Roads due to the proposed expansion of the A40 for a bus lane.	No	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0144	Respondent expressed that the construction and operation of the project will destroy the ancient meadow land that is near Swinford Toll Bridge.	N/a	Cable route avoids the ancient meadow, as shown on the Masterplan [EN010147/APP/2.1] .
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent queried Paragraph 5.3.17 of the NTS regarding the consideration of both temporary and permanent access requirements. They sought clarification on the purpose of permanent accesses beyond substations, and requested specifics on the number and locations of temporary compounds, which they deemed necessary information prior to the ES stage.	No	The construction traffic flows along each link in the traffic and transport study area and construction access routes is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent expressed concerns about Paragraph 5.4.2 regarding construction compounds in the PEIR, stating that there is a lack of detail.	No	Please refer Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0103	Respondent stated concerns about Table 17.23's conclusion of "major adverse" effects, applying solely to the 5.7 hectares under substations. Table 17.22, on the other hand, fails to adequately reflect the full scale of impact.	No	Please refer ES Vol 1 Chapter 6 Project Description [EN010147/APP/6.3] The legs of the array tables are pushed into the ground.
BW2_EF_0103	Respondent raises critical points from the assessment: Table 17.15 prompts questions about the location and coverage of soil and subsoil heaps during construction, while Table 17.18 raises queries regarding the relocation and reasons for access routes and the recontouring of land. Paragraphs 17.9.2.1 and 17.9.2.2 highlight omissions regarding Subgrade 3a land, known for its high sensitivity, and details about access and maintenance roads, including whether "unbound stone" tracks will be permanent and their potential implications for soil management, respectively.	No	Please refer the Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .
BW2_EF_0049	Respondent criticised the deficiencies in the Traffic and Transport section, questioning the feasibility of installing an average of 86,000 solar panels per month and associated infrastructure over a 24-month construction period, emphasizing logistical challenges and the reliability of traffic estimates.	No	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
Decommissioning			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0017, BW2_EF_0049, BW2_EF_0144	Respondent expressed concern about the possibility of the site reverting to agricultural use after decommissioning.	Yes	An Outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] an Outline Decommissioning Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] have been prepared as part of the application.
BW2_EF_0118, BW2_EF_0128, BW2_EF_0144	Respondent enquired about the plan for dismantling panels during decommissioning.	Yes	Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] provides the Project description, and the parameters used for assessment purposes, including removal of equipment. The Applicant has also produced an outline Decommissioning Plan which will provide the means by which the detail can be agreed and secured [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .
BW2_EF_0021, BW2_EF_0152, BW2_EF_0082 BW2_EF_0130, BW2_EF_0049, BW2_EF_0085, BW2_EF_0123, BW2_EF_0130	<p>Respondent expressed concerns about decommissioning, including the future land use after the project is decommissioned.</p> <p>Respondents have asked for further detail on decommissioning.</p> <p>A respondent asked how much has been reserved to cover decommissioning costs and if this money will be placed in escrow. The respondent then asked if not what guarantees do</p>	Yes	Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] provides the Project description, and the parameters used for assessment purposes, including removal of equipment. The Applicant has also produced an outline Decommissioning Plan which will provide the means by which the detail can be agreed and secured [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	they have that Solar Five/PVDP will be solvent enough to cover the decommissioning.		
BW2_EF_0140	<p>Respondent stated that there is no guarantee of the panels remaining viable or PVDP remaining solvent for the duration.</p> <p>Respondent asked if sufficient plans have been made to cover removal in the event of insolvency.</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] provides the Project description, and the parameters used for assessment purposes, including removal of equipment.</p> <p>The Applicant has also produced an outline Decommissioning Plan which will provide the means by which the detail can be agreed and secured [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p>
Noise			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_EF_0113, BW2_EF_0128, BW2_EF_0129, BW2_EF_0141</p>	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the project's potential impact on noise, including on wildlife.</p> <p>Respondents have requested more detail on the noise impact of the project.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A full noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES reference [EN010147/APP/6.3], with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4], and ES Volume 3 (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5]. This assessment has identified that the development will not cause any significant adverse effects on noise sensitive receptors.</p> <p>During the construction phase noise will be controlled and limited by the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Noise from the operational phase will be controlled and limited by the Outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.5] (OMP). This operational management plan will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect.</p>
BW2_EF_0102	<p>Respondent asked if the generators for the construction compounds have acoustic barriers to reduce the noise.</p>	Yes	<p>A full noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES reference [EN010147/APP/6.3], with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4], and ES Volume 3 (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5]. This assessment has identified that the development will not cause any significant adverse effects on noise sensitive receptors.</p> <p>During the construction phase noise will be controlled and limited by the Outline</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). This code of practice will ensure that no resident experiences a significant adverse effect. The CoCP includes construction phase noise limits, and construction times.</p> <p>Therefore, noise screens will be installed if they are required to control construction phase noise.</p>
BW2_EF_0123	Respondent expressed that training at the local school, specifically radio and film need complete silence for recording purposed, as continuous noise would make recording impossible.	Yes	<p>A full noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES reference [EN010147/APP/6.3], with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4], and ES Volume 3 (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5]. This assessment has identified that the development will not cause any significant adverse</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>effects on noise sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Noise from the development will not contribute significantly to the existing ambient sound level. Therefore, the existing measures which are in place to provide "...complete silence for recording..." will likely be sufficient to attenuate noise from the development.</p>
BW2_EF_0143	<p>Respondent stated that they are not sure what p.13.14.1.6 of the PEIR means. The respondent added that the noise and vibration during the construction phase of hammering 2 million panel supports into the ground will not be trivial as implied in 13.14.1.6, and that there is no supporting evidence that the noise will only be 'minor adverse'. The respondent stated that anecdotal reports from other areas involving ground mounted solar pointed towards unrelenting noise.</p>	No	<p>Paragraph 14.14.1.6 of the PEIR relates to transboundary cumulative effects. (e.g. those which occur across the borders of countries. This is part of the normal EIA process, and more relevant in mainland Europe.</p> <p>The c.2 million solar supports will be distributed both geographically, and chronologically, and so the impact will not be felt, in one location, or over a short time period. The impact of the installation of the solar supports is detailed in Volume 3, Appendix 13.2:</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Construction Phase Noise and Vibration [EN010147/APP/6.5].
Recreation and Amenity			
BW2_EF_0003, BW2_EF_0127, BW2_EF_0011	Respondents expressed that walking along the perimeter of metal fences and solar panels will not be uplifting, but rather will make one feel like they are walking along the outside of a prison enclosure.	Yes	Landscape and visual effects are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, document reference [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed that the Neighbourhood Plan in place protects the footpath network, views and general uplifting experience for human beings.	Yes	Planning Policy is considered within Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) including Green Belt Case, document reference [EN010147/APP/7.1].

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed that how much is promised to create or replace footpaths, it is forgotten that this will be totally overlooked.		<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6]. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project.</p> <p>This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.</p>
BW2_EF_0026	Respondent highlighted the negative effects of losing recreational spaces for local residents, stressing the need to evaluate the social and community impact and consider ways to preserve these areas.	Yes	Information on recreational space are available within Vol 1, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0073	Respondent noted that the recreation area was recently acquired from Blenheim Estates after a	N/A	This does not form part of the project.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	long-fought land swap and is now a valued community amenity.		
BW2_EF_0076	Respondent suggested a recreational off-road alternative between Bladon and Hanborough rail station, supported in principle by Blenheim Estates, requiring a simple hard stone gravel surface.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0125	Respondent stated that the central zone hosts a community recreation area on land purchased from Blenheim, and yet only the area in Bladon has been provided for recreation and events.	N/A	This is not within the project Order Limit.
BW2_EF_0125	Respondent stated that the emerging children's play park, wildflower meadow and orchard has cost a great deal in community time, effort and money. The respondent further noted that on the basis of the information provided, this asset will be drastically diminished.	Yes	This is adjacent to the Project, with a mitigation strip set aside for Community Growing adjacent to the play park
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent agrees with the proposals for establishing new and enhancing existing footpaths.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0011	Respondent stated that it was ironic that new residents of houses being constructed by Blenheim are enjoying the same views/ walk that will be impacted.	Yes	Landscape and visual effects are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0031	Respondent stated that is estimated that 11,000 homes would be adversely affected as well as miles of footpaths and country roads.	Yes	The effects of the development upon residential visual amenity, the enjoyment of public rights of way, and the impacts on local traffic and highways are considered within the Environmental Statement, in particular within Vol 1, Chapters 8, 15, 16 & 17 [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent believes that the annual community fund of £50,000 is inadequate compensation for the loss of these amenities.	Yes	A community benefit fund is not a requirement, it is a optional benefit provided by the applicant. The chapter has not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed that the Hill End Centre on the Wytham Woods side overlooks this valley and is at present an oasis of nature and an outlet for lots of children and families and the whole area is used by walkers.	Yes	Landscape and visual effects are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3]. Nature in these areas is considered in Vol 1, Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Conservation. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0042	Respondent criticised the project's perceived trivial amenity benefits.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent asked what efforts have been made to consult with those whose public rights of way will be imposed upon by the proposed solar installation areas.	Yes	Consultation information is available within the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
Cycle Routes and Footpaths			
BW2_EF_0089	Respondent dismissed the proposed footpath between Church Hanborough and Cassington as inadequate compensation for the loss of natural habitat, viewing the project as favouring large landowners and investors over the public.	No	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed that the use of existing pylons to connect the solar farm would not lead to footpaths being crossed over with underground cabling.	No	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent voiced concerned regarding enclosing public rights of way and footpaths with 2.1m high fencing due to safety and wildlife issues.	Yes	Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0029	Respondent suggested a cycle route from Eynsham to Farmoor.	No	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are set out in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0031	Respondent highlights the importance of the bridleway running from Begbroke to Bladon, which is part of the Shakespeare Way Long-distance Footpath. They stated that this path is used daily by a variety of people including walkers, families, groups, and cyclists, all of whom would have their experience spoiled if the bridleway were fenced off and the open fields were lost.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are set out in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0031	Respondent criticised the project documentation for significantly underestimating the adverse effects on users of public rights of way. They argue that the loss of the open fields and bridleways would severely impact the enjoyment and recreational use of these areas by the local community and visitors.	Yes	Details of Socio-economic effects are identified and assessed within Chapter 15 [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0031	Respondent expressed a broader concern that the proposed scheme would negatively impact the extensive network of paths in the area, which are valuable for recreational and community well-being.	Yes	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project.</p> <p>This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.</p>
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent asked whether footpaths can be redesigned to maintain a natural feel rather than being surrounded by solar panels.	Yes	<p>Examples of designs for the proposed footpaths are provided within the Operational Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3]</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0073	Respondent requested a visualisation from Footpath 132/2, starting at the lane past Bladon Primary School and the Churchyard entrance, and looking towards Viewpoint 17. This area is frequently used by Bladon residents for recreation and community events.	Yes	Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_EF_0073	Respondent emphasized that Footpath 132/2 is popular among villagers for various activities, making its inclusion in visualizations important.	Yes	Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_EF_0076	Respondent noted that the proposed new footpaths and cycle paths shown in the Illustrative Masterplans are inadequate and poorly targeted.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0076	Respondent expressed that any new footpaths or cycle routes should reflect the community's desire for active travel.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0076	Respondent recommended that PVDP commits to a comprehensive improvement of the National Cycle Route No. 5 from Upper Dornford to Woodstock, restoring the original width, repairing the subgrade, and adding a waterproof top surface.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are set out in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3.]
BW2_EF_0076	Respondent suggested that the existing bridleway linking the National Cycle Network to Tackley	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are set out in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	village should be upgraded to the same standard as NCN Route 5.		Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0076	Respondent recommended that PVDP work with Oxfordshire County Council to improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians at the Weaveley/Upper Weaveley crossroads, which is a critical route identified as a cable route on plan 2.4A.	Yes	The proposals for new routes are shown on the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities Layer Plans [EN010147/APP/7.3.3]
BW2_EF_0076	Respondent acknowledged the proposed cycle provision at Hordley but noted that it does not provide significant strategic connectivity.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0076	Respondent recommended improving the existing bridleway from Heath Lane, Bladon, through Bladon Heath wood to Begbroke, rather than the proposed new Bladon to Begbroke cycle/footpath connection, which does not reflect significant travel desire lines.	Yes	The proposals for new routes are shown on the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities Layer Plans [EN010147/APP/7.3.3]
BW2_EF_0078	Respondent suggested improving recreational footpaths.	Yes	The proposals for new routes are shown on the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities Layer Plans [EN010147/APP/7.3.3]
BW2_EF_0078	Respondent doubts the effectiveness of footpaths mitigating against the broader impact of the solar farm.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are set out in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0099	Respondent emphasized the need for Botley West Solar to adhere to established processes for changes to PRow, involving organizations like Oxfordshire County Council and Oxfordshire Ramblers. They criticized the vagueness in the project's proposals	Yes	The proposals for new routes are shown on the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities Layer Plans [EN010147/APP/7.3.3]
BW2_EF_0099	Respondent criticised the vagueness in the project proposals for new footpaths and cycle routes, highlighting the need for proper consultation and clarity on who proposed these changes.	Yes	The proposals for new routes are shown on the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities Layer Plans [EN010147/APP/7.3.3]
BW2_EF_0111	Respondent suggested a commitment to create a network of new rural footpaths and cycle routes in recognition of the existing countryside footpaths which will be lost to the community.	Yes	The proposals for new routes are shown on the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities Layer Plans [EN010147/APP/7.3.3]
BW2_EF_0111	Respondent stated that many short people will not want to walk distances surrounded by lakes of Solar Panels with a rake possibly waist to shoulder height.	Yes	Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0127	Respondent stated that older people have no use for cycle lanes.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent noted support for increasing recreational use with respect to increasing footpaths and cycle routes.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent expressed that local cycling groups should be consulted in the process.	No.	Sustrans was consulted but no response was received.
BW2_EF_0129	Respondent stated that the proposed cycle path between Eynsham and Long Hanborough crosses Lower Road at two points. The respondent added that is a very busy road with much HGV traffic with currently a national speed limit of 60mph. The respondent stated that given the reduced visibility of the cycle lanes, what is the justification for these crossings.	Yes	The proposals for new routes are shown on the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities Layer Plans [EN010147/APP/7.3.3] . These routes would be subject to detailed design and approval pre-construction.
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent would like a footpath from Stonesfield to the Thames following the Evenlode Valley.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent would like key cycle routes to join local communities.	Yes	The proposals for new routes are shown on the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities Layer Plans [EN010147/APP/7.3.3]
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent would like Blenheim park to be extended.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent requested specific details of all the new footpaths and landscape enhancements.	Yes	Landscape and Visual impacts are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Resources, Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent requested the actual dates where applicable work will take place supplemented with relevant map references.	Yes	Please refer Outline Code Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BW2_EF_0156	Respondent stated that the footpaths/cycleways must have a minimum clear width of 20 meters, wider in key sections of paths like Oxfordshire Way and Akeman Street, to prevent aesthetic damage from high fences, hedges, or views of solar arrays.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0011	Respondent stated that many people from the surrounding villages and Woodstock walk, job etc around the circuit which also runs through the hamlet. The respondent then stated that this circuit runs across fields 1.16 and 1.17 is a very popular walk and was a life-line for many during COVID	No.	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0141	Respondent stated that the proposed cycling path has safety issues with multiple crossings on a busy road.	Yes	The proposals for new routes are shown on the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities Layer Plans [EN010147/APP/7.3.3] . This route would be subject to detailed design and approval pre-construction.
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent would like BWSF to maximise the opportunity for more footpaths and cycle routes.	No.	The Applicant notes this comment.
Community Impact			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0021, BW2_EF_0078, BW2_EF_0085, BW2_EF_0091, BW2_EF_0123, BW2_EF_0151, BW2_EF_0152	Respondents expressed concern about the project's impact on property values.	No	An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it was agreed any impact would not be significant.
BW2_EF_0091, BW2_EF_0092, BW2_EF_0138, BW2_EF_0141, BW2_EF_0128	Respondents expressed concern about the mental health impacts of the project on residents and the community.	Yes	Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental health) as a result of the Project. This includes assessment of impacts on community identity, and risk perception and its associated effects on mental health.
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent stated that promises of help with community projects is an attempt to give residents "sweet lozenges" while ruining everything they hold dearly in terms of nature and the green environment.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0011	Respondent noted the impact of 1.15 upon another popular walk as well as its obscene proximity to the ancient Weaveley Furze providing the following link: https://weaveley.blogspot.com/p/wher.html	Yes	The proposals for new routes are shown on the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities Layer Plans [EN010147/APP/7.3.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0026	Respondent urged reconsideration of the Botley West Solar Farm, advocating for a balanced approach that supports renewable energy while preserving the local environment and community character.	Yes	An evaluation of the balancing of impacts have been evaluated throughout the EIA, and can be read in the "Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships" [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent finds it extraordinary that crime and fear of crime have been scoped out in Section 6.12 on human health.	No	The concern around crime is acknowledged, however the potential for widespread actual or perceived crime that could significantly affect population health is considered unlikely. These consultation responses have informed the conclusions reached in Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3] of the ES.
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent stated that the proposed solar farm is disproportionate and threatens the well-being, natural capital, local heritage, education, and leisure of the surrounding rural and residential communities.	Yes	An evaluation of the balancing of impacts have been evaluated throughout the EIA, and can be read in the "Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships" [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent noted that technical glitches during the online feedback submission process may have prevented some responses from being recorded.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The online feedback form was checked that it was working throughout the consultation period.
BW2_EF_0084	Respondent expressed that the project is essential for future generations.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0087	Respondent stated that if it is to go ahead the local population much be compensated for the loss of value in social and economic terms.	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0138	Respondent expressed that the scheme would results in severe tourism impacts.	Yes	Socioeconomic impacts of the Project are assessed in chapter 15 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0152	Respondent voiced the need for independent assessments on job creation.	Yes	Socioeconomic impacts of the Project are assessed in chapter 15 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0152	Respondent expressed the need for independent assessments on the economic impact on local tourism.	Yes	Socioeconomic impacts of the Project are assessed in chapter 15 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0120	Respondent expressed that South Oxfordshire District Council should consider the impact on local residents.	N/A	Impacts on local residents have been evaluated throughout the EIA, and can be read in the "Summary of Significant Effects" [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0093	Respondent commended initial steps taken towards collaboration with Low Carbon Hub and community benefit proposals but find these measures insufficient.	N/A	A community benefit fund is not a requirement, it is a optional benefit provided by the applicant. The chapter has not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0091	Respondent emphasized that the development fails to address the adverse effects on local residents and does not provide adequate positive benefits or compensations.	N/A	Impacts on local residents have been evaluated throughout the EIA, and can be read in the "Summary of Significant Effects" [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0144	Respondent questioned the safety of populations living close to solar farms, citing concerns about electromagnetic radiation, noise, and access to nature.	Yes	Issues related to EMF (actual risk as well as perceived risk), noise, and access to open green space, along with other wider determinants of health, are assessed in Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0083	Respondent expresses frustration with the developer's lack of accountability for the potential negative impacts on communities. Developers redirected responsibility to NSIP and did not engage meaningfully with community feedback on rethinking the project's scale or impacts.	Yes	Impacts on local residents have been evaluated throughout the EIA, and can be read in the "Summary of Significant Effects" [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent commented on the Phase Two Community Consultation Leaflet, likening it to real estate marketing rather than a comprehensive assessment of the proposed power station. They argue it fails to address the significant carbon footprint of the project and dismisses mitigation efforts as inadequate and misleading.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0083	Respondent questions the rationale behind creating community food growing options within	Yes	The Project Description at Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] sets out the status of discussions with local food

