



**New South Wales Government**  
**Independent Planning Commission**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

RE: GLENELLEN SOLAR FARM (SSD-9550)

**DEPARTMENT MEETING**

COMMISSION PANEL: DR SHERIDAN COAKES (PANEL CHAIR)  
MR ADRIAN PILTON  
DR BRONWYN EVANS AM

OFFICE OF THE IPC: JANE ANDERSON  
PHOEBE JARVIS

DPE CLAY PRESHAW  
REPRESENTATIVES: IWAN DAVIES  
JOE FITTELL  
ELISHA DUNN

LOCATION: VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE AND AT IPC, SUITE 15.02,  
LEVEL 15, 135 KING STREET, SYDNEY NSW 2000

DATE: 9.30AM, WEDNESDAY, 1 NOVEMBER 2023

**TRANSCRIBED AND RECORDED BY APT TRANSCRIPTIONS**

DR SHERIDAN COAKES: Good morning everyone and welcome. Before we begin I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from the land of the Worimi people and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the country on which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to Elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Glenellen Solar Farm case currently before the Commission for determination.

10 The applicant, Trina Solar Pty Limited, is seeking approval to develop the Glenellen Solar Farm located approximately two kilometres north-east of Jindera in the Greater Hume Local Government Area. The project involves the construction of a solar farm with a generating capacity of approximately 200 megawatts along with the upgrading and decommissioning of the structure and equipment over time. The project is proposed to connect to the adjacent Transgrid substation.

My name is Dr Sheridan Coakes, I'm the Chair of the Commission Panel. I'm joined by my fellow Commissioners Mr Adrian Pilton and Dr Bronwyn Evans. We're also joined by Jane Anderson and Phoebe Jarvis from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture  
20 of information, today's information is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. The meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination.

It's important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees, clarify issues wherever it's considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and not in a position to answer please feel free to take that question on notice and provide any additional information in writing which we will put up on our website. I request that all members here today please introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all  
30 members to ensure they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. So we'll now begin. So thank you everyone for joining us this morning bright and early and also thank you, I think you've put together a presentation to go through that addresses some of the items that we highlighted in the agenda. So without further ado I'd like to hand over to whoever is giving the presentation. Who's giving the presentation today?

MR DAVIES: I will be, sorry, thank you.

40 DR COAKES: OK. Thanks. That's fantastic.

MR DAVIES: I may just ask Elisha to share the slides please.

MS ELISHA DUNN: Let me know if you can see those? I haven't done sharing on Zoom. Wait, here we go. Can you see those?

DR COAKES: Here they are, we've got them, thanks, Elisha, yes, just in front.

MR IWAN DAVIES: If you perhaps just hit presentation. There we are. Great. OK. Thank you, Sherrie. Good morning all, my name is Iwan Davies, Director, Energy Assessments at the New South Wales Department of Planning and Environment. I'm here today with my colleagues Clay Preshaw, Executive Director, Energy Resource and Industry Assessments, Joe Fittell, Team Leader and Elisha Dunn, Senior Environmental Assessment Officer.

10 I would also like to acknowledge the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation who are the traditional custodians of the land on which we are joining today's meeting. I would like to pay my respects to their Elders past, present and emerging and extend that respect to any Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people here today.

I will begin with a few brief comments about the assessment report itself and then very briefly identify what we believe are the key issues associated with the proposal. I will also use this opportunity to provide further details on the key assessment issues and our evaluation of the project and, in particular, the key reasons for the Department's recommendation to the Commission to approve the project.

20 The applicant proposes to develop a 200 megawatt solar farm which would connect directly to the adjacent Transgrid substation. The site is located in a rural setting about two kilometres north-east of Jindera in the Greater Hume LGA. There are three approved SSD solar farms within 50 kilometres of the project which are Jindera Solar Farm approximately 320 metres north-west, Walla Walla Solar Farm, 18 kilometres north and Culcairn Solar Farm, 21 kilometres north.

30 Before I dive into the assessment issues it's important to provide some strategic context about the project in relation to its location and access to the existing electricity network. The Riverina-Murray region of New South Wales has attracted considerable interest from solar developers given the presence of major transmission lines and existing electricity substations. Noting that all coal-fired power plants in New South Wales are scheduled to closure in the next 20 years the project will assist in providing large-scale renewable energy generation to the increased electricity demand.

40 The Department considers that the project is consistent with the relevant national, state and local policy documents which identify the need to diversify the inter-generation mix and reduce the carbon omissions intensity of the grid by providing energy security and reliability. Building on the strategic context, there are additional considerations from a regional context that the project site would benefit from. The site has direct access to the electricity network by Transgrid's Jindera substation which is adjacent to the project and it connects with two 132kv transmission lines, a 330kv transmission line that traverse the site.

The transport route for the site would require minimal road upgrades. The site is located in a rural area. The Department considers that there will be no significant visual impacts on residences and the rural character and visual quality of the area would be preserved as far as practical. The site is located on land that is not mapped as biophysical strategic agricultural land, that is BASL land and predominantly on land that has a landing soil capability of class 4 which is defined as land with moderate to severe limitations for

agricultural purposes. The land is currently primarily used for grazing of sheep and cattle with infrequent cropping of fodder to support the grazing.

10 Overall, the Department considers the site to be appropriate for the project and is consistent with the Department's large-scale solar energy guideline. The project would also provide flow-on benefits to the local community including up to 200 construction jobs and contributions to council of 2.5 million through a voluntary planning agreement. There would be broader benefits to the state through an injection of 250 million in capital investment into the New South Wales economy. The Department considers that the project will result in benefits to the state of New South Wales and the local community and is, therefore, in the public interest and approvable.

20 Regarding community engagement, the Department exhibited the EIS from the 31st of October until the 30th of November, 2020 and received a 107 public submissions, consisting of 79 objections, 27 supporting submissions and one comment. Advice was received from 12 government agencies along with an objection from council which it subsequently withdrew. The Department also consulted with council and the relevant government agencies throughout the assessment, inspected the site on the 20th of May, '22 and held a community information session that covered the four SSD solar farms in the LGA in 2019. None of the agencies or utility providers objected to the project and some recommended the implementation of appropriate mitigation and management measures. Council initially objected to the project but withdrew its objection as we'll discuss in further detail.

30 Regarding public submissions. Submissions in support generally raised the benefits of transitioning to renewable energy sources, the increased employment opportunities along with the economic benefits to the local community. The most common matters raised in public objections were land use compatibility, visual amenity, traffic, biodiversity, project location and devaluation of land.

40 Regarding project amendments. Following the EIS exhibition the applicant made changes to the project which it presented in its amendment report. The originally-proposed development footprint is shown in black hatch in the figure. Key amendments to the project design included a revised heavy vehicle haulage route which avoided the use of Glenellen Road to address council's concerns, reduced impact on native vegetation by avoiding 2.7 hectares and four paddock trees, recontouring of an inundation area in the south-east of the site to avoid inundation into adjacent properties and reduction of visual impacts through relocation of the substation expansion, removal of more than 22,000 solar panels, reduction in height of fencing and the Met station, increased setbacks from Lindner Road, Ortlipp Road and Drumwood Road and increased vegetation screening around the project site. Despite the amendments, the generation capacity of the project would remain unchanged at 200 megawatts.

Regarding key issues. I'm now going to talk about what we found to be the four key issues for assessment. These are energy transition, land use compatibility, traffic and visual amenity. Regarding energy transition. The project has a capacity of 200 megawatts which would generate enough energy to power about 76,000 homes. This is consistent with the New South Wales Climate Change Policy Framework of achieving

net zero emissions by 2050. The project, while not located in the declared renewable energy zone, is in an area with direct access to the transmission network with available capacity and abundant solar resources. The project would play an important role in increasing renewable energy generation and capacity and contributing to the transition to a cleaner energy system as coal-fired generators retire.

10 Regarding land use compatibility. While the Greater Hume LGA has transitionally relied upon agriculture, the introduction of solar energy generation would contribute to a more diverse local economy. Importantly, the project is permissible with development consent under the infrastructure SEPP and is consistent with council's strategic planning statement and the Department's regional plan. The vast majority of the site is currently used for sheep grazing. The project components have been cited to avoid important agricultural land consistent with the Department's large scale solar energy guideline.

20 All of the development footprint is on land mapped as class 4 under the land and soil capability mapping for New South Wales which means agricultural use of the land has moderate to severe limitations and would require active management to sustain any cultivation on a rotational basis. The site represