



ELINOR CRAFT

OBJECT

Submission No: 196731

Organisation:	Key issues: <i>Social and economic, Land use, Traffic and Transport</i>
Location: <i>New South Wales 2831</i>	
Submitter Type: <i>an individual making a submission on my own behalf</i>	
Attachment:	

Submission date: 9/5/2024 6:44:52 PM

I have a few concerns for this Project. My major concerns are Water, Traffic, Property Values and the decommissioning of the Project.

The Spicers Creek Wind project has an expected Construction phase of 40 months. The water requirement during this period is listed as 80-120mgl per year for dust suppression, concrete production, vehicle and equipment wash down, firefighting, and amenities. That is a minimum of 267 million litres of water,

The issue of Water for the Spicers Creek Project seem to have a number of solutions suggested, and there is no avenue that has not been covered, including access to Ground Water if needed. To quote the Assessment Report "to(sic) Ensure the development has adequate water supplies for the project and that it obtains any necessary licences under the Water Act 1912 or Water Management Act 2000. The Project has an agreement with Dubbo Regional Council with regard to waste water of 250 Megs per year, but this then has to be transported to the Project by road. This equates to 13 trucks at 55,000 liters per day to and from Dubbo - altogether an extra 130 truck movements per week.

With regard to Property Values, there appears to be a complete misrepresentation and misunderstanding of the nature of the properties involved. These are not just houses, investment or otherwise. They are businesses, built up through the hard work of many generations and heavily reliant on property value to underpin their operations. Lower property value means a reduction in borrowing capacity, thus increasing the risk of financial hardship and affecting the ability to handle the vagaries of farming.

In its assessment report, the Department avoids this issue by merely pointing out that any losses incurred are for the greater good. To Quote - "the Department considers that the social and economic benefits of the project outweigh the negative social and economic impacts. As such, the project is in the public interest"

The only measurement we can go by is the evidence. Property sold prior to the project sold well and above Market Expectations and similar property with a neighbour agreement for the Spicers Creek project has been on the market for an extended period with no market offers being received.

Another matter of concern is the issue of the Decommission and Disposal of the Structures at the end of the Project. Squadron Energy has stated that they are responsible for this, but the State Department has a policy that the landholder is responsible. I feel that the IPC needs to reassure itself exactly who will be held responsible, especially if the project is on sold to another provider. This happens all too often in this industry. Are the contracts valid if with another provider, or do they revert to the policy held by the Department? This is definitely not clear and will leave landholders(hosts) in extreme financial difficulty if the responsibility for the Cleanup is left to them.

Within a radius of 35km of the Spicers Creek Project there are a total of 21 projects either proposed or already approved as shown on Page 3 of the Assessment report. A total of over 9GW of power generation, including future capacity of 4GW this brings the amount to 13GW within 35 kilometres.



This situation is unprecedented. There is no measurement that can be appropriately held up as a standard as the impacts of this project and others are completely unknown and untested. The cumulative effects of all these projects together MUST be considered as a whole. Only then, will you be able to really assess the full implications for the area on which they are being developed.

When these Renewable Energy Zones were announced the Department proudly declared that these areas would be "Modern day Power Stations". I really don't believe that anyone within the area affected had any idea what was to be inflicted upon them, and I believe that they still don't. The lack of information that is openly available, and the practice of burying information on Departmental websites, is proof of this.

The "Gold Rush" attitude of the proponents is encouraged and welcomed by the organisations that are involved in this race to "Net Zero".

I implore the IPC to consider this project as a part of a whole and assess the impact of all of these projects on our small regional communities and allow everyone to be able to participate in a fair deal. This process should not have winners and losers, but should be a win-win for everyone concerned.
