



**HENRY ARMSTRONG**

**OBJECT**

Submission No: 179629

Organisation:		Key issues: <i>Land use compatibility, Visual impact, Traffic and transport, Social impacts, Temporary accommodation, Other issues</i>
Location: <i>New South Wales 2844</i>		
Submitter Type: <i>I am the owner or a tenant of a neighbouring property to the proposed development</i>		
Attachment: <i>Henry Armstrong</i>		

Submission date: 6/14/2024 10:17:01 AM

*To Whom it may concern,*

*Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the independent planning commission at the recent public meeting held in Dunedoo. Please include the recording of my presentation as part of this submission.*

*There are many reasons that I object to the approval of the Birriwa Solar and Battery project, all of these are on the basis of being an adjacent land owner and manager and as being part of a long-standing agricultural community. I will mention my concerns in point form and expand on some of them.*

*I believe this development should not be approved because:*

*â€¢ The outcome of the Energy Co transmission line has not been finalised*

*â€¢ There has not been sufficient or specific water studies carried out with regards to flooding and the potential for significant erosion issues that will ensue. White creek is a prime example of this concern. This has also been stated in all reports that the soil type is â€œfragileâ€.*

*â€¢ Studies have not been carried out to determine the potential for chemical leaching from the site and carried by water or dust to the neighboring properties. As a landholder that is downstream from this proposed development, I have major concerns in regards to this. Our business is based on the production of food and fibre, if there are risks of chemical leaching from the site it has the potential to enter the food chain as our business will receive 100% of the runoff from the proposed solar and battery site.*

*â€¢ The public liability insurance issue is far too ambiguous for adjacent landholders. This is an issue I believe needs to be addressed immediately. I believe the panel from the IPC that is reviewing this matter should pause the approval process until this matter is resolved fully. I believe it is time to get some clear guidelines and assurances from all levels of government and insurance providers for adjacent landholders that protect their businesses and livelihoods with regards to public liability insurance and the acceptable level we can obtain as landholders adjacent to these types of developments.*

*â€¢ There is a significant chance of the spread of noxious weeds from the development site. Without proper management there will be an explosion of weeds such as St Johns Wart (toxic to sheep and cattle) and Spiny Burr Grass (can cause scabby mouth in sheep which will exempt any export of meat).*

*â€¢ The loss of Agricultural land in the region is going to have significant negative effects in the community. Many businesses and individual contractors rely on agriculture to make a living. Once we start to take small chunks out of this chain there will be larger negative impacts that will snowball through the community.*

*â€¢ The influx of workers is going to put not only the existing residents of the region but the workers themselves at greater health and communication risks due to the lack of medical and under sized communication resources in the area. I feel it would be negligent of the IPC to approve such a development*



*without the required health and communication services and communication infrastructure available to deal with such an increase in population.*

*â€¢ I understand that each development is assessed on a singular basis. The difficult thing for existing residents is that we have to live with these projects cumulatively. I believe it is the panels responsibility at the very least to take into serious consideration the cumulative impacts these developments as a whole will have on our community and region. I think the epicentre of the CWOREZ being at Dunedoo is far too great a burden to be placed on a small rural community and should be considered as such.*

*â€¢ There are four topics on a very local sense I will bring up as a neighbour:*

*â€¢ The issues of roads and traffic has been raised in all the reports. I would like to see some conditions be put in to any subsequent approvals that all traffic in and out of the development site be via the Castlereagh Hwy, where the local dirt roads are not to be used for any reason. These are important arterial roads for the adjacent agricultural businesses, the extra traffic due to this development should not be allowed to use these roads and thus minimizing negative impacts to existing businesses adjacent to the site.*

*â€¢ I think it would be seen as a gesture of good will both from the IPC and the proponent to not place any panels to the north or east of the Killara house. This would give a very good set back to Birriwa Bus Route Nth and also the neighbouring property to the east.*

*â€¢ Further to the previous point a set back of 500m should be made mandatory for both Birriwa Bus Route North and South. This would enable any chain wire fence be set back well away from the road and not give the local residents the feeling of driving into a prison when they are leaving or returning home.*

*â€¢ Any screening projects taken out by the proponent need to be carried out in a manner that will guarantee the successful growth. If in the case of drought does the proponent have to ensure the survival by watering when necessary and or replanting when required.*

*Regards*

*Henry Armstrong.*

---

To Whom it may concern,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the independent planning commission at the recent public meeting held in Dunedoo. Please include the recording of my presentation as part of this submission.

