

Response to submissions made at D5

With a proposed development of this magnitude and the far reaching consequences for thousands of households as well as the Oxfordshire landscape significant concerns remain:

the number of incomplete plans and the delay in providing important details requested by the Inspectorate (some until after the DCO decision)

The delay in publication of the "Change 2 request" document

Inadequate consideration of flood risk especially in light of increased rainfall expected as a result of changes in the climate.

The refusal to make changes in areas most significant to landscape character.

The continuing issue of "one size fits all" solution to hedging.

Concerns remain regarding lack of provision for management of PRow and their maintenance.

The absence of detail on waste types and the management route required for replacement of panels.

There remains concern regarding minerals safeguarding.

Only minimal removal of panels in areas most affected: roads, residences, PRow, the character of the landscape.

In light of environmental concerns The Applicant appears to be relying on the temporary nature of the scheme. However, a major concern remains the likelihood of the supposedly temporary site becoming permanent, derelict and the soil contaminated. There does not appear to be detailed assurance of sufficient funds to enable safe decommissioning at the end of the operational lifespan of the scheme.

Regarding biodiversity, claims are made that are not substantiated, therefore not verifiable, concerning protection of arboriculture and archaeological sites and heritage assets, flora, fauna, bat and skylark populations.

No one can doubt that we need to source alternative energy solutions but a balance is essential to ensure the advantages are not outweighed by the cost.