

Name: Bernadette Walker

Address: 97 Mulligans Flat Road Sutton

I wish to remain anonymous: NO

Springdale Solar EIS - Proposal number 8703

I OBJECT to the Springdale Solar development.

My reasons for objection are as follows:

I have been a Sutton resident for 30 years and have raised my family in Sutton. We chose our property because of the views over the beautiful, serene, pastoral landscape, as many, if not most, residents to the north and south of Canberra have done. While I am not a resident of Tallagandra Lane (I live on Mulligans Flat Road), I entirely empathise with those residents whose properties would overlook the proposed development because of the loss of amenity.

The evidence is very clear that large scale solar developments should not only be placed on large, flat acreage, but should also be surrounded by large, flat acreage, so as to minimise the loss of amenity to surrounding homesteads. (Renew's projects alone to date confirm this). This is not the case with the proposed development which is surrounded by 34 residences whose amenity will be directly impacted.

Not that the owner of the property on whose land the solar farm is being built will be living there to experience the impact himself; neither would the board members of Renew Estate or AECOM who conducted this EIS. It is entirely disingenuous for the EIS to claim that the project has the support of the local community and Yass Council when it does not.

The EIS totally understates the negative impacts on 'visual receptors' with highly subjective statements about the significance of the visual impact. These do not represent the opinions of the impacted residents at all.

I also object to the patronising comments in the EIS about how the project gives the local community a chance to enjoy the socio-economic and environmental benefits of developing renewable technology. It is clear from the EIS that the cheaper electricity generated by this solar farm is for the benefit of ACT residents, not residents of Sutton or NSW. The compensation being offered to affected residents and the local community is frankly an insult when compared to their loss, and the gain to be made by the landowner and Renew shareholders were this project to proceed.

All this for a project that will be decommissioned in 30 years.