



KATHRYN REYNOLDS

OBJECT

Submission No: 179737

Organisation:	<p>Key issues: Land use compatibility, Visual impact, Traffic and transport, Social impacts, Temporary accommodation, Other issues</p>
Location: New South Wales 2843	
Submitter Type: I am a member of the community with a view about the proposed development	
Attachment:	

Submission date: 6/14/2024 3:39:47 PM

The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure state on 7 June 2024 that:

â€¢ although the site is RU1 (Agricultural) and ACENâ€™s plans to subdivide the site result in the creation of lots smaller than 90% of the applicable 100 ha minimum lot size (as per the Mid Western Regional Local Environment Plan 2013)

â€¢ this subdivision is consistent with the key objectives of the RU1 Zone as it would encourage diversity and primary industry enterprises and minimize conflict between land uses.

â€¢ Therefore the department consider the subdivision should be approved.

On what basis does Iwan Davies, Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure, give for his view that this subdivision will encourage diversity and primary industry enterprises? Currently the land is cropped and grazes livestock. This 1330 ha block will never produce crop like it does now, no solar project in NSW produces crop nor grazes sheep (for longer than it takes to get a media photograph). Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure have already demonstrated that their calculation on cumulative impact is incorrect, plus they donâ€™t appear to appreciate that cropping land in NSW, in Australia and in the World is finite. Cropping country cannot be bunked together and called Agricultural land. Not all agricultural land can be cropped, this land at Birriwa solar will likely never be cropped again given the amount of cement required for the project and without considering leached contaminants from solar panels.

The Premier of NSW has clearly stated that the decommissioning and the rehabilitation of the land will ultimately rest with the landowner. The so called â€œdiversityâ€ described by Mr Davies will last as long as the solar panels and then the landowner will likely leave the project to deteriorate given that rehabilitation and decommissioning will be too costly and impossible to achieve.

There is no evidence that this project has any social licence. There is substantial evidence that this project has no social licence and ACEN have only managed to create ill will towards their company and the project itself. The fact that the ACEN team have little knowledge of the project and even less empathy with the community have been evidence by the constant changing ACEN team working in the community. To date ACEN have earned a reputation of ruthless vindictiveness, with one farmer losing his firearms and firearms licence and another community member banned from ever holding job with Australia Post. Why? They both expressed their displeasure with various ACEN projects. Oh to be a union leader or demonstrator or politician where there are no consequences and the permissible behaviour much worse.

Evidence so far indicates that heavy vehicle accidents will increase, with only Stubbo (ACEN) under construction we have experienced three B Double accidents in a period of 6 weeks. Fortunately, no one has been injured or killed yet. What procedures are in place to ensure heavy vehicle drivers are appropriately trained? What procedure is in place to ensure accident sites, where thousands of solar panels are broken, are appropriately cleared? To date with the three B Double Truck accidents (2 on the Golden Highway between Jerrys Plains and Denman, and 1 on the Golden Highway at Whittingham) there has been no investigation, no consequence for



the transport company, and no procedure in place to appropriately decontaminate the sites. That is 3 accidents in a six week period. What next for the users of the Golden Highway?

What assurances does the IPC have that slave labour is not being used to produce the solar panels that ACEN plan to install in this project? The three B Double traffic accidents, transporting panels to Stubbo, were clearly carrying solar panels produced by slave labour in China.

If the reputation of the applicant, ie financial status or any past planning regulation breaches, and the issue of whether the applicant is a 'fit and proper' person are not the remit of the IPC, who responsibility is this? Obviously not the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure given that Beryl Solar did not adhere to their consent conditions and there were zero consequences. Perhaps the IPC could assist the community by providing us with this information.

This project has no social licence, the IPC saw clear evidence of this at the hearing and the submissions (not one support from the community). This project is not in the public interest.

This project will ensure that electricity becomes more unreliable and expensive while putting our community risk. Undoubtedly all government agencies will sign off and at the end of the day no one will be responsible for any adverse outcomes. Oh, except the unfortunate farmer who is found guilty of negligence when a fire starts on nearby land and then causes billions of damages to the electricity network, plus they can then be blamed for the toxic smoke that engulfs the area. As for the government agencies and individuals signing off, no responsibility at all.
