

Glenellen Solar – SSD 9550

Independent Planning Commission of NSW

Objection Submission

As I have previously stated and I reiterate again, this is a horrendous time of the year to be placing this revised development proposal on us, we are super busy with hay and harvest season, our main source of income for the year (no fortnightly salaries here) and we have a desire to keep headlong into our operations whilst the weather holds, if we pull up to review and provide diligent comment on this horrid proposal we lose time and ultimately money.

After speaking with your staff members Caitlan Last and Stuart Morgan I understand that you only have a relatively short time to deal with this matter, however someone needs to hear our plight which goes unanswered time and time again, maybe your unit could mention this farcical pattern that the developers and DPIE keep initiating during this time of the year.

One of the many things I would like to see changed is the vernacular on calling these massive industrial developments a farm, it just allows an easier approval and assessment process, imagine the hoops I would have to undertake if I wanted to turn my farm into an industrial zone, DPIE or the local council would not allow it to get past first base.

Trina Solar wholly owned Chinese photovoltaics company with headquarter in Changzhou, commenced business in 1997. Their own overview is hard to fathom, as one area quotes 13,000 employees mostly Chinese, then in another area of their overview the employees are listed as 30,000, a large disparity just there. What I am alluding to is it is hard to have belief in anything we are given from them.

If we have to go through the unproven path of renewables why don't we take a leaf out China's book, all of their major solar developments are in desert areas like the Tenegger Desert, on the Mongolian Steppe or the Tibetan Plateau in conjunction with a major hydro development, none of them are within 15km of areas of closer settlement and not one of them are on even basic agricultural land let alone prime agricultural land, why you ask? Because they see the need to feed the masses. If they can see this then why can't we?

I have attached a kmz file to this submission so you can view firsthand where the Chinese solar plants are located.

Also as previously mentioned, when we first had these plethora of renewable energy projects hit our desks in 2017 and 2018 the then guidelines wouldn't have allowed either Jindera or Glenellen proposals to go ahead. During the review stage and public submission stage of these guidelines, we made submissions in an attempt to tighten up the conditions around agricultural land and proximity to townships, only to have the adopted guidelines go the opposite direction and make it even easier to desecrate our beautiful landscape and prime agricultural land. Once again, we, the custodians of this prime agricultural land, went unheard.

There is nothing new about the Glenellen solar development. It has been haunting us since CWP first approached us in early 2018 and at that time we were offered to join the proposal by placing part of the solar array on our property. While the numbers looked enticing to say the least, we had more respect for our land and our neighbours than to go ahead with the easy money. It is also worth noting that when Trina Solar came on board, they also broached the subject of joining the proposal once again, which we once again declined.

Once again, I try to draw anyone's attention to the original public exhibition period of 31/10/2020 to 30/11/2020 and the total disdain that both the proponent and DPIE treat us with. In August 2020 the then Project Manager from Trina Solar Dave Allen, sat at my dining room table along with some other affected landholders and specifically asked when a good time for us was to have adequate time to review the proposal. We stated to completely avoid the period of April to June due to sowing operations and the period from October to January due to hay and harvest operations. You have no idea of our dismay when it landed in late October 2020. I then wrote to Mike Young, the then Executive Officer of DPIE, explaining our situation and seeking an extension to the exhibition period. This request went unanswered and fell on deaf ears, so our plight with this cycle is nothing new. Thankfully Trina Solar's first attempt was so poor that they were given another opportunity by the department to get it right, although given the way the department approves these developments it must have been rather poor indeed.

Do you look at where the objections and supporting submissions come from?

Objections are primarily local with support primarily from further afield, does this not ring alarm bells?

As for the L&SCM, we have spoken to DPIE at length in this regard. Having spent 24 years in the public service arena working on soil, water and vegetation programs, plus another 10 years as a private consultant in Natural Resource Management project areas, I will challenge anyone that the majority of this proposals' footprint lays on a minimum of class 3 land, it also appears that 40% of the proposals footprint falls on State Significant Agricultural Land, that in itself should negate the approval of this proposal.

The other locally approved solar instillation, Jindera Solar, will be back-to-back with the Glenellen proposal. If the Glenellen proposal is approved that will see a continuous line of panels for 6.8km from my northwestern boundary. If these two proposals are approved back-to-back my microclimate will be changed irrevocably and not for the betterment of my business or lifestyle, or those of the surrounding community.

The removal of 160 mature eucalyptus trees from within the footprint of this proposal and the removal of similar trees from the Jindera site will change our environment and microclimate in several ways. One, but not the least of which, is that these mature trees are the groundwater pumps of our area, remove them and the groundwater will start to rise causing saline soils and dryland salinity problems, that will take decades to reverse. Also, these trees provide transpiration of the groundwater which in turn provides a cooling affect and also provides moisture for precipitation.

