

Planning Services  
Department of Planning and Environment  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

Attention: Director - Resources and Energy Assessment

Dear Sir/Madam

#### OBJECTION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SPRINGDALE SOLAR FARM

I object to the development of the Springdale Solar Farm at Sutton NSW. The proposed development is neither a farm or is its land use consistent with rural land use value of the surrounding Sutton area. In addition, so-called community benefits will be limited to the owner of the land — for the rest of the community there will be costs.

#### *Not environmentally or community friendly*

Imported solar panels, switching gear, steel framing and concrete all brought into the region by truck is not 'environmentally friendly'. The use of heavy equipment during the construction phase and the proposed security fence will dramatically impact on wildlife, including turtles and skinks.

The construction and the operational phase will significantly impact on the amenity value of the local area. Personally I am horrified at increase in heavy vehicles movements. Tallagandra Lane is already heavily used by trucks and regional traffic. For example, on Saturday 11 August, we had up to 6 trucks — included trucks and dogs as well as tippers — continuously bringing in fill to be dumped in Tallagandra Lane between 7am and 1pm.

Sutton Chatter (May 2018) reported that we will get a lot more of that heavy traffic.

*The developers of the proposed Springdale Solar development have confirmed that there will be, "Up to approximately 75 heavy vehicle movements per day during the peak material delivery period...". More than twice as many as initially advised... It should also be recognised that these heavy vehicle movements are on top of the already advised up to 400 light vehicle movements per day to and from the site... On top of this are up to 400 light vehicle movements per day.*

What else will they underestimate? The noise of this traffic and the continual use of compression braking of the heavy vehicles will be unacceptable. The impact on the roads will be devastating: these are not arterial roads and not even rated as regional roads for maintenance by the council. The roads are narrow, and are not designed for this type of traffic.

#### *No economic benefits for NSW or the local community*

This proposal is made possible by an agreement made with the ACT Government to purchase green power and by access to subsidies ultimately paid for by taxpayers. This is clearly a case where the ACT Government wants to outsource its need for green power to an interstate location and avoid previous issues with developments within the ACT.

The proposal relies on subsidy and government purchasing and is not market-based. The Renewable Energy Target will close in 2020 and beyond that — these types of power stations will rely on

renewable energy certificates until they close in 2030. With larger-scale energy certificates covering up to **40 per cent** of the capital costs now<sup>1</sup> — the financial sustainability of the proposal relies heavily on maintenance of current subsidies and policy settings.

All the materials and services will be imported into region. We also know that there is a shortage of construction workers in the ACT and the region — so the required labour will also be imported. Those employed will live and spend their money in the ACT — with none of the benefits foreshadowed in the development application.

We do however expect local residents to bear long-term economic costs. A recent study by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage titled *Review of the Impact of Wind Farms on Property Values* concluded that the impact of wind farms on property values would be minimised if their location was confined to areas with larger farms. As these facilities get closer to towns and smaller residential blocks, the impact was likely to be larger. It just this larger farm is surrounded by smaller block holders.

While personally, my property does not have a direct line-of-sight to the proposed power station, it will be negatively impact by increased traffic levels over the construction and operational phases. I emphasise with those residents who are adjacent to the development.

#### *Conclusion*

I believe that the application underestimates project costs and overstates benefits. The development would have minimal economic benefit for NSW but significant costs in terms of disruption and loss of amenity in the Sutton area. Such a development should be located in the ACT where the requirement for such a facility is.

Yours faithfully

Derek Quirke  
587 Mulligans Flat Rd  
Sutton NSW 2620  
dquirkecie@gmail.com  
28/08/2018

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.todaesolar.com.au/resources/news/2018-budget-confirms-2020-cliff-solar-subsidies-businesses-hurry-get-projects-pipeline/>