

## **I object to the Sandy creek solar farm on several grounds.**

Excessive foot print, at a cost to farming

Fire and insurance

Buffer zone

Feral animals

Lifespan

Income security

Jobs

Visual and Noise pollution, Health

Property prices.

Remediation requirements

1. The incredible amount of land that solar farms require reduces our capacity to feed ourselves and the animals we grow to feed us and other countries. We cannot continue to use up good farming land for **expensive, poor quality, inefficient generation of electricity**. The Paris agreement clearly states, that countries must not use food production land for the purpose of solar electricity production, so we **are going against the Paris agreement here** to start with. The use of Chinese manufactured Panels (**that is slave labour in China**) does not improve the cost effectiveness of the solar factory either, and then there is the Government (**tax payer**) **subsidising the project** supposedly for cheap electricity. If renewable energy is so cheap, **why does the tax payer subsidise it? The carbon foot print of all renewables is much greater than we are led to believe, and is therefore NOT GREEN. It appears that it is OK for companies to participate in vandalism of our rural lifestyle and landscape for the use of cities who demand 'Green' energy. It is environmental vandalism!**
2. Solar farms are frequently catching on fire, fires cause incredible amount of stock and wild life losses not to mention infrastructure and human loss.  
Battery fires burn for days and reignite themselves, so they are not safe in any environment! The EIS states there would be 50,000 Lt water tank for the onsite use of workers who will be accommodated there at the site. They are going to need to refill that tank frequently for the 350 workers if they are to shower each day!  
The 20,000 Lt water tank for emergency firefighting will see them in very short supply for fighting fire, when a domestic home in the rural NSW must have minimum 30,000Lt available for fire at their property for use of Fire fighters, so the 20,000 Lt tank is nowhere near what would be required for a large-scale solar factory covering so many acres.  
It should also be a requirement for solar farm operators to have an independent inspection of the integrity of all solar panels at least once a year. This may reduce the risk of fires from faults within the system.  
There is also the problem of farmers not being able buy **sufficient public liability insurance** if any, to cover the industry thrust into their neighbourhood. This will be a major issue if fire breaks out, and will bankrupt many farmers. Again, causing loss of production of our food!

Again, this goes against the **Paris agreement which states these renewable energy farms should not threaten food production.**

It is worth noting here that fire fighters in some areas are declaring they will not enter the site of wind and solar farms as they are not sufficiently equipped (wind tower fire) they are **volunteers** and they risk being entrapped in solar farm fire due to high fencing and insufficient room to manoeuvre, also lack of water supply endangering their lives as **VOLUNTEERS**. And why should they put their lives at risk for an industry they did not want in their area, has taken farming land, taken money from their local economy, destroyed the amenity of the landscape and their enjoyment of their land.

3. 50 Mt buffer zone from the creek to protect the wild life in the creek, what about the heat island effect for neighbours? should there not also be a 50 mt buffer on the boundary fences of neighbour properties? Should there not be a legislated buffer zone from Electromagnetic fields, the Jury is out on this subject, and we can only go by WHO recommendations, which places residences near some of these solar farms too close. What about the other wild life on the property? they don't matter?
4. Wild pigs move the heaviest traps and can drag them many metres, shocking those tasked with trapping the animals, so a chain mesh fence is not going to keep them out. Solar farms are going to increase the feral population of some animals as the natural predators will be kicked off the land for the solar farm, they will move on and cause more expense for the existing farming communities, because they have to direct their time money and energy to kill or trap them just so they can produce an income for their family. **Perhaps the host of the solar farm should pay for these costs to community as they are the reason for the increase in feral animals being, Foxes, rabbits, wild, dogs, pigs etc.**
5. The project is supposed to have a life span **of 40 years**, everyone knows this is **misleading** information, as solar panels last 25 to 30 years.
6. Income security for whom? Not for the local community, they lose a farmer producing upward of 500,000.00 per year, who then spends his/her income in the area.

The solar farm will supposedly produce up 1,000,000.00 but precious little, if any will go back into the local economy. **There is NO gain financially for the local community.**

7. There are no local jobs on solar farms, the companies bring in their own from overseas to erect the solar farm, they dry hire machinery for the work, which gets mistreated and abused by **the overseas workers**, also the imported workers do not have the English language skills to assist with smooth running of the job, or to maintain the machinery on site, they also have no respect for the local communities and their property. **This damage to property results in increased cost of the solar farm, which then is passed onto the electricity consumer, thus more expensive electricity.**  
At the completion of the work there may be a handful of jobs IF there are any trained persons to do the work.
8. Ongoing noise from the construction to the commissioned Solar farm will bring enormous change to the farming community. An extra 100 vehicle movements per day, plus machinery including pile drivers while construction takes place, over a 2 year period, is an invasion of

farming life, where there may be occasional tractor, truck, motorbike and header or farm animals going about their usual day. This extra noise invasion will impact the health and well being of some people who have not ever been subjected to ongoing noise pollution. For me, noise pollution is anything that was not and has not normally been there, yesterday or the week before!

The Visual pollution is also up in the top causes with Noise pollution, of mental health problems for affected nearby farmers, people who live in the country do not share the same perception of the scenery out their window or from their veranda as city people, that is why they live and work in the country!

**Mental health issues are not addressed by the developers, they shrug their shoulders when someone asks for help, or mentions suicide! NOTHING TO SEE HERE!**

**No Machine can measure an individual's perception of the level of noise before it becomes irritating to that individual, causing loss of sleep, which in turn causes health issues, including heart attack, or mental issues including suicidal thoughts.**

**A machine cannot measure an individual's perception of their vista, that is personal to that individual, also, a photo depiction of the site with the solar farm drawn on it does NOT show a true representation of the vista after construction. It is a computer model! NOT ACTUAL VISION, perceived by an individual. Comparing rural vista to a world-famous icon e.g., Sydney harbour bridge, to grade it as mildly affected or lowly affected by vision of a Solar farm is just disgraceful! This is NO comparison for an individual's perception of where they live in rural NSW.**

There will be more litigation by landowners as we continue to smother our landscape with renewable factories, vandalising the environment, reducing enjoyment, and lifestyle.

I note that health was an issue in the survey response, it's disgraceful that the developers don't talk the locals or don't listen to the locals showing they don't care about the locals. The developers show the same disregard for the wildlife, claiming not to know they existed (which shows the poor investigation undertaken by the developer) or they stare into space when asked, about a species.

9. Property prices. This is also a very concerning issue, the developers say they don't know or unaware of this as an issue, because they choose to ignore information readily available to them. **Property prices currently are dropping by up to 40% for near neighbours and down to 10% for lesser near neighbours. But no, these developers bury their head in the sand, and put their hand out for the carbon credits and subsidies, and say too bad, we are building it anyway!** Millions lost in land values by neighbours are dollars lost in the economy.

10. **Requirements for remediation are quite inadequate**, there should be demands on the developers to have a trust fund set up with the funds in the trust before the development begins. Just as Mining companies do.

It has been suggested that the developers could not afford to have the funds in a trust prior to development, I suggest then, **they should not be building the renewable farm!** The risk is that farms are sold to another company, this company goes broke and then is unable to foot the bill for remediation. The tax payer pays the bill again! Adding More expense to their electricity bills. A trust fund set up prior would mitigate this risk.

Jeanette Shirley Goulburn NSW