



RICHARD CROFT

OBJECT

Submission No: 161942

Organisation:		<p>Key issues: <i>Energy Transition, Biodiversity, Visual impacts, Traffic and transport, Noise and vibration, Heritage, Agricultural impacts and land use, Social and economic, Physiological - infrasound noise / electromagnetic interference / shadow flicker / blade glint</i></p>
Location: <i>New South Wales 2354</i>		
Submitter Type: <i>I am a member of the local community who would be particularly and directly affected by the proposed development</i>		
Attachment:		

Submission date: 20240307 21:38:00

My family and many relatives have lived in this region and shires for many years, as far back as the 1840's.

The reason for the settlement of New England was obvious - it is prime agricultural land.

This New England Region has now been selected by politicians, supported by urban electorates most of whom who have chosen not to produce their "own" electricity, or live in housing unsuitable for solar panels. Those same urban electorates have already rejected wind towers on suburban sites and in nearby ocean sites. Apart from household solar they haven't erected many solar panels either.

1. Over recent years the residents of New England have been told by public servants, or their contractors, that New England must supply thousands of Megawatts of electricity because there is an "emergency" and the cities are "desperate for power for their future" but that power was previously provided by regional coal fired plants and distributed to the cities (with a much smaller proportion being sent to country areas) and which urban people are calling to be shut down.

2. However as the AEMO has pointed out on numerous occasions for example Greater Sydney, Wollongong and Newcastle Regions are producing less than 25% of their possible electrical energy, and the Governments have allowed suburban and local infrastructure to fall so far behind that extra local power is often refused. Nor are there any "suburban batteries" being created to cover the periods of low power generation which was also an AEMO suggestion.

3. New England towns and cities do not have the infrastructure and services to provide support for any more temporary workers for such projects as Thunderbolt Wind.

4. It is definitely not a "farm" by the way it is an industrial business and our Councils should be authorised to charge industrial rates for these businesses and any other industrial enterprises established on agricultural land but the government has not, or will not allow such levying.

4. Subsidies have been promised and provided to many proponents of renewable power which is extremely unfair to Australians particularly farmers and regional communities who are interested to install units for their own use and benefit.

5. Many of the proponents are foreign enterprises who have the advantage of reporting their business revenue and profits outside Australian Tax Laws by "charging" their own enterprises high interest rates, high material costs, freight charges etc. They could very likely declare profits in countries which don't recognise our laws as well.

6. The overseas proponents will not be returning the subsidies or capital spent on accommodating powerlines, roads or services support: They don't have to because they are not being asked to repay, no, the Australian



consumers and businesses will be paying for those benefits through power charges for many years to come. This unsound economic planning against our own citizens.

7. Environmental damage from wind tower access and construction is significantly higher on agricultural and environmentally sensitive land. Such damage is permanent and similarly smaller scale projects already constructed are proof of such damage. The developers cannot, and do not take care, their timelines are set by non resident planners, in some cases resident overseas who couldn't care less.

8. Agricultural land appears abundant in Australia, particularly to the eyes of urban and overseas planners; this is definitely not correct. High quality agricultural land represents a very low proportion of our land mass. New England as a whole is high quality land and climate.

9. Social disturbance from short term projects is not a benefit unless there is a direct quantifiable economic and environmental benefit such as free power, permanent quality housing, upgraded or new services etc. None of the projects built in NSW so far have recorded substantial local benefits. Virtually none have an environmental benefit. Typically very few have created any extra jobs once construction is finalised, management too moves away.

10. Point 6 above lists all the reasons that render this project unacceptable. All point 6 issues confirm to me that New England does not deserve such projects.

If these projects "must" go ahead then I am happy to introduce the Government/s to areas in NSW where large areas of land are available, where there would be much less disruption to communities and agriculture, where there are already functioning projects and huge areas for expansion.

Most importantly they are NOT in New England.

Thank you for the opportunity to refute such exaggerated benefits.

Richard Croft.

"Dunvegan",

██████████ 2358

██████████
