

Objection Submission - Glenellen Solar Plant

Jim Parrett

23rd November 2020

As you have been previously notified the timing of this DA and EIS is not very satisfactory, however we have had a slight rain delay to our program and instead of catching up on some sleep and / or maintenance of equipment I find that I have to depress myself with reading the very ordinary proposal of GSF. I also have to try and dispel some of the mistruths in this EIS as it appears from previous dialogue that no one in the Department is doing so.

I understand that the Government has a mandate on renewable energy provisions, which in turn means the Department also has the same mandate, however you don't have to make it so easy for these foreign companies to manipulate the evidence to change the way of how and where I live my life.

If the Department / Government was truly looking at making an impact on emissions you would look to where the carbon emissions come from and that is not here where we are, we out here process your carbon and turn into food and oxygen, when you finally get that point we may start to get somewhere.

I have only the time to look at the executive summary at a glance for now as our timing request has once again fallen on deaf ears within the Department, every step that the Department currently takes is in favour of the developer, not us the existing landholders.

A few quick points for you to ponder:

The Proposal

- The proposal is not powering homes in our region, and no solar plant to date has gone anywhere near producing the power they claim they can. This is all to offset the carbon footprint of the larger city centres, so let them enjoy the panels where they live, to date I have not seen one building covenant come from the government that new homes in the urban fringe have mandatory renewable energy targets with the inclusion of statutory panels etc
- Once again I reiterate we are not the carbon emitters out here, once again just a fix for the city dwellers to feel good about themselves
- Panels up to 5mt above natural ground surface, we have covenants out here that don't allow us to build our machinery and hay sheds

this high and here we are an absolute myriad of irritable eyesores higher than any building on the horizon, it is not right or just

- How long do we have to wait for the so called screening works to save us from the view, and if the other solar plants now dotted across the region such as Finley and Bomen whose screening works have failed dismally through a lack of effort / knowledge and not one step of compliance from DPIE to adhere to the conditions of consent, it is criminal

Community and Stakeholder Consultation

- Sadly one of the biggest jokes I have read in some time, extensive consultation utter garbage, since February 2018 we had two meetings with CWP, earlier this year we had an introductory handover meeting with CWP and Trina Solar, since then 1 phone call and 1 email both in September from Trina Solar project manager who was going to submit EIS / DA in the new year as he understood we were to busy currently, also was going to send us some of the finer details around the proposal to date we have got nothing and were rather shocked when the proposal came out in late October. Even more staggering is the fact we have had not one point of contact from Ecological Australia, not certain how they gauged our low impact conditions??
- There were no community sessions with CWP prior to Covid 19 and certainly none planned under Trina Solar, I see in their DA that they are allowed to proceed with no community sessions thanks to the department, place them on hold until times are right again, don't just railroad us along your merry path
- Ongoing communication with neighbouring residents, absolutely laughable, do you as a department follow up any of these claims or just let it go on as the utter tripe and lies that it is
- Media coverage – have not seen anything
- Ongoing must = still waiting, it is all in the way you phrase something obviously

Land

- At least we have some acknowledgement of IAL from this group, I suppose that now the Department has once again changed the rules of engagement to assist these proponents they no longer have to lie about the land classification as the other proponents have done, how do you go from having guidelines that precluded IAL, irrigated lands, no large developments within 10kms of each other etc to now just having it as open slather, take any land you want, I hope that

one day you wake up hungry and wonder where your food is going to come from

- 30 years, some sectors describe a generation as 20 years, some 25, either way, however in relation to changes to a landscape whilst not permanent these developments will constitute a permanent change to our landscape and environment for a generation and a half, so my kids and grandkids have to grow up in an industrial zone, thank you for your humility
- Where is the evidence that the proposed development will not affect the capacity of immediate neighbours, a number of neighbours to a number of these proposed developments have entered into mental health care, depression is becoming a rather prevalent side issue to these proposals currently, according to one arrogant project manager we will learn to live with it, wow
- I asked both Trina Solar and Greenswitch / Hanwa to do some research or provide details around the cumulative affect of the heat island affect of the two developments being side by side as from my NW boundary there will be over 7km of panels on a NW path which is our predominant weather path. To date I have received nothing from either and all they normally talk to me about is the European models or Cogupna near Shepparton which is only a 30MW instillation, this is so wrong as any of the data coming out of South America and Africa (similar climate to ours) with any development over 100MW is alarming at how much it can change the ambient temperature, with the cumulative affect I am looking at 4 to 5 degrees addition to the ambient temperature for up to 2km prior to dissipation, I may as well salvage what I can by selling my place (if I can and moving somewhere else) you need to protect us your law abiding, tax paying residents not spoon feed and help these companies who are trying to railroad us. You also need to be vigilant in your appraisal of these proposals

