

As a 4th generation farmer who will be farming adjacent to the proposed Glenellen Solar Farm I would like it noted that I STRONGLY OBJECT to this development. I will state my reasoning for this in dot points below.

As potentially the most affected neighbour, I believe, due to having the largest stretch of boundary with the proposed project, I am appalled that I have not been contacted verbally nor in writing, to advise that the Glenellen development is open for public submission. The process has left me outraged by the lack of communication and minimal time allowed to read, process and comment on such a huge submission which will affect myself and my family for many years to come. It is causing disappointment and added stress to myself and my family at a time when our workload is at its annual peak, harvest time, especially with what is set to be the best yielding grain harvest we have had for a decade. In that respect the timing around the EIS being made public has been inconsiderate and shows no regard or understanding of the farming neighbours their lifestyle and the challenges we already face.

- The farmland this project is proposed to go on is some of the most productive in the state not to mention some of the best in Australia, due to its reliability of rainfall and its loamy clay soil. We, the Moll family, have been hosting Variety trials, better known as NVT's since the 1940's. NVTs, originally administered and funded by the NSW Agricultural, the Department of Primary Industries and now Grains Research and Development Corporation, compare trial sites of select crops eg. wheat and canola varieties, against each other. Results are ranked against all other sites across the state and country. Nearly every year "Gerogery site" which is our farm trial, is ranked in the top 5. In drier years we consistently come in the top 2. Keeping this in mind, the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), has declared 164.5 ha of the land for this project as class 4 important agricultural land, which would be as good and if not better than our holding. I really think this needs to be considered more and investigated further before this development goes ahead. Class 3 land (OEH, 2012) is defined as high capability land: Land has moderate limitations and is capable of sustaining high-impact land uses, such as cropping with cultivation.

-Visual Amenity impact, this development will in no way be aesthetically pleasing. As a family privileged to live and farm in such a beautiful area, I believe a development like this will be an eyesore. My family's place of residence, 313 Fielder Moll Road Glenellen, is no more than 1.6km north with a 39m elevation above this proposed development; and our family homestead, 167 Fielder Moll road Gerogery, is no more than 2km, north east with an elevation of 43m above this proposed development, it begs my belief in the EIS appendix F, page 25 visual amenity assessment that BOTH these residents are classed as being low visual impact, with the panels being north facing and being elevated 5 metres from ground the development will be quiet visible structures and glare from both residents. On top of this, 290m to the west of our home residency, at the same elevation, the dwelling is considered to have a high visual amenity impact.

-Flood Hydrology Assessment

Being a custodian of the land and having worked this property for the last 19 years, I have experienced extreme weather events.

The flood maps that have been produced for this H A R are a complete load of rubbish, and I'm bemused at how it can be taken seriously, when on page 6 of the H A R it states that "No localised rainfall data, water levels or discharge data were identified at the site".

How can flood maps be produced, when it has just been stated that there is no localised data, the modelling has been based on regionalised information?

Furthermore, the 1-in-10 year flood event map and the 1-in-20 flood map are no more than a typical wet winter, not an extreme weather event.

The 1-in-500 year flood map looks like events we experienced in 2010 and 2016, where our annual rainfall was in the order of 1000mm. These studies are very inconclusive, especially as water shed rates from these panels will be higher.

Our property positioned on the lower side of the proposed development, has Bowna, Kilnacroft and Dead Horse creeks running through it, the increased water shed rate from the panels will increase water logging and inflows of water volumes down these natural creeks, leading to crop and pasture loss and increased erosion.

-Salinity is also of great concern. The development has a considerable number of native trees earmarked for removal. With these removed and no deep-rooted perennial pastures growing underneath these panels, I'm very concerned about a rising water table leading to salinity issues.

- Land Values, - I cannot in any way see this proposed development being favourable for land prices for neighbouring properties. We are in no way looking to sell or subdivide, but need our business to be in an equitable position. Falling land prices put pressure on this.

-Vehicles accessing the proposed development from the north will have to use Glenellen Road, from experience driving heavy vehicles this road is not suitable. It is a very narrow and windy road which is notorious for being engulfed by dense fog through the winter. Being treed on both sides, if 2 trucks are required to pass it requires both vehicles to get off the paved surface. I believe increasing truck activity on this road poses a safety concern for the numerous cyclists that use this road and a number of school buses with their frequent stopping for children.

- Overseas ownership of this project is also of concern. Trina energy is a Chinese owned company, in recent months we've seen a trade war erupt with China and Australia by the Chinese implementing trade bans and tariffs on commodities we produce, eg, barley, wheat and beef. Although this may seem minimal it is still a fact that doesn't sit well with me. I believe we produce premium products and should not be dictated to from other countries.
- My understanding is that the majority of the components in this project will be manufactured overseas and shipped here. If the government was fair dinkum about stimulating the economy with these projects, surely they would use local manufactures, achieving greater benefit to our local community, not just construction jobs.

- Community impact, these developments divide a community, as objectors we are not a bunch of red neck farmers against solar or against a cleaner future for our children. My family and I share the view that renewable energy is the way of the future, but it needs to be produced in areas that are so significant in primary production. I believe there could be a much better model for these projects that would better benefit communities in more in more marginal country, that could really advantage from a cash injection.
- I'd like it noted, that we, as a business were offered by CWP Energy to put one of these proposed developments on our property, but chose not to, as we value our peace and tranquillity. It was a difficult decision to make, when you weigh up the money on offer, it is astronomical, but we went with what we believed in, and that is: agriculture, a lifestyle and set of values living off the land offers, and a farming future for our children, should they choose it. We also believe in doing what we love, and are extremely passionate about farming sustainably and producing food, wool, and other premium products.

This is just some of the many issues I have with this proposed project, I have put this together under time constraints and have not had as much time to thoroughly comb through the EIS as I would have liked. It would be appreciated, if there was an opportunity made for me to provide further comment after our harvest season.

Kind Regards,
Daniel Moll