



**From:** Botley West Solar Farm <[BotleyWestSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:BotleyWestSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 3, 2024 6:32 PM  
**To:** RELewis [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Botley West Solar Farm <[BotleyWestSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:BotleyWestSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: Botley West Solar Farm Project Ref: EN010145

Dear Rosemary,

Thank you for your email, I'm glad you found my previous email useful.

Our [advice note 14](#) sets out further information about the Applicant's consultation report, which will be submitted as part of the application documents. An applicant's consultation report should include information and evidence about:

- Who was consulted and how the consultation was carried out;
- how, and when, the project was publicised; and
- how the responses were taken into account.

I appreciate you have indicated that you have already contacted the Applicant, but I would reiterate the advice previously given by George that we would encourage you to continue to raise any concerns about the developer's pre-application consultation with the developer (I believe George has already provided contact details for them, however do let me know if you need these re-sent).

If you have contacted the developer but you are not satisfied that they have, or will, take account of your comments, you can make your comments to the relevant local authority. The Planning Inspectorate will request the relevant local authorities' view on the adequacy of the developer's consultation when the application is submitted. The application is expected to be submitted before the end of September 2024.

Should the application be accepted for Examination, you will be able to register as an Interested Party by submitting a Relevant Representation. This must be submitted on the 'Registration and Relevant Representation form' which will be made available on the project webpage of the National Infrastructure Planning website at the appropriate time. Further information about registering as an Interested Party can be found in the Planning Inspectorate's 'Advice Note 8.2: How to register to participate in an Examination' which can be found here: [Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects - Advice Note 8.2: how to register to participate in an Examination - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-note-82-how-to-register-to-participate-in-an-examination)

You may also find it helpful to subscribe to receive email notifications for key events that occur after the application has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate: [Get updates | Botley West Solar Farm \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](https://www.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/get-updates/)

The Planning Inspectorate has a duty to publish all advice given on the project webpage under s51 of the Planning Act 2008. Therefore, we will publish this advice, alongside your enquiry, on the Botley West webpage in due course.

Best wishes

Kind regards

Caroline

*She/Her*



The Planning  
Inspectorate

**Caroline Hopewell | NSIP Case Manager (please note I  
work part time, my working days are Tuesday – Friday)**

The Planning Inspectorate

T [REDACTED]

**From:** RELewis [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 1, 2024 9:41 PM  
**To:** Botley West Solar Farm <[BotleyWestSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:BotleyWestSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Re: Botley West Solar Farm Project Ref: EN010145

Dear Caroline

Thank you so much for your prompt and comprehensive reply and for clarifying that the Inspectorate's inability to host digital plans relates to interactive plans only.

Nevertheless, the lack of maps at sufficient scale that were available in either hard copy or online form at the Statutory Consultation was a serious shortcoming affecting people's ability to understand the overall size of the proposal and the vast amount of panels and related infrastructure (inverters, sub-stations, fencing, security lighting, construction compounds, etc, etc) which were all almost impossible to distinguish. This has already been pointed out to the Applicant. Furthermore, NO masterplan maps were available at community access points and many of the online files could not be opened and kept crashing due to their size - even after the developer split some files into smaller sections.

Despite the unprecedented scale of this proposal, at every point, the Applicant has complied to only the minimum legal requirements in terms of publicity, locations and documents and there remains a serious concern about the ability of the many affected communities to access the ES files and maps in sufficient detail.

We now learn, from the meeting note of 13 March 2024, that:

*“The Applicant informed that as a result of consultation feedback, changes were being proposed to the red line boundary which includes removing cable options and including a new route, all of which the Applicant informed the Inspectorate it planned to undertake further targeted consultation on shortly. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to ensure an explanation is provided in the Consultation Report in due course as to why the consultation was targeted as opposed to full.”*

I'm wondering why the Applicant is only being asked by PINS to explain the targeted consultation “in due course”. **Changing the red line boundary for the cable route is a matter of serious concern to all consultees. Who is being consulted? Can the Applicant not be required to carry out a full consultation now? Is the local community not entitled to see the red line changes immediately?**

The Adequacy of Consultation report currently in production by West Oxfordshire District Council will illustrate many other shortcomings in terms of missing information, inadequate maps and limited access opportunities for many of the 11,000 affected households living within 1.5km of the red line boundary.

A statement by PVDP's spokesman during a Radio Oxford interview (Sophie Law Breakfast Show, 26 October 2023) promised that the PEIR's non technical summary “is the key document that explains every single thing we're going to do on this site from the panels to the community agriculture.”

This demonstrably didn't happen, yet we are now expected to believe their latest statement that “it will all be in the final Environmental Statement (ES) when the DCO Application is submitted.” But can we really trust them to do this?

It does seem that the process is stacked in the Applicant's favour and I would welcome your advice on what is the most effective thing we can do effect the outcome. Writing to the Applicant has already shown itself to be a waste of time!

Kind Regards  
Rosemary

*Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.*

*Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.*

*The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.*

DPC:76616c646f72

