

It seems to me that PVDP's attitude to the questions of the Examining Authority and the legitimate concerns expressed by interested parties is one of pure arrogance. I cannot see how the Examiners can recommend this project nor indeed how the Secretary of State can approve it, given the flaws and missing evidence in the applicant's case. PVDP's sketchy Residential Visual Amenity Assessment is a case in point. PVDP state that having ranks of solar panels only metres from homes is acceptable. Well, they would say that wouldn't they? A gap of at least 250m should be mandatory. Similarly PVDP's insistence that landscape impacts would be insignificant are just nonsense. The Oxfordshire Host Authorities put forward some sensible recommendations for mitigating landscape impact and visual amenity loss. I cannot see how PVDP can justify taking so much agricultural land out of food production. This is just short-sighted, when we have a growing population and food security in an increasingly dangerous world is a serious issue. PVDP hide behind the claim that the solar "farm" is temporary. In reality, I suspect this will prove illusory. Decommissioning plans are incomplete. The proposed community food-growing is a red herring, as it appears to be a commercial exercise and the local community is well-served by allotments already. Finally I am still deeply suspicious of the funding for this project. Nothing is transparent. A few individuals are likely to benefit financially to an extraordinary degree, while local communities will have to cope with the environmental degradation for at least a generation.