Visual

- Absolutely misleading in their account of visualisation, to give elevation measurements based on road infrastructure is another incorrect part of this assessment, many of the local properties have their homes built on the highest rises of their properties to take advantage of the magnificent views on offer in our region.
- Overall impact of the proposed development on the rural landscape is low, please explain how anyone could come up with this assessment, is this assessment based on any methodology or just a city based planner whose daily view is a heavily impacted and damaged area

- Zone of visual impact, what digital model are they using, where are they taking their measurements from? All of my life I have offered people respect, this is waning at a rapid rate, I am no longer a person, resident, landholder, I am now a receptor or receiver what demeaning terminology for us locals, is this another ploy from the government/department to dehumanise the proposals and make it easier for your conscious to cast us to the wolves?
- Anyway to use a similar model to Ecological Australia Pty Ltd, I have found 37 affected landholders within 2km not 7, do you check any of the garbage produced by these companies, absolute mistruths at every step just to sell a proposal that is impacting us not you.
- A quick assessment of the elevation change across the proposed solar plant site gives an elevation change of approximately 19m, hardly relatively flat farming land as the proponent would lead us to believe
- Many of these impacted landholders are listed in below table with distance from development not to their respective boundaries but to their point of residence and also the elevation in metres above the proposed development, as the proposed development is one of the lowest points in our local neighbourhood

Property	Name	Distance	Elevation	Dual Impact Jindera
Lewana Park	Parrett	1463m	18m	no
Waitara	Moll	1351m	14m	no
Elderslie	Moll	1966m	31m	no
Oakridge	Moll	1671m	28m	no
Boxwood	Hamson	1616m	27m	no
Roseleigh	Moll	1428m	19m	no
Forest Air	Murray	958m	11m	yes
	Sparkes	1094m	13m	yes
	Hill	1349m	13m	yes
	Mojsiewicz	760m	12m	yes
	Lyons	493m	12m	yes
	Duncan	496m	11m	yes
	Brand	1006m	15m	yes
	Habermann	875m	21m	yes
	McGibbon	693m	28m	yes
	May	440m	16m	no
	Cumming	577m	16m	no
	Guy	402m	15m	no
	Knobel	301m	13m	no
	Deegan	336m	13m	no
	Hobbins	340m	18m	no

	Bartley	365m	33m	no
Drumwood	Palmer	223m	25m	no
	Trethowan	1465m	20m	likely
Spring Park	Toohy	1990m	43m	yes
Cabell Park	Baker	1931m	48m	yes

Plus there are 11 more properties on Nioka Road (not even mentioned in the EIS summary) all with highly elevated sites and all around the 2km distance mark from the proposed development.

I have managed to fit in a quick look at Section 4. Visual Impact Assessment and I am really looking forward to giving it more time in the future, however a current quick snapshot is as follows;

- We are the nearest neighbour to the east of the proposed development and share a common boundary with host proponent
- Our property sits 18m higher in elevation than the lowest platform of the proposals footprint, it is not predominantly level farming country as the proponents would have you believe, in fact there is a 19m elevation change across the proposal footprint, add to this a further 5m elevation for the panels, such an unneeded eyesore
- Currently if you sit on our front veranda and look to the north west you can see approximately 80 acres of natural ground surface of the proposed development, on top of this any viewpoint from our property west of our easterly divide gives us vision of farmland that is to be covered with panels
- The viewability will only increase once 5m high panels are installed as the angle of elevation will negate the screening affect of some of the natural timber along the creek line
- Our property is listed in the VAI Report for visual impact as 'None', absolute lies based on a theoretical desktop model with obviously some very questionable data input into the model, I invite any departmental officer to come and have a look for themselves
- You can't take as gospel what these companies are portraying, there are big dollars at stake and they will pass off any information to get there project over the line
- I understand from dialogue with the department that you are under resourced and unable to check these erroneous claims from the proponents, however some one needs to start listening to our side and question what is being proposed and look to why, therefore any departmental person making a decision around the evidence provided by the proponent needs to start questioning the proponents evidence as it is vastly flawed and skewed in their own favour