Our property is shown as BRE001, Figure 4 once again misleading shows us at 1750m from the proposed development, whereas the nearest panels are only 1300m. I don't know how closely you or DPIE look at these proposals, however there are so much misguiding information in them that beggar's belief. If only we were given the same time the department and proponent were given, we could pull these proposals to pieces.

Have you ever wondered why NGH Environmental and Eco Logical Australia keep popping up in these types of proposals? The reason why is that they are willing to provide a manipulation of the facts and evidence to suit the proponents. I have reviewed many EISs and REFs in my time in the NRM game, and I have rarely seen one as poor as this one. I just wish I had the time to provide evidence to refute most of the claims.

I notice that there is no mention of the Tiger Quoll in their endangered or threatened species assessments. There have been numerous Tiger Quoll sightings over the last few years, including two I saw at 1.55am Saturday

11th November whilst I was baling hay in my creek paddock. At first, I thought they were young fox cubs but closer inspection when I got my main lights on them showed them to be Tiger Quolls. They scampered across some mown ground and then through the boundary fence and headed towards Four Mile Creek (I have attached a photo of what I believe to be Tiger Quoll scat, collected near our chicken coop). We had been losing chickens at the rate of approximately one per week and this then made sense when I saw them, as a fox if it gets in a chicken coop will kill all birds and then just take one, however a Tiger Quoll will kill just what it needs.

A few of the issues I spoke about in my presentation appear in more detail below:

Visual amenity

The developer has been misleading with their description of visual impact on the rural landscape as only being low. Do you or the department investigate these claims? I would encourage someone to explain to me their methodology to come to this conclusion or is this just the work of a city-based planner whose daily life is impacted by the concrete jungle? Once again, our property is listed as BRE001, in the original proposal our visual impact was listed as none, now it has been upgraded to low, still laughable, just because I can't see it from my lounge chair I am deemed to have low impact.

- Every time I walk out my front door, I will see it
- Every time I walk to my sheds or chicken coop, I will see it
- Every time I hop in my car, I will see it
- Every time I am driving up our driveway, I will see it
- Every time I am working my fields on a tractor or mustering stock, I will see it

So, the visual will be very meaningful to me.

In their assessment we are now called receptors or receivers, not landholders. This is demeaning. It's like we have been dehumanised just to make it easier for this horrendous proposal to go ahead.

Also, in their assessment they list that only 7 properties within 2km radius will be visually affected. Do you ever check this garbage produced by these charlatans? Using a similar model to Eco Logical Australia I have found 37 affected landholders within 2 km of the site, who will be visually affected.

A quick assessment of the elevation changed across the proposed footprint gives an elevation change of approximately 19m, which is hardly relatively flat farming land as the proponent would lead us to believe.

As the proposed property is the lowest sitting in our local area, we all have an elevated view of it, the lowest being 11m above and the highest being 48m above, hardly low-level visual impact.

We understand through earlier conversations with DPIE that they are under resourced and can't check the validity of the proponents claim. Maybe someone should start listening to us, as we can check some of their claims, and prove them to be misconstrued. I am certain you understand that there are big dollars at stake and if they can stretch the truth to get their project up they will.

Heat Island Effect

Instead of allowing the proponents and DPIE to negate any questioning around the cumulative heat island effect by using European models (totally different climate) or the very loose data from Cogupna near Shepparton based on a tiny 30MW installation, you need to look at data and research from Africa and South America. You should also look at a very good paper based on recorded data not some modelling by *Barron-Gafford et al, 2016* The Photovoltaic Heat Island Effect: Large Solar Power Plants increase local temperatures.

Increased soil temperatures and shorter cooling periods, 3 to 5 degrees increase in ambient temperature, up to 2km dissipation factor, changes to air currents. My property will ultimately become a much less productive property and that is certainly not a desired scenario and certainly not fair.

Neighbourhood Relations

These have certainly soured. We used to talk a lot and help each other out a bit, now the only time I hear from my neighbour is when he wants to bring cattle up the lane.

Another neighbour were long time friends with the host landholder and now it appears they are bitter enemies, which is very sad.

Our host neighbour has also showed his lack of compassion to our neighbourhood by placing a feed lot right behind landholders who had the audacity to object to this proposal. Maybe the EPA should have a look into

that little side project as it could be outside current guidelines and certainly not good form.

As I mentioned at the presentation day ostensibly our neighbours are good people, however I think the big carrot has tarnished their vision when it comes to the neighbourhood, I could only imagine the fuss that would be made if the roles were reversed.

All of this impacts the mental health and wellbeing of the overall community. It has divided our community and will continue to do so.

Grid Capacity

Transgrid had already made it rather clear that the current Jindera to Bomen powerline does not have the capacity to take all of these developments, so are these projects going to be more "white elephants"?

