

## Submission for Oxley Solar Farm

I am an affected landholder and live within 2 km of the proposed industrial solar development.

I object to the proposed development on the following grounds,

Firstly the EIS does not address the requirement in the issued terms regarding cumulative impact, they waffle on about the other developments and even go so far as to say the adjacent Stringybark development has been completed, which it plainly has not. Once these developments are completed I and other residents will have a view of solar panels covering 40 % of our views, I consider the development of the Oxley solar farm creates a cumulative impact that is untenable in our community.

Secondly, this is a major change of land use and does not adequately fit the SEPP Primary Production and Rural Development 2019 planning outlines which were created to reduce land conflict, this industrial development actually is causing conflict.

Thirdly there is completely inadequate information as to the potential for erosion when they clearly state that 74% of the land has a slope of 10-20% and if that land receives concentrated water flowing off panels onto a particular line, this issue is not even addressed, the erosion impact will be horrendous in soils already stated to be high risk for gully and sheet erosion shown in tables on page 221 in EIS. The sediment will flow into the major watercourses disrupting habitat and potentially causing devastation to the biodiversity in the region, particularly the indigenous and threatened platypus.

In section 8.2.3 it is stated that erosion may be mitigated by keeping 70% live ground cover, that is extremely difficult in this environment due to the cycle of nature, ground cover does not grow all year round thus opening up opportunity for erosion.

Fourthly the cumulative impact is going to change the visual amenity of the landscape, as noted earlier the views which are visible from the road covering circa 40% of the view, remembering that this is the gateway to a heritage listed area and is frequented by approximately 25000 visitors every year, tourism is a huge contributor to the economy and this can cause irreparable damage. The viewpoint number 3 is over our property and is not indicative of how the human eye sees the landscape, these montages seriously underestimate the visual impact which the planning department should be aware of if they had made the effort to visit the surrounding areas.

Finally, the proponent has failed to consult adequately with the large number of potentially affected landowners, consultation requires more than providing information, it is implied that everyone can have a say as to how they feel about an industrial development ruining people's outlook and potentially impacting their mental health when there are more appropriate sites available. The proponent has also failed under the planning act to show they have expertise in actually developing and operating a development of this scale.

I am opposed to this development.

Lachlan McPhie  
1203 Castledoyle Rd  
Armidale.