- From what I can gather so far, all proponent deliberations have been listed as 'surface models', so desktop assessment I presume, with no infield assessment conducted, how wrong
- Our property doesn't even get listed in the RVIA report and nor do many others that have direct visual impact, they appear to base some of their evidence of not listing properties based on screening activities, I have visited the majority of solar plants in the Riverina over the last 18 months, not one has had a successful screening program
- Any visual impact on our amazing vista is significant, we certainly don't need some modeller from an urban environment who is used to looking at steel and concrete everyday to tell us that we have no visual impact and that this is a low impact development on our rural landscape

I could go on however time negates this activity continuing currently, however it shows the true light of the mistruths provided by these companies just to sell an idea. Disappointingly, the department does not call them into question or seek the truth in matters such as these.

- In discussing the proximity to Jindera SF we are led to believe that GSF has low levels of impact, please explain how this can be an honest and logical appraisal? Any view of the proposed plant is a significant impact on our local community, in the landscape as previously mentioned it is the lowest property in elevation in our immediate community and visually we all look down to it from elevated platforms
- What ongoing commitment to consult with significantly impacted landholders, 1 introductory meeting, 1 phone call (discussing the weather, project managers flash car and a possible pending visit) and 1 email, in my mind is in no way significant commitment or dialogue around a project of such magnitude
- The proposed screenings of which I can't find any dialogue on currently, will take at minimum of 15 to 20 years to be a viable screen from this eyesore on our landscape. If the other solar plants that have popped up in the Riverina of late are anything to go by, we shouldn't expect anything viable here either, the commitment by the companies and the department to the absolute failings in providing screenings to date is deplorable
- Traffic control is non-existent on any of the sites I have visited during construction to date, the time of day is not conditioned here, most of the sites I visited the traffic commences around 5.45am 6 days/week, and the security staff are on site driving in and out 24 hours per day with beacons blinking away night and day

Water

- There are three defined water courses with defined bed and bank within very short distance of the development and are in the run off catchment of the proposed development
- What hydrological model did they use, rainfall / runoff scenario, what exceedance factor are they using if any, the 100% shed rate of the panels will cause significant rilling and significant change to the catchment parameters, in time without cultivation and soil ameliorants and only grazing under the panels the soil becomes compacted further impacting the run off potential of the proposed development, it is obvious none of these factors have been taken into account with their deliberations/calculations, a model is only as good as the information you are willing to input into it. Our catchment is already overloaded higher up with urban development and the maximum shed rate that comes from this, this proposed development will only exacerbate the current problem
- No water from local creeks should be used on this project as this would impact on downstream landholders and the Murray River Catchment as these creeks run into Bowna Creek 3.2km downstream of the development and it in turn runs directly into Lake Hume.
- I have yet to find any dialogue around the groundwater impacts that we will expect once they remove our local mature trees which are our groundwater pumps, they provide drainage of the groundwater table, they also provide transpiration which equates to precipitation. Have a look at the work done by a fellow department in DPI around removal of mature trees in the catchment, it is not rocket science

Surface Water Quality Impacts

- Under no circumstances is the "Blue Book" relevant to this environment, I had technical input into the original Red Book that the Blue Book is based on back in the early '90's, and it is not relevant to this environment on a site such as this at this scale
- Pollution control has been non-existent at other solar sites within the Riverina, especially in consideration of dust control, or mud on local roads after rain from the heavy traffic volume, no compliance orders from DPIE, thankfully the EPA is now taking a semi-active role in this issue
- What do they clarify as best practice for creek crossings?
- No compliance from DPIE on any site that I have visited in the last two years, can't even find a compliance contact on your website

Hazard & Risks

Time not available at this stage, this is a topic that requires lengthy dialogue

Waste

- Another of the humorous sections?
- Impossible to police and manage
- The plastic that flew around the Finley development was obscene
- In September I visited the Bomen site for the second time, needed a post construction look, I visited a number of pasture and cropping paddocks east of the development which were strewn with plastic debris 12 months post construction, we don't need this in our environment, and once again not one iota of compliance or adherence to conditions of consent from DPIE

