

22ND November 2023

OXLEY SOLAR – DANGARSLEIGH – ARMIDALE DUE 5 p.m
Sydney Time - 4 p.m QLD Time.

Dear Commissioner Chris Wilson
NSW Independent Planning Commission Suite 15.02 Level 15
King Street
Sydney 2000. Email;<submissions@ipcn.nsw.gov.au>



Dear Commissioner Wilson and Panel Members

Re Oxley Solar Farm (SSD -10346)

Our greatest concerns concerning this proposal are as follows:

Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth) (EPBC Act),

The farming landscape to heavy industrial use is a completely different change of land use.

We ask if it is a fair or reasonable process, whereby a paid environmental company is allowed to gloss over the issues raised in over 50 submissions. Can the public view the submissions? Is it a fair process where offsets certificate prices for companies soar offering a Carbon windfall for global investors but offers no long-term benefits to the region.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS AND UNKNOWN LONG-TERM AFFECTS

- Contamination risk of PV panels and BESS infrastructure

Waste management - Ignition risk of solar power station facilities

Requirement for detailed management plans and related approval conditions - Hydrology, soils and land management

Ecological assessment approach and survey findings

Electromagnetic fields and 'heat island effect'

- Community engagement

This project involves large scale development that the developer identifies as a solar 'FARM' , but in fact it is a proposal that will have lasting environmental effects

Even if there was an upfront bond for the removal of industrial waste, it would likely be just a token. It would take considerable resources to return an industrial site back to it's original state. These are not just solar farms, or solar parks, that this industry would have the public believe. It is in fact a potential toxic future hazard.

This is not to mention the potential fire hazards from increased temperatures. Rainfall could be seriously affected by large scale industrial developments that covers the photosynthesis and biodiversity that makes our planet so different to other planets. There also may be

increased temperatures of around 5%. We have evidence of the temperature increases of solar infrastructure compared to the area prior to clearing the vegetation.

Is the vegetation to be cleared or poisoned for this Solar 'FARM'

Are sheep & cattle still being promoted to be compatible with this industrial site proposal? We have information that sheep may cause damage to infrastructure, so why pretend that sheep in an industrial high voltage estate are compatible?

If the general public knew the impacts, would they consent or give social license?

Does the Council, State and Federal have a responsibility or duty of care to inform the public that there are serious impacts to ENVIRONMENTAL HARM, CLIMATE AND a DECREASE IN RAINFALL LIKELIHOOD with this tsunami of infrastructure?

Progress without care or foresight IS NOT PROGRESS.

There are other alternatives, such as nuclear, which is safe, provides dense energy, and reliable.

Nuclear – Save the planet <https://www.prageru.com/video/abundant-clean-and-safe>

CLAIMS are over-exaggerated or just plain false:

With Oxley Solar proposal, we question the claims that are made and their calculations. Please refer to the following links:-

Every 1% increase in "green energy" increases Greenhouse gas emissions 0.9%; and I think the authors were really only looking at rare earth mining & processing. The mind boggles...

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969722021155>

[sciencedirect.com](https://www.sciencedirect.com)

WATCH: An Honest & Sensible Conversation about Global Energy | Scott Tinker

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aTfwqvNuk44>

The WIND & SOLAR MYTHS HAVE BEEN EXPOSED.

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2023/05/10/wind-solar-renewables-pointless-waste/>

The challenges that this proposal needs to consider:

* Vast ecological footprint

* Renewable ?

destroys the soil, the ecology, the climate, and water cycle.

* Australians put a high value on habitat, farming, tourism and other opportunities.

The risk to this land returning to its original use is unlikely.

The opportunity for regenerative agriculture is shamefully not considered should this proposal be approved

Who bears the cost – the next generation?

THE GOVERNMENT KNOWS THE RISKS to our environment.

The Government also knows that the spatial footprint is huge for renewables. BUT it is nothing compared to the minerals required.

For those who have not watched or read the printed version Professor Simon Michaux explains it well.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?app=desktop&v=MBVmnKuBocc&t=690s>

Printed Version – Prof Simon https://tupa.gtk.fi/raportti/arkisto/16_2021.pdf

CURRENTLY this is a REAL Farm with it's own carbon sink vegetation and trees which holds a beauty of it's own. ADOPT LANDCARE POLICIES instead. Or if our Government is

Really serious about climate action, then consider the new Gen Nuclear which is safe, for Australia's long term power solutions

Thankyou for your consideration

Kind regards

Caroyne Emms

President, Rainforest Reserves Australia.