If the grid does not have the capacity to take the developments, the taxpayer is investing in structures that have no value to the local, state or national interest. The carbon credits are to be offset by a major costly development, and those credits will go offshore to China, as Trina Solar is a Chinese firm. There will be no renewable power options available if the power cannot be linked to the grid.

Does someone know something we don't? There were some recent upgrades on one of the feeder lines to the Jindera Sub Station. I happened to run into one of the contractors as he was lost, and I was heading down to Drumwood Road to take photos for my presentation. I asked him what he was up to as he had an excavator and pole boring machine, he said they were upgrading the power poles for the new solar farm (sic). I beg the question are we wasting our time as everything to date is skewed in the proponent's favour. This is not affording stakeholders fair process, which is against policy.

Land Values

I have spoken to two property valuers over the last few years and now even more than before (as these plants are popping up everywhere) they are saying a minimum 20% value loss and more likely 25% devaluation of our land. How is this a fair outcome for us? Are the IPCN or DPIE or the proponent going to kick the tin when the time comes to see that we get our true value for our investment? I fear not.

Local employment

This is another furphy. I have been involved in major construction projects in the past and historically the construction crews follow the work and very little is available for locals, short or long term. This is why currently our social media pages are full of requests for temporary accommodation from persons working on the Walla solar project. You could also talk to local real estate property managers, and they are also inundated with requests for temporary accommodation from the same people.

Community and Stakeholder Consultation

Probably the single biggest joke of the lot, we have had very little contact from the proponent and / or the department for a very long period of time.

Last time we received anything from the department in relation to Glenellen Solar was April 2021, and from Trina Solar was April 2022. I have written to the department in May 2023 expressing my concerns over the lack of dialogue, I am still awaiting a reply.

This is truly appalling.

Solar Irradiance

Another we wonder why they are being planned for here, the solar irradiance on offer in our little area is not great, for instance in winter 2022 I kept diligent records of the weather and there were 42 days that these panels would have been whirring away looking for some sun and they wouldn't have found it, so that is a staggering 46% of the days of winter that these panels would not be producing power, couple that with the very wet spring and summer we suffered over the past two seasons, I can not see how these will be a viably producing solar plant in our area. There is something more to gain that has nothing to do with base load power.

Sadly, I am out of time and energy, however I would like to leave some parting comments:

- You are playing with the rest of our natural lives, and the lives of our children and grandchildren. Please be careful and diligent and

look at some of the facts presented and just don't take the proponent and departments word verbatim.

- I know our back yard is bigger than your back yard; however nearly 400,000 panels outside my back yard is for you like a couple of your neighbours placing 40 panels on 5 metre pedestals in their back yards. Why should we tolerate this, as I can only imagine the backlash if this was in a town or city?
- Biodiversity credits, so the department proposes to allow our biodiversity to be shattered to give credits to where? We are not the polluters out here; we process your carbon emissions and turn them into oxygen and food. Someone needs to realise that at some stage.
- We are heading down the path of no longer being the lucky country to being the poorest 'green country' in the world
- We will be unable to bankroll our comeback once all this lunacy is over, and at the same time making the world's biggest polluters (India & China) the new world super powers
- Who would run our country then, certainly not the greens, when there is no money to spend they will be missing in action.

There are a number of attachments and photos included.

Thank you for your time.

Regards Jim

Jim Parrett



Jindera, NSW, 2642



Attachments

- World Solar Plants 200MW and above
- World Solar Plants kmz file
- John Barilaro letter
- Minister letter
- Mike Young letter
- Email to DPIE May 2023
- Photo tiger Quoll Scat
- Meme showing what city people believe is a good environment

World Solar Plants 200MW and above

- **Tengger Desert Solar Park – 1547MW**

Zhongwei, Ningxia, China

Population 1m, 14km from plant to city

Supposedly the largest in the world covering 43km², however imagery from 21/03/2019 only shows 30km²

Tenggeli Desert -11C to 31C

- **Bhadla Solar Park – 1365MW**

Bhadla, Phalodi tehsil, Jodhpur district, Rajasthan, India

Nearest village is Awaya with no listed population, Phalodi Tehsil covers an area of 7700km² and has a listed population of 564,560 which is very sparse by Indian standards

Supposed capacity by 2019 is to be 2255 MW making it the biggest in the world, imagery from 06/01/2019 shows current plant at only 20km².

Digging further, due to multiple contracts and low bidding price the project is currently stalled on increasing capacity, also land procurement issues have caused a stumbling block

Multiple companies involved, Finnish Fortum, Rising Sun Energy, Solaire direct, Softbank, ACME, Phelan Energy, Avaada Power.

