

In taking the position that their initial assessments are correct and not listening to the views of local people, the applicants have both disrespected the expertise of other parties and missed opportunities to mitigate negative impacts.

As a resident of Cassington, I remain concerned about the increased risk of flooding to village properties as set out by the hydrology report commissioned by the parish council. The deleterious affects on mental wellbeing, public amenity, visual impact, wildlife and heritage expressed by so many local residents and participants in the Forever Fields exhibition have been minimised, rather than understood. These views could have been taken into account by the applicants to reduce the scale of the proposal and to reduce the proximity of solar arrays from residents' homes and PRoW's, but no such respect has been paid. More modern ways of combining solar panels with farming and nature could have been considered, but these would presumably lead to less intensive energy production than carpeting 11 miles of countryside and 15 human settlements in arrays and potentially more modest profits.

The decommissioning and re-instatement plan is vague and uncosted, raising doubts that the applicant has any interest or intention of restoring the land to its previous condition and use, despite the promise that the proposal is 'temporary'. I can only conclude that setting aside funds for decommissioning is unpalatable to the developer's single motivation to make profits and this indicates their lack of seriousness about their duty of care to the environment.

Yes, we need a 'green' transition and renewable energy is vital to this country. However, we need the right projects in the right places at the right times, with the right motivation. There are many important demands on our land, not least food production, flood protection, bio-diversity, housing and public amenity. Just because a giant solar farm could be built does not mean it should be built at the cost of all other land uses. The well-researched and democratically supported energy plan for Oxfordshire does not require this proposal and has been making good progress without it. Proper community involvement in the development of infrastructure is critical to sustainable long-term outcomes. A national surplus of solar energy that ultimately cannot be deployed, is not in the national interest. The applicants have not demonstrated that this proposal is strategically justified. Neither have they shown the capability or motivation to be good custodians of such a large area of land with which thousands of residents identify and care deeply about. This application should be refused.