There are many reasons that I object to the approval of the Birriwa Solar and Battery project, all of these are on the basis of being an adjacent land owner and manager and as being part of a long-standing agricultural community. I will mention my concerns in point form and expand on some of them.

I believe this development should not be approved because:

- The outcome of the Energy Co transmission line has not been finalised
- There has not been sufficient or specific water studies carried out with regards to flooding and the potential for significant erosion issues that will ensue. White creek is a prime example of this concern. This has also been stated in all reports that the soil type is "fragile".
- Studies have not been carried out to determine the potential for chemical leaching from the site and carried by water or dust to the neighbouring properties. As a landholder that is downstream from this proposed development, I have major concerns in regards to this. Our business is based on the production of food and fibre, if there are risks of chemical leaching from the site it has the potential to enter the food chain as our business will receive 100% of the runoff from the proposed solar and battery site.
- The public liability insurance issue is far too ambiguous for adjacent landholders. This is an issue I believe needs to be addressed immediately. I believe the panel from the IPC that is reviewing this matter should pause the approval process until this matter is resolved fully. I believe it is time to get some clear guidelines and assurances from all levels of government and insurance providers for adjacent landholders that protect their businesses and livelihoods with regards to public liability insurance and the acceptable level we can obtain as landholders adjacent to these types of developments.
- There is a significant chance of the spread of noxious weeds from the development site. Without proper management there will be an explosion of weeds such as St Johns Wart (toxic to sheep and cattle) and Spiny Burr Grass (can cause scabby mouth in sheep which will exempt any export of meat).
- The loss of Agricultural land in the region is going to have significant negative effects in the community. Many businesses and individual contractors rely on agriculture to make a living. Once we start to take small chinks out of this chain there will be larger negative impacts that will snowball through the community.
- The influx of workers is going to put not only the existing residents of the region but the workers themselves at greater health and communication risks due to the lack of medical and under sized communication resources in the area. I feel it would be negligent of the IPC to approve such a development without the required health and communication services and communication infrastructure available to deal with such an increase in population.
- I understand that each development is assed on a singular basis. The difficult thing for existing residents is that we have to live with these projects cumulatively. I believe it is the

panels responsibility at the very least to take into serious consideration the cumulative impacts these developments as a whole will have on our community and region. I think the epicentre of the CWOREZ being at Dunedoo is far too great a burden to be placed on a small rural community and should be considered as such.

- There are four topics on a very local sense I will bring up as a neighbour:
  - The issues of roads and traffic has been raised in all the reports. I would like to see some conditions be put in to any subsequent approvals that all traffic in and out of the development site be via the Castlereagh Hwy, where the local dirt roads are not to be used for any reason. These are important arterial roads for the adjacent agricultural businesses, the extra traffic due to this development should not be allowed to use these roads and thus minimising negative impacts to existing businesses adjacent to the site.
  - I think it would be seen as a gesture of good will both from the IPC and the proponent to not place any panels to the north or east of the Killara house. This would give a very good set back to Birriwa Bus Route Nth and also the neighbouring property to the east.
  - Further to the previous point a set back of 500m should be made mandatory for both Birriwa Bus Route North and South. This would enable any chain wire fence be set back well away from the road and not give the local residents the feeling of driving into a prison when they are leaving or returning home.
  - Any screening projects taken out by the proponent need to be carried out in a manner that will guarantee the successful growth. If in the case of drought does the proponent have to ensure the survival by watering when necessary and or replanting when required.

Regards

Henry Armstrong.