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	the solar farm, suggesting more practical uses like supporting local food banks.		growing groups, and the ambition to offer land for their use under a lease agreement, and the illustrative Masterplan [EN010147/APP/6.4] identifies areas where community food growing could take place.
BW2_EF_0093	Respondent stated that for the Botley West Solar Farm to succeed, it must adopt a genuinely collaborative, inclusive, and participatory approach with the community. They recommend creating team/work structures and cultures that emphasize working 'with' the community rather than 'for' them. This should apply throughout the planning, construction, and stewardship of the site over its 40-year lifespan.	No	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0099	Respondent stated that Blenheim estate has not installed solar panels on new housing development and contrasted this with the Southill Solar co-operative model, which provides minimal returns to shareholders and significant community benefits.	No	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0108	Respondent criticised what they perceived to be an inadequate consideration of the project's impact on local communities in the consultation materials, particularly regarding property values.	No	An assessment of the impact of the development on house prices was scoped out of the socio-economic assessment as it was agreed any impact would not be significant.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0017	Respondent stated that the proposal involves a macro approach to power generation – logically a better solution would be multiple 'micro' generators using panels on the extensive roof area which the proposed development of 1,800 houses between Yarrnton and Kidlington and any new residential houses being constructed.	No	The Applicant notes this comment
Supply Chain and Employment Opportunities			
BW2_EF_0008, BW2_EF_0006	Respondents stated that they would like to get involved with the Botley West project and asked if there were any job vacancies at the site.	Yes	Socioeconomic impacts of the Project are assessed in chapter 15 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent would like the panels and associated infrastructure associated with the building of the solar farm to be sourced from companies with the best possible green credentials.	Yes	Socioeconomic impacts of the Project are assessed in chapter 15 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
Archaeology and Cultural Heritage			
BW2_EF_0144, BW2_EF_0152, BW2_EF_0140, BW2_EF_0142, BW2_EF_0117	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the proximity of the solar panels to listing buildings, ancient woodland and Blenheim's WHS.</p> <p>One respondent stated concerns about bypassing 'Green Belt' laws and building in proximity to the UNESCO World Heritage site of Blenheim, emphasizing its cultural significance and economic importance to the local area.</p>	No	<p>A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the likely</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
<p>BW2_EF_0141, BW2_EF_0138, BW2_EF_0092</p>	<p>Respondents expressed that the project would lead to a loss of heritage.</p> <p>A respondent emphasised that this loss of cultural heritage and sense of place would profoundly affect residents who value their peaceful surroundings and connection to the countryside.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The assessment of the likely impacts and effects on the historic environment is presented within Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0031	Respondent added that the historic environment should be considered as a whole, not just in terms of specific sites, The respondent added that their value and meaning depend on the surrounding areas.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the likely impacts and effects on the historic environment is presented within Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BW2_EF_0078	Respondent emphasised the solar farm's potential impact on UNESCO heritage regulations.	Yes	A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].
BW2_EF_0088	Respondent referred to table 7.4 of the report and page 11. The respondent stated that (1) 'No such assets have been identified' directly contradicts the developers and Blenheim's own ground based radar surveys which identify further expansion of the Roman town at Sansom's Platt. Fields upon which it is proposed to site solar panels. (2) The developers Atlas Geophysical Heritage Asset Survey Map included in the PEIR presentation shows extensive Roman buildings on field 1.11 by Sansom's Platt which are to be covered in solar panels. The respondent further mentioned (3) another geophysical survey which included in the PEIR presentation clearly identifies Roman town remains in fields 1.12 & 1.13 directly adjacent and overlooking Sansom's Platt.	Yes	Approximately 17 hectares of land around the Scheduled Monument at Sansom's Platt has been removed from the developable land and will be retained within the Project Site as managed grassland. This is to prevent harm to the significant buried archaeological remains here and also to reduce impacts on the setting of the Scheduled Monument.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0088	Respondent specified Table 7.7 'Issues scoped out by the assessment' and noted the following issue: Effects arising from impacts on buried archaeological resources during operation and maintenance. The respondent stated that it is pure speculation on behalf of the developer to say "activities associated with the operation and maintenance of the project are 'unlikely' to damage or result in the permanent loss of buried archaeological resources. The respondent stated further that developing known or suspected heritage remains is contrary to the UK's ratification of the UNESCO 1972 convention: National Protection and International Protection of the Cultural and Natural Heritage.	Yes	A total of 43 areas containing significant archaeological remains have been removed from the developable area and will be retained within the Project Site as managed grassland. There would be no impact on any buried archaeological remains during the operation and maintenance phase of the Project.
BW2_EF_0088	Respondent specified Table 7.7 'Issues scoped out by the assessment' and noted the following issue: Effects arising from impacts on buried archaeological resources during operation and maintenance. The respondent stated that developing known or suspected heritage remains is contrary to the UK's ratification of the UNESCO 1972 convention: National Protection and International Protection of the Cultural and Natural Heritage.	Yes	A total of 43 areas containing significant archaeological remains have been removed from the developable area and will be retained within the Project Site as managed grassland. There would be no impact on any buried archaeological remains during the operation and maintenance phase of the Project.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0088	Respondent references Blenheim Palace's 2017 Site Management Plan, highlighting the obligation to protect surrounding countryside without fixed limits as mandated by UNESCO and UK laws (NPPF). They stress that the plan opposes developments like solar farms that could harm the rural character. This protection aligns with the NSIP Action Plan (2023) which requires early consideration of environmental impacts to deliver better outcomes. Respondent asserts that the Botley West Solar Farm PEIR fails to meet these environmental standards.	Yes	A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0088	Respondent referred to p.28. Table 7.9, stating that the description does not acknowledge Blenheim's Site Management Plan referencing UNESCO's 2015 Operational Guidelines which clearly values the unique heritage land around the WHS and without boundaries.	Yes	A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0089	Respondent referred to p.28. Table 7.9, stating that the value description of 'Generally Low' ignores, for example, Sansom's Platt whose hitherto untouched setting makes it unique within the UK and gives a (so far) pristine example of why the Romans settled at Sansom's Platt alongside a Roman road linking Cirencester to St Albans.	Yes	The assessment of the likely impacts and effects on the historic environment is presented within Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0088	Respondent contends Chapter 7 of the PEIR on the historic environment is flawed, selectively presented, and overlooks legislation. The respondent stated that the proposed Botley West Solar Farm's location near Blenheim Palace, a UNESCO World Heritage Site, contravenes Blenheim's own 2017 management plan, which opposes such developments to protect the surrounding countryside.	Yes	A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0092	Respondent stated that the countryside is a cherished part of their heritage, providing a sense	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	of belonging, peace, and memories of life among fields, woods, and streams.		
BW2_EF_0117	Respondent argued that solar panels visible to visitors will detract from the area's prestige and that Blenheim trustees should oppose the scheme to protect cultural and historical significance.	Yes	A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0124	Respondent stated that Blenheim estate should be sanctioned for damaging the setting of a UNESCO World Heritage site.	Yes	A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0125	Respondent stated that on the Phase Two consultation leaflet page 20, there is no specific location for the proposed conservation areas in Bladon and Hanborough. The respondent added that if one of them is Bladon Heath it has always been designated protected ancient woodland and has never been offered for development.	Yes	Bladon Heath is outside the Project Order Limit. Mitigation areas are shown on the Masterplan [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0129	Respondent believes the proposal to be an opportunistic and designed attempt to provide income for Blenheim and its partners to the detriment of the World Heritage Site.	Yes	A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent highlights concerns regarding the treatment of the historic environment in the consultation. They criticize the lack of clarity on proposed actions regarding newly identified archaeological sites and express dissatisfaction with the assessment's conclusion on potential impacts.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the likely impacts and effects on the historic environment is presented within Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0130	<p>Respondent questions the adequacy of the assessment's conclusions regarding the historic environment, particularly concerning designated heritage assets. They argue that assertions of no significant effects and reliance on reversible impacts are insufficiently supported, and they emphasize the need for detailed plans, including decommissioning strategies, to preserve current settings adequately.</p>	Yes	<p>A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>No significant adverse effects have been identified. All impacts would be fully reversible following decommissioning of the Project. The Outline Decommissioning Plan contains information regarding the nature of the decommissioning and includes consideration of the measures proposed for the protection of the historic environment document reference [EN010147/APP/7.6.4].</p>
BW2_EF_0140, BW2_EF_0152	<p>A respondent asked if UNESCO, Historic England, ICOMOS-UK and DCMS have been consulted regarding the visual impact of the panels on historic land.</p> <p>A respondent stated concern over the lack of comprehensive support from all relevant</p>	Yes	<p>A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	stakeholders in regards to the use of Blenheim, a UNESCO WHS.		<p>Site – Heritage Impact Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>This has been prepared through an iterative process involving Historic England, DCMS and UNESCO.</p>
BW2_EF_0153	Respondent raised concerned regarding the impact on significant archaeological sites and asked what the plans are in the likely event that a significant find is made during installation.	Yes	<p>A greater level of understanding of buried archaeological remains within the Project Site has been established as a result of the geophysical survey and other non-intrusive surveys that have been undertaken. This information is presented within Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment of the ES, Volume 3, Appendix 7.2: Assessment of Airborne Remote Sensing and Satellite Imagery for Archaeology of the ES, and Volume 3: Appendix 7.3: Geophysical Survey Report of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>Where these surveys have identified the presence of areas containing significant archaeological remains, no development is proposed and these areas would be</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			retained as managed grassland within the development.
BW2_EF_0088	Respondent commented on P.6 Table 7.1 and P.7 of the PEIR Report - Stating that none of the above have been properly considered or executed in the case of the Northern Sector where a Protected Heritage Monument 'Sansom's Platt' is to be surrounded by highly visible Solar panels (because the Platt is surrounded by hills and upward sloping countryside) immediately adjacent to the protected Monument in fields 1.11, 1.12 & 1.13. The respondent added that this section of the PEIR presentation should be dismissed.	Yes	Approximately 17 hectares of land around the Scheduled Monument at Sansom's Platt has been removed from the developable land and will be retained within the Project Site as managed grassland. This is to prevent harm to the significant buried archaeological remains here and also to reduce impacts on the setting of the Scheduled Monument.
BW2_EF_0115	Respondent expressed that there should be a compensation scheme to address the use of land that is adjacent to a UNESCO World Heritage site.	No	There is no mechanism for this form of compensation.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0088	Respondent referenced p.46 which states that the material is out of step with the UK's ratification of the UNESCO 1972 convention: National Protection and International Protection and International Protection of the Cultural and Natural Heritage (Articles 4 & 5) which references the responsibility of the state to protect all heritage sites 'known or suspected and their settings'.	No	The assessment of the likely impacts and effects on the historic environment is presented within Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of Volume 1, Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BW2_EF_0091	Respondent stated that the potential negative impact on the historic character of Cassington has not been adequately explored or addressed. The village, with its conservation area and listed buildings, faces potential devaluation and character loss due to the development. The respondent	No	A detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects of the Project resulting from changes within the setting of designated heritage assets is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This includes assessment of likely impacts and effects on the Cassington Conservation Area.
BW2_EF_0138	Respondent expressed concern about heritage stewardship issues.	No	The Applicant notes this comment
Climate Change and Energy Need			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0106	Respondent acknowledges widespread awareness of climate change but seeks clearer national planning strategies.	No	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0106	Respondent called for a balanced approach to renewable energy, prioritising cost-effective solutions like integrating solar panels into existing infrastructure.	No	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0127	Respondent asked what huge amounts of carbon will be used in this enormous project and what equally large amounts of energy will be used to dismantle it eventually if ever.	Yes	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects, alongside commentary on carbon payback period (years of operation required for the project to become carbon neutral).
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent stated that embedded carbon should be reduced throughout the supply chain including in mining, manufacture and transport. The respondent added that the developer's buying power should be used to influence suppliers and service providers to reduce their carbon footprints.	Yes	Commitments around efforts to reduce the carbon footprint of the Project's supply chain has been included within the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent stated that the developer's buying power should be used to influence suppliers and service providers to reduce their carbon footprints.	Yes	Commitments around efforts to reduce the carbon footprint of the Project's supply chain has been included within the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .
BW2_EF_0136	Respondent would like a centre focused around raising awareness for climate change; an excellent example of this can be found at Ardley Incinerator.	No	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent would like to see the scientific justification behind the statement that solar energy is key to decarbonising the UK's economy.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0144	Respondent stated concerns about the emissions and ethical issues related to the manufacture of solar panels, often produced in polluting countries like China. They questioned the end-of-life provisions for solar panels, noting limited recycling options and potential environmental harm.	No	Decommissioning effects have been assessed within Volume 1, chapter 14: Climate Change [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Additionally, the scoping report confirmed that The Inspectorate would expect to see a Decommissioning Plan, agreed with the Local Authority, secured through the inclusion of an Outline Decommissioning Plan or similar with the Application. This has been submitted in support of the ES [EN010147/APP/7.6.4] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0144	Respondent pointed out a contradiction between the project's goal to address climate change and its environmental impact, including traffic and construction emissions.	No	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects, alongside commentary on carbon payback period (years of operation required for the project to become carbon neutral).
BW2_EF_0144	Respondent noted the impact of black body radiation from large solar farms creating micro-climates, and questioned the knowledge and impact of such changes due to the project's unprecedented scale	No	There is uncertainty with regard to the impact of black body radiation and the impact on microclimates. No robust scientific evidence can be relied upon for the ES to seek to quantify such impacts. As such, this has not been considered as part of the assessment of likely significant effects.
BW2_EF_0152	Respondent voiced doubts regarding the solar farm's contribution to Oxfordshire's energy strategy.	No	As is found in section 4.1.3 of the Oxfordshire Energy Strategy (OxLEP) – Technologies: 'The majority of the low carbon energy needed In Oxfordshire is likely to be met by solar PV – delivered through household and community

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			schemes and a number of larger scale developments.'
BW2_EF_0152	Respondent questioned the accuracy of claims made regarding carbon reduction targets.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0100	Respondent argued that there has been no effort to store energy from solar.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0127	Respondent stated that they do not agree that there is a need to install solar infrastructure.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent criticised the optimistic portrayal of solar energy benefits.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0144	Respondent expressed concern about the project's effectiveness in preventing future blackouts.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent expressed concern about the 10-year carbon payback period.	No	An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 1, Chapter 14: Climate change of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] , including an assessment of whole life effects, alongside commentary on carbon payback period (years of operation

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			required for the project to become carbon neutral).
BW2_EF_0021	Respondent stated that the unpredictable climate of Oxfordshire can produce weather conditions hostile to solar energy, the respondent proceeded to question the ability of the site to produce 840MW in light of those conditions.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0021	Respondent stated that the erratic nature of energy production from the site would mean that expensive, manned alternative energy sites would have to be planned.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent expressed concern about the environmental impact of transporting materials globally.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0078	Respondent raises scepticism about the accuracy of energy production claims.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0093	Respondent stated that the necessity for this large-scale solar project stems from government inaction on national energy infrastructure.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0012	Respondent stated that they believe that solar farms are not currently useful with regards to the UK. They added that they may not be entirely useless for any limiting circumstance whatsoever but are best useful in certain conditions and circumstances.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0012	Respondent stated that more proof is required for the economy, effectiveness and efficiency of solar panels.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0023	Respondent raised concerns about grid management, highlighting that Botley West Solar Farm's peak summer production may not align well with winter demand peaks.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0023	Respondent has sought clarification on how the grid plans to manage this seasonal mismatch.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0031	Respondent stated that solar is not the most efficient source of green power.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0049	Respondent acknowledges solar power's role in a low carbon economy but opposes building an 840MW solar plant on 1300ha of productive greenbelt farmland in Oxfordshire.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
Site Selection and Alternatives			

