

From: [Paul Nixon](#)
To: [Do-Not-Reply IPCN Submissions Mailbox](#)
Subject: [SPAM]
Date: Monday, 23 September 2024 11:17:55 AM

My attendance at the public meeting in Tamworth has necessitated this response.

I am dismayed to hear that rehabilitation works will not be required to remove infrastructure any deeper than 50 cm.

Surely with the building code requiring electric cabling to be no less than 60 cm below surface level, then it is obvious there is no intention to remove the cabling.

That fact alone, will not permit the re establishment of the area to its current condition.

Currently this area is a fully productive and well established improved pasture, which has been the case for decades past.

To establish pastures correctly and successfully a landowner must deep rip the ground and it is not uncommon to rip as deep as possible and at least 60 cm in depth.

Also concrete footings will be far deeper than 50 cm, so again these must be removed to allow for future farming practices to continue.

Therefore the commission must take this into account and place a condition on the developer, that the subject land must be reinstated to exactly the same condition it was, prior to any development.

That means; NO BELOW GROUND INFRASTRUCTURE TO REMAIN.

Also I was dismayed to listen to Ewan.....?, the planning departments representative paying scant attention to the needs of locals with regards to screening and also his acceptance of information being supplied by the developer without any questioning by his department.

There were numerous other points in his response on the day which indicated a complete disregard for due process.

You, The Commissioners have a responsibility to not only local landowners but the community as a whole to ensure that when your decision is reached, that you have explored every questionable avenue and with clear conscience can say that this particular development should be supported or not.

You all must know full well that there is NO other better suited area to develop and not disturb land which does, has done for past decades and could continue to produce food and commodities for the community forever.

Remember, FOOD NOT ELECTRICITY - PARIS AGREEMENT.?????

PLEASE do not listen to inconsistent departmental advices to the contrary.

This land IS VALUABLE AGRICULTURAL LAND.

Another concern is relative to landowners liability insurance and its premium costs. It should be a condition on the developer that landowners are indemnified against any liability whatsoever in the event of local area bushfires. Landowners generally require a figure of 20 million. We could not afford to cover their potential loss from such an event

In summation my personal opinion is that based on several responses from the developer at the public meeting, that consultation about numerous issues will be undertaken at an appropriate time.

Obviously they expect a positive outcome for their development and only then, will they deal with the many issues not responded to at the public meeting.

This to me would be;

Putting the cart before the horse, or even, Shutting the gate after the horse has bolted.

Thank you.