Rangeland Desert Bhaalachuron Ki, semi arid low rainfall, 9C to 42C

- **Pavagada Solar Park – 600MW to 2000MW**

Pavagada Talul, Tunkar District, Karnataka, India

Site selection due to low population density, high solar radiation, land availability, low rainfall and elevated plateau

Drought declared 54 times in last 60 years

Like a lot of Indian set ups multiple companies involved, Parampujya Solar Energy, Fortum Finnisurya Energy, ACME Solar, Tata Power Renewable Energy, Yarrow Infrastructure, Renew Power.

Arid zone low rainfall, -5C to 45C

- **Kurnool Ultra Mega Solar Park – 1000MW**

Panyam Mandal, Kurnool district, Andhra Pradesh, India

Is an inland district of Andhra Pradesh state, not unlike MIA, arid zone with channelled water for horticultural irrigation with water released from Srisailem Dam via channels

Arid low rainfall, 16C to 40C

Sun Edison, Softbank Energy, Azure Power, Adani Power

Site badly damaged by a thunderstorm in may 2017

- **Datong Solar Power Top Runner Base – 1000MW**

Datong, Shanxi Province, China

Elevation 1040m, mountainous area that borders Inner Mongolia, principally a coal mining area

Continental steppe climate, with long dry winters and monsoonal summers

-10.4C to 28.5C

No web site

- **Longyangxia Dam Solar Park – 850MW**

Longyangxia, Gonghe County, Qinghai Province, China

Tibetan plateau, very low population density, average elevation 3000m, arid landscape

One of the problems the developer faced was how to deal with sandstorms

-18C to 21C

- **Villanueva Solar Park – 828MW**

Villaneuva, Hidalgo State, Mexico

Wind swept central Mexican state, arid with low population density

4.8C to 28C

No web site

- **Rewa Ultra Mega Solar Park – 750MW**

Rewa, Gurh Tehsil, Rewa District, Madhya Pradesh, India

Located on semi arid plateau country between two river deltas

Very low population density

11C to 41C

- **Kamuthi Solar Power Project – 648MW**

Kamuthi, Ramanathapuram district, Tamil Nadu, India

Very basic construction techniques, panels are supported by a series of 200ltr drums and are not sun tracking as is the same with most of the Indian and Chinese set ups

Recognised as one as one of the biggest chilli pepper producers in the state of Tamil Nadu

Low density population

Hot and oppressive year round 21C to 39C very humid

- **Charanka Solar Park – 615MW**

Charanka, Patan district, Gurajat, India

Apparently made up of 31 individual projects, no coordinates given, not even on India Solar Site, makes you wonder, I believe this and the Gurujat Solar Park are one and the same

Arid low rainfall 10.5C to 42C

- **Solar Star I & II – 579MW**

Rosamond, Kern County, California, USA
Pop 18,150 and around 21km from solar site
Westernmost point of Mojave Desert
Adjacent to Tylerhorse Canyon Wind Plant
Also adjacent to Garland Solar Facility and Antelope Valley Solar Ranch
Arid climate, -5C to 41C

- **Copper Mountain Solar Facility – 552MW**

Boulder City, Clark County, Nevada, USA
Pop 15,000, 23km from plant
Arid creosote bush desert, was a large gold and copper mining area in the 19th century
Adjacent to Techren Solar Park
4C to 39C

- **Desert Sunlight Solar Farm – 550MW**

Desert Center, Riverside County, California, USA
Pop 204, 11km north
Smack bang in the middle of the Mojave Desert
7C to 40C

- **Topaz Solar Farm – 550MW**

Carrizo Plain, San Luis Obispo County, California, USA
Semi arid rangeland, nearest community Lost Hills 45km to east 6C to 36C
Low density rangeland grazing country

- **Huanghe Hydropower Golmud Solar Park – 500MW**

Golmud, Qinghai Province, China
Pop 205,000, 24km east
Arid Tibetan plateau desert
-9C to 18C

- **NP Kunta Ultra Mega Solar Park – 500MW**

Also known as Ananthapuram Ultra Mega Solar park
Nambulapulakunta mandal, Ananthapur, Andhra Pradesh, India
Low population density with two nearest villages being Nambulapulakunta and Veligallu not having recorded populations
Semi arid to arid plateau country
17C to 40C

- **Three Gorges Golmud Solar Park – 500MW**

No web site

No coordinates

Have not been able to identify or locate project

- **Three Gorges Delingha Solar Park – 500MW**

Same as above, no information available

- **Mount Signal Solar Park – 594MW**

Also known as Imperial Valley Solar Park

Calexico, Imperial County, California, USA

Pop 38,000, 14km east

Decommissioned irrigation area, sub tropical hot desert (Baja California)

Calexico is a major trucking transport hub

5C to 42C

- **Mesquite Solar Project – 400MW**

Arlington, Maricopa County, Arizona, USA

Pop 194, 15km west

Sonoran Desert, 2C to 43C

- **Piropora Solar Project – 400MW**

Buritizeiro, Piropora, Minas Gerais, Brazil

Pop 26K, 8km west

No web site or coordinates but managed to locate

Poorer farming community with 605 farms and only 107 tractors between them

Main industry now is the production of iron silicon, metallic silicon and textiles

