Director Resource and Energy
Assessments
Dep't of Planning&Environment
GPO Box 39 SYDNEY 2001

Name: [redacted]N
Address: [redacted]e
[redacted]3 Sutton 2620

Signature: [redacted]

PLEASE DELETE OUR PERSONAL INFORMATION BEFORE PUBLICATION.

SPRINGDALE SOLAR FARM---SSD8703

We OBJECT to the proposal on the following grounds:

(1) HEAT We have serious concerns about the rise in temprature above the solar panel array.The Executive Summary(page x)of the Main Report of the EIS states:"PV panels although having a low heat capacity can be up to 20*C warmer than the ambient temperature during the day causing the surrounding air mass to heat and rise."

Our residence is some 500m directly South of the array and we have a large Arboretum of worldwide trees(largely Conifers)established in 1979,with the closest group being some 300m to panels.Even in favourable weather conditions when much of this air would rise and disperse this situation is worrying.On a severe Bush-fire risk day with temperatures of 35-40*C and strong northerly winds the heat blown onto our trees would likely cause individual losses or even spontaneous ignition---notwithstanding that some heated air would rise and/or be dispersed.This would create a disastrous situation that could endanger our home.As an example one imported mature Rocky-mountain Fir was killed by one 39*C day in early november.

On the N/W-N border our site is largely shielded by elevated ground but is quite exposed on the N/E flank(the group closest to panels).Air-flow behaviour over/around wind-breaks is well-documented.They only divert flows over relatively short distances.

Mitigation:Given that heat generation would be continuous and in adverse weather condition strong winds would push most of the heated air-mass onto us before appreciable lift or dispersion could take effect,it is difficult to see what steps could be taken in mitigation.

(2)GROUNDWATER:A number of references are made in the EIS on possible oil and chemicals spillage.In the Operation Stage these seem to be well controlled by enclosing apparatus in containers.However,during the Construction Stage controls are less convincing--there will be alot more machinery,vehicles and people on site.

Mitigation:Given the numbers and variety of workers on site a thorough briefing and training of all personnel on the need to prevent spills and gain an understanding of the potential damaging effect of these on groundwater which is vital for local landholders would be indicated.

(3)NOISE:A lot of noise data and analysis has been presented in the EIS,but there are two areas that are not convincing.Firstly,we consider the night background noise (as on average)level overstated.We note that the figure quoted refers to an Industry standard and perhaps the authors do not fully appreciate how quiet nights in a rural environment are.

Secondly,linked to the background level we have concerns about the night noise level during the operational phase.Whilst we appreciate the several statements that such work would be infrequent and only embarked upon if important and after careful consideration but it is unsatisfactory that the operator is the sole arbiter in deciding whether some work is important and urgent.And our major concern is that given a low background noise level even a low-level persistent noise can be extremely annoying during the night.

Mitigation:Comments that those aggrieved can contact the Police or write to the Department are unrealistic at best and facetious.What is required as a minimum is a dedicated person who can be contacted should the "out-of-hours"/night-time work become more frequent against all assurances.After all people are unlikely to choose a quiet rural lifestyle(in spite of its inherent negatives)only to find themselves on the doorstep of some Industrial Estate.

(4)FIRE:At p153 of the Main report of the EIS there is a listing of the main potential causes of Bush-Fires during both the construction and operational stages.There is also a statement that this is not considered a bushfire prone area.This may be so,but in February 1979 the local area experienced the biggest fire in its history started at Hall by a transmission line fault.The authority denied liability but was forced to pay considerable compensation.Over the years there were other fires in this area.In a recent summer we had 3 fires which were uncomfortably close---one started by grass cutting the other by members of the ACT Intelligentsia.

A common feature of these fires was that notwithstanding low temperatures and modest fuel loads the fires spread with disconcerting speed.In one case had it not been for a concentration of ground units and 2 waterbombing aircraft dwellings would almost certainly have been lost.There is no guarantee that this many units will always be available--they may be engaged elsewhere.

Mitigation:We have cited these examples as we have the impression from the EIS that consultation with the RFS and acquisition of fire fighting equipment is deemed to fulfil the proponents obligation.During the construction phase a large number of vehicles and workers will be on site.Some of these people may have never been in a fire situation and probably do not appreciate how quickly a fire can get away.In windy conditions 5 minutes can be a long time.We therefore consider that in this situation an informed and fire-fighting trained workforce is essential.

It will be interesting how our Home insurance company will rate this risk as reflected by the premium.