

29 July 2023

Director
Energy Assessments,
Development Assessment
Department of Planning and Environment
Locked Bag 5022
PARRAMATTA NSW 2124

Dear Director,

Re: Objection to Application No.SSD-8911 by Sundown Solar Pty Ltd

I object in the strongest possible terms to the development of this 'solar farm' from first sod turning.

In the first instance, the fire hazard is real. I am aware of the frequency of fires at 'solar farm' sites. There is a shorter route available to this particular site, which is being ignored under the guise of saving biodiversity, yet would save emergency services travelling an extra 13-14kms (whilst at the same time, the biodiversity of the solar panel area is sacrificed – a double standard.) All rural landowners understand that time is of the essence in regard to fires, particularly in wind swept areas, which this is, as there is a wind farm within sight, up on the mountain range to the east. Couple the initial bush fire hazard with toxic smoke from the explosion of batteries or ignition of electrical equipment and there is an environmental pollution issue, which we cannot find remedy for within the documentation for the development. How will this be mitigated, controlled, cleaned up, guaranteed that the site will be deemed usable beyond the 35 year lifespan of the development, particularly in light of the approx. 100 year agricultural use that the site has already served? How is the entire Macintyre River Catchment protected from irreversible pollution? How will these fires be fought? Does the general population know that they could be exposed to toxic compounds? I have experience in broad acre agriculture and crops can be damaged by spray 30kms away from the spray site. Fires and explosions don't usually wait for the dew point to be correct before activating.

Secondly, it appears that water, for 'panel washing' and, we assume, reduction of site dust after soil cover is removed for the building process, will be procured from Kings Creek – a creek which runs dry frequently. It is stated that the company will have access to other sources of farm water within a 5km radius of the site – in other words, from other landowner's supply for their own businesses purposes, which are wholly disconnected from the enterprise that is Sundown Solar. In any other setting, this would be deemed as theft.

Thirdly, the fragmentation and total disturbance of the neighbourhood. Host landowners have been contracted to silence regarding finer details of the proposal creating questions about the integrity of the whole development, as neighbours who traditionally would discuss major events with one another are disabled from doing so. The noise created and the interference to primary production practices of the area are being forced on those that live there, and the cut to property valuation and increases in insurance premiums, will be felt by them, not by Sundown Solar.

I note that Senator Gerard Rennick has been questioning CSIRO over costings of 'renewable' projects and the modelling utilised has cost factors missing. This works in the investor's favour, since the Australian population is kept in the dark regarding the truth and how much they will have to pay for generations to come. Meanwhile, Australia will continue to export its coal (and gas) to other countries, which they will burn, to the strength of their own economies, while Australia pretends it is saving the planet. What happens to our energy situation when shipping lanes are closed, or Australia can no longer import solar panels? Will Sundown Solar have special permission to continue their enterprise somehow?

Purported 'renewables' for base load power will be the destruction of the nation.

Sincerely