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0007, BW2_EF_0015, BW2_EF_0029, BW2_EF_0113, BW2_EF_0114, BW2_EF_0151, BW2_EF_0129, BW2_EF_0099, BW2_EF_0024, BW2_EF_0029, BW2_EF_0030, BW2_EF_0049, BW2_EF_0071, BW2_EF_0078, BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0089, BW2_EF_0092, BW2_EF_0093, BW2_EF_0102, BW2_EF_0031, BW2_EF_0133, BW2_EF_0140, BW2_EF_0141, BW2_EF_0120	<p>Respondents expressed desire for alternative locations, such as rooftops, carparks, industrial sites, and brown field sites.</p> <p>Respondents expressed desire for alternative renewable energy sources, such as offshore/onshore wind, tidal, wave or nuclear power.</p> <p>One respondent suggested that there are many alternative methods for generating green energy that are less detrimental to farmland, the ecosystem, and mental health.</p> <p>Respondents suggested the use of the large buildings forming part of the industrial estate near the former Didcot power station.</p> <p>Respondent stated that the projects shows no consideration of alternative sites being considered or applied.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0113	<p>Respondent expressed that the project should not be situated near residential properties.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed that the vast majority of this project is way north of them and it is unfair that their small area should be completely ruined because the developer wants to connect to the pylons in this area.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed that the developers should go and find a more suitable site along the pylon line for the project's connections.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0029	Respondent stated that the options being offered are all low cost and could be carried out anyway by caring landowners outside the scheme anyway if they were such a good idea.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0100, BW2_EF_0116	Respondent expressed that Blenheim Estate should put roof-mounted solar panels on its new builds. Respondent expressed that all homes should be installed with roof-mounted solar before this project goes ahead.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0091	Respondent stated that the proposed new railway line from Carterton to Oxford should be factored into the solar panel locations.	No	Site Selection and Alternatives are considered within Vol 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives Considered. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0091	Respondent requested a reassessment of the proposed solar sites to accommodate other critical infrastructure projects.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0031	Respondent expressed that wind power would require fewer acres of productive farmland.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0103	Respondent highlighted missed opportunities for diverse land use in Botley West beyond solar panels.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0017	Respondent stated that the proposal involves a macro approach to power generation – logically a better solution would be multiple ‘micro’ generators using panels on the extensive roof area which the proposed development of 1,800 houses between Yarrton and Kidlington and any new residential houses being constructed.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
The Consultation Process			
BW2_EF_0002, BW2_EF_0018 BW2_EF_0020, BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0125, BW2_EF_0141, BW2_EF_0107, BW2_EF_0049, BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0120, BW2_EF_0130, BW2_EF_0144, BW2_EF_0149,	<p>Respondents have expressed their concern over the consultation process for the project.</p> <p>Respondent expressed that the consultations came at a very bad timing. They stated that most of the public would have been busy with pre-Christmas activities.</p> <p>Respondents stated that the consultation was rushed and premature, and not enough publicity was provided.</p>		<p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_EF_0152, BW2_EF_0157</p>	<p>Respondents have requested a further round of community consultation on updated proposals.</p> <p>Respondents have criticised the timing of events.</p>		<p>a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p> <p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0007	The respondent asked how the Botley West information line and this email info service being paid for.	No	The information line and email service are being paid for by the Applicant.
BW2_EF_0007	The respondent asked if the community can be assured of their democratic right to protest without any adverse consequences.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0024	Respondent emphasized the need for clear justification and community involvement in the development of Botley West solar farm. They argued that the project's scale demanded careful consideration to avoid exacerbating the climate crisis and protect the environment and way of life.	Yes	<p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p> <p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p> <p>This included notifying over 23,000 properties within the vicinity of the Project, which were identified within a defined Core Consultation Zone presented in the SoCC. In addition to this, the Applicant made all consultation materials available online, at CAP sites, at public information events and by request to the Project communication channels. Consultation opportunities and materials were further publicised by local media advertising, statutory notices, and maintaining a register of interested individuals</p>
BW2_EF_0025	Respondent stresses the importance of achieving agreement among government, developers, and local communities regarding proposed renewable energy projects. They advocate for considerations that are fair, reasonable, and not merely binary choices between development and non-development.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0029	Respondent highlighted 71% local opposition to Botley West Solar Farm, indicating widespread community concerns persisting since July 2023.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0062	Respondent noted the poor colour differentiation on the consultation documents, specifically similar shades of green used for Proposed Mitigation and Enhancement Areas and Existing Woodland, which caused confusion during their review.	No	<p>Through consultation, the Applicant has prepared and published a range of consultation materials available in a various formats to cater for differing preferences and levels of interest and expertise. For example, this includes: a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR); a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR; Community Consultation Leaflet; and a Feedback Form.</p> <p>The Applicant also maintained a range of free-to-use communication channels (Freephone, Freepost and email) throughout the pre-application period.</p>
BW2_EF_0062	Respondent expressed scepticism about the responsiveness to community concerns, referencing past experiences in Woodstock, and urged for the project's reduction or reconsideration in light of significant local opposition.		The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent observed that developers have not adjusted the proposal around Cassington despite feedback highlighting the local value of open fields and rights of way. They noted that local flooding issues, particularly on Elms Road and the playing fields, are not adequately reflected in the flood risk maps.		<p>The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>A summary of the effects is contained in Table 8.24 and 8.25 of that chapter. On balance it is considered that the quality and character of the landscape and visual resources would largely be maintained and would have the capacity to accommodate the Project without significant effects beyond those identified at a very local level or where it would be difficult to entirely mitigate visual effects.</p> <p>In addition, proposed planting would have a longer term benefit reinforcing the landscape character of the local landscape.</p>
BW2_EF_0083	Respondent criticizes the language of uncertainty in the consultation booklet.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0083	Respondent finds Question 8 of the consultation form inadequate for nuanced responses, emphasizing opposition to large-scale solar projects like BWSF.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0025, BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0101, BW2_EF_0102, BW2_EF_0112, BW2_EF_0132, BW2_EF_0133, BW2_EF_0142	Respondents highlight inadequate information in the consultation materials, including the language used within the community consultation materials.	No	<p>Through consultation, the Applicant has prepared and published a range of consultation materials available in various formats to cater for differing preferences and levels of interest and expertise. For example, this includes: a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR); a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR; Community Consultation Leaflet; and a Feedback Form.</p> <p>The Applicant also maintained a range of free-to-use communication channels (Freephone, Freepost and email) throughout the pre-application period.</p>
BW2_EF_0114	Respondent stated that the feedback form does not allow them to represent their views.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0114	Respondent noted significant variability in responses from PVDP representatives at events held between December 2023 and February	No	The Applicant's pre-application consultation is described and evidenced in the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	2024, attributing it to the representatives' lack of knowledge.		
BW2_EF_0114	A respondent has stated that they were expecting a response to their feedback from phase one.	No	A Phase One Consultation Summary Report was published following Phase One Consultation, and can be viewed in [EN010147/APP/5.1.3] .
BW2_EF_0116	Respondent found insufficient detail provided in the second consultation despite PVDP having time to prepare. Many questions raised by attendees remained unanswered, hindering the Respondent's ability to fully grasp the potential impact of the solar panels on their situation.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0123	Respondent stated that the map supplied with the consultation document lacks both detail and a key.	No	To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0125	A respondent criticised the quality of events and venues.	No	The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BW2_EF_0129	Respondent stated that the consultation report has misrepresentations, errors, omissions and lacks clarity. The respondent added that it seems to confuse and negate significant issues such as the lack of detail regarding the noise and vibration report.	No	A full noise impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant technical and planning guidance, with noise mitigation measures suggested where they are required. The assessment can be found in Chapter 13 of the main ES reference [EN010147/APP/6.3] , with additional information provided in ES Volume 2 (Figures) [EN010147/APP/6.4] , and ES Volume 3 (Appendices) [EN010147/APP/6.5] . This assessment has identified that the development will not cause any significant adverse effects on noise sensitive receptors.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0130	<p>Respondent mentioned that the PEIR documents were inaccessible in points and the highly frequent cross referencing. The respondent stated that 7000 pages of unfamiliar material were not accessible to many members of the general public.</p> <p>The respondent also criticised the quality of the consultation, including publicity and at events.</p>	No	<p>To support responses to the consultation, the Applicant published a range of consultation materials including a Community Consultation Leaflet summarising the proposals, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR, held a series of in-person and online information events where the proposals could be discussed with members of the Applicant's Project Team, and hosted free-to-use Project communications channels for enquiries.</p> <p>The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p>
BW2_EF_0132	Respondent stated that the events before and after Christmas were not promoted to locals by the developer and PR company in any meaningful way or using any platforms that communities	No	The Applicant undertook its consultation in compliance with commitments made in its published Statement of Community Consultation, which in turn was informed

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>engage with. The respondent added that there were no social media or adverts in relevant newspapers.</p> <p>Respondent stated that attendees could not answer all of their questions.</p> <p>Respondent stated that specialist advisers were not present at the consultation. The respondent added that the person responsible for Landscape management was not present as they had retired. The respondent concluded that such a vital element should be present.</p>		<p>through consultation with relevant local authorities. This is described in Section 6 (Preparation for Statutory Consultation) of the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p>
BW2_EF_0140	<p>Respondent stated that no formal UK address has been provided for the consultation and would like a physical address.</p>	No	<p>A freepost address was provided (FREEPOST BWSF) for anyone to submit physical feedback.</p>
BW2_EF_0142, BW2_EF_0148	<p>Respondent expressed uncertainty about receiving a response or acknowledgment and questioned whether an independent party would verify all responses.</p> <p>A respondent has asked how responses received are accounted for and recorded.</p>	No	<p>All feedback responses made to the statutory phases of consultation have been recorded, considered and consolidated, which are presented in Appendix 5.1.9 Section 47 Applicant Response [EN010147/APP/5.1] and Appendix 5.1.10 Section 42 Applicant Response [EN010147/APP/5.1].</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Project Description			
BW2_EF_0003, BW2_EF_0014, BW2_EF_0020, BW2_EF_0022, BW2_EF_0089, BW2_EF_0100, BW2_EF_0127, BW2_EF_0030, BW2_EF_0013, BW2_EF_0078, BW2_EF_0087, BW2_EF_0113, BW2_EF_0138, BW2_EF_0056, BW2_EF_0062, BW2_EF_0117, BW2_EF_0031, BW2_EF_0003, BW2_EF_0004, BW2_EF_0021, BW2_EF_0092	<p>Respondent stated that they strongly oppose Botley West Solar Farm.</p> <p>Respondents stated that they would prefer if the project did not go ahead.</p> <p>One respondent called for Blenheim Estates and PVDP to abandon the project.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
<p>BW2_EF_0031, BW2_EF_0013, BW2_EF_0100, BW2_EF_0007, BW2_EF_0078, BW2_EF_0085, BW2_EF_0140, BW2_EF_0092, BW2_EF_0125</p>	<p>Respondents have criticised the developer, Photovolt Development Partners (PVDP).</p> <p>Respondents have stated that they are sceptical of the developers of the project, including their financial backing. They believe that the intention of the project is profit driven over other aspects.</p> <p>Respondents have asked for evidence of PVDP's track record of past projects, particularly large-scale projects.</p> <p>A respondent has asked how many employees PVDP have in the UK.</p> <p>A respondent asked who will benefit financially from the Botley West Solar Farm? The respondent further asked what the expected profits are and who will receive them.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The need case is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]</p>
<p>BW2_EF_0007, BW2_EF_0013, BW2_EF_0021, BW2_EF_0022, BW2_EF_0029, BW2_EF_0127,</p>	<p>Respondents have queried the intentions of the Blenheim Estate in this project. This includes questions on the financial background of Blenheim, including how Blenheim will gain financially as a result of the project.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The need case is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0151, BW2_EF_0007			
BW2_EF_0001, BW2_EF_0007, BW2_EF_0021, BW2_EF_0055, BW2_EF_0007, BW2_EF_0020	<p>Respondent expressed concern about the use of Russian money and the connection between PVDP and Russia.</p> <p>A respondent has raised concerns following reading an article in Private Eye linking the project to Russia.</p>	No	PVDP operates within all laws of the United Kingdom and no person involved with the project is on the UK's sanctioned persons list.
BW2_EF_0006, BW2_EF_0008, BW2_EF_0009, BW2_EF_0076, BW2_EF_0084	Respondents expressed that they support the project.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0083, BW2_EF_0092, BW2_EF_0029, BW2_EF_0020, BW2_EF_0031	Respondent expressed concern that due to the project's size was deliberately increased to fall under NSIP, undermining local opposition and democratic processes.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0003	Respondent expressed that reading about future scientific progress makes them think that the proposed power station will be long obsolete before the so-called temporary period is over.	Yes	The need case is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0005	Respondent stated that a strong way of countering local opposition would be emphasising the financial and logistical benefits of the scheme.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and the Applicant welcomes this insight and support.
BW2_EF_0007	Respondent asked for clarification regarding where the salaries for the project are coming from and if there is confidence that they are legal sources.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0007	Respondent stated that 'community funding' was mentioned and would like to know how much, when it will be deployed, where it will be invested and how it will be. The respondent stated that the statements around this are carefully worded to be non-binding and imprecise.	Yes	<p>The Applicant notes that a community benefit fund is not a requirement, but is an optional benefit to be provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to deliver the community benefits via a Community Benefits Package. This will be agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with the relevant local authorities (see Planning Supporting Statement e.g. at paragraphs 3.5.24 and 8.4.71) [EN010147/APP/7.1].</p> <p>The Environmental Statement has therefore not attached any significance to this fund when assessing the impact of the development given that the beneficial impacts associated with the</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>community benefit fund are not yet fully known and thus cannot be committed to as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as described in Table 6.2 of the Project Description, Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] in terms of changes to the Project since the PEIR, the Applicant is introducing a mechanism whereby electricity energy costs will be reduced in the region. The Applicant is also increasing its annual contribution to a Community Benefit Fund from £50,000-00 to £200,000-00 per annum.</p> <p>Once operational the Project will set up a Community Fund which will receive £200,000-00 from SolarFive Ltd every year. That is the equivalent of approximately £7,500,000-00 over the lifetime of the Project (expected to be approx. 37.5 years). The Community Fund would be administered by a body comprising representatives from PVDP, The Blenheim Estate and local community leaders. It is expected that grants will be made to local causes and</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>organisations. The Community Fund will be delivered as part of a Community Benefits Package agreed outside the scope of the DCO application, with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>Once consented, the Applicant will establish a new retail electricity company and that company will offer BWSF electricity and green power from other suppliers to all of Oxfordshire. Residential customers within the 2km consultation zone will be offered a 5% discount from the Ofgem price cap.</p>
BW2_EF_0010	Respondent has asked what the overall total cost of the development is, including planning, design, consultation costs and the build costs.	Yes	<p>Information on funding can be found within the Funding Statement. [EN010147/APP/4.2.]</p>
BW2_EF_0010	Respondent asked what the lifespan of the solar panels is and what is the lifespan of the technology.	No	<p>The consent sought for the Project is time-limited and covers the periods of construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning. UK government policy is that time-limited consents, where granted, should be described as temporary regardless of the duration of the consent (e.g. National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure.</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0010	Respondent asked what the expected overall timeframe is should it ever get approval.	No	The project is anticipated to connect into the National Grid in 2029, in terms of the first full year. Following this, the solar will have an operational period, including time for decommissioning, of 40 years. Table 6.1 in Chapter 6 of the ES, Project Description, sets out the assumed project stages from consent to decommissioning [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0012	Respondent stated that they have no confidence in the government instigating a national power strategy.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0020, BW2_EF_0151	Respondents have criticised the name of the project.	No	The name of the project was determined by the location of the connection point into the proposed Botley West substation, to be built by National Grid.
BW2_EF_0020	The respondent stated they were unhappy about this project being done to power new housing developments.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. SolarFive Ltd has a connection agreement with National Grid to export 840MW to the Grid. The project will not directly power homes.
BW2_EF_0022	Respondent acknowledges the need for renewables but criticizes BWSF as a strategic ploy to secure approval by proposing an excessively large solar project.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0023	Respondent questions 840MW being the maximum exportable power, noting that power is an instantaneous value and not dependent on operational hours. They argue that this assumes that the solar farm can operate at its maximum output for 1000 hours annually but raises concerns about suboptimal conditions due to reduced sun elevation, estimating the yearly average power output might be closer to 100MW.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0025, BW2_EF_0085, BW2_EF_0102	Respondents criticize the lack of detailed costings provided by the project.	Yes	Information on funding can be found within the Funding Statement. [EN010147/APP/4.2.]
BW2_EF_0029	Respondent criticised National Grid inefficiencies in connecting renewable projects, viewing Botley West as diverting resources from more impactful national initiatives.	Yes	The need case is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]
BW2_EF_0078	Respondent argues that the solar farm's connection to the National Grid offers no direct benefits to Oxfordshire residents.	Yes	Electricity users in Oxfordshire are supplied with power from the National Grid via the DNO grid, so the solar farm's output will be consumed locally by domestic and business users.
BW2_EF_0030, BW2_EF_0114	Respondents contend that the term "Solar Farm" is misleading; the project would actually create an extensive and intrusive industrial site in the countryside, not a farm, despite the Applicant's	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	claims of landscaping, biodiversity areas, and permissive paths.		
BW2_EF_0049, BW2_EF_0140	Respondent criticizes the documents from PVDP, noting inconsistencies and lack of firm commitments, with many suggestions instead of binding undertakings for local community and environmental benefits.	Yes	All Requirements of the DCO consent will be enforced by the Local Planning Authorities.
BW2_EF_0049	Respondent highlights critical decisions yet to be finalised.	Yes	The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0049	<p>Respondent argues that the security measures planned, like a 1.8-2.1m wire stock fence, are inadequate for a facility of strategic importance housing potentially hazardous equipment such as power transformers and HV cables. They foresee a need for a more robust and visually intrusive boundary fence.</p> <p>Respondent questions operational staffing adequacy during emergencies, noting the absence of information about the control room's</p>		Fencing, lighting and security systems are proposed to enclose and secure the main Project infrastructure components. The fencing will be for operational security purposes. Lighting and CCTV will be installed too, but only within limited areas of the development, generally around the high voltage infrastructure for safety and security. Chapter 6, Table 6.4 [EN010147/APP/6.3] provides details.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	location and the capacity for rapid response in critical situations.		
BW2_EF_0049	The respondent questions the justification for the Botley West Solar Farm project based on the British Energy Security Strategy and National Policy Statement EN-1.	Yes	The need case is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]
BW2_EF_0049	Respondent expresses apprehension about the absence of detailed fire protection systems and procedures for handling fires involving transformers and electrical equipment on-site, posing potential risks to safety and environmental integrity.	Yes	The ES considers the likely significant environmental effects. Fires are considered to be unlikely. To the extent this is relevant fire risk will be referred to in the Outline Operational Management Plan, and developed in detailed management plans for approval as Requirements under any DCO approval [EN010147/APP/7.6.2]
BW2_EF_0078, BW2_EF_0114	Respondents challenge the assertion that the solar farm is temporary and prefers the term "time-limited" instead.	No	The consent sought for the Project is time-limited and covers the periods of construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning. UK government policy is that time-limited consents, where granted, should be described as temporary regardless of the duration of the consent (e.g. National Policy Statement for

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), paragraph 2.10.66).
BW2_EF_0083	Respondent questions why Merton College withdrew from the project, expressing scepticism about MOL's explanation and transparency regarding the withdrawal reasons.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0090	Respondent asked why the cables cannot be run alongside either Willow walk, the edge of Oatlands recreation ground or underneath the line of existing pylons that go that way. The respondent believes this will cause less disruption both for installation and future maintenance and will probably be cheaper as a result.	Yes	Details of route options considered are provided in Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent stated that a word search in the PEIR highlights a narrow focus on solar energy, with 129 mentions of "solar" and none of "wind" or other renewable sources in the 'Non-Technical Summary,' and 81 mentions of "solar" compared to only 7 of "wind" in 'Chapter 5.'	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0102	Respondent questions the project's need against NPS EN-3	Yes	The need case is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0103	Respondent criticises RPS's chosen assessment matrix for evaluating effects during Botley West Project phases. They argue its 16 cells heavily favour "not significant" outcomes, lacking a standardised approach seen in environmental assessments. With 11 cells favouring "not significant" versus 5 for "significant" impacts, Respondent questions why RPS did not adopt a more balanced matrix used in comparable projects, suggesting bias that could downplay adverse effects.	Yes	The overall approach to evaluation within the Environmental Statement, including the assessment matrices, the consideration of the significance of effects and mitigation, is set out in Chapter 4 of the ES, Approach to Environmental Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0122	Respondent stated that Government policies now prioritise grid expansion over energy source connection, transitioning from a "first come, first served" approach to a system-based distribution strategy. The Botley West/Blenheim Estates application conflicts with these new regulations, overseen by the Future Service Operator, and should be dismissed for not aligning with the policy focus on expanding an overloaded National Grid before connecting new energy sources.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0122	Respondent stated that the UK's energy transition requires an organised approach to grid expansion, connecting generation only after the distribution network is adequately developed. This shift aims to manage speculative applications	Yes	The need case is set out in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	from large landowners and rationalise the allocation of sites, ensuring a balanced integration of renewable energy. The Botley West proposal, driven by speculative motives, disrupts this structured transition and fails to acknowledge OFGEM's new policy context.		
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent would like a live counter of the amount of electricity being generated on the BWSF website would be nice to see.	No	The project website states that "Botley West could deliver 840 megawatts (MW) of clean, affordable power to the National Grid".
BW2_EF_0129	Respondent stated that as BWSF is in breach of government guidelines and Planning Practice Guidance, the project should not be approved under section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989. The Planning Act 2008 or any other relevant statutory legislation.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent finds the nomenclature surrounding substations confusing and inconsistent across project documentation. They point out discrepancies in how substations are labelled and described, particularly noting the discrepancy between "Power Converter Stations" and "Power Converter Stations (PCS)" as used in different sections of the Non-Technical Summary.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent raises concerns about the lack of clarity regarding the size, location, and impact of substations in project documentation. They highlight difficulties in understanding the proposed footprint and height of substations, as well as inconsistencies in how these are depicted on maps and described in the Non-Technical Summary.	No	The project is described within the Project Description at Chapter 6 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0130	Respondent challenges the assertion in paragraph 6.7.1 of the Non-Technical Summary that decommissioning is unlikely to affect traffic and transport. They argue this claim lacks substantiation and should not be dismissed without evidence, emphasizing the need for thorough assessment and transparency in the consultation process.	Yes	Traffic and Transportation effects are identified and assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES along with all assumptions used [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BW2_EF_0131, BW2_EF_0153	<p>A respondent would like a breakdown of the carbon output and the predicted savings.</p> <p>A respondent expressed doubts about the long-term sustainability of the project and the overstatement of potential carbon reduction.</p>	Yes	Climate Change Chapter 14 of the ES assesses the overall carbon cost and balance of the development [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0135	Respondent stated that calculations provided for the Botley West Solar Farm's energy production are fundamentally flawed. They do not consider the actual available land area and disregard	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	critical conversion and transmission losses, making the claimed energy production highly implausible		
BW2_EF_0024	Respondent called for decisions grounded in logic and science rather than superficial opposition.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent would like details of any batteries that are being installed for the panels.	No	There are no batteries included as part of the project.
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent requested details of the use of each and every field over the last 20 years featuring all uses.	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land. The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and</p>