Sub tropical climate, cloud cover is a staggering 82% in the wet season and is recorded as partly cloudy

72% of the time in the dry season

15C to 32C

- **Yanchi Solar Park – 380MW**

Very close to Tengger Desert Solar Park, same demographics

- **Cestas Solar Park – 300MW**

Neoen Behind Culcairn proposal constructed this one

Cestas, Gironde, Nouvelle-Aquitaine, France

Company web site has next to no information

Pop 16K, 10km east

1C to 26C

- **Techren Solar Park – 300MW**

Adjacent to Copper Mountain, same data applies

- **Nova Alinda Solar – 292MW**

Supposedly going to be Brazil's newest and biggest

No web site

No coordinates

I cant locate as yet

- **Agua Calicente Solar Project – 290MW**

Borders Yuma County and Maricopa County

Nearest community is Buckeye 80km away

Was going to be the biggest in the USA, however plans have stagnated due to a lack of retail opportunity

- **California Flats Solar Project – 280MW**

Cholame Hills, Monterey County, California, USA

Nearest community San Miguel 36km east, pop 2300

Semi arid rangeland inland coastal bioregion, low density grazing
-1C to 36C

- **Springbok Solar Farm – 328MW**

California City, Kern County, California, USA

Another one that has been talked up a fair bit, however imagery data is old at 05/09/2015 so cant locate development, no photos or information on company website

- **Don Jose Solar Farm – 260MW**

No website

No coordinates

Haven't managed to locate as yet

- **Ituverava Solar Farm – 254MW**

No website

Managed to identify

Tobocas do Brejo Velho, Bahia, Brazil

Pop 3492, 16km west

Highland area, low population density

Warm and humid

19.4C to 39C

- **Mandsaur Solar Farm – 250MW**

Runija, Suwasara Tehsil, Mandsaur district, Mathya Pradesh, India
Pop 4943, 5km
Adjacent to Rewa

- **McCoy Solar Energy Project – 250MW**

Blythe, Riverside County, California, USA
Pop 21K, 16km
Palo Verde Valley, Colorado Desert
Hot desert climate, 4C to 51C

The Honourable

John Barilaro
Deputy Premier NSW
Minister for Regional NSW
Minister for Skills
Minister for Small Business

Gabrielle Upton
Minister for Environment
Minister for Heritage
Minister for Local Government

Anthony Roberts
Minister for Housing
Minister for Planning
Special Minister of State

Niall Blair
Deputy Leader Nationals
Minister for Primary Industries
Minister for Regional Water
Minister for Trade & Industry

Don Harwin
Minister for Resources
Minister for Energy & Utilities
Minister for Arts

Bronnie Taylor
Parliamentary Secretary to
the Deputy Premier

5th March 2019

Dear Deputy Premier and Ministers

I write to you today out of fear and dismay for what is currently happening within our farming sector in relation to the instillation of Renewable Energy installations (in our shire primarily solar plants, however in others wind plants also) on prime agricultural land and land of closer settlement.

In the last six months our shire (Greater Hume Shire) has been inundated with applications to build solar industrial plants (I cant call them farms as farms produce food and fibre), to date I think there are 10 proposed in our area all on prime agricultural land or IAL (Important Agricultural Lands).

I would appreciate if you could carefully consider the following issues as time is running out very quickly in relation to approval for these industrial plants.

Firstly let me state that I am not against renewable energy projects or systems, however there is a place for everything, the recent drought is a major highlight why our land is not suited to solar arrays being developed, our area in the midst of a severe drought was the most productive area in NSW during this period, people need to consider that we still need the ability to feed the nation. I will discuss later in this dialogue where ideal locations for these plants should be.

NSW Guidelines for large scale Solar Development

We approached DPE in regards as to how weak some of the conditions were in the draft document in relation to protecting prime farming land and some associated issues with the draft, you can't imagine how shocked we were when the adopted guidelines were produced and had even further watered down any criteria in respect to protecting prime farming land. It was if a smooth ride was being given to all of these overseas companies to rape and pillage our genuine farming districts to allow the government to abide by a misplaced Paris accord.

The guidelines appear more apparent in helping the renewable companies get what they want than protecting everyday Australian farming families.

Another point that is worth acknowledging is your very own NSW Departments came up with a renewable plane which designated Northern Tablelands, Central Tablelands and South West as their targeted renewable zones, not the South East where we are located.

