

PETER O'CLERY		OBJECT	Submission No: 189399
Organisation:			
Location:	New South Wales 2618		
Submitter Type:	an individual making a submission on my own behalf	Key issues:	Land use compatibility
Attachment:			

Submission date: 7/30/2024 5:39:48 PM

In my previous submission number 187074 on the Wallaroo Solar Farm I included a statement that $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{R}$. on properties immediately surrounding the proposed development would see a significant degradation of their visual and environmental amenity $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Loss of visual and environmental amenity could be expected to have a value impact on properties.

In the Assessment by the Department of Planning Housing and Infrastructure, devaluation was included in $\hat{a}\in \infty$ other issues $\hat{a}\in \mathbb{Z}$ raised in prior submissions and was supposedly responded to in Attachment H. However, Attachment H just comprises some broad statements about zoning, suitability of the site for the project and that it is $\hat{a}\in \infty$ not predicted to result in any unacceptable offsite impacts $\hat{a}\in \mathbb{Z}$

This kind of response seems to reflect the almost universal approach of developers/advocates of large solar facilities that there will be no adverse value impact on adjoining properties.

Reviewing a myriad of reports and assessments, a great many of which are desktop reiws of some academic large scale studies generally related to close urban projects, there seems to be a consensus that there is some adverse impact within a 0.5 to 1.5km radius and sometimes wider. The most often quoted is the Dutch and Gaur & Lang studies.

The Dutch Government acknowledges the potential impact of large infrastructure projects and can compensate for property loss due to such infrastructure. Taylor Wessing, An overview of damages and compensation under the new Dutch Environmental Act (2022). Apparently, as a consequence, few projects are approved in Holland if there is a risk of compensation liability.

Most independent studies have found that for properties in close proximity to such projects, the impacts were much higher. $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{R}$ We find substantially larger negative effects for properties within 0.1 miles and properties surrounding solar sites built on farm and forest lands in non-rural areas. $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{R}$ Gaur & Lang, University of Rhode Island Property value impacts of commercial-scale solar energy in Massachusetts and Rhode Island (2020).

"Though diminution in value varies, as the result of a detrimental condition's impact upon a property's utility, the evidence presented in these case studies of 100MW or less solar farms, indicated that solar farms damages property values by at least -6.0 percent to -30 percent.†Mary Clay, Appraiser, Kentucky, USA

In the case of Wallaroo, properties in close proximity could be impacted by aspects of the project, such as -

- $\hat{a} \in c$ Transformation of a quiet rural landscape into a sea of solar arrays
- $\hat{a} \in c$ Substitution of rural fencing for industrial security fencing
- $\hat{a} \in c$ Substitution of former farm animals for solar arrays
- $\hat{a} \in c$ Visual impact of the arrays (which is acknowledged in the body of the document), no matter at what scale



 $\hat{a} \in \hat{c}$ Inhibition to creation of new or expanded tourism activities due to the proximity of a non-rural $\hat{a} \in \hat{c}$ eyesore $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{N}$ reducing the apparent visitor attractiveness of the location

 $\hat{a} \in \hat{c}$ The possibility that potential buyers of properties close to the project being put off by the $\hat{a} \in \hat{c}$ presence $\hat{a} \in \hat{c}$ of an industrial scale solar farm. Issues such as bush fire risks, emissions, erosion, biodiversity (whether real or perceived) all impact on how potential buyers react on an individual basis these factors would impact the desirability/value to prospective buyers or investors in neighbouring properties.

Overall, while maybe the project would seem to be $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{Z}$ permissible $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{Z}$ for the various reasons stated in Appendix H, the reality is that we are seeing a potential major industrial scale intrusion into the ambience and setting of the long established $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{Z}$ bush $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{Z}$ environment around the Nation $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Anyone purchasing a property in the surrounds could reasonably expect that Governments at all levels would respect that vision.