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units.
BW2_EF_0140	Respondent asked how many jobs will be created during the installation of the panels and afterwards once they have been installed and how many will be local.	Yes	Socio Economic impacts of the Project are assessed in chapter 15 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BW2_EF_0152	Respondent stated the necessity for clear information on financing, ownership, and stakeholder support from relevant organizations like National Grid and local councils.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0128	Respondent strongly supports Blenheim Estate becoming environmental steward for the site for the duration of BWSF. The respondent added that this would provide a simple and direct route for feedback regarding BWSF for local residents.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
BW2_EF_0114	Respondent expressed concern about the perceived permanence of the project.	No	The Applicant notes this comment.
EIA Process			
BW2_EF_0031	Respondent noted that the baselines assessment was made via a desk-top exercise. The respondent concluded that this was no substitute for the experiences of people who actually live there.	No	The Applicant notes this comment

ID code	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BW2_EF_0049	Respondent critiques the subjective nature of content in Chapters 11 to 20, noting dependencies on final site layouts and contracts, particularly highlighting noise assessments as contingent on these factors and urging for more concrete information.	No	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0078	Respondent criticizes the extensive PEIR report for being inaccessible and the public consultation process for lacking effectiveness.	No	The Applicant notes this comment
BW2_EF_0071	Respondent mentioned that the PEIR non-technical summary lacks sufficient illustrations, making it difficult to understand the proposal fully.	No	The Applicant notes this comment

Table 8: Applicant response to Section 47 feedback to targeted consultation

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Northern Site (Changes 1 - 21)			
BWT_FF_0005, BWT_EF_0085, BWT_EF_0091, BWT_EF_0098, BWT_EF_0055	Respondents stated that Dornford Lane must be preserved as must the associated Public Right of Way running West to East from Dornford Cottage. The respondents stated that it is a narrow path with significant biodiversity and totally unsuitable for vehicle access, however "occasional". The respondents added that contradictory statements have been used about the use of the passage for maintenance and then for temporary cabling work.	Yes	Dornford Lane and the Oxfordshire Way will be retained, and the approach to managing construction in relation to Public Rights of Way is dealt with in the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010146/APP/7.6.1] which form annexes to the Outline Code of Construction Practice.
BWT_FF_0006, BWT_FF_0037, BWT_FF_0045,	Respondents stated that change 3 contains errors, specifying that it talks about the track being used for maintenance and later as used for	No	Noted

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0088, BWT_EF_0025	temporary cabling work, the respondent added that this is contradictory and unclear.		
BWT_FF_0006, BWT_FF_0013, BWT_FF_0037, BWT_FF_0045, BWT_FF_0047, BWT_EF_0033, BWT_EF_0074, BWT_EF_0079, BWT_EF_0086, BWT_EF_0091, BWT_EF_0095	Respondent stated that change 18 contains an error in the description as it refers to the wrong footpaths, the respondent requested further clarification. ERROR IN Applicant's document – map in thumbnail diagram is of Woodstock, but text refers to Eynsham, Thames Path Promoted Routes and Green Belt (Change 50). Change 18 (Woodstock) may still affect public right of way as it is unclear whether it refers to the bridleways or land alongside. Laying cable along a well used bridleway would cause lasting damage.	N	Noted
BWT_FF_0006, BWT_FF_0013; BWT_FF_0037, BWT_FF_0045, BWT_EF_0033, BWT_EF_0038, BWT_EF_0048,	Respondent asked what "infrequently" means and what guarantees that only "light" vehicles will be used for maintenance and that no further damage to hedgerows will be caused.	Yes	Traffic and Transportation effects are identified and assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES along with all assumptions used [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0074, BWT_EF_0088, BWT_EF_0091, BWT_EF_0099, BWT_FPF_0002, BWT_FF_0076, BWT_EF_0055			
BWT_FF_0003, BWT_EF_0101, BWT_EF_0103	<p>(1) Respondents stated that the booklet claims that the 25.5km "new hedgerow" will be planted without making it clear that this is spread over the whole site and does not say how much the well established existing hedgerow will be removed.</p> <p>The respondents also requested a figure for this total amount of hedgerow to be removed over the whole site (not just as a result of these latest challenges).</p>	Yes	<p>The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]. A crossing schedule had been produced detailing planned crossing point by location, method and if applicable length of hedgerow lost [EN010147/APP/7.3.9]</p> <p>The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations.</p> <p>However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0022, BWT_EF_0092, BWT_EF_0080	Respondents stated that change 1 will impact Dornford Lane and the Sustrans national cycle route NCR5. The respondents stated that the Lane is an ancient drover's road of historical importance associated with the history of the Blenheim Estate and the old Woodstock Manor which preceded Blenheim. The respondents added that a large part of the protected Roman Town archaeological site of Sansom's Platt lies alongside Dornford Lane. The respondents stated that Dornford Lane is a designated footpath and bridleway - not suitable for vehicles. The respondents added that the developer proposed to use the lane for access during the construction stage and for maintenance - hence threatening to destroy and area of historical importance.	Yes	The antiquity and importance of Dornford Lane is noted within Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . No part of Dornford Lane would be removed, damaged or impeded during construction and operation and maintenance of the Project. No part of the Project is within the Scheduled Monument at Sansom's Platt. A substantial buffer zone has been established within the Project Site in order to minimise any impacts on this Scheduled Monument that could arise as a result of change within its setting. The intention is not for vehicles to track along it, but there will be the need for a crossing point for vehicles and cable trenches, but priority is given to users of the Public Rights of Way
BWT_FF_0037, BWT_FF_0045, BWT_EF_0055, BWT_EF_0058, BWT_EF_0078,	Respondents questioned the stated "intention not to use" Dornford Lane for access during construction is too vague. The respondents asked what guarantee is in place to ensure	Yes	The approach to managing construction in relation to Public Rights of Way, including Dornford Lane, is dealt with in the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0088, BWT_FF_0006, BWT_EF_0099	Dornford Lane will not be used during construction.		[EN010147/APP/7.6.1] and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010146/APP/7.6.1] which form annexes to the Outline Code of Construction Practice. The intention is not for vehicles to track along it, but there will be the need for a crossing point for vehicles and cable trenches, but priority is given to users of the Public Rights of Way.
BWT_EF_0017, BWT_EF_0086	Respondents stated that Dornford Lane is ancient lane dating back to the medieval era. The respondents added that it is currently less than 2m wide in party and has significant ancient hedgerows. The respondents stated further that it makes no difference how frequently access is required. The respondent stated further that habitats will have been destroyed even if it is never used in practice.	Yes	The antiquity and importance of Dornford Lane is noted within Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The hedgerows along Dornford Lane would be protected during construction and operation through the provision of any necessary fencing and buffers.
BWT_EF_0033, BWT_EF_0091	Respondents stated that change 1 would impact Dornford Lane and the Sustrans national cycle route NCR5. The respondents stated that the lane is not suitable for the use proposed by	Yes	The antiquity and importance of Dornford Lane is noted within Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . No part of

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	the developer. The respondents added that the historical/medieval background of the lane is essential.		Dornford Lane would be removed, damaged or impeded during construction and operation and maintenance of the Project.
BWT_FF_0006, BWT_FF_0045	Respondent stated that it is not clear what the impact will be to nearby properties or the wide hedgerow.	Yes	A crossing schedule had been produced detailing planned crossing point by location, method and if applicable length of hedgerow lost [EN010147/APP/7.3.9]. No adverse effects are predicted to ecology, landscape or amenity. No part of Dornford Lane would be removed, damaged or impeded during construction and operation and maintenance of the Project.
BWT_FF_0009, BWT_FF_0076	Respondent stated that the use of Dornford Lane illustrates BW's lack of local knowledge and care. The respondents added that it is an ancient piece of land of historical significance. The respondents added that this is the same for change 3.	Yes	The antiquity and importance of Dornford Lane is noted within Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5]. No part of Dornford Lane would be removed, damaged or impeded during

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			construction and operation and maintenance of the Project.
BWT_FF_0037, BWT_FF_0045	Respondents stated that it is not clear what the impact will be in change 21 to nearby properties or the wide hedgerow, the respondents would like clarification.	No	No removal of hedgerow is anticipated in this location.
BWT_FF_0003	(1) Respondent requested an explanation as to how the removal of many kilometres of ancient hedgerow will contribute to the promised 70% biodiversity net gain.	Yes	<p>The total hedgerow removal across the Project site as a whole is 666m in 72 locations. This is out of a total resource of over 70km. However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.</p> <p>The impact of this hedgerow removal is described in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The calculation of BNG is set out in Volume 3 Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5]. It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0005	Respondent stated that access should be limited to the already paved pathway with entry to the field at the far northern end and all other access made within the field containing the panels. The respondent added that the rest of Dornford Lane, an ancient drove way, current cycle route and bridleway should not be touched. The respondent further stated that it is bordered by a significant ancient hedgerow which would be damaged or lost if widening for "occasional" vehicle use were to be allowed.	Yes	The antiquity and importance of Dornford Lane is noted within Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . No part of Dornford Lane would be removed, damaged or impeded during construction and operation and maintenance of the Project.
BWT_FF_0005	Respondent stated that hedgerow removal is totally unacceptable. The respondent added that while new hedgerow planting is to be applauded, this will take at least a decade to achieve anywhere near the biodiversity of long-established hedgerows.	Yes	During Project design, subsequent to the submission of the PEIR, the need to remove small lengths of hedgerow to facilitate access was identified, in particular for visibility splays for site access, and in some locations for open trenches where the use of HDD would be unsuitable. Paragraph 6.4.20 in Volume 1, Chapter 6 Project Description [EN010147/APP.6.3] explains the approach in detail.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>A crossing schedule had been produced detailing planned crossing point by location, method and if applicable length of hedgerow lost [EN010147/APP/7.3.9]</p> <p>The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations.</p> <p>However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.</p> <p>By Year 5 new hedgerows will start to be effective in screening adverse effects.</p>
BWT_FF_0005	Respondent stated that significant disruption to Public Rights of Way is unacceptable.	N	Noted.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0010	Respondent stated that change 18 on the map will cause huge disruption both visually and with noise. The respondent added that no indication was given of construction times, referring throughout the information to things being 'temporary' but this can mean up to 40 years.	Yes	<p>Landscape: Change 18 is referring to the cable route(s). Therefore any effect would be in construction only, so temporary. Cables are below ground so there would be no residual landscape or visual effect for the operation of the Project. It amounts to a reduction in overall Project area. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p> <p>Noise: Change 18, is a reduction to the order limits, and therefore presents a reduction to the area for the Project. The term 'temporary' relates to the construction phase, which is estimated to take 24 months. Due to the area utilised by the scheme, the construction works will be distributed across the site area, meaning that any one receptor would not be adversely effected by construction noise for the whole 24 month period. [EN010147/APP/6.3]. A Code of Construction Practice is also</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			proposed to protect against adverse effects [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BWT_FF_0010	Respondent stated that change 18 impacts public rights of way, mental and physical wellbeing for local residents. The respondent references the huge cumulative effect of closing or disrupting so many footpaths.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy (EN010147/APP/7.6). The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent. Chapter 16: Human

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Health of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. Impacts on the public rights of way network are covered in great detail under the "Open space, leisure and play" determinant of the health assessment. This assessment takes into account the collective changes to public rights of way. See also Human Health Chapter 16 [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>
BWT_FF_0012	<p>Respondent stated that the removal of sections of hedgerows will be detrimental to wildlife. The respondent added that it needs a continuous corridor without gaps. The respondent also stated that machinery working in these areas will disturb nesting birds and also mammals, therefore the project will be removing mature hedgerows. The respondent concluded that new planting will take many years to mature and be of benefit.</p>	Yes	<p>The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations. However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up. Continuity of hedgerow is</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>considered important, and to minimise any gaps.</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p> <p>The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3].</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] will act as a mechanism to record and monitor ecological data on created, or evolving, habitats during the operation of the Project.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0014	Respondent stated concern with the boundary moving closure to the top of Samson's Lane and affecting the Roman Villa site located nearby.	Yes	No part of the Project is within the Scheduled Monument at Sansom's Platt. A substantial buffer zone has been established within the Project Site in order to minimise any impacts on this Scheduled Monument that could arise as a result of change within its setting.
BWT_FF_0014	Respondent stated concern with the impact of the HDD compound on the nearby cattery.	Yes	Pipelines and cables will be laid via trenchless techniques (e.g. HDD) which limits disruption above ground. Impacts of HDD are considered within the Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Mitigation measures are proposed where necessary – see Mitigation measures, Appendix 6.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5] and CoCP [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BWT_FF_0019	Respondent stated that in the Northern site, they are concerned about the impact on Dornford Lane, an ancient green lane, if used for access and maintenance purposes, and on the loss of hedgerows in several locations, even if offset by new planting.	Yes	The antiquity and importance of Dornford Lane is noted within Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0058	Respondent stated that the changes noted previously refer to the applicant seeking mitigation efforts - adding that there is no confirmation that any mitigation efforts will actually happen. The respondent would like confirmation on how this is rectified.	Yes	The Project Mitigation Measures are considered within Vol 3, Appendix 6.1 Project Mitigation Measures and Commitments Schedule. Document Reference [EN010147/APP/6.5] . Mitigation measures and other controls will be enforced by the relevant local planning authority.
BWT_FF_0073	Respondent stated that more of the usable countryside is being taken away, the respondent stated that this includes their favourite walking and cycling paths. The respondent added that suitable mitigations. The respondent asked if there are mitigations against destroying our lanes and ancient pathways.	Yes	<p>The potential impacts of the Project with respect to agricultural land are identified and assessed in Volume 3: Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BWT_FF_0074	Respondent stated that changed 1,2,3 should not happen.	No	Noted
BWT_FF_0084	Respondent stated that the inclusion of Stratford Lane and the B4027 is unacceptable. The respondent added that the Lane is a small (single track in places) lane that provides the main link from many Oxfordshire villages to the M40 direction and is incredibly well used. The respondent stated that the disruption regarding construction would have a significant negative impact on local residents	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including Stratford Lane and the B4027, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BWT_FF_0111	Respondent stated that given any impacts are short duration, what is meant by a short duration. The respondent would like clarification in terms of minutes, hours, days and weeks.	Yes	There will be an open cut trench require to cross the PRow, to connect the arrays within the two fields either side. The construction work associated with this particular trench will be for a limited

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			number of days (to be determined on appointment of suitably qualified contractor but likely to be less than 2 weeks), and effects on the PRow will be managed under the outline PRow Management Strategy, which forms part of the outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BWT_FF_0111	Respondent asked what evidence there is to state that change 17 is unlikely to lead to significant adverse environmental effects.	Yes	This change is a due diligence boundary removal. No adverse effects are predicted.
BWT_FF_0111	Respondent stated that it should be noted if the project will disrupt footpaths. The respondent stated that there is a need to provide more details on the significance of the effect and guarantees in place to ensure the safety of those using the footpaths.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BWT_FF_0111	Respondent asked what evidence there is to state that change 19 is unlikely to lead to significant adverse environmental effects.		Due diligence boundary addition
BWT_FF_0111	Respondent asked how it can be pretended that reducing the project site boundary by removing the corridor coloured in green will avoid potential adverse impacts on potentially important archaeology in the area.	Yes	All areas of significant archaeological remains within the Project Site have been removed from the development and will be fenced off during construction and then retained as managed grassland. This is set out within Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_EF_0033	Respondent stated that the Victoria County History for the Parish of Wootton confirms the historical interest of this track. The respondent added that the lane is essential to the Banbury-Oxford road and avoiding the centres of villages.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BWT_EF_0033	Respondent stated that the historic use of Dornford Lane for moving goods and livestock between towns and villages has resulted in a footpath and bridleway surrounded on either side by ancient hedgerows with an extraordinarily rich mix of trees, shrubs and other planting. The respondent added that the footpaths which meet with Dornford Lane also have ancient hedgerows with similarly wide and rich tree growth.	Yes	The antiquity and importance of Dornford Lane is noted within Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . No part of Dornford Lane would be removed, damaged or impeded during construction and operation and maintenance of the Project.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0033	Respondent stated that change 3 would impact not only Dornford Lane but also the east-west bridleway linking Wootton to Dornford Lane. The respondent further stated that this bridleway is used for maintenance during the operation of the solar farm but later it says it would be used for temporary cabling work. The respondent added that these contradictory claims are confusing and needs to be clarified.	Yes	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy (EN010147/APP/7.6). The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.</p> <p>The Project Works Plans also explain the types of work envisaged across all of the site - [EN010147/APP/2.3].</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0033	Respondent stated that change 9 would impact Sustrans NCR5 as well as the Glyme Valley Way.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BWT_EF_0033	Respondent stated that change 16 refers to a PRow for which the official designation is 342/6/10. The respondent added that the definitive map describes this route as a footpath, not a track as claimed. The respondent added that this means it may not be wide enough to lay a 33kV cable.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs,

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent. The 33kV cable corridors have been assessed as adequate to lay the cables.</p>
BWT_EF_0033	<p>Respondent stated that change 18 kay still affect another PRow, number 342/2/20, although it is not clear from the description whether it refers to the bridleway itself or a strip of land alongside it. The respondent stated further that an option the developer could consider is to route construction traffic along the line of the dismantled railway immediately to the north or this bridleway.</p>	Yes	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6]. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BWT_EF_0033	Respondent stated that change 21 would impact the large established hedgerow on the north-west side of the A4095. The respondent added that the entry and exit point of the proposed HDD compound would be on a busy A road, the A4095, and have traffic implications.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_EF_0069	Respondent stated that they are concerned about the loss of native hedgerow and dangers to associated species. The respondent added that the replanted hedgerows will not have the same biodiversity as established ones.	Yes	The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The total hedgerow removal across the Project site as a whole is 666m in 72 locations. This is out of a total resource of over 70km. It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0069	Respondent stated that they are concerned about the impact on the public right of way. The respondent stated that although the document states that the disruption will be of a short duration. The respondent also stated that the laying of cables and disturbance to the existing right of way might have long term effects.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy (EN010147/APP/7.6) . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BWT_EF_0069	Respondent stated that they appreciate the need to avoid the landfill, but they are concerned that there will be an unknown 'level of disruption to footpath users'.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs,

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BWT_EF_0074	Respondent stated that this change would impact Dornford Lane, an ancient road and the Sustrans national cycle route NCR5. The respondent asked how can it be guaranteed that the hedgerow will not be disturbed.	Yes	The antiquity and importance of Dornford Lane is noted within Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_EF_0074	Respondent asked what impact there will be on the wide hedgerow and also to neighbouring properties.	Yes	The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A crossing schedule had been produced detailing planned crossing point by location, method and if applicable length of hedgerow lost [EN010147/APP/7.3.9]

