

Planning Services

20 August 2018

Department of Planning and Environment

GPO Box 39,

SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Director - Resources and Energy Assessment

Dear Sir/Madam,

Objection Submission regarding the Proposed Springdale Solar Farm Application
No. 8703

I formally lodge my objection.

My first objection is the play on words, which is calling the proposed industrial power plant a 'solar farm'. This was highlighted by the marketing pamphlet No. 1 with a shearing shed and a beautiful tree to prepare the community for a 350,000 solar panel generated facility.

Objection 2

Research has shown the 350,000 solar panels have the potential to create a 'heat island effect', raising the temperature by 2 – 6 degrees, which forms a microclimate. This will directly affect my ability to earn and enjoy the fruits of my labor and money. I have been a land owner in the Sutton valley for in excess of twenty years. I have considered my relationship with council as a partnership in the upkeep of my property. I have taken my responsibilities in relation to weeds, pasture health, tree plantings and environment very seriously. This is evident in the restoration work undertaken by myself on the abandoned clay quarry. This has been done by heavy plant machinery, tree lines, addition of lime and superphosphate at my expense to ensure my land is productive.

Objection 3

All the equipment needed to build this development, being transported in by approximately 75 heavy vehicle movements per day, will have a huge impact on the existing roads.

The road through Sutton Village, across the small culvert, past the Post Office, Bakery, Sutton Primary School, and the Child Care facility is also not suitable for this many extra heavy movements per day.

There are no pedestrian crossings for the children to cross the road safely outside the school and the childcare Centre on the proposed route where the heavy vehicles will be driving.

The roads in our local district are stretched to the limit and are not coping well with our normal development growth let alone with a massive increase applicable to this proposal.

Objection 4

Chemicals used to clean the 350,000 panels will have the potential to end up on my land and in the creeks that flow into my land. This area is identified in the EIS as leading to the Yass Valley water catchment.

Objection 5

Developers say they propose to plant screening trees and this will fix visual problems. The developers have proposed 5 litre pot size plantings which will never screen the development from my land. This would need to be changed to very large mature screening trees and even this would not assist. I consider that the visual aspects of this proposed development a disgrace.

Objection 5

People who live adjacent to solar developments have identified the glare from the solar panels as having a significant impact on their daily lives (Described by Local resident Jennifer Howlett in the Canberra Times Article 7 March 2014 – *“Bright lights put living with solar farms in perspective”*).

The Springdale solar proposal is to install 350,000 solar panels, including galvanized steel structures to support them, 22 power conversion stations, an electrical switch station of 4,500m² and a control building.

Objection 6

The big picture, politically this is becoming very sensitive, everyone understands without large scale storage facilities solar can only be of value in day light hours and yet the demand is mainly outside these times. Marketing of this facilities claims it will power 35000 homes (not true). Consultation seems to be replaced by marketing and deception.

Objection 7

It is confusing to believe Sutton is the proposed site. The NSW Government Submission on AEMO's Integrated Systems Plan - March 2018 on Page 10 the Figure 3 shows a map with three (3) Potential Energy Zones in NSW identified – Hay, Dubbo and Armidale. Stating the South-West Energy Zone containing particularly strong solar resources. Sutton seems an unusual fit.

Objection 8

The proposed solar development is not a farm and its land use is not consistent with the rural land use in the surrounding area.

Highest and best use of geographic sites is paramount. It seems confusing at best that the proposed site as solar generation use is its highest and best use. Australia has 53 percent non-agricultural land and 47 per cent suitable for agriculture and we have chosen high valued agricultural land close to our capital city to place 350,000 solar panels.

Objection 9

The developer representatives at our first meeting agreed that our property would be devalued if the proposed Solar Development was approved. In the second meeting this comment was denied. I have been informed by my neighbor who is selling that they will have to take considerable loss due to the solar farm. This has been current feedback from interested parties. Approval should not be given to a development proposal that flies in the face of what an ordinary person would ever have ever considered being built in such a location.

Objection 10

We have been told the fire risk will be controlled by sheep grazing under the panels. Australia wide experience indicates that sheep are a risk of entanglement with power leads and connections in such power generated plants. Obvious problem.

I understand I have only identified problems and concerns from me as an individual but I think it is a far greater issue than me. I believe Planning and Environment has an opportunity to analyse the many part-time power facilities already in place. The future belongs to he who plans for it.

Regards,

Ron Weston