



JOHN MOORE

OBJECT

Submission No: 176368

Organisation:	Key issues: Land use compatibility
Location: Victoria 3677	
Submitter Type: None of the above apply to me OR I am making a submission in relation to advice the Commission has been asked to provide	
Attachment:	

Submission date: 5/30/2024 8:57:04 AM

Why agricultural land should NEVER BE PERMANENTLY POLLUTED by a Solar Factory. I would like to propose two important questions that should decide the debate as to whether agricultural land should be maintained in agricultural production or whether it should be allowed to be polluted by a solar factory?

The first is from 2040 to 2100, some sixty years and beyond. What will the agricultural land produce? Both in physical production and economic benefit?

One answer is if it is kept as productive agricultural land, which is a very precious and a finite resource. Which cannot be reproduced and if it is polluted, it may be lost forever. It will continue to grow food and fibre, without which we humans cannot survive. Particularly in wartime, Australia as an island nation, is in a perilous state if we cannot provide sufficient food and fibre to sustain ourselves.

Therefore if kept as agricultural land, it will continue to provide food, fibre, huge economic benefit and on and off farm jobs for the next 100 hundred years (from 2024 to 2100) or more. That will benefit the farmer, the surrounding community and Australia as a whole.

If on the other hand it is covered by a solar factory, up until about 2040, (if it is not wiped out by a fire or hailstorm before then). It will produce a small amount of intermittent electricity for only a maximum of eight hours or 33% of each day. This is because the fuel which powers solar panels is in very limited supply each day. This is because the Sun which provides the weather fuel sunshine, only provides worthwhile sunshine, after it rises from 8.30am, until 4.30pm when it begins to set. This means the solar factory at best can only generate for about eight hours or only 33% of every day, if the day is overcast or raining, much less or no electricity might be produced. Because the solar factory is so inefficient, it needs backup electricity from the grid, to fill in the sixteen hours, when the solar factory has no access to any weather fuel. With this need for backup fuel for sixteen hours a day, it means that the electricity generated by the solar factory is heavily subsidized and actually very expensive when all costs (such as mining, manufacture, all transport, operation, dismantling and disposal) are taken into account.

But of even greater detriment if a solar factory covers the land is the loss of potential economic agricultural production from the land from say 2025 to 2040. And then if the solar factory is not dismantled and disposed of, in say from 2040 to 2042 (which is highly unlikely as the cost would seem prohibitive, as it could not be bulldozed, but would have to be carefully dismantled by hand. And then the question is, where are the toxic solar panels going to go?). And who is going to pay for it all? The solar factory owner has probably gone into liquidation.

In fact, it would appear to be extremely likely that from 2040 until 2100 and beyond, the land is going to be an unproductive, toxic, fire prone and feral pest wasteland. A blight on the environment and a threat to the above and below ground water supplies for all residents in Cities, Towns and residents of surrounding areas

I believe the only answer to this debate is that the land must remain as productive agricultural land.