

Email dated 12/12/2023 11:02am

To: NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Submission for Gunning Solar Farm.

Application Number SSD-46668486

Assessment Type State Significant Development

Development Type Electricity Generation - Solar

Local Government Areas Upper Lachlan Shire

I object to the proposed development based on the following:

The proposed solar farm takes up a substantial percentage of the total land area of our suburb of Lade Vale. To date we have seen proposals for compensation of a maximum of \$1000 per year. I note that there was mention it may increase but nothing more has been communicated to me. Considering the small number of nearby properties that are in the 1km distance and that the proposed solar farm is classed as a major project this proposed compensation is not sufficient to offset against:

1. Probable substantial reduction in land values near the solar farm. I would not buy land near a solar or wind farm / PowerStation;
2. Risk of lithium battery fires and should any fire start inside the solar farm they are usually very difficult to control and that is a risk to our properties. Lithium batteries often catch fire and release chemicals and toxic gas;
3. Change to the rural landscape, the solar farm will change the area from beautiful cattle grazing land to industrial power generation facility with cables and solar panels and these facilities look very unsightly and people may not want to live there anymore;
4. Large solar farms may affect temperatures creating a heat island affect;
5. Soil degradation under the solar panels, studies have found soil reduces water absorption capability over time;
6. Will the solar farm emit light at night? Could it impact stargazing activities? ;
7. Dust - will settle on houses and contaminate drinking water ;
8. Noise levels are unknown to us. We know there would be noise during construction but we don't know about the noise during operation.
9. Risk of contaminants getting into soil and water courses if solar panels and batteries are destroyed by hail or fire.

There is a cost to the local land owners for all these issues. I object because it seems currently the cost is not being met by the project owner: \$250 ~ \$1000 a year does not cover this and does not seem like a serious offer.

Any major project must directly benefit the local population in a worthwhile way and local property owners need to be in a position where they benefit directly in a worthwhile way and be compensated so that they are in as good or better position than they are without the project. I can only approve of projects that provide sufficient benefit to local land owners and not leave them in a worse position.