Socio Economic

- How does this benefit our community, we are not the carbon emitters out here, we have to change the way we live to allow the major polluters to lead a better life in the cities, we shouldn't have to wear the pain for your benefit
- Once again climate change is a natural process if you think differently place these industrial plants in your cities not our pristine environment out here
- As for the garb on local workers we have discussed this before, it doesn't happen and I challenge you to prove it to be different
- Tourism drawcard, best belly laugh I have had this week, only for the city dwellers whose ideology is going to change where I live

Cumulative Impacts

- Have a look at the size of the Victorian developments, or Corowa for that matter, these developments are much more in keeping with the local environment and not having the same impact on residents such as these massive proposals do
- As previously mentioned above, not one mention of the cumulative heat island affect, can anybody hear me????
- All four solar proposals in our region are quick to quote the European model in their deliberations, why not build these such as in Europe where the average size of a solar plant over there is under 25Ha, not these massive industrial complexes

As previously mentioned in earlier submissions with the three other proposed solar plants, I am definitely not against renewable energy, however size (greed) and location (ease and low cost hook up to the grid), if everyone was seriously looking at best bang for their

dollar, here would not be the location, poor solar irradiance compared to sites 200km west of here, much cheaper land to lease, landholders who need a financial kick after years of drought, if a farmer cant make money in our area he may as well give it away now. Make these plants a maximum of 50ha and you will soon see these fly by night developers disappear

There is so much more that needs to be said however I have wasted 15 hours of my life that I can ill afford at the moment.

Considering that the department was negligent in advising us of the pending DA and EIS being lodged, I received my notification on 30/10/2020 dated 19/10/2020, one day's notice, how grand, and apparently I was the lucky one, some affected residents didn't get their notification until after the public exhibition had commenced and a number of affected residents still have had no official notification from the department or the developer, including one of the biggest neighbours bounding the proposed development, this is abhorrent behaviour and doesn't fill us with much faith for a fair and just outcome.

The submission period should have been put back for this reason alone, not just the other issues which we have previously discussed.

We the public deserve some decent service from the public service, we feel we are really up against it, considering the Departments recommendation of approving Jindera SF you are obviously not listening or taking us into account, considering the parameters to invoke IPC have been changed in the last month does not instil much confidence in us either, we feel like we are on a hiding to nothing with no one caring or hearing us. It appears like a free ride for these companies that wont pay the taxes we pay, wont be here for the long run and all of the companies and components come from Foreign lands, we are always here look after us.

You are assessing irrevocable changes to our landscape based on misleading information having been hastily prepared by companies not interested in our outcomes, just the jingle of my tax paying dollar at the end of the day

I would like to thank Rob Beckett EAO with DPIE for his assistance and understanding in our current timing plight with another well planned (in relation to timing) but ill timed submission, these companies don't want any feedback, just your approval. I will take up his offer of submitting further submissions post submission closure as soon as we have finished

harvest, I wish to review each section in detail as much of it from a glance is very misleading. It is refreshing to have someone who actually operates in engaged listening, thanks.

I declare that I have made no political donations, however I have made 22 donations of my time, equipment and produce doing 22 hay runs this year alone to those touched by drought and/or fire, I also normally drive the Carevan (feeding homeless and less fortunate people) however Covid has put a stop to that for the time being and I do not get rostered on at this time of the year due to obvious time constraints. In time the hay runs may well change due to my future barren landscape being east of two rather significant solar plants will be unable to produce the fodder that it currently does.

I spent 7 night shifts on the fire ground in January 2020 (receiving a Bushfire Emergency Citation next week actually) and also delivered 15 semi loads of hay and fodder to the fire victims on both sides of the border during that time, since then I have done hay runs to drought victims in Armidale and Cobar, and five runs to the fire victims of the far south coast, what has my proponent landholder neighbour done, not one fire shift and not one bale of hay donated, says a lot about some of the people of our community. There are givers and takers, you decide which is which.

Finally my apologies for my at times emotive response, not very professional of me however that is how I feel absolutely sick to the core, please start listening to the longterm residents, not some flash project manager who will gone by 2022.

Regards Jim

Jim Parrett
0428 609 835