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0078	Respondent stated that the blue rectangular area appears to be outside the red line. The respondent added that it is said to be the chosen site for both the main construction site and secondary substation. Furthermore, the corresponding blue mark on the Northern Site map is almost impossible to see.	No	The red line wraps around the blue land - please see Streets, Access and Rights of Way Plans - Sheet 2 of 13 [EN010147/APP/2.2]
BWT_EF_0078	Respondent stated that change number 15 was unclear to them. The respondent elaborated by stated that it appears to be a long spike shape, the whole length of which on both sides does not border any fields within the red line Order Limits. The respondent asked why should it accommodate construction access. The respondent asked if there is to be another construction site there.	Yes	The red line area has been amended to incorporate the length of the hedgerow on the eastern side of Banbury Road, which requires removal in part, in order to allow for suitable visibility to the proposed construction access - please see Streets, Access and Rights of Way Plans - Sheet 3 of 13 [EN010147/APP/2.2]
BWT_EF_0078	Respondent stated that the secondary substation shown on the larger scale Northern Site map at the Phase Two Information Events on the opposite corner of the cross-lanes is not shown on either the Maps of Changes or	Yes	The maps of changes and table of changes did not show substations. The substation in the vicinity of Banbury Road is located to the north east of Change 15 and can be viewed on the Operational Development Plan Northern

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Table of Changes maps. The respondent concluded by asking if it has been withdrawn or moved and if so where.		Site Area (2 of 2) [EN010147/APP/7.3.2]
BWT_EF_0078	Respondent requested a better explanation regarding how HDD (Horizontal Direction Drilling) and if it is different from the Dynamic Pipe Ramming process.	Yes	The application is supported by a Cable Laying Methodology, including HDD - Appendix 6.2 [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BWT_EF_0079	Respondent stated that change 3 shows inadequate planning and understanding of the project itself and the area affected.	Yes	Change 3 has arisen to allow for flexibility in the location of cable crossing points, and is reflective of the iterative nature of the design work that the Applicant has to undertake.
BWT_EF_0085	Respondent voiced objection to the planned use of Dornford Lane for vehicular access to the Northern Site. The respondent added that they use this as part of the National Cycle Network and they know it as an ancient trackway with deep, dense and biodiverse hedgerows on either side. The respondent stated that aside from the small section which is a surfaced farm track, this route is wholly unsuitable for vehicles, which would	Yes	The antiquity and importance of Dornford Lane is noted within Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . No part of Dornford Lane would be removed, damaged or impeded during construction and operation and maintenance of the Project.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	destroy important environmental and heritage assets.		
BWT_EF_0086	Respondent stated that change 3 is a very old pathway with extensive, well established hedging/vegetation and unsuitable for these purposes. Respondent concluded by stating that it is unacceptable damage and loss of amenity.	Yes	The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BWT_EF_0086	Respondent stated that there are consequences for Sustrans NCR5 and Glyme Valley Way would resulting in damage and loss of amenity.	Yes	Landscape: Change 9 is related to the cable route(s). Landscape and visual effects would be present during the temporary construction phase only and seen in the context of the surrounding construction works. There would be no residual landscape or visual effect during operation as the cables are below ground. No significant residual effect upon amenity from this specific

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			change – see Landscape Chapter 8 [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BWT_EF_0086	Respondent stated that change 16 is a popular footpath (not 'track' as referred to in the booklet) circular walk from Woodstock which they know well and use often. Respondent added that it is surrounded by beautiful trees and wide, well established hedgerows.	No	Noted
BWT_EF_0086	Respondent stated that although it does not state it, this would impact on existing hedgerow. The respondent added that the access to the proposed HDD compound would be onto the already very busy A4095 and therefore have significant traffic management implications.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3). The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BWT_EF_0088	Respondent stated that the Northern Sector directly affects the Roman Town at Sansoms Platt because they now have evidence that the town extends beyond its protected Historic Monument Area.	Yes	No part of the Project is within the Scheduled Monument at Sansom's Platt. A substantial buffer zone has been established within the Project Site in order to minimise any impacts on this Scheduled Monument that could arise

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			as a result of change within its setting. [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BWT_EF_0092	Respondent stated that it is unclear whether the maintenance route is intended to join and use Lower Dornford Farm Lane which joins the B4027 at the top of a steep hill with poor visibility for traffic. The respondent added that it is not an acceptable route for any construction or maintenance traffic for the solar farm and is well outside the limit of the boundary. The respondent asked for further clarification and stated that the use of areas outside of the red boundary cannot be acceptable in this case.	Yes	The approach to managing construction in relation to Public Rights of Way, including Dornford Lane, is dealt with in the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010146/APP/7.6.1] which form annexes to the Outline Code of Construction Practice. The intention is not for vehicles to track along it, but there will be the need for a crossing point for vehicles and cable trenches, but priority is given to users of the Public Rights of Way.
BWT_EF_0092	Respondent stated that change 6 relates to the use of Stratford Lane at the junction with the B4027 is immediately adjacent to Oxford Drama School and residential housing. The respondent added that the exact use of this section is unclear. The	Yes	Landscape: Change 6 is related to the cable route(s). Landscape and visual effects would be present during the temporary construction phase only and seen in the context of the surrounding construction works. There would be no residual landscape or visual effect

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>respondent concluded that there is an entrance to another PROW footpath leading across open fields towards Hordley Farm and the dangerous junction which cannot be widened without severe impacts on the landscape. The respondent concluded that change 6 requires much more clarity.</p>		<p>during operation as the cables are below ground.</p>
BWT_EF_0095	<p>Respondent added that in this location 2 old paths converge, known locally as Sansoms Lane and Green Lane. The respondent added that the disruption of the area is inevitable so care should be taken to restore.</p>	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0095	<p>Respondent stated that they appreciate that the footpaths have not been included but there is a missing significant hedgerow north east of the Banbury Road/Sansoms Lane intersection, leading to Weaveley Furze. The respondent hopes that this hedgerow will not be removed between the two solar containing fields.</p>	Yes	<p>The only hedgerow removal that is necessary for the Project as a whole is the creation of small gaps or the widening of existing ones to facilitate access. No hedgerow between fields will be removed in its entirety. The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations.</p> <p>However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up. A crossing schedule had been produced detailing planned crossing point by location, method and if applicable length of hedgerow lost [EN010147/APP/7.3.9]
BWT_EF_0095	Respondent noted that this is a relatively narrow path between thick vegetation.	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0099	Respondent asked what guarantee is there that Dornford Lane will be used for maintenance.	Yes	The approach to managing construction in relation to Public Rights of Way, including Dornford Lane, is dealt with in the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010146/APP/7.6.1] which form annexes to the Outline Code of Construction Practice. The intention is not for vehicles to track along it, but there will be the need for a crossing point for vehicles and cable trenches,

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			but priority is given to users of the Public Rights of Way.
BWT_EF_0103	Respondent asked if the compound access point onto the A4096 in Woodstock has been approved by OCC.	Yes	Details of the engineering works to form accesses and compounds have been discussed in meetings with OCC, in preparation of the DCO materials. Details on access are provided within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010145/APP/6.3) and Volume 3, Appendix 12.8: Accesses and highway drawings [EN010145/APP/6.5] .
BWT_EF_0025	Respondent stated that there are references in several places to Dornford Lane but the blue colour on the map marks instead Claud Duval Way, a Cycle route.	Yes	The Claud Duval Way is a 90 mile bridle route for riders - of which Dornford Lane forms a part.
BWT_EF_0025	Respondent asked if there are physical changes intended to be made to the bridleway/Claude Duval Way and the footpath right across the field to meet Dornford Lane. The respondent added that if so, what physical changes are to be made.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs,

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.</p>
BWT_EF_0071	<p>Respondent stated that for losses of hedgerow changes, the stated changes are individually promised 25.5 km of new hedgerows. The respondent stated that since it is evident that 25.5km covers all hedgerow loss, PVDP fail to indicate the extent per change.</p>	Yes	<p>The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations.</p> <p>However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
Central Site (Changes 22 - 49)			
BWT_FF_0006, BWT_FF_0037, BWT_FF_0045, BWT_EF_0041, BWT_EF_0043	Respondents stated that the disruption, inconvenience and noise nuisance to Heath Lane residents is totally unacceptable. The respondents added that the damage to the ancient hedgerow would be a great blow to biodiversity.	Yes	<p>The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations.</p> <p>However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.</p> <p>It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>
BWT_FF_0026, BWT_EF_0094, BWT_EF_0068	Respondents stated that they are a resident living on Heath Lane and would like to know what is meant specifically in the Engineering and Feasibility Boundary Addition, particularly in relation to noise and vibration. The respondents cited "temporary adverse impacts on Heath	Yes	<p>The impacts of construction noise and vibration upon residential receptors, including Heath Lane, are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES : Noise & Vibration [EN010147/APP/6.3] and the method of managing works is set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] The proximity to</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Lane, depending on construction technique and precise location of works'. The respondents added that "adverse effects" are mentioned regarding public rights of way.		residents at the end of Heath Lane has been carefully considered post PEIR, in relation to the best way to install the connecting cable in this location and it is proposed to cut a trench rather than use HDD, in order to limit the noise and vibration effects. This would, however, necessitate the removal of a 5m section of hedgerow. The route set out is one of two options, the other being to the south of Bladon Heath Wood.
BWT_FF_0027, BWT_EF_0042, BWT_EF_0047	Respondents stated that it has not been stated how noise and disruption will be mitigated, just that it 'could' be done.	Yes	Mitigation measures to reduce the potential noise impact of the scheme will be implemented during the construction and operational phases of the scheme. The mitigation measures implemented will vary depending upon the phase of the scheme – Volume 3, Appendix 6.1. [EN010147/APP/6.3] . During the construction phase, measures will be put in place to reduce the potential impact, and will include varying the working method, temporary noise screens etc. Operational phase

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			noise will be attenuated through the design of items of the scheme - see CoCP [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .
BWT_FF_0006, BWT_FF_0045, BWT_EF_0038, BWT_EF_0091	Respondents stated that the hedgerow to be removed is protected by a covenant as are the adjacent fields.	N	Noted.
BWT_FF_0004, BWT_FF_0037	Respondents stated that planting new hedges in no way recompenses for the loss of ancient hedgerows and associated wildlife corridors.	Yes	<p>The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations.</p> <p>However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0011, BWT_EF_0090	<p>Respondents stated that point 36 crosses the mains water pipe supply to Goose Eye Farm. The respondents further asked what specific work has been undertaken to identify and protect this water supply from any effects of the proposed dynamic pipe ramming in this vicinity. They requested that the data is also addressed regarding the vibration effects of DPR, requesting that they provide the applicable Water Board certified pipe location maps that support your answers.</p>	Yes	<p>As a core principle, landscape features will be retained and the removal of hedgerows has been avoided as far as practicable. Where it is necessary for cabling to cross these features and also infrastructure (roads, railway, and buried services including water mains) HDD or pipe-ramming laying methods are used.</p> <p>A Cable Laying Methodology and Indicative HDD Crossing Locations report is produced as Appendix 6.2 to the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p> <p>A crossing schedule is also produced detailing planned crossing point by location and method [EN010147/APP/7.3.9].</p> <p>Where used, the exact method of trenchless cable installation will depend on the constraints and obstacles encountered but will typically involve a combination of Horizontal Directional Drilling and dynamic pipe ramming. Pipe ramming will introduce some level of</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			ground vibration associated largely with the nature of ground conditions. All cabling works would necessitate a full survey and clearance of buried services prior to construction works. Works would be conducted using a method, speed and sufficient depth required to avoid potential for damage to water mains and other infrastructure.
BWT_FF_0011, BWT_EF_0090	Respondents stated that there is a long standing right of way from the nearby carriageway (lower road) up to a gated rear entrance to Goose Eye Farm. The respondents added that this right of way is an essential safety route for access and egress to Goose Eye Farm in the event of emergency. The respondents added that an essential, emergency access RoW cannot be obstructed and the impact on local wildlife must be addressed and considered.	No	Noted
BWT_EF_0030, BWT_EF_0086	Respondent stated that change 28 will bring unacceptable disruption to Heath Lane residents. The respondents added that they will be dealing with	Yes	Construction impacts (including dust and noise) will be managed in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice and its associated

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	noise, dust, pollution from vehicles, vibration from heavy digging machinery. The respondents further stated] that the construction works will impact on locals significantly.		management plans. The CoCP is secured through a requirement of the DCO and will be agreed with the relevant planning authority. An Outline CoCP is included in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .
BWT_FF_0037, BWT_FF_0045	Respondents stated that the use of an "existing rural road" for access is of serious concern.	Yes	Traffic and Transportation effects are identified and assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES along with all assumptions used [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_FF_0110, BWT_EF_0086	Respondents stated that in addition to the land covered by this change is a rare heathland environment which is essential habitat for many butterflies plus other important flora, fauna and fungi. The respondents added that it is surprising that this has not been identified in the survey of the site.	Yes	The Project site has been subject to a full suite of ecology surveys as set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5]

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0056, BWT_EF_0073	<p>Respondent requested clarification on terminology used to describe change 28, specifically:</p> <p>What does 'intention not to use' mean?</p> <p>What does 'infrequent' mean?</p> <p>What does temporary mean? We have been repeatedly told that Botley West is temporary as it will only be in operation for 40 years; will the temporary disruption to public rights of way last for 40 years?</p> <p>What does 'light vehicles' mean?</p> <p>Footpaths, bridleways, and the NCN are not designed for vehicles - what damage will be done to them by vehicles?</p> <p>What damage will be done to footpaths, bridleways, and the NCN by digging them up for cabling? Why are you not using tunnelling to cross them?</p> <p>What will be the cumulative impact of all the disruptions to public rights of way?</p>	Yes	<p>The potential impacts of the Project on PRoW is assessed in Chapter 17 of the ES: [EN010147/APP/6.3]. The outline management measures proposed for affected PRoW within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRoW Management Strategy (EN010147/APP/7.6). The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRoW during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRoW Management Strategy post-consent.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0008	Respondent stated that the numbered changed (40-49) are those in the area around Cassington. The respondent added that none of these changes address the issue of how close the proposed site is to their community. The respondent continued that similar issues will be found throughout the proposed development. The respondent added that the proposed development is too large and too close to communities. The respondent concluded that these issues have been raised time and time again but they can see no significant reductions.	No	Noted.
BWT_FF_0010	Respondent stated that change 26 further destroys access to footpaths and green space. The respondent elaborated that the extensive security fencing will render the paths unusable for humans.	Yes	Landscape: No significant landscape or visual effect as a result of this boundary change. Effects upon user of footpath are assessed in Chapter 8: LVIA [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_FF_0011	Respondent stated that any interference with the access/ egress is likely to have a detrimental impact upon the socio-economics of the running of Goose Eye Farm. The	Yes	Chapter 15: Socio Economics of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses the impact on disruption to travel patterns, informed by Chapter 12: Traffic and

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	respondent also wants clarification on what alternatives are to be proposed to ensure the access/egress is preserved.		Transport's [EN010147/APP/6.3] assessment of impact on access.
BWT_FF_0013	The additional disruption to Heath Lane, which is a small single track with narrow pavements used by primary school children and elderly residents.	Yes	Chapter 15: Socio Economics of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses the impact on disruption to travel patterns, informed by Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport's [EN010147/APP/6.3] assessment of impact on access.
BWT_FF_0013	Respondent asked why the developer is able to accommodate the requests of commercial parties and unable to accommodate the requests of the project to be scaled back by residents.	No	Noted.
BWT_FF_0020	Respondent stated that changes at item 36 has a specific effect within the Hanborough Parish Boundaries. The respondent refers to engineering and feasibility, transport and access boundary additions. The respondent continued that the developers state that the project boundary has been changed to include lower road. The respondent followed this by stating that this will allow the connection between	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	two fields and the laying of cables via dynamic pipe ramming process.		
BWT_FF_0020	Respondent stated that there would be significant effects on both Mill and College Farms. The respondent added that there is no mention of this in item 36. The respondent added that there are no identifiable construction site or traffic control plans for this end of Hanborough. The respondent added that this could have significant effects on access to Church Hanborough and the east end (rail station) of Hanborough and Bladon too. This will be especially noticeable during peak commuting times when traffic runs through Church Hanborough and the Lower Road/A4095 road junction becomes bottle-necked. The respondent added that this is a big concern since this could/will be a problem for a very significant period of time during the construction phase.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010145/APP/6.3]. An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010145/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0022	<p>Respondent stated that the developer acknowledges that all of the proposed changes (as listed) will entail the loss of substantial amounts of hedgerows (in change 29 also mature trees) to "secure appropriate visibility" during construction. The respondent added that they accept this will adversely impact the ecological and biodiversity value of all these areas. The respondent added that the documentation suggests that the situation will be mitigated by planting "approximately 25.5 kms of hedgerows" - but it is not clear where. The respondent concluded by criticising the lack of precision regarding the documents.</p>	Yes	<p>The impact of the Project on hedgerows is set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3]. Further details on the creation of hedgerows is provided in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, provided in EN010147/APP/7.6. The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations.</p> <p>However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.</p>
BWT_FF_0022	<p>Respondent stated that it is acknowledged that there will be significant adverse impacts on the public right of way (National Cycle route 5) of these two areas that they will be temporal, but with no commitment to restore the situation after the end of construction.</p>	Yes	<p>Measures to manage the interactions with public rights of way (including NCR5) during construction will be implemented in accordance with the Public Rights of Way Management Strategy. The Strategy forms part of the CoCP and will be agreed with the relevant planning authority as secured</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			through the DCO. An Outline PRoW Management Strategy is included in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .
BWT_FF_0022	Respondent stated that the change which will affect the footpath Cassington 152/8/10 is presented as 'temporal' yet it is acknowledged that access will be needed for maintenance (i.e. not just during construction) The respondent added that it is not clear what the applicant purposes to do to mitigate the situation.	Yes	Access to this location will be required for maintenance activities throughout the operational lifetime of the Project. The frequency of vehicle movements during the operation phase is anticipated to be minimal and comprise light goods vehicles and general agricultural machinery. Therefore, no additional works are necessary to facilitate access during the operation phase. Where operational access intersects with or follows existing public rights of way, the infrequent and non-intrusive nature of these vehicle movements ensures that no further management measures are required
BWT_FF_0025	Respondent stated that the whole process from the beginning has been unsatisfactory and the information provided vague and sometimes inaccurate. The respondent added for	N	Noted.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	such a large project that will have such a significant impact on the areas affected forever, from ancient hedgerows and paths used by walkers not vehicles, impossible access points, the loss of valuable farming land.		
BWT_FF_0026	Respondent asked what "suitable mitigation measures" have been put into place to be sure that they do not adversely effect the environment. The respondent stated that they would rather have a better understanding of this than to use the term unlikely.	N	The approach to mitigation is set out in Volume 1 Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The mitigation is implemented under various management plans provided in EN010147/APP/7.6 .
BWT_FF_0027	Respondent stated that more hedgerow losses to accommodate access for your machinery, stating that it is not acceptable regardless of how much more is proposed to be added	N	Noted.
BWT_FF_0027	Respondent stated that significant interruption of the cycleway is referred to, the respondent added that it has not been advised how long this interruption will be for.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BWT_FF_0027	Respondent stated that the locations of crossings has not been stated, which should be known in advance. The respondent added that there is no guarantee it won't be built in an unacceptable position.	N	A Crossing Schedule [EN010147/APP/7.3.9] is provided as part of the DCO. Consultation with the Highways officers has also been undertaken.
BWT_FF_0027	Respondent stated that any damage to ecology is totally unacceptable, regardless of 're-planting' proposals.	N	The Project site has been subject to a full suite of ecology surveys as set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The impact of the Project on ecology is fully assessed in Chapter 9.
BWT_FF_0027	Respondent stated that no changes to footpaths are acceptable. The respondent added that walking and	N	Noted

