

I am concerned that the applicant has failed to submit much of the evidence requested, that there are apparently so many unanswered questions, and that reasonable requests for adjustments to their plans have been either dismissed or ignored.

I would like to repeat that a project of this size should not be located so close to communities. There are a great many areas of the country where something on this scale would have significantly less impact on the lives of so many. If there are genuine reasons why this project should be in this location, other than the willingness for the landowners in question to profit, then the current proposals are still significantly too large and in many areas much too close to housing. This issue has been raised many times by individuals, experts and by council authorities, but as far as I can tell very little changes have been made to the proposed boundaries. For example, figures 1.27 and 1.28 from the recent visual assessment clearly shows the zone of theoretical visibility pushing right up to the properties on the north west of Cassington village. A simulated image of this view from the village was notably missing from the applicants earlier consultation presentations.

The fields slope down towards the houses on this side of the village and the current proposed panel positions will dominate the skyline. I cannot believe this can be either justifiable or acceptable.

The footpaths we enjoy will be surrounded by panels. The suggested mitigation measures will just turn the footpaths into tunnels with little or no views of the countryside.

In addition to the significant impacts on communities, experts have many other concerns regarding impacts on the environment, flood risk, wildlife, archaeology and the loss of arable land amongst others.

I am not in a position to offer any quantifiable opinion on these, but I can tell you that prior to the changes the applicants have already made around our village, in anticipation of the approval of this project, there were working farms which have been growing and harvesting crops for generations, which I believe clearly contradicts the applicants claim that this land is 'poor'.

I strongly believe these fields should be kept for food production, contributing to the food security of our country, and for the enjoyment, leisure and exercise of our communities. Loss of this land for food production, and the consequential loss of the way of life and essential character of these communities is nothing short of criminal.

In conclusion, I urge those responsible for the approval of the proposed project to give serious consideration to the impact of a project of this scale on communities.

It is too big and too close.