Prime Agricultural Land

The above mentioned guidelines allude to Class 1, 2 and 3 prime agricultural land (or irrigated lands) be avoided but not precluded. Well I can assure you that every solar plant I have inspected in the last month is on prime agricultural land Classes 1 and 2 and irrigated lands. This is totally against all recommendations, why you ask, it gives very easy connection to the renewable companies, close to either sub stations or high capacity transmission lines with little to no transmission costs for the proponents.

Currently, every single applicant in our shire is on Class 1 and 2 land, even though in a most recent case for the Walla Walla Solar (Farm) the scoping study (Preliminary Environmental Assessment / PEA) produced by a consultant lists all the land as class 4, this is so incorrect and misleading that it is sinister in its intent and just goes to show money talks.

The ultra concern with these misleading PEA's is these are the very documents that get submitted to DPE for review and approval for what needs to go in the companies EIS, when it is misleading from the start there is not much hope for the remainder of the project being honest.

Fire Risks

Over the last two days I have been out fighting spot fires from lightening strikes, from my western boundary there are three separate solar plants proposed and up for approval, these amass to 1600 acres of prime farming land, we have already been instructed as an RFS member if a fire is present we are not to enter a solar facility as they have limited access and exit points and a multitude of hazard that would be a death sentence to those that enter.

In my case the prevailing weather conditions come from west to east and I am in line to either be burnt out or poisoned through the toxic plume that heads my way, neither are very endearing to me.

We have heard in recent rumours that the renewable companies are canvassing the government to seek cropping exclusion zones on neighbouring properties that will grossly limit the activities you can perform on your property, in order to protect their investment, well what about our businesses and long term investments? I think that the renewable companies should be made to have a much more inclusive fire management plan, the ones I have seen to date are urban driven and not applicable to our rural settings, these companies are not playing a fair game.

It is worth noting that if this proposed renewable facility was given the green light and did burn you would have to evacuate the rural township of Jindera however more importantly you would have to evacuate the regional city of Albury, the components are very toxic when burning.

How do the proponents propose to reduce the fire fuel load, as the half dozen existing solar plants I have inspected to date have no reduction works carried out to reduce fire load and / or weed load (another problematic issue) how are these companies to be made compliant to either policy or guideline recommendations, in most cases I have seen to date these fly by night companies come in construct and then sell the facility to a third party in all cases bar one to another overseas venture. Compliance on all levels is going to be a major ongoing problem and I feel that DPE are grossly underestimating the issues this may cause.

We believe that the renewable companies should have exclusion zones imposed on them to protect our farming practices, weed risk, drainage (flooding), drainage (salinity) fire risk as above, changes to our micro climate and harbouring vermin etc.

Where to locate

We are all aware why they are suddenly popping up in our area, no transmission costs for the proponents and adequate high voltage transmission lines, how about the government ponders the following suggestion.

Successive governments have just about killed the food bowl / irrigation areas of NSW and other states, however NSW has been hit the hardest in an effort to abide by a poorly developed MDBP, in an effort to give those farmers who were unduly affected and had their businesses decimated why not make the renewable companies invest in transmission lines from those areas to give those affected the most an opportunity to earn an income on their once productive lands.

Anyway, I have probably lost your attention already, however I think dialogue between concerned landowners and the appropriate government agencies needs to be enacted pronto as these plants are popping up all over the place. I would dearly like to enter into further dialogue to discuss a myriad of issues that don't appear to be of concern to DPE, some of these appear below:-

- Limited information forthcoming and none from the involved landholders as they have had to sign silence disclosure documents from the renewable companies (tad dramatic and bizarre)
- Our area is the fastest growing rural lifestyle area in our region according to Real Estate Institute, this scale of development will no doubt devalue many local assets
- Ambient temperature increases, not even included in PEA's or EIS's, this a real concern and most research shows an ambient temperature increase of 2 to 5 degrees
- Changes to micro climate which will change our business
- Will stagnate future subdivision potential for neighbouring properties
- Increased rainfall coefficient runoff, adding to flooding of local creeks
- Destruction of high quality / value agricultural land and its production potential
- Loss of aesthetic value / total eyesore
- Effectively a solar industrial plant, however calling them farms to avoid land classification changes to industrial not rural land
- Renewable companies to date have only had dialogue with those that they think are immediately affected and that to date has been very minimal and lacked scientific rigour
- All information provided to date has been rather vague, they can't even tell us what size panels they are using
- The multitude of proposals in our shire will definitely change where we live
- No climate mapping provided in relation to cloud cover, fog, rainfall mapping and the like, one of the proposals that I had the opportunity to review used solar / climatic data from Urana which is an entirely different climate and environment, they a wolves in sheep clothing these companies, trying every trick in the book
- No research in to health issues for residents exposed to long term irradiation from panels, transformers and lithium battery's
- Definitely divides communities and neighbours
- Green energy options are fine if installed in more suitable locations

- No research into scientific, economic and cultural issues
- Multiplier effect of losing productive land = loss of production = loss of local employment
- These type of developments rarely employ local people short or long term

I have a 35 year career in Natural Resource Management with 24 of those years spent with Soil Conservation Service and State Water, I am also a farmer, so I believe I have some idea on the issues discussed above.