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	other forms of exercises should be fully protected.		
BWT_FF_0028	Respondent stated that the proposals detailed are far too big, stating that it is farm land, and food has to be grown locally. Respondent added that this is transferring one climate change issue for another. The respondent concluded that solar panels should be on rooves not on critical farm land.	Yes	The land will continue to be used for agriculture, for conservation grazing, and up to 30ha is being offered to local food growing groups. The overall planning balance, including impacts on farmland and the need for renewable energy generation at scale to meet targets, is weighed in the Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1]
BWT_FF_0035	Respondent stated that changes affecting Dornford lane, one of the oldest routes in the area, a bridleway, and the only safe, off road cycling route in the area. The respondent added that the proposal to use it for construction vehicles and later on for maintenance vehicles clearly indicates a complete disregard for the historic importance of this route. The respondent believes that the promises are too vague, the fact that it will be used for temporary cabling work means it will be dug up and unusable	Yes	The antiquity and importance of Dornford Lane is noted within Appendix 7.1: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] . No part of Dornford Lane would be removed, damaged or impeded during construction and operation and maintenance of the Project.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	for the local population, both on foot, by bike or on horseback.		
BWT_FF_0040	Respondent stated that the impact on residents at the top of Heath Lane cannot be overstated. The respondent stated that on a narrow lane, frequently used by families and young children, the impact of construction vehicles into and out of the area behind Heath Lane presents a significant risk to safety, a significant impact on the safety and integrity of the road surfaces of Heath Lane	Yes	Impacts of construction traffic will be managed in accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which forms part of the Code of Construction Practice secured through a requirement of the DCO. An Outline CTMP is included in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] , which includes measures to set routes for construction traffic.
BWT_FF_0040	Respondent stated that point 28 will have a significant impact on the biodiversity of the woodlands directly behind, in particular on the bird populations including red kites and woodpeckers.	Yes	Noted. The Project site has been subject to a full suite of ecology surveys as set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The impact of the Project on ecology is fully assessed in Chapter 9.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0047	Respondent stated that the hedgerow is protected by a covenant which has been completely ignored.	No	The Applicant understands the restrictive Covenant is in relation to the hedge within the field, and therefore not being removed.
BWT_FF_0052	Respondent stated that the disregard to the impact this proposed project has on the residents of this area is shameful.	No	Noted
BWT_FF_0059	Respondent stated that they believe 31 would be greatly detrimental to the fragile balance in this landscape to have solar panels. The respondent added that this is a natural corridor between woodland areas and also an area with beautiful views and wildlife diversity which as a landowner they are interested in preserving.	Yes	The Project site has been subject to a full suite of ecology surveys as set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The impact of the Project on ecology is fully assessed in Chapter 9.
BWT_FF_0062	Respondent stated that many of the proposed changes are not outlined in enough detail to be able to ascertain their impact. The respondent added that a number of the changes appear to result in the removal of mature hedgerows. The respondent added that these cannot be replaced simply	Yes	The impact to hedgerows is assessed in in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . During Project design, subsequent to the submission of the PEIR, the need to remove small lengths of hedgerow to facilitate access was identified, in particular for visibility splays for site access. A crossing schedule had been

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	by replanting as their ecology has been built up over many decades.		<p>produced detailing planned crossing point by location, method and if applicable length of hedgerow lost [EN010147/APP/7.3.9]</p> <p>The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations.</p> <p>However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.</p>
BWT_FF_0062	Respondent stated that it is not clear where exactly the footbridges outlined in points 34/35 will be. The respondent stated that it would be a useful amenity for Cassington to have a footpath and footbridge connecting Cassington with Church Hanborough.	N	Noted.
BWT_FF_0072	Respondent stated that no effort whatsoever to respond to comments and adapt the proposal to protect versatile agricultural land, specifically in the central site.	Yes	Justification for the location of the Project, including the design and environmental constraints considered is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 5: Alternatives of the ES

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010147/APP/6.3]. The potential impacts of the Project with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified and assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way (EN010147/APP/6.3). Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on agricultural land are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 17: Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3]. This includes the preparation of a Soil Management Plan in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6], which has been submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction of the Project.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0072	Respondent added that (re.38) they have deduced that previous proposals were to make the occupant of New Barn Farm homeless. The respondent stated that this is representative of the callous approach to local sensibilities.	Yes	Noted.
BWT_FF_0084	Respondent stated that transport and boundary additions in the local roads including Langford Lane and the A44 will bring major disruption to residents trying to live their lives, commuting and leisure transport will be majorly affected. The respondent stated that as the site spans such an enormous area, the road affected in these boundary additions will mean it is virtually impossible for residents and visitors to travel to the North.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including highway safety, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3). The Outline Code of Construction Practice includes a Construction Traffic Management Plan which should reduce or avoid adverse effects during construction. [EN010147/APP/7.6.1].
BWT_FF_0097	Respondent stated that in regards to the point noted, they are concerned as to the impact this will have on traffic and potential accidents. The respondent also stated that the road is fast, narrow, and in some cases has no markings. The respondent added that if the road was shut this would add	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including highway safety, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The Outline Code of Construction Practice includes a Construction Traffic Management Plan which should reduce or avoid adverse

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	a lot of inconvenience to local residents.		effects during construction. [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .
BWT_FF_0098	Respondent stated that they do not want this proposal they do not wish to live in an area surrounded by a huge solar farm. The respondent stated further that they object to their plans.	No	Noted.
BWT_FF_0107	Respondent stated that the changes are positive and can only help to improve their route to net zero.	No	Noted and the support welcomed by the Applicant.
BWT_FF_0110	Respondent stated that it is not clear from the information provided whether access to the bridleway at the end of Heath Lane will be temporarily or permanently effected by the proposed change. The respondent added that if permanently effected it is not clear that there will be any public rights of way remaining to residents of Bladon.	Yes	The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6] . The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BWT_FF_0111	Respondent asked what evidence is there to state the change is unlikely to lead significant adverse environmental effects.	Yes	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0111	Respondent stated that it is unacceptable to have a copy and paste from other changes (relating to 15.) The respondent added that therefore the approximately 25.5km of new planting to offset the loss is in total for the entire farm, not just the area displayed in change 23	Yes	The total hedgerow removal across the Project site as a whole is 666m in 72 locations. This is out of a total resource of over 70km. The impact of this hedgerow removal is described in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The calculation of BNG is set out in Volume 3 Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BWT_FF_0111	Respondent stated that any change implying potential significant adverse impacts on the public right of way need to be revisited.	Yes	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6].</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.
BWT_FF_0111	Respondent stated that change 27 will badly impact the ability to access the area.	Yes	Traffic and Transportation effects are identified and assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES along with all assumptions used [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_FF_0114	Respondent stated that they are concerned about the environmental impacts on species endemic to this area.	Yes	The Project site has been subject to a full suite of ecology surveys as set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] and associated appendices [EN010147/APP/6.5] . The impact of the Project on ecology is fully assessed in Chapter 9.
BWT_FF_0131	Respondent stated that the proposed works along Cassington Road will be hugely disruptive especially as they are immediately at the entrance to their property. The respondent asked what guarantee can be given that	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010145/APP/6.3] . An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>would mitigate the nuisance and upheaval of constant road works. The respondent concluded by asking who will repair the inevitable verge damage. The respondent concluded noting that there is a weight limit of the specified road of 7.5t that their neighbours and themselves will ensure.</p>		<p>[EN010145/APP/7.6.2] has been prepared to be secured as part of the CoCP requirement within the draft DCO.</p>
BWT_EF_0017	<p>Respondent stated that Bladon Heath and its earthworks are already subject to enormous disruption and long-term impact under the proposal and this amendment does not improve the situation. The respondent stated further that there are no commitments in the targeted proposal to reduce or minimise the noise or vibration for nearby residents. The respondent added that no details of "suitable mitigation measures" are provided to avoid significant adverse environmental effects.</p>	Yes	<p>Noise and vibration mitigation measures to be applied are detailed within Volume 1, Chapter 13 Noise and Vibration [EN010147/APP/6.3] and the associated appendices.</p> <p>The impacts to upon ecology and nature conservation are assessed in Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>No adverse effects are predicted to Bladon Heath.</p>
BWT_EF_0028	<p>Respondent stated that the Noise and Vibration stated on page 14 causing a potentially significant effect, but the</p>		<p>Noise and vibration mitigation measures will be implemented so as to avoid any significant adverse effects on any noise sensitive receptor.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	effect on the drama school which works 8am - 8pm 5 days a week.		
BWT_EF_0028	Respondent stated that the PEIR states that it will take 15 years for the replacement planting to mature so that the visual effects of the development are no longer significant. The respondent added that the traffic noise will therefore interrupt the radio and film training for decades and jeopardise the future of the school on this site.	Yes	<p>New vegetation (including dense hedgerows, trees, planting etc.) will start to provide effect screening from year 5. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Landscaping itself does not provide any noise mitigation, and so the potential removal, and re-instatement of planting will not change road traffic noise at the radio and film training school. Furthermore, the development will not cause a significant adverse effect in terms of development led road traffic noise.</p>
BWT_EF_0030	Respondent stated that they are a neighbour to the cabling site at point 28, referencing a prior survey carried out many years ago as a precursor to applying to buy the property from Cottsway Housing which indicated ground movement and the possibility that underpinning would be necessary in future. The respondent added that	Yes	<p>The construction activities and their term are listed in Chapter 6: Project Description of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>Figures 2.4a - 2.4d of Volume 2 shows the Cable Corridor [EN010147/APP/6.4]. Chapter 11: Ground Conditions of the ES also</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	they are concerned that this could affect properties in the area.		assesses the ground conditions within the Project Site Boundary.
BWT_EF_0033	Respondent stated that this change would impact Woodstock FP6, part of a popular circular walk from Woodstock which goes through a beautiful tunnel of trees and well-established hedges.	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0033	Respondent stated that this change would impact Bladon BR5, part of Shakespeare's Way and an important route between Bladon village, the Bladon Heath woodland, Begbroke and Yarnton. Respondent added that there is also considerable concern amongst the residents of the numerous houses on either side of Heath Lane, Bladon about the level of impact, clarification was requested.	Yes	Likely significant environmental impacts and their effects have been identified and analysed on a topic basis. No significant adverse effects are predicted by reason of design and layout and/or the mitigation measures and protections the Applicant is proposing for the Project – see for example mitigation measures schedule [EN010147/APP/6.5] , the Layout and Design Principles Document and the various management plans that it refers to [EN010147/APP/7.7] .
BWT_EF_0033	Respondent stated that this change proposes to remove a hedgerow that	No	This is a Transfer which contains Covenants over title ON264873; the hedge is not being removed

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	is, like the adjacent fields, protected by a covenant.		
BWT_EF_0033	Respondent stated that whilst the new footbridge would improve the connectivity of the local path network, it would be at the cost of the destruction of the countryside.	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0035	Respondent stated that the HDD and cabling beneath watercourse must follow the environmental protection and enhancement principles set out.	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0035	Respondent stated that the footbridge over watercourse must follow the environmental protection and enhancement principles set out.	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0035	Respondent stated that the footbridge over watercourse must follow the environmental protection and enhancement principles set out.	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0035	Respondent stated that the HDD and cabling beneath watercourse must follow the environmental protection and enhancement principles set out.	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0042; BWT_EF_0103, BWT_EF_0043, BWT_EF_0047, BWT_EF_0073, BWT_EF_0091, BWT_EF_0041, BWT_EF_0094, BWT_EF_0099, BWT_EF_0033, BWVT_EF_0017; BWVT_EF_0026; BWVT_EF_0017; BWVT_EF_0029	Respondents commented on the consultation material provided and their ability to navigate the information.	No	The Applicant sought to provide sufficient information to allow comment on the specific changes being consulted on. Information was provided in paper copy and online, to allow it to be viewed at different sizes. The Applicant encouraged questions to be submitted to their range of free-to-use communications channels.
BWT_EF_0047	Respondent stated that this has not been well publicised, and many residents in the area are unaware of the cabling route which will be within 20 yards of their properties. The respondent added that a neighbour next to the cabling site carried out a survey previously as a precursor to applying to buy the property from Cottsway Housing and the survey indicated ground movement and the possibility that underpinning would be	No	The Applicant notes this comment.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>necessary in future. The respondent added that they are concerned that this could also affect their and others property and, impacted residents will likely take further action if any detriment is caused.</p>		
BWT_EF_0048	<p>Respondent stated that the map relating to Northern section shows track between point 1 and B4027 marked as to be used for vehicular access for 'maintenance'. The respondent stated that this track is only wide enough for vehicles until roughly level with point 2, after that it becomes a footpath roughly 2-3 foot wide. The respondent asked if this was intended to be widened.</p>	Yes	<p>Access to this location will be required for maintenance activities throughout the operational lifetime of the Project. The frequency of vehicle movements during the operation phase is anticipated to be minimal and comprise light goods vehicles and general agricultural machinery. Therefore, no additional works are necessary to facilitate access during the operation phase. Where operational access intersects with or follows existing public rights of way, the infrequent and non-intrusive nature of these vehicle movements ensures that no further management measures are required.</p>
BWT_EF_0048	<p>Respondent stated that south of point 3 of the map shows coloured blue a track running west from Dornford Lane. The respondent stated that this</p>	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	is an extremely narrow footpath giving onto a farm lane.		
BWT_EF_0059	Respondent stated that the table of changes to order limits no.28 engineering and feasibility boundary addition is an extremely unwelcome negative impact.	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0059	Respondent stated that the central site suggestions reveals that the villages affected will be fundamentally changed by the construction phase and 40+ years of co-habiting with an industrial sized solar farm. The respondent added that panels will be so close to homes that it will be claustrophobic. The respondent also voiced concern for the unknown impacts of the conversion of fields into energy generation.	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0064	Respondent stated that the map item 32 showing the front of the respondent's driveway is incorrect. The respondent added that they own the driveway including the hedge on each side all the way to the road. Based on this, the respondent stated	No	The Applicant notes that the land shown is indicating the area which has changed, not the whole of the title.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	that this includes both the bit coloured blue and the grey bit directly underneath, making a straight line all the way along. The respondent concluded that the statement in the document 'project boundary has been changed to align to the legal boundary is therefore a blatant untruth as the real boundary is quite clearly stated in the land registry.		
BWT_EF_0065	Respondent stated that they are a resident of Bladon, shown on the central site. The respondent added that huge areas of solar panels should not impinge on a pleasant village. The respondent would like to see more radical changes.	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0074	Respondent stated that this is contradictory as it says the use will be for maintenance and later for temporary cabling work. The respondent asked what exactly does this mean.	No	The construction activities and their term are listed in Chapter 6: Project Description of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0078	Respondent stated that in the text at no.36 there is reference to connection between fields but nothing about access for either a construction site or substation, both of which were described to us at one of the Phase Two information events, The respondent added that even the larger scale central site map that was available at the information event showed the secondary substation with a minute black blob.	Yes	Both the Transport and Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of way chapters consider 'internal' access points - Chapters 12 and 17 [EN010147/APP/6.3] . See also Volume 3, Appendix 12.8 (Access and Highway drawings) [EN010147/APP/6.5] , Site Construction Compound Accesses [EN010147/APP/7.3.1] and Crossing Schedule [EN010147/APP/7.3.9] .
BWT_EF_0078	Respondent stated that 35 and 35 which assert significant benefit, do not show the route of the PRow or the proximity of thousands of serried ranks of solar panels so the reader is misled into thinking that this will be a nice country walk whereas the area will be surrounded by solar panels.	Yes	Landscape: Changes 34 and 35 refer to the access across Evenlode that will connect the PRow network providing a benefit. There are no panels proposed in the Evenlode corridor. Proposed hedgerow, woodland and tree planting to the edges of the Project boundary in this area will help to mitigate effects. However, due to rising land on Evenlode valley sides, filtered views to the solar panels will remain, broken by the proposed planting. Illustrative Masterplan gives details of proposed planting [EN010147/APP/6.4] .

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0078	Respondent asked what does the maintenance facility mean and where is it being moved to. The respondent asked how many are there and where will they be and how often will they be used? The respondent asked further if the maintenance staff will be using these facilities regularly and will they be using noisy equipment.	Yes	Change 38 involves the omission of a complex of farm buildings that were previously considered as possible buildings for maintenance. The outline Operational Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] sets out the anticipated maintenance activities.
BWT_EF_0081	Respondent stated that both additions to the order are in very close proximity to the ancient Burleigh Woods and Bladon Heath, which are sanctuaries for wildlife. The respondent asked if the applicant could be any more specific in description of the adverse effects mentioned. Respondent asked what would the extent of the noise, vibration and lighting be and for how long. The respondent would also like clarification on what 'temporary' means in this case.	Yes	<p>The effect upon ecology and nature conservation is assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>No adverse effect is predicted to Burleigh Woods or Bladon Heath.</p> <p>The construction activities and an explanation of the construction terms are listed in Chapter 6 of the ES – construction for the whole project is expected to last for two years. The management of the construction phase is set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>[EN010147/APP/7.6.1] and the general phasing and timing of the works packages within the wider construction period will be developed in more detail for discharge as Requirements.</p>
BWT_EF_0081	<p>Respondent stated that the applicant has added 1.5 miles of Lower Road and a Part of Cassington Road north-west of Burleigh Woods in the order. The respondent requested a default explanation about the impacts is being offered in both cases. The respondent asked further if the applicant could provide a more thorough explanation as to where and how the cable routing is planned. The respondent requested further clarification regarding what "connection between the two fields adjacent" means.</p>	Yes	<p>The construction activities and their term are listed in Chapter 6: Project Description of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3]. Figures 2.4a - 2.4d of Volume 2 shows the Cable Corridor [EN010147/APP/6.4]</p>
BWT_EF_0081	<p>Respondent stated that the applicant that the effects of including Lower Road on the public right of way are going to be significant.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_EF_0081	Respondent asked if the applicant has completed a risk assessment while placing the access to the site within a short distance from the narrow passage under the railway bridge. The respondent asked if the applicant could publish such a risk assessment.	Yes	Consideration for risks will form part of the OMP [EN010147/APP/7.6.2] and the CoCP management plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.1]
BWT_EF_0081	Respondent stated that they are puzzled as to the need of footbridges to be included both the agricultural bridge and the footbridge are already in place. The respondent asked further if the applicant could explain why they need to be included in the order and why their inclusion would have such a 'significant beneficial impact.	Yes	No new footbridges are proposed although repairs or improvements may be required to existing footbridges as they form part of the network of existing/proposed permissive footpaths and rights of way. Access to these areas is encouraged. Increased access is regarded as beneficial. The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0085	Respondent stated that the addition of crossings over the River Evenlode that would become public rights of way can in no way qualify as benefits, since paths between acres of solar panels surrounded by securing fencing will not attract any members of the public.	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0085	Respondent stated that point.26 moves the boundary to include Lower Road but fails to adjust the gross intrusion of the western edge of the Central Site on the historic landscape and sweeping views around the conservation area of Church Hanborough. The respondent added that this must be rectified in future iterations.	Yes	The assessment of likely impacts and effects on the historic landscape and on the Church Hanborough Conservation Area is presented within Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . More detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects on the Church Hanborough Conservation Area is set out within Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BWT_EF_0097	Respondent stated that the A44 junction with Langford Lane is an extremely busy junction, especially during peak rush hour times. The respondent added that this will cause major disruption to road traffic commuters in addition to the disruption of the public rights of way cycle route	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES (EN010147/APP/6.3) .

