

I strongly object to the Jindera Solar farm and believe that solar developments in Greater Hume Shire are an opportunistic money grab by foreign developers that have no sensible planning and far too many negative impacts that greatly outweigh any benefit they may offer.

The huge financial return to Foreign companies and landowners is being put before our planning instruments, policies and plans that promote the protection of agricultural land for primary production. The companies make opportunity of clever marketing terms twisting the construction impacts and installation of industrial, mined metal structures somehow into agricultural retention.

The short term 18 month to 2 year employment benefit in exchange for the impact to the environment from construction and manufacturing along with loss of agricultural production far from warrants this development over the long 30 year term. Sheep grazing on solar farms is a farcical marketing attempt by solar companies to alleviate the departments concerns about agricultural loss. No doubt few sheep can be maintained for grazing purposes "where practicable" when vegetation is available but the mixed farming benefits of cropping with grazing cannot be undertaken under panels and therefore production to near current levels will not be achievable nor is there any requirement to do so. There has been minimal pasture available in the last 2 years and hay and grain production to feed these stock will not be able to be maintained once the land is covered by panels.

We are being led to believe these developments will result in environmentally positive outcomes however there is a substantial negation to consider the impacts from the construction of such developments including the products that need to be mined and the manufacturing processes to create renewable energy infrastructure along with the loss of the immediate environment and ecology at the site of the development. The carbon footprint of all processes associated with photovoltaic panels creates a series of waste, liquid and gaseous by-products that are harmful to the environment and should damage to panels occur our community will be at risk. Solar companies have an intention, we should not believe their documentation and full thorough independent investigation should be undertaken to assess the ecological destruction. Offsets and environmental trade offs such as ecosystem and species credits cannot overcome the true local impact to the environment.

There is hypocrisy in destroying the environment to save the environment and the long term waste issue that will follow at the end of the life of these structures must not be ignored, especially when large foreign owned companies have no financial guarantee to decommission or remediate the land. Are you willing to risk the future of these prosperous communities with the potential they may become surrounded by solar waste lands? Is the government going to pick up the tab when the landowner cannot afford to decommission?

The massive footprint of large scale solar projects should be located in renewable energy zones with low agricultural production value and not locations in the close proximity of growing townships or where they will affect productive agriculture. This development will have a significant number of associated receivers that will be heavily impacted by industrialisation and cause potential mental health issues.

Convenient infrastructure to minimise cost to developers is not an excuse for the inappropriate location of these developments.

I note that the department recommendation references the Greater Hume LEP and in contradiction it could be considered that fragmentation may occur as a result of these developments. Further

contradiction to the Greater Hume LEP is applicable to the following aims that the department neglects to address.

This development opposes Greater Hume LEP aim to protect and retain productive agricultural land that has been confirmed as intended to be mapped as Important Agricultural Land which under the NSW Solar Guidelines should be an area of constraint.

The Greater Hume LEP aims to provide opportunities for the growth of townships that would potentially be inhibited by this development. The township of Jindera has been a strong growth area of Greater Hume that will be disrupted by the cumulative impact of multiple massive solar projects.

The removal of paddock trees and native vegetation does not meet the Greater Hume LEP aim to protect, conserve and enhance natural assets.

And what of the RU1 zone objectives to maintain the rural landscape character of the land. Solar is most definitely NOT a part of the rural landscape and is an absolute visual eyesore. If the screening vegetation proposed in developments is tubestock it is useless as a mitigation strategy as trees take many years to grow.

What is the point of the Greater Hume LEP if we are not going to take any notice of it? Why should local people have to abide by this if Foreign Companies do not? The agriculturally and environmentally wealthy Greater Hume Shire is not the place for solar developments. The Infrastructure SEPP should not overtake all other matters of planning. I would ask that the commissioners seriously consider the true intent of planning instruments and not be confused by the twisting words of solar developers to construe favour towards their development.

You must consider the Rural SEPP and the Ministerial Direction for Rural Lands designed to ensure the protection of the agricultural production value of rural land and also support the actions outlined in the New South Wales Right to Farm Policy.

With so many objections including Council it is questioned if the government is really listening to the people of this community. Approval of a development should NOT consider any intention of a return of funds to the community, hedging a financial return against approval of a development is improper and is seen as so by many community members. This is so in the form of the company using VPA funds as marketing.

Climate alarmism is creating nonsensical rushed action without serious sensible planning. If climate concern is to be the driver of renewable energy projects then in turn structured planning should include the protection of agricultural land due to the impact of climate change on food security. Drought and irrigation issues will continue if our climate is severely affected and food will be hardest hit, a reason to put these developments on arid land. Solar can go elsewhere but farming CAN NOT!

Fire and emergency management issues should be a matter of planning and not just a condition of consent. If towns and neighbours are at increased risk this should be considered as part of the determination. Fire suppression will be extremely difficult within the footprint of a solar development and RFS members are not suitably qualified to enter such sites without HAZMAT training and with WHS issues of entrapment, electrocution and toxic fumes notwithstanding the proximity of the development to Jindera in relation to emergency management.

Cumulative impacts of two developments close to town must be considered and increased traffic through Jindera will create a safety issue for the main street of the town.

With many developments proposed for Greater Hume and even hearing of some that may not be yet on the table there are many questions about grid capacity and transmission issues that are not explained and downturn in profitability could see these foreign companies disappear leaving the true cost to our local community and the remaining landowner who may not have the capacity to decommission such a massive development. Financial Guarantee should be a requirement of government not just a promise.

How on earth can the NSW Department of Planning ensure compliance with the huge number of developments on the table or will it be our local Council left to pick up the pieces in the future or when issues arise.

I wish to strongly recommend that the true cost to our community be considered in determining all solar developments in Greater Hume shire and that the Independent Planning Commission members seriously consider that the short term financial construction benefit should NOT be the sole driver of any approval as opposed to the long term benefits of viable agriculture including post farm gate and such relevant employment.

Personally, I continue to be repulsed by the lack of long term vision, risk mitigation and absolute truth as to how these developments will actually benefit **OUR COMMUNITY** into the future, or will they just be to our detriment. The local area of Jindera is not broken, it does not need these developments, it is thriving with growth. I ask that you please consider the true cost rather than place priority on the short term financial benefit of few.