We need some clear direction in these issues and I look forward to hearing from you or your staff in the near future before these plants get out of hand.

Yours sincerely

Jim Parrett
Rural & Environmental Services
[REDACTED]
Jindera, NSW, 2642

[REDACTED]
For and on behalf of
Jindera and Surrounds
Solar Awareness Group

Dear Sir/Madam,

This letter is to express my concerns in relation to the planned Solar Plant developments in the Glenellen, Jindera, Culcairn and Walla Walla districts. These concerns are exacerbated by the recent limitations to current planning practices brought about by the COVID-19 restrictions of 2020 and how much the proponents of these plants are hiding behind the veil of Covid 19 in relation to delivering information and plans without consultation or visits.

With that comment in mind we recently had drilling services conducted on one of the proposed sites, with drones also flying over affected peoples properties and houses and it wasn't until the company was called out that they delivered a letter of intent to the community over a week later from the activities beginning.

It is also worth noting that in recent dialogue with two of the proponent companies they have both readily admitted when questioned that they wouldn't be here if it wasn't for the ease of hook up to the grid.

Our concerns are as follows:

1. The nomenclature of the Solar project, as a farm, where in fact it is a major industrial plant, is problematic. This is a plant, where there is multimillion dollar infrastructure, major changes to the community, and long term impact to the community. In calling it a farm, there has been a lack of due diligence in the planning of this project. If this was considered a major industrial enterprise, there would be far more planning, consultation, and research into the contracted companies.
2. Further to this, the planning onsite and inspections on the land itself has not been afforded to this area as a consequence of travel reduction due to COVID-19 restrictions. At the very least, time spent onsite should be made available before any significant developments are approved, with this in mind we have not seen anyone from IPC in our districts, these very people who are charged with a decision that will change our very lives as to where we live.
3. The companies involved have little information on their financial success, which is important, as if these companies fold, there is uncertainty as to the future of the infrastructure on our community. There have been company changes midway through planning, which does not inspire confidence. In Finley, there are local contractors still owed money due to company bankruptcy, and the company practice of using backpackers and offshore workers drained, not enhanced, resources from their communities.
4. This area was graded in the 1980s drought as occasionally arable land, which if due diligence was being undertaken, would be reviewed, as this is very reliable land for agricultural production. During the drought ending in 2019, this area produced fodder and crops for other areas in the state. The 2020 rainfall has ensured the capacity of this area as a food bowl for the state. We are still patiently waiting for the IAL assessment to be delivered, first it was going to be handed down in July 2019 and then August 2020, we have seen nothing to date and cant get an answer out of DPI in relation to when that assessment will be available, is the go slow to enable these plants to go ahead before you tell us what we already know that our land is 'important agricultural land'
5. During COVID -19, this Border Region has been significantly impacted as the point for restriction between Victoria and NSW. The Deputy Premier, John Barilaro, visited the region recently and made a commitment to visit again, with the view to supporting the area. This

commitment can and should include the long serving agricultural sector of the Greater Hume Shire. As a case in point is that agricultural industries along the border were among the first to be supported in allowing workers to cross the border restrictions. Any solar plant previously constructed has used cheap labour from outside the district on a short term basis, not injecting badly needed economic relief for the community, thereby negating solar plants as a long term economic opportunity.

6. In all of this, as a resident of Greater Hume Shire, and understanding what may transpire in our local area, I have concerns about fire hazards, and the insurance prospect of residents nearby. Has this been considered? Farms neighbouring the plants may not be able to insure their properties, and so one neighbour will profit, and one neighbour will not be able to conduct business without major upgrade if obtainable public liability insurance. This, in a district with a number of small productive farms affects the long term health of a now-thriving community. Creating a fire risk in this area, after the worst fire season in living memory, is negligent.
7. The impact on the infringement of the community needs careful, thorough and diligent consideration, and the long term future of the community needs to be factored into this project development. In a time where there are so many communities suffering from residualisation, due to drought and the Murray Darling Basin Plan fiasco impact, there are areas in the state that could much better support the development of such a large industrial plant. I understand that this is due to the location of the plants to the existing grid, but this again is a rushed decision – a new grid west of this area could much better support alternate townships, an injection of much needed infrastructure in residualised areas of the state.
8. I have asked a number of the proponents if they have taken into account our mental well being as we live with the fear of these developments night and day, there is not a day goes by where it is not on your mind or a community member asks you how its tracking etc. One of the proponents Project Managers told me that we would learn to live with it, stellar answer that.
9. I also note that in previous correspondence the guidelines for large solar development were discussed, well we thought your draft guidelines were a bit weak and favouring the development, however we were shattered when one of the guidelines, that of no plant within 10kms of each other has been removed from the adopted guidelines, can you make it any easier for these fly by night companies at the expense of your long term residents and tax paying businesses.