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	5. The respondent added that the fact that it was only temporarily not relevant particularly as PVDP seems to have a very loose definition of what temporary is.		
BWT_EF_0097	Respondent stated that Lower Road is an extremely busy road. The respondent added that it is interesting to note that the farm buildings are no longer required as a 'potential maintenance facilities', the respondent asked where will the maintenance facility be situated instead.	No	Noted
BWT_FF_0031	Respondent stated that removing the last of the greenbelt in Begbroke is being insisted on rather than simply adding another field in the northern area.	Yes	<p>The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1]. At Appendix 8 to</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			the PSS is the Very Special Circumstances case in respect of that part of the Project that falls within the Oxfordshire Green Belt.
BWT_EF_0036	Respondent stated that 'area 31' is also in an area which provides a wildlife link between Begbroke Wood and Bladon woods also. The respondent also stated concern that this with the university and Merton's use of the PR9 site is valuable for diversity and wildlife and will be compromised greatly.	Yes	The effects of the Project on Ecology and Nature Conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3] . It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BWT_EF_0068	Respondent voiced concern for the additions to order lines 28, specifically the extra traffic on the busy road through Bladon will be increased, with a substantial impact on the residential Heath Lane.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport, including on roads through Bladon, is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010145/APP/6.3] .
BWT_EF_0076	Respondent stated that 80% of the land west of the river Evenlode and bounding Lower road is BMV and will be destroyed if the proposal goes ahead.	Yes	The best and most versatile land comprises Grades 1, 2 and Subgrade 3a of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food 1988 ALC System. The results of the Agricultural Land

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>Classification survey show that 36% of the land within the Project comprises best and most versatile land, with the majority comprising lower quality Subgrade 3b land. The proposal will lead to the permanent loss of only approximately 5.5ha of the best and most versatile land associated with the development of the substations and PCS units. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] contains an Outline Soil Management plan that includes measures to limit the impacts on soil resources, wherever practicable, through the application of recognised best practice measures in soil management.</p> <p>The impacts of habitat removal are assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWVT_FPF_0002, BWVT_FPF_0003, BWVT_FPF_0004, BWVT_EF_0020, BWVT_EF_0022	Residents stated that the changes specific to point 28 in the Central Site were not sufficient to insulate Bladon from the visual ramifications of the project, stating that they would prefer the project boundary pulled back to an already existing footpath, allowing for a field already existing to act as a buffer zone, preferably converted into a wildflower meadow. See image below:	No	The Project allows for a significant buffer zone from the southern edge of Bladon. See Figure 2.2a and 2.2b [EN010147/APP/6.4].
Image in relation to above response		n/a	n/a
Southern Site (Changes 50 - 57).			
BWT_FF_0003, BWT_EF_0091, BWT_EF_0093, BWT_FF_0055, BWT_EF_0029, BWT_EF_0051, BWT_EF_0075	Respondents asked how many years 'temporary' means in the Information Note on Targeted Consultation.	Yes	The Applicant notes that impacts associated with construction were described as 'temporary'. Construction is anticipated to take approximately 2 years – see Chapter 6 Project Description [EN010147/APP/6.3].
BWT_EF_0074, BWT_EF_0091, BWT_EF_0097, BWT_EF_0098	Respondents stated that although it is good to see that Long Mead Wildlife Site is no longer going ahead, the remaining routes would directly impact	Yes	Pipelines and cables will be laid via trenchless techniques (e.g. HDD) which limits disruption at the above ground. The impact of the cable route on flood

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	the restoration meadows in the area. The respondents added that flooding risks would be exacerbated by putting cabling beneath the river.		risk and water quality including any required mitigation is set out in Volume 1: Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk. [EN010147/APP/6.3]
BWT_EF_0093, BWT_EF_0094, BWT_EF_0098, BWT_FF_0076, BWT_EF_0019	Respondents stated that the 'targeted' consultation has not completed its purpose as the local residents being consulted did not each receive an information booklet via the post.		The Applicant's approach to consultation was consistent with the principles established in the SoCC, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BWT_FF_0006, BWT_FF_0037, BWT_FF_0045	Respondents stated that the new river crossing may save Long Mead but asked if it is damaging another rare meadow.	Yes	Pipelines and cables will be laid via trenchless techniques (e.g. HDD) which limits harmful effects above ground. Please also see Figure 5.1 to 5.5 [EN010147/APP/6.4] and Volume 3, Appendix 6.2 for the Cable Laying Methodology and Indicative HDD Crossing Locations [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BWT_EF_0016, BWT_EF_0041,	Respondents concluded based on the documents available that the feedback given in the previous stage has not been taken seriously.	No	Noted. The full consultation process and consideration of feedback is identified in the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .
BWT_EF_0074, BWT_EF_0091	Respondents stated that the inclusion of the very busy Lower Road within the boundary of the project site concerns me. The respondent added that this is	Yes	Traffic and Transportation effects are identified and assessed in Chapter 12 of

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>a sensitive area close to the ancient Pinsley Wood and the Evenlode Valley. The respondents added that the significant adverse impact on the public right of way is worrying and as you haven't decided where you would put the cabling crossing means yet again it is difficult to Traffic issues would be of great concern.</p>		<p>the ES along with all assumptions used [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
<p>BWT_FF_0033, BWT_FF_0034</p>	<p>Respondents stated that cables will now be installed across the vehicle entrances to the Eynsham Allotment Association site, (on the western side of Wharf Road, Eynsham). The respondents added that they are a plot-holder with an allotment there. The respondent concluded that they are therefore interested in the potential for disruption and loss of amenity if digging works block the access. The respondents also added that on the allotment side of the road there are large trees, and were concerned about how they will be affected by laying a trench close to their roots.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>During the detailed design stage of the cable routes, specific details of crossing and tree impacts would be considered. At this stage each & every driveway, track or tree conflict is not detailed. The COCP deals with the high-level protection and management mechanisms, which would be further elaborated upon at detailed design.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0015	Respondent stated that the red lines which specify the order limits in change 52 are so poorly drawn (around 15ft out to the east), that is appears the order runs under a small barn building. (which is not even marked on the map). The respondents stated further that among the fauna such as pipistrelle bats grass snakes, buzzards and occasional badgers,	No	Order Limits drawn to reflect the adopted highway boundary which were provided by Oxfordshire Country Council.
BWT_FF_0015	Respondent stated that given the fact that the same red line extending along the B4144 Cumnor Road is 15ft out to the East. The respondent added that in the 21st century, it is not that difficult to map things to the mm, which is concerning because they cannot help but wonder if the vagueness is intentional.	Yes	Order Limits drawn to adopted highway boundary which were provided by Oxfordshire Country Council.
BWT_FF_0017	Respondent asked if the plans have been changed because it is perceived to be easier to take on the Eynsham Allotments rather than Siemens.	Yes	The Applicant can confirm that this is not the reason for the change.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0018	Respondent stated that the inclusion of Denman's Lane will have significant environmental impact on the footpath and lane plus unacceptable noise impact and disruption for Cumnor residents over a long period, particularly those living in the immediate vicinity.	Yes	<p>The outline management measures proposed for affected PRow within the Project site are set out in the Outline PRow Management Strategy [EN010147/APP/7.6]. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g., NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project. This includes requirements for temporary closures and diversions of PRow during construction of the Project. The final measures will be included as part of the detailed PRow Management Strategy post-consent.</p> <p>The noise and vibration impact assessment set-out in Volume 1, Chapter 13 Noise and Vibration [EN010147/APP/6.3] shows that the Project will not cause any significant adverse effects from either the construction or operational phase</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0023	Respondent stated concern at the impact of change 50 to Wytham Woods in general and the university's research facility. The respondents added that this is a precious area of unspoilt, ancient environment that is both important as an amenity to local residents such as themselves and in the case of the university research facility, of global scientific importance.	Yes	<p>The effects of the Project on Ecology and Nature Conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3].</p> <p>No adverse effects are predicted in respect of Wytham Woods.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment provides a detailed assessment of the Project, and indicates the overall significance of effects, and mitigation measures being proposed. [EN010147/APP/6.3]</p>
BWT_FF_0036	Respondent stated they do not support the project, nor its changes. The respondent added that this is destruction of the countryside. The respondent added that they do not support the use of Denman's Lane or fields either side of it. The respondents added that the lane is used by walkers for recreation and access will be	No	Noted

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>denied temporarily. The respondent also stated that the fields either side of Denman's lane will no longer be pleasurable to walk down when the panels have been deployed.</p>		
BWT_FF_0067	<p>Respondent stated that they note that access to PROW 206/5 at the Allotments site will be affected by a cable route, according to the information change note. The respondents added that this will adversely impact the extremely important and much-used allotments location.</p> <p>The respondent added that they believe the proposal is to dig up on the allotment side of Wharf Road, where there are many mature trees, rather than the open grass verge on the Siemens side. The respondent added that they would assume based on this that the contractors will dig around the trees by hand to minimise root damage.</p> <p>The respondent concluded by requested that the contractors are</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>During the detailed design stage of the cable routes, specific details of crossing and tree impacts would be considered. At this stage each & every driveway, track or tree conflict is not detailed. The Outline CoCP deals with the high-level protection and management mechanisms, which would be further elaborated upon at detailed design.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	asked to minimise loss of vehicle access and safe parking at the allotments, assuming that putting cables through will disrupt vehicle access to either field.		
BWT_FF_0071	Respondent stated that the entire scheme is too big. The respondent added that however much boundaries are changed by metres, it's a horrific prospect for residents, wildlife, and environmental balance. The respondent concluded that they support solar power but the size has to be reduced.	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the need for Botley West Solar Farm [EN010147/APP/7.1] . The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES along with the reasoning for selecting the site and the scale of the project.
BWT_FF_0075	Respondent noted that the stated changes have not addressed any of the concerns raised in their feedback to the statutory consultation.	No	Noted

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0114	Respondent stated that they are still concerned about environmental impacts on species endemic to this area.	Yes	The impacts to ecology receptors are assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_FF_0124	Respondent stated that using those fields to host solar panels will ruin the visual appeal of the countryside and the walks, including ancient woodland. The respondent then stated that the natural habitat of species in the area should not be disrupted by the project.	Yes	The landscape and visual effects are assessed and reported in Chapter 8 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The effects of the Project on Ecology and Nature Conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3] . It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]
BWT_FF_0127	Respondent stated that destroying wildlife surrounding Wytham woods renowned all over the world is linked to the changes stated. The respondent stated that it is an enormous site	Yes	The effects of the Project on Ecology and Nature Conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3] . No adverse effects are predicted in respect of Wytham Woods.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0132	Respondent stated that map point 50 which is near where they live, will cause huge disruption whilst building works are carried out to bury cables. The respondent added that disrupting a major route into Oxford. The respondent also stated that there is no timescale for the disruption.	Yes	During the construction phase, disruption will be minimised as far as reasonable. An Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] is produced and includes a Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan. Construction impacts such as noise, air quality and transport have been considered. Impacts will be controlled by measures within the Outline Code of Construction Practice [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] (CoCP). A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Exact timescales for the completion of cabling works in certain areas is yet to be determined.
BWT_FF_0133	Respondent stated that the specified area is still too large and shouldn't be built.	Yes	The Applicant has produced a Planning Supporting Statement (PSS) which draws overall conclusions as to the planning balance in respect of the need for the Project [EN010147/APP/7.1] . The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES along with the reasoning for selecting the site and the scale of the project. [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
BWT_EF_0005	<p>Respondent raised concerns about the conservation area in relation to point 28. The respondent stated that access to the site runs roughshod through the bottom of Heath Lane which forms part of the Bladon conservation area. The respondent added that the volume to traffic, machinery and works will impact the historic character of the area.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of likely impacts and effects on the historic landscape and on the Bladon Conservation Area is presented within Chapter 7: Historic Environment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p> <p>More detailed assessment of the likely impacts and effects on the Bladon Conservation Area is set out within Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>
BWT_EF_0005	<p>The respondent challenged point 28 in terms of the Bladon community relying on its character to bring in tourism, many of them enjoying walking the footpaths while visiting Churchill's</p>	Yes	<p>Chapter 15: Socio Economics of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses the impact on the visitor economy, including users of Public Rights of Way, as a result of the Project. This assessment is informed by Chapter 12: Traffic and</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	grave and supporting local businesses (such as pubs).		Transport [EN010147/APP/6.3] , Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010147/APP/6.3] , Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3] and Appendix 7.4: Heritage Impact Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BWT_EF_0005	Respondent referred to Heath lane being a dead end and a very narrow street, heavy lorries and machinery will block the road which will cause potential risks to local residents getting to work but most notably challenges for emergency services.	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_EF_0005	Respondent stated that point 28 had challenges regarding surface water, with Oxfordshire County Council's Fix My Street having numerous reports of surface water running down Heath Lane to collapsed surface water drainage. The respondent stated that the solar farm and proposed works at the top of Heath lane will exacerbate an already problematic issue.	Yes	Whilst the Applicant notes this pre-existing flooding the proposed design of the site is to ensure no significant increase in flood risk on or off-site. The design of the Solar PV ensures that any water that would have fallen on to the land in the pre-existing baseline will continue to do so during the Project. A comprehensive literature review of how solar farms effect runoff and mitigation measures used during the design are outlined in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BWT_EF_0005	Respondent also addressed Bladon Heath Ecology, with the proposed sites encroaching into Bladon Heath which is home to diverse hedgerows and trees including various fruits. The respondent further stated that the community not only enjoys this recreationally but also the area provides a refuge for wildlife in the area.	Yes	Noted. The effects of the Project on Ecology and Nature Conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3] . Bladon Heath is not adversely affected.
BWT_EF_0005	Respondent stated that access to Bladon Woods is also as essential note to point 28. The respondent added that local residents enjoy and use the various foot paths at the top of Heath Lane, notably to the North East towards Oxford Airport and (South) Easterly route towards Cassington. The respondent added that this is important to the physical and mental health of local residents.	Yes	Chapter 16: Human Health of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses human health impacts (both physical and mental) as a result of the Project. Impacts on access to open green space is covered in great detail under the "Open space, leisure and play" determinant of the health assessment, which includes detailed assessment of health impacts as a result of changes to public rights of way. Chapter 15: Socio Economics of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] assesses the

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>impact on the visitor economy, including users of Public Rights of Way, as a result of the Project. This assessment is informed by Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [EN010147/APP/6.3], Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010147/APP/6.3], Chapter 16: Human Health [EN010147/APP/6.3] and Appendix 7.4: Heritage Impact Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p>
BWT_EF_0005	<p>Respondent stated that the UK atmospheric emissions inventory show Bladon as having 100 - 1995 Units tonnes/1x1km Carbon Dioxide as Corbon in the air, putting us in the amber zone, the works could put them at +1995 into the red zone.</p>	Yes	<p>Consideration has been given to the impact GHG emissions through construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases. As is consistent with the IEMA GHG EIA Guidance emissions have been contextualised against national carbon budgets and alignment with existing/emerging policy to achieve net zero carbon as presented within Vol 1, Chapter 14 Climate Change [EN010147/APP/6.3]. It is not for this application to comment on whether emissions would in isolation contribute to a change in the zones.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0017	Respondent stated that Denmans Lane is another area which will be damaged by the project, also falling within the Cumnor conservation area adopted in 2011 requiring additional considerations to development proposals.	Yes	An assessment of the likely impacts and effects on the Cumnor Conservation Area is set out within Appendix 7.5: Settings Assessment of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BWT_EF_0018	Respondent focused on change 50, specifically the "new large corridor" which comes very near to the boundary of the SSSI at Wytham Woods. The respondent added that the term "suitable mitigation measures in place", making light of the 'adverse environmental effects' in relation to this site. The respondent added that HDD and pipe ramming seem to be fairly disruptive mitigation measures in such a location.	Yes	The impacts to ecological receptors are assessed in the ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Wytham Woods is not adversely affected.
BWT_EF_0018	Respondent further stated that neither the actual route of the major cable run along the B4044 & B4017 nor the estimated timescale for the installation of the cables are mentioned. The respondent stated further that that installing the cable will have significant	Yes	A full assessment of traffic and transport is included within Chapter 12 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	adverse traffic consequences on both roads.		
BWT_EF_0032	Respondent noted that item 50 will remove previously expected impact on species rich grassland, so the change in the plans is welcome. The respondent added that the changes set out in this consultation do not address the matters raised in the original consultation. The respondent stated that there is insufficient evidence and detail to enable the true potential impact of the Botley West Solar Farm on the local natural environment. The respondent added that impact of the farm on wildlife cannot be overstated.	Yes	The effects of the Project on Ecology and Nature Conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3] . The proposals are also supported by an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] .
BWT_EF_0033	Respondent stated that this change shows a revised cable route running very close to Wytham Woods university research centre and SSSI.	Yes	The effects of the Project on ecology and nature conservation are assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology & Nature Conservation [EN010147/6.3] . Wytham Woods are not affected.
BWT_EF_0034	Respondent stated that 6 of the changes stating that there will be few	Yes	Th environmental effects of the Project are reported within the ES

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	"significant adverse environmental effects' are stated in a manner which does not state much confidence.		[EN010147/APP/6.3] . Mitigation Measures are included at Appendix 6.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5] and the in the Layout and Design Principles Document [EN010147/APP/6.5] itself referring to a number of management plans which themselves afford a variety of protective measures.
BWT_EF_0034	Respondent stated that the developer asserts that their proposed mitigations will make it unlikely that there are 'significant environmental effects'. The respondent added that given the lack of detail is in this consultation, as with the previous consultation, CPC is unable to assess the developers assertions, and so has a very low degree of confidence in the statements made.	Yes	Noted. Further detail is provided in the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Mitigation Measures are included at Appendix 6.1 [EN010147/APP/6.5] and the in the Layout and Design Principles Document [EN010147/APP/6.5] itself referring to a number of management plans which themselves afford a variety of protective measures.
BWT_EF_0074	Respondent stated that this would impact Bladon BR5, part of Shakespeare's Way and a very important route out of Bladon towards Begbroke and Yarnton over Bladon	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Heath and would cause considerable disruption to the residents of heath lane.		Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_EF_0083,	Respondent stated that particularly with the Southern Site, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies continue to be either under-played or ignored. The respondent added that it is still not clear how this proposal will comply with local plan and neighbourhood plan policies. The respondent concluded by stating that given the serious concerns outline by the Local Authorities' Landscape Team on the recent Red House Farm Proposal.	Yes	The Planning Supporting Statement [EN010147/APP/7.1] and its supporting appendices contains a full assessment of relevant Development Plan policy, including Neighbourhood Plans, and relevant National Policy Statements. Red House Solar Farm has, at the point of this application submission, been withdrawn.
BWT_EF_0085	Respondent stated it is clearly sensible to remove the historic and precious Long Mead water meadow from inclusion in the Southern Site, but the document presents no information on the alternative route, which is potentially of similar environmental value. The respondent added that without it this change cannot be claimed as beneficial.	Yes	Long Mead Meadow has been removed from within the Project site with the proposed HDD (Section 9.8) now to the north of the Swinford Crossing in order to ensure no impacts to the LWS. This is stated in Chapter 9: Ecology of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] , and Figure 5.5 [EN010147/APP/6.4]

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0093	Respondent stated that item 57 adds a long section of Denmans Lane, a key metalled public right of way from the heart of Cumnor village down into the Farmoor valley. The respondent added that the Lane is heavily used by residents of Cumnor and elsewhere for daily dog walks and rambling. The respondent added that this will ruin the enjoyment of people using the route.	Yes	Traffic and Transportation effects are identified and assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES along with all assumptions used [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_EF_0093	Respondent asked if developers after so much time to make plans, really have so little idea where they intend to put stuff in those fields. The respondent added that as it is a steep north facing slope unsuitable for solar panels, they should consider eliminating the fields either side of Denmans Lane from their proposals as they lie so close to Cumnor village, and are between protected woodlands.	Yes	The layout and design of the Project has evolved over a number of years responding to important environmental constraints. This evolution in layout is described in Chapter 5 of the ES [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_FPF_0002	Respondent stated that there are no indication of how long Denman's lane will be unavailable/ disturbed as cables are installed.	Yes	Traffic and Transportation effects are identified and assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES along with all assumptions used [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0002	Respondent stated that consideration has not been given to the toll gate at Eynsham with congestion. The respondent asked if compensation will be given to the houses on the road in Farmoor which go to Cumnor. The respondent concluded that residents have already been told their houses will be devalued.	Yes	. Traffic and Transportation effects are identified and assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES along with all assumptions used [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Traffic for the scheme is not being directed over the toll bridge. The effects of the proposed development on the value of property is not a material planning consideration.
BWT_FF_0135	Respondent stated that the changes will have a negligible effect on the local neighbourhood, particularly in the Southern Site.	No	Noted
BWT_EF_0024	Respondent stated concern for the impact on the road from Cumnor to Farmoor B4017 and specifically the village of Filchampstead, since it appeared at the presentations made at an earlier consultation that access to these sites would be via this road and not directly from the Eynsham Road (B4044). The respondent added that if the B4-44 was used instead, this would negate traffic to/from the sites	Yes	Traffic and Transportation effects are identified and assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES along with all assumptions used [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	via both Farmoor and Filchampstead, as well as Cumnor, since access via the A420 and B4044 would be sufficient.		
BWT_EF_0037	Respondent stated that the connection to the national grid is still ill conceived and not properly thought through. The respondent added that the change to avoid the ancient meadowland is welcomed but the option to now come downstream has a serious challenges and threatens to encroach land owned by Wytham Woods an area of SSI.	Yes	The impacts to ecological receptors are assessed in the ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . Wytham Woods is not adversely affected.
The Consultation Process			
BWT_FF_0001; BWT_FF_0009; BWT_FF_0010; BWT_FF_0095; BWT_EF_0034; BWT_EF_0038; BWT_FF_0015;	Respondents commented on the undertaking of the targeted consultation.	Yes	The Applicant's approach to consultation was consistent with the principles established in the SoCC, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010147/APP/5.1] .

