

Submission to the IPC for the Springdale large-scale solar energy generating facility SSD 8703

My name is Dianne Burgess of Sutton and I live within close proximity and will be visually impacted by the proposed development.

We searched for a long time before choosing to live here. Having personally gone through two life threatening experiences within 12 months it made us think about our lifestyle and finding somewhere that would provide us with a sense of peace. The main attraction for this location was the views of open space and the restrictions of the land zone which is RU1. At the time of purchase in 2008 the minimum lot size was 80ha which was later reduced to 40ha. This meant smaller landholdings would be the most likely outcome of the change. No-one could have ever envisaged that this type of proposed development would be considered for this area. It is unfathomable how the DPIE consider this development as diversification of primary industry and that it will just blend in! But when you are creating your own reality it is pretty easy to ignore facts!

The Yass Valley Council (YVC) has made it abundantly clear that this part of the Yass Valley is special for many reasons, one of which is the unique geography of this location. It is a small pocket tucked away in the corner between the ACT and NSW and bounded by Mulligans Flat and Gorooyarroo Nature Reserves which link up with regionally significant biodiversity corridors. YVC's proposed 5km buffer zone has been supported by the NSW OEH and the YVC is endeavouring to prevent inappropriate development from being considered for this area. If not for the Infrastructure SEPP we would not be having this discussion, YVC would not approve such a development. Being considered an SSD it has been taken out of council's hands and being left up to others to decide, who have no relationship with the area.

These same people may have visited the area once, some may not have even been here, but are making decisions that will affect some of the residents for the remainder of their lives. Decisions which are based on fanciful notions such of being in the public interest. If the DPIE is genuinely concerned about serving the public then putting this type of development in a more appropriate location would serve the public much better and have a lot less impacts on both biodiversity and residents.

The proposed development of approx. 850 acres is massive and when I walk around my property as I look towards the south and the west my view is dominated by the proposed site. It is highly visible even with the existing mature vegetation in between. I regularly ride my horses on my property and especially the paddocks that look south and west, there is nothing more peaceful than being able to stop and look over farmland, trees, livestock and the hills and enjoy the outdoors.

The addition of approx. 300,000 shiny black panels will overtake my view and it will stand out because there is nothing like it any where I can see. The entire site will become nothing more than a huge industrial complex. Just because they may be going to plant some vegetation, which by the way is not going to provide any visual barrier, that is assuming it grows, will deprive me of my ability to enjoy my property as is my right.

There is no denying it will look industrial. If it contains all the components of an industrial facility, i.e.. Concrete, steel, hundreds of thousands of solar panels, roadways, buildings and or shipping containers all surrounded by a 2m high mesh fence, then it is an industrial facility. Just because it is on farmland and you use words like farm to make it more appealing, that does not change what the

development is. **ITS NOT A FARM, ITS AN INDUSTRIAL FACILITY, STUCK IN THE MIDDLE OF FARMLAND AND EVEN WORSE, ITS IN A HIGHLY PROMINENT POSITION, THAT IS UNABLE TO BE HIDDEN.**

The reasoning that the DPIE and RES use that try to portray the proposed development as 'low-lying' or benign and not noticeable is based in their own perceptions and realities, **not facts**. If these types of development are not offensive, then why are RES going to so much trouble (their interpretation, not ours) to try and address our objections (which they haven't) about visual impact?

The supposed effort that RES has made is nothing more than changing lines and words on paper. Physically nothing has changed for those who will be visually impacted. The SSAG's presentation goes into much more detail about how unreliable the LVIA's are and backs up their comments with FACTS, especially how developers and the DPIE use varying methods and do not necessarily agree. Whereas 'experts' such as those that acted for Minister Stokes in the Land and Environment (LEC) Court Rocky Hill case use a totally different approach which was considered acceptable. Even the DPIE's own independent expert's methods which are different from the DPIE have been accepted in other assessments. **THERE IS A COMPLETE BIAS AND DOUBLE STANDARD BEING APPLIED HERE.**

The proposed development is ill-conceived and is not appropriate for this area. The consultants for both Renew Estate and RES, AECOM, who consider themselves world class in their field, if they are that smart why have they encouraged this development to be located here when they knew that this area is not at all suited for large-scale solar. There is only one reason, GREED, they get paid no matter how ridiculous their clients ideas area.

The SSAG and the Sutton and District Community Association (SDCA) have proven beyond doubt that the impacts are significant and cannot be mitigated effectively. The DPIE's recommendation is based on nothing more than the developer's words and there is a 132kv power line in proximity. If this is all that is needed then the NSW and Commonwealth governments are wasting an inordinate amount of time developing REZ's as a means for phasing our fossil fuel electricity generation. DPIE appears to believe they can just go anywhere. They are quite wrong.

If AECOM were really clever and genuine about renewable energy, they would have suggested to their client they would be better placed to look for a more suitable location for this development. No alternative site proposed, this site was purely opportunistic. When this development was a thought bubble in the minds of some, this development was being promoted by Mr Simon Corbell, former member in the ACT government. It was going to be considered as part of the ACT's 100% renewable energy strategy. Based on the history of renewable energy assessments in NSW they considered it would be a slam dunk. What no-one had counted on was this community objecting so strongly and showing how ill-considered this plan was. Nothing has been provided to convince us that our objections are not valid.

I will not waste your time with regurgitating the reasons to refuse raised in the SSAG and SDCA's submissions. I wholeheartedly endorse every reason they put forward as to why this development should be refused approval. **JUST BECAUSE YOU CAN, DOESN'T MEAN YOU SHOULD**

Thank you, for taking the time to read my submission. Dianne Burgess