Ultimately, in our state, we have always made haste slowly. There is a need to consider renewable energy opportunities, but to rush into such huge decisions, the considerations of location, local impact, productivity, community health, wildlife habitat and risk have not been taken into account in a thorough and timely manner. This is especially the case during times where onsite inspections cannot take place to support such large and permanent structures being built in our now-suffering border region.

Minister Spokes made a statement recently that a number of SSD's were to be fast tracked including the Solar Plants of our shire to help rebuild the economy, I am no economist however I do run a business and I would dearly love anyone in government to enlighten me as to how these solar plants rebuild the economy, everyone of them is foreign owned, all the components are made in China (haven't we had enough gifts from China this year?), all the construction is primarily done by 457 visa backpackers, no local is going to give up a good job to work on a project like this for 12 months and then be out of work, the people that should work on a project such as this are sitting back receiving a generous welfare payment to be interested, so how

does this rebuild our economy. On top of that you have government subsidies helping these companies long term that just drains the public purse not rebuilds it.

I wrote previously on 5th March 2019 with a list of concerns, apart from a standard receipt letter from Minister Barilaro's office I have had no return correspondence in relation to this issue at all, that is 19 months without one single concern being addressed, this is not good enough from a government historically voted in by areas such as ours.

Yours sincerely

Jim Parrett

Rural & Environmental Services

[REDACTED]

Jindera, NSW, 2642

[REDACTED]

For and on behalf

Greater Hume Solar Awareness Group

17 November 2020

Mr Mike Young
Executive Director
Department Planning Investment and Environment

Dear Mr Young

We the undersigned are writing to you in the hope that you will grant an official extension of time to the recent GIS and DA for Glenellen Solar.

Once again we find ourselves in the midst of a very busy hay and harvest season and the pressure and stress that comes with this, being one of the best seasons in over a decade and at the same time we once again find ourselves having to try and find the time to review another ordinary solar proposal.

Given the recent change to the assessment process i.e. – removal of 10km exclusion zone between solar projects, changing objection levels from 25 to 50, not accepting pro forma objections from those with limited confidence and no experience in dealing with projects such as these, the magnitude which is unparalleled in our community.

Given that all parameters and changes appear to be in favour of the developer and not the resident landholders it would be favourable if you could see this current situation from our point of view and grant a viable and timely extension that would grant us an opportunity to digest to 500 plus page proposal and give valid and diligent comment.

It may be worth noting the pattern of proponent application for major projects has been on every occasion delivered on our doorstep at the worst possible time for us as farmers.

E.g. Jindera	Hay Season	2018
Walla Walla	Harvest	2019
Culcairn	Sowing	2020
Glenellen	Hay/Harvest Season	2020

It appears that the proponents don't wish to receive any valid comments from those that will be affected by these proposals long term.

A number of us have discussed in the past the suspicious and unfairly manner in which these projects are delivered for review, with either yourself or your Department, it is dialogue that goes unheeded.

There are many points that require clarification and refuting of the proponents claims. It is worth noting that granting an extension of time until the end of February 2021 to assist us in providing viable and relevant dialogue would not hinder or prejudice this project going through the due course as it has been ongoing since 2017.

Thank you for your consideration.

Daniel Moll
Stirling Moll
Jim Parrett
Michael Knobel
David Palmer

		Glenellen	
visit			27/04/2021
Nicole Brewer job	DPIE	Glenellen & Jindera no longer her	21/04/2021
Major Projects approved	DPIE	Culcairn development	25/03/2021
Rob Beckett	DPIE	Glenellen Solar	
Sent Items Dave Allen application	Trina	second chance	19/04/2022
issues		Retrying development application	01/12/2021
		Assessments	21/10/2021
		Landscaping	23/09/2021
Nicole Brewer Issues (unanswered)	DPIE	Glenellen and Walla	23/09/2021
visit (unanswered)		Glenellen issues and site	22/04/2021
Karl Okorn parameters	DPIE	Glenellen site visit and contact	28/04/2021
Iwan Davies visits	DPIE	divided community site	21/04/2021
Brewer		Email trail with Rob Beckett and Nicole	21/04/2021
		" " "	21/04/2021
		" " "	21/04/2021
Rob Beckett Solar	DPIE	Glenellen and Walla	10/03/2021

Since this series of projects have entered our lives and put us under so much duress, the communication has been appalling, I was registered on all four sites and now cant even log into any of them as a registered submitter, what is going on?

Don't use my new email address as an excuse as we have only been using this over the last six weeks.

A response and some information would be appreciated.

Regards

Jim Parrett



Blight Road East