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0085; BWT_FF_0087; BWT_FF_0088; BWT_FF_0091; BWT_FF_0093; BWT_FF_0094; BWT_FF_0063; BWT_FF_0070; BWT_FF_0063; BWT_FF_0076; BWT_FF_0019; BWT_EF_0085; BWT_EF_0083; BWT_EF_0071; BWT_EF_0067; BWT_EF_0051; BWT_EF_0025; BWT_EF_0059			
BWT_FF_0020	Respondent stated that the map on page 22 of the consultation shows just one footpath which connects Lower Road with Pinsley Wood.	No	Noted.
BWT_EF_0035	Respondent stated that the proposed amendments may affect the permit applications. The respondent added that it should be ensured that the	No	Noted.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	changes are factored into the permit application with the Thames area Consenting Team.		
BWT_EF_0048	Respondent stated that the consultation period stated to start on the 14th June to the 28th of July. The respondent added that they received notice of this is as a resident on the 19th of June.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The consultation was publicised through a range of methods, including placing a notice in local newspapers, emailing all parties that had registered or to be kept informed, and writing to properties consistent with commitments in the Applicant's SoCC. Materials were posted before the start of the consultation period.
General Feedback on the Targeted Consultation			
BWT_EF_0085, BWT_FF_0044, BWT_FF_0070, BWT_FF_0076, BWT_EF_0029, BWT_EF_0051, BWT_EF_0061	Respondents stated that they are disturbed by the destruction of hedgerows, often ancient, which is referred to throughout the document. The respondents added that this is unquantified, so there is no way to know whether the claimed 25.5km of new planting (location unspecified) is in any way equivalent. The respondents also asked how it will lead to a biodiversity net gain.	Yes	The impacts to hedgerows are assessed in the ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] , and the Hedgerow Removal Plan [EN/010147/APP/2.10] . The calculation of BNG is set out in Volume 3 Appendix 9.13 [EN010147/APP/6.5] . It is intended that the Project will have a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]</p> <p>The Defra Statutory BNG Metric has been used to demonstrate net gain.</p>
BWT_EF_0086	<p>Respondent stated that the booklet repeatedly refers to the effects to local population/land/wildlife of this project as being "not significant" and being temporary in nature. The respondent added that this is a subjective opinion and one which is given by someone who does not have to live among the construction, industrial infrastructure and transformed landscape. Respondent noted that the project is described as temporary but is in fact 40 years.</p>	Yes	<p>The Environmental Statement [EN010147/APP/6.3] has been prepared in line with IEMA guidelines, based on the Scoping Opinion received from PINS, and in line with the EIA Regulations. Volume 1, Chapter 4, Approach to Environmental Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.3] also describes how significance is judged.</p>
BWT_EF_0091	<p>Respondent stated that putting cabling under the Thames and towpath will be harmful wherever it is located, likely to destabilise the riverbank and increase</p>	Yes	<p>Pipelines and cables will be laid using trenchless techniques (e.g. HDD) which limits disruption above ground and allows clearance of important surface</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	<p>the risk of erosion of the towpath. The respondent added that the banks are already under increased pressure because of the increase in flooding events, making erosion more likely. The respondent stated furthermore that cable-laying is likely to exacerbate the situation, asking where the research on the topic is.</p>		<p>features. The impact of the cable route on flood risk and water quality including any required mitigation is set out in Volume 1:, Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
BWT_EF_0091	<p>Respondent cited the 25.5km of new hedgerow that would be planted, stating that the established and ancient hedgerows are important and require rigorous protection.</p>	No	Noted
BWT_EF_0091	<p>Respondent stated that one of the changes would adversely impact part of a popular circular walk from Woodstock which goes through a tunnel of trees and well-established hedges.</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>
BWT_EF_0091	<p>Respondent stated that one of the Bladon area changes would impact adversely impact part of Shakespeare's way and an important route between Bladon village, the</p>	Yes	<p>The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3].</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	Bladon Heath woodland, Begbroke and Yarnton.		
BWT_EF_0091	Respondent requested clarification of the impact that the work that the residents who live on either side of Heath Lane and Bladon.	Yes	Construction impacts (including dust and noise) will be managed in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice and its associated management plans. The CoCP is secured through a requirement of the DCO and will be agreed with the relevant planning authority. An Outline CoCP is included in the DCO application [EN010147/APP/7.6.1] .
BWT_EF_0093	Respondent stated that the removal of extensive but unspecified lengths of ancient hedgerows will significantly reduce biodiversity.	Yes	The impacts to hedgerows are defined and assessed in the ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] . A crossing schedule had been produced detailing planned crossing point by location, method and if applicable length of hedgerow lost [EN010147/APP/7.3.9] The total length of hedgerow to be removed is circa 622 m across 75 locations.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			However, there is still proposed to be 26.5km of new hedgerow planting, and 22km of hedgerow reinforcement / gapping up.
BWT_EF_0094	Respondent objected to limiting the access to the bridleway which were frequently used for running/walking. The respondent added that the damage to the ancient hedgerow would be a great blow to biodiversity, asking how this could be justified.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on agriculture, land use and rights of way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] The impacts to hedgerows are assessed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [EN010147/APP/6.3] .
BWT_EF_0097	Respondent stated that there are at least 13 modifications or temporary closures of Public Rights of Way. The respondent stated that this will have a big impact on the use of all footpaths and cycle tracks in the area. The respondent added that many footpaths are difficult to use during the winter months due to overuse and waterlogging so the cumulative impact of all these closures on the ability to use the footpath network will be huge.	Yes	The assessment of the effects of the Project on Agriculture, Land use and Public Rights of Way are presented in Chapter 17 of the ES - Agricultural Land Use and Public Rights of Way [EN010147/APP/6.3] .

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0098	Respondent asked how will the proposed site impact on the Blenheim World Heritage Site environs after the changes, including the impact on the Churchill grave site.	Yes	The likely impacts and effects on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site are assessed within Appendix 7.4: Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site - Heritage Impact Assessment [EN010147/APP/6.5] .
BWT_EF_0101	Respondent stated that nothing has been changed to reduce the flood risk to Cassington village and to the B4095 where it runs alongside the Evenlode, the respondent added that both areas were flooded last winter.	Yes	<p>Surface water modelling has been undertaken for the catchment area upstream and including Cassington. The results of which are detailed in Appendix 10.5: Surface Water Modelling Report [EN010147/APP/6.5]. The model report shows that flood depths may reach up to 0.5m during a modelled 100 year plus climate change event.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed to provide a betterment to surface water runoff and this is discussed in the Conceptual Drainage Strategy for the site within Volume 3 Appendix 10.2: Conceptual Drainage Strategy [EN010147/APP/6.5].</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_EF_0102	Respondent stated that on behalf of the Worton estate, they raise concerns regarding the groundworks and associated infrastructure of laying power cables will exasperate the already high flood risk to their site and obstruct important drainage ditches along the Cassington and Yarnton roads. The respondent concluded by stating that their own flood report supports this.	Yes	Pipelines and cables will be laid via trenchless techniques (e.g. HDD) which limits disruption above ground. The impact of the cable route on flood risk and water quality including any required mitigation is set out in Volume 1:, Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk.
BWT_FPF_0002	Respondent asked where the battery storage would be situated.	n/a	The Project does not include battery storage.
BWT_FPF_0002	Respondent stated that the big consultation reality in the Cumnor neighbourhood plant reporting on the vitality of the green fields has not been considered.	Yes	Comment unclear. If it is referring to ecological or landscape enhancements then the Applicant would refer the respondent to the Landscape, Ecology and Amenities plan [EN010147/APP/7.3.3] the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010147/APP/7.6.3] and the Project BNG report which demonstrates a gain of at least 70% Habitat BNG. Full details of the gain are set out in Appendix 9.13. [EN010147/APP/6.5]

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWT_FF_0007	Respondent stated that the changes seem sensible and proportionate in line with the feedback given.	No	Noted
BWT_EF_0013	Respondent stated that in spite of the changes proposed, the project will still have a negative impact on the farmland.	N	Noted
BWT_EF_0020	Respondent requested off lead dog walking to be made available on Blenheim estate to compensate for the loss of the quality walking routes.	N	Noted
BWT_EF_0067	Respondent stated that they live next to field 260, where the drainage channels in this area are already unable to cope with the water discharging from the fields.	Yes	Please refer ES Vol 1 Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk [EN010147/APP/6.3] . The proposed development is unlikely to exacerbate the situation, as it seeks to maintain the current hydrological regime.
BWT_EF_0070	Respondent stated that the footpath between fields 1.17 and 1.18 is flanked on either side with ancient trees and hedgerow which provides a natural biodiversity habitat and refuge to wildlife. The respondent asked why one footpath between fields 1.17 and 1.18 can be left untouched.	N	Noted

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWVT_EF_0017	Respondent stated that the Veteran tree consultation is inadequate. The respondent added that there were no dates or venues where questions regarding the veteran tree could be answered.	No	The Applicant invited questions to be submitted to their range of free-to-use communications lines.
Comments specific to the veteran tree			
BWVT_EF_0021, BWVT_EF_0024, BWVT_EF_0028; BWVT_EF_0030	Respondents believe that the advice published from the Woodlands Trust and Forestry England does not seem to be followed.	Yes	The veteran tree report does adopt the advice by FC and NE. Including appropriate buffer zones.
BWVT_EF_0005, BWVT_EF_0007	Respondents stated that they agree with/support the proposed changes regarding the veteran tree.	No	Noted
BWVT_EF_0004, BWVT_EF_0010	Respondents stated that they do not object to the proposed changed in principle.	No	Noted
BWVT_EF_0004, BWVT_EF_0028	Respondents stated that all veteran trees deserve protection. The respondent added that they query whether you understand the science behind the estimates for the amount of space the trees might need.	Yes	The veteran tree report does adopt the advice by FC and NE. Including appropriate buffer zones

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWVT_EF_0009	Respondent asked what is the distance from the trunk of the veteran tree to the new cable route now proposed. The respondent further added that if the exact route hasn't been decided what are the maximum and minimum distances from the tree.	Yes	Detailed cable routes and design will determine precisely how close the cable is to each veteran tree. The Project intends to protect veteran trees.
BWVT_EF_0009	Respondent asked why a route south of the cable route was not chosen. The respondent stated that at present the route north of the tree has been chosen, squeezed against the protected area of Bladon Heath.	Yes	Detailed cable route location design will determine precisely how close the cable is to trees, hedgerow or woodland.
BWVT_EF_0012	Respondent stated that cabling should not be going anywhere near veteran trees.	No	Noted
BWVT_EF_0015	Respondent highlighted both Forest England and the Forestry Commission and Woodland Trust operate a root protection zone of a minimum of 5 metres beyond the tree canopy of all veteran trees. The respondent added that if the cable routes disregard this guidance, they will endanger the veteran oak tree that is the subject of this consultation as well as numerous	Yes	One of the key principles is to avoid loss of trees, directly or indirectly. The Project has been designed with that in mind. Protection measures are built in and can be found in the Mitigation Measures schedule [EN010147/APP/6.6] Volume 3, Appendix 6.1, the Layout and Design Principles document

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	other veteran trees on Bladon/Worton Heath.		<p>[EN010147/APP/7.7] which itself refers to various management plans designed to achieve the same ends.</p> <p>Detailed cable route design will determine precisely how close the cable is to each veteran tree. All designs and protection methods will acknowledge the recognised FC / NE guidance.</p>
BWVT_EF_0016	Respondent stated that no action must be taken that could in the slightest threaten the veteran oak tree in question nor damage the root systems of other established veteran trees in the vicinity as well as the one that is the subject of this consultation.	Yes	Agreed. Veteran trees will be protected.
BWVT_EF_0014	Respondent believes that the new cable route options would take the cable too close to the veteran tree in question and would cause serious and unacceptable damage to the root system.	Yes	<p>One of the key principles is to avoid loss of trees, directly or indirectly. The Project has been designed with that in mind. Protection measures are built in and can be found in the Mitigation Measures schedule</p> <p>[EN010147/APP/6.6] Volume 3, Appendix 6.1, the Layout and Design Principles document</p> <p>[EN010147/APP/7.7] which itself refers</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			<p>to various management plans designed to achieve the same ends. Detailed cable routes and design will determine precisely how close the cable is to each veteran tree. All designs and protection methods will acknowledge the recognised FC / NE guidance.</p>
BWVT_EF_0017	<p>Respondent stated that: "the radius of the larger black circle is at best misleading and wrong the radius of the yellow circle is insufficient to protect the roots the distance from the small black circle to the double blue line is also too small to protect the roots the canopy reaches beyond the yellow circle and even beyond the proposed cable trench. If the boundary red line on the southerly side is to be fenced at this point, the fencing and its supporting structure below ground will also damage the tree"</p>	Yes	<p>One of the key principles is to avoid loss of trees, directly or indirectly. The Project has been designed with that in mind. Protection measures are built in and can be found in the Mitigation Measures schedule [EN010147/APP/6.6] Volume 3, Appendix 6.1, the Layout and Design Principles document [EN010147/APP/7.7] which itself refers to various management plans designed to achieve the same ends. The proper guidance provided by Natural England and Forestry England has been applied, relating to suitable buffers.</p>

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
BWVT_EF_0018	Respondent stated that Forestry England recommends the implementation of a root protection zone, marking a minimum of 5 metres beyond the canopy around every veteran tree. The respondent also voiced concerns regarding the impact of compacted soil from infrastructure around Veteran Trees.	Yes	One of the key principles is to avoid loss of trees, directly or indirectly. The Project has been designed with that in mind. Protection measures are built in and can be found in the Mitigation Measures schedule [EN010147/APP/6.6] Volume 3, Appendix 6.1, the Layout and Design Principles document [EN010147/APP/7.7] which itself refers to various management plans designed to achieve the same ends.
BWVT_EF_0019	Respondent stated that a larger black circle may be a misleading attempt to represent the veteran tree's canopy. And the yellow circle may be intended to represent an area sufficient to protect the tree routes from cable trench digging. The respondent stated that they believe it is not of sufficient radius to achieve this.	Yes	One of the key principles is to avoid loss of trees. The Project has been designed with that in mind. Protection measures are built in and can be found in the Mitigation Measures schedule [EN010147/APP/6.6] Volume 3, Appendix 6.1, the Layout and Design Principles document [EN010147/APP/7.7] which itself refers to various management plans designed to achieve the same ends.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			The proper guidance provided by Natural England and Forestry England has been applied, relating to suitable buffers.
BWVT_EF_0021	Respondent stated that although the veteran tree proposal seems reasonable, the proposal does not go far enough. The respondent then went on to detail the environmentally negative impact of the project.	No	Noted.
BWVT_EF_0025	Respondent stated that the veteran tree is important.	No	Noted and agreed.
BWVT_EF_0026	Respondent stated that they are a member of the Woodlands Trust and they recommend a Root Protection Area (RPA) with a radius which is 15 times the diameter of a veteran tree. The respondent added that this is supported by standing advice from the government which suggests at least 15 time the tree's diameter or 5m from the edge of the tree's canopy whichever is the larger. Furthermore, the fine roots and mycorrhizal networks stretch even further. The respondent believes the	Yes	One of the key principles is to avoid loss of trees. The Project has been designed with that in mind. Protection measures are built in and can be found in the Mitigation Measures schedule [EN010147/APP/6.6] Volume 3, Appendix 6.1, the Layout and Design Principles document [EN010147/APP/7.7] which itself refers to various management plans designed to achieve the same ends.

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
	cables would still damage/incur upon the tree.		
BWVT_EF_0028	Respondent stated that there is a significant number of other mature oak trees in the locality of Worton Heath/Bladon Heath ancient woodland and it is likely that similar damage could be caused to these veteran trees in addition to the tree that is the subject of this consultation.	Yes	One of the key principles is to avoid loss of trees, veteran or otherwise. The Project has been designed with that in mind. Protection measures are built in and can be found in the Mitigation Measures schedule [EN010147/APP/6.6] Volume 3, Appendix 6.1, the Layout and Design Principles document [EN010147/APP/7.7] which itself refers to various management plans designed to achieve the same ends.
BWVT_EF_0028	Respondent stated that they believe the proposed cabling route would cause significant damage to other trees,	Yes	One of the key principles is to avoid loss of trees. The Project has been designed with that in mind. Protection measures are built in and can be found in the Mitigation Measures schedule [EN010147/APP/6.6] Volume 3, Appendix 6.1, the Layout and Design

ID Code	Comments	Has this been addressed by a change to the Project or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant Response
			Principles document [EN010147/APP/7.7] which itself refers to various management plans designed to achieve the same ends.