



NAME REDACTED

OBJECT

Submission No: 189667

Organisation:		<p>Key issues: <i>Land use compatibility, Biodiversity, Traffic, Heritage, Water, Waste, Dust, Hazards and risks, Community benefit, Cumulative impacts</i></p>
Location:	<i>New South Wales 2618</i>	
Submitter Type:	<i>an individual making a submission on my own behalf</i>	
Attachment:		

Submission date: 7/31/2024 4:55:53 PM

Our household strongly object to the proposed Wallaroo Solar Farm proposal.

As a local resident, living withing close proximity to the site, I had no idea about the proposed Solar Farm until July 4th, 2024 when a concerned neighbour brought it to the local community's attention.

Consultation

I have received NO consultation or information about the proposal from the proponent to date.

The proponent has a captured audience if they had been serious about engaging and informing the local Wallaroo Community. There is one road in and one road out – a SIGN at the top of Wallaroo road and/or near the community notice board at the corner of Gooromon Ponds/Wallaroo Road would have obvious option!

The "Social Impact Assessment" 3.1. EIS engagement program

–EIS engagement program included a range of engagement activities aimed at broadening awareness of the Project, responding to concerns, working through issues, and capturing opportunities–

***With whom exactly if owners of neighbouring properties were unaware and not consulted/approached?*

–A key focus of the EIS engagement program has been to understand the concerns of the closest, directly impacted neighbours, to ensure they had a high level of Project understanding and to work with them to mitigate potential negative impacts. Engagement activities have also aimed to capture the perspectives of residents further from the Project and address their concerns, as well as interested members in the broader community.–

***How many locals were engaged exactly? I will be directly impacted by this proposal – I have never been engaged by any means!*

–The engagement program demonstrated that while there is localised concern regarding the Project, it is balanced by a high level of support and encouragement from some near neighbours and residents, as well as the broader community.–

***What engagement program exactly? Clearly INADEQUATE if the vast majority of the local residents only heard about the proposal on July 4, 2024 thanks to a concerned neighbour. He was the one that notified a*



group of 100+ local residents about the meeting to be held in Murrumbateman (why this location?) in the very middle of the school holidays, at 10am on a weekday. Majority of us were unable to attend due to the late notice (we wouldn't have even know had it not been for our neighbour's alert).

Fire (CATASTROPHIC)

While it has been argued that the risk of fire is deemed low, it has also been confirmed that if the solar farm was to catch fire the result would be CATASTROPHIC.

This may not seem such risk while considering this proposal in the height of winter, however, if the assessment was to be carried out on a blistering hot summer day with 35km wind predominantly westerly suddenly this risk is significant. Our family have resided in Wallaroo for 43 years and am only too aware of the number of fires started by locals or visitors/workers with their slashers, mowers, welders etc etc On a day like that I have described all that would be required is for one of these blazes to hit the solar farm and it would be catastrophic (confirmed by Wallaroo RFS Captain) no in between either not on fire or CATASTROPHIC.

Who would have thought the 2003 Canberra Fires could have penetrated Canberra suburbs the way it did. Again the winds here are predominantly from the West and could easily impact Canberra suburbs. Of course this fire risk within such close proximity to my property presents a high level of anxiety I have 6 grandchildren within 5 km of the site and livestock that I need to keep safe faced with catastrophic fire on a one road in, one road out this would ABSOLUTELY put lives at definite risk.

Archaeological Technical Report / Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA)

The values potentially impacted by the development are any social and cultural values attributed to the artefacts and the sites by the local Aboriginal community. The extent to which the loss of the sites or parts of the sites would impact on the community is only something the Aboriginal community can articulate.

****Where is this articulated anywhere in the report?**

The Report states that the Proposal Area is generally accepted to be located within Ngunawal country. The Ngunawal people have well established links to the land of which the Proposal Area falls within. Surely as a bare minimum, the Ngunawal People should have provided an opinion on the proposal?

According to the report 19 RAPs registered, the mandatory consultation period lapsed with only two responses received from RAPs. The

response received from a) Gunjeewong Cultural and b) Murri Bidgee Mullangari.

The Gunjeewong cultural are NOT one of the 19 registered RAPs.

Neither of the RAPs, registered or a ring-in are in the local area.

Where is the documented approval from the above groups they do not appear to be attached to the EIS.

Statements within the report such as "While further comment was not received from RAPs in response to this draft report, it was made

clear from the comments provided by RAPs in the field that the landscape and archaeological sites contained within the Wallaroo Solar Farm hold cultural significance to the local Aboriginal community. RAPs present during the fieldwork also voiced their opinions that they were happy with the excavation methodology and the subsurface testing programme undertaken for this project."

Where is the written confirmation? Where are any of the supporting documents for such claims? Where are the signed letters from the RAPs registered or not confirming their agreement and any caveats?



Wallaroo Road

The road is extremely volatile with current traffic, increasingly so during periods of wet. The stretch on the ACT side of the border is continually being patched for crater sized pot holes – they are extreme when left and definitely pose a risk to lives should a driver swerve to miss and have an on-coming accident. With the proposed number of trucks per day / 2 years – during a period of wet, the road will be lucky to stay intact for a few days and will require frequent repair.

Trucks

We are alarmed at the size / width / frequency/ duration of the proposal. Local residence will be a risk negotiating the road with vehicles this size on an inadequate road.

Mental Health

Constant trucks for 2 years negate the very reason residents live here, anxiety levels will be sky high.

Local Children

Our grandchildren catch the local bus, the bus is FULL. These kids are at risk when being collected or dropped home with trucks of this size and frequency on a winding country road, many driveways are concealed. One death is too many, the safety of our children outweighs this proposal.

Proximity to houses

This proposal is setting a precedent, more research should be undertaken to ensure the safety of the residents in fringing dwellings.

How is the distance measured

On Feb 22 Cameron Ash and Iwan Davies visited a fringing dwelling (corner of Gooromon Ponds / Southwell road). The landowners were told that the measurement of the proximity to the site is from the edge of their back deck - despite the outer border of their property being a further 250-300 metres away! This surely cannot be correct! If a resident does not happen to have a DA in place for the build of an additional house on their property (to coincide with a Solar Farm Application) then apparently the measurement is from their existing house! How is that a fair and just approach? The distance SHOULD be measured from the adjoining/fringing landowner's boundary!!

Critically Endangered Golden Sun Moth

This solar farm proposal threatens an already threatened species.

Striped Legless Lizard

EPBC confirmed that surveys were NOT undertaken at the site (ref 2.4) despite being deemed vulnerable. Why no survey?

Pink-tailed Legless Lizard

EPBC confirmed that surveys were NOT undertaken at the site (ref 2.4) despite being deemed vulnerable. Why no survey?

The lack of supporting documentation from the proponent and consultant in every aspect is extremely evident throughout.
