

Merino Solar Factory Objection

written by Dale Towell
Tirrannaville resident

15 August 2025

I am a Tirrannaville resident, living at 22 Meadow Lane and within a few kilometres of the proposed Merino Solar Factory.

My husband and I moved to this property nearly five years ago, and my upbringing was on a dairy farm in Moss Vale. I have an understanding of country life, the value it holds for the whole of Australia, the work required to maintain production and the heart that drives every story of successful, productive land development and food production.

This region is prime land, it has been very much a major player in the wealth of this country and it will continue to produce what is vital to the livelihood of our entire population. That is, if allowed to do so, if allowed to maintain this production.

The solar farm proposed, the size, the capacity, the huge impact that this development will impose upon Goulburn, will not allow the vital production of primary industry to continue.

I should say at the outset, we are not against care of the environment, renewable energy or efficient use of resources. I will say however, that solar panel factories will not achieve any of these.

Renewables are not cheaper, the opposite is in fact the case.

It is not safe for the environment, and production of these factories indicates this – the machinery, the raw materials, the production process, the transport of materials, the ‘end of life’ process of each panel and the damage to land used.... are all contrary to zero emission requirements.

Visual pollution – from the expanse of beautiful pastures, stock grazing and homesteads dotted within view, the solar factory promises a sea of man-made constructions. Mitigation of this visual impact is difficult to believe possible – what we will see in the 3kms, between our property and the Braidwood Road (we can now see vehicles moving along Braidwood Road) is an expanse of one million panels, all reflective, all audible as they adjust to capture maximum sun

and all cancelling out potential optimum land use for stock and crop production.

Reduced productive land space – how is this of benefit when it reduces food produced in face of a growing population?

Local benefit – how is this a claim when property values decrease under cover of solar panels. AND when none of the power claimed to be generated is actually for use in this area? All the benefit goes to city areas where residents don't want these panels in their back yard.

Noise – one million moving man made arrangements will be very much audible when they turn to face maximum sun.

Danger – breakage, harmful emissions, pathogens, fire. *'Broken solar panels pose several dangers, primarily related to fire, electrocution, and toxicity. Damaged panels can allow water to enter, causing electrical faults and potentially starting fires. Exposed wiring presents an electrocution risk. Additionally, solar cells contain toxic materials like [cadmium telluride](#) and [gallium arsenide](#), which can be hazardous if released during a fire or if the panel is broken.*

.... and panels do break under heavy storm activity.

I would like to note that much of the proposed site for the Merino Solar Factory is in a low lying swamp area, not conducive to safety given our rainfall here and the fact that electricity and water don't work well together.

Insurance – I have been unable to ascertain if our property insurance will remain as it is, whether it will rise in cost given the possible 'danger of proximity to this factory', or if it will even be possible to hold insurance as a result of living next door to a solar factory.

Land Use – future access to land covered over by panels is minimal to zero. Cattle cannot graze in this space and if they could it is impossible to till that land or prepare it for improved pasture and cropping. Access for the required machinery would not exist.

Climate - thick fog was one of the major factors into the rejection of an airport upgrade/expansion. Would this not also be an argument against the suitability of a solar factory in the same area? The low temperatures and rainfall is also not conducive to high solar output.

Security – 'creators' of many renewable energy projects have begun with a company that does not commit long term and changes hands. Yes, land

owners have the option to gain advantage from this solar factory, but what security do those who sign up, have in the case of a change of hands? This also impacts on the process planned, or the commitment for this process, when it comes to the expiry of the panels.

Infrastructure for development access – already, Painters Lane is used as a short cut thoroughfare for heavy vehicles who don't want to adhere to the speed limited and sealed roads that provide the same access they require. Instead, they cut across the unsealed Painters Lane, they travel at high speeds, the airborne dust and pathogens off the road compromise the tank water storage of every resident along that route and the safety of other vehicle movement to local road users becomes critical. Noting that tank/dam is the sole supply of water in this area.

Development in practical terms – the swell in vehicle numbers using this land for the solar factory development has neither been factored in or if it has, not been documented into any impact statement.

Zoning – this area is zoned Rural, not industrial. We as residents, are governed in what we place here, build, what we do with our space, by the zoning requirements. Why is an industrial factory permitted here, when we cannot add 'industry' to our properties?

Personal - the impact on our lifestyle at Tirrannaville would be huge. We purchased our property here for every reason that will now be adversely impacted. In the time here, we have made this our home and invested in improvements. We have added solar to our own space, a Tesla battery to utilize this solar, water storage to be self-sufficient, gardens and tree cover, and we have given the environment, deserved respect. We have imposed no detriment on our acreage, instead, we have improved our entire property. ... with no imposition on anyone else.

Anti climate has been labelled anti-human, but money is the deciding control, not the best outcome.

We have no objection to a better, safer environment, but one million solar panels being placed over this beautiful country area is not progress. It is destruction. A backstep for all the good people who bought here and planned their future.

Take this 'factory' to an industrial area, not a rural space. Take it at a distance from impact on people and their homes. OR take it to where the power generated will be provided – to the city.

We here, and many others in this area, generate our own power and we have spent considerable dollars to reach a point where we take very little and place minimal impact on the earth. [Why now, are we inflicted with a sea of artificial constructions – neither proven as sustainable or beneficial – right at our back door, and potentially harmful, during the development process, during operation and ultimately when they expire and reveal to be impossible of disposal.](#)

This is our home. Do the ones pushing this development have homes? Where are they? Take this solar farm to where they live, and consider their reaction.

Better Future

Allow the 'load' to be shared.

We have worked to make ourselves as independent as possible, and we draw very little from council services – in regard to water supply, power supply, recycling, sewerage.

If each resident was encouraged have their own solar, and if sufficient support for this was offered with a tariff that made this solar investment worthwhile, the world would be a better place. 'Each being responsible for themselves', would reduce the perceived need for solar farms and factory dimensioned developments aimed to benefit entire cities and rather than the full impact of solar factories being shouldered by the country areas where they were positioned, the cities who were recipients of the benefit of these factories, would be making their own contribution for what they used themselves. More importantly, each person with their own systems on their own properties, would not be impacting on anyone else. Making the tariff reward for input a \$ amount sufficiently substantial to make a difference, would provide incentive for this to happen.

Please consider our situation, as if it was that of everyone, and move this development to a place where personal life and rural production will not be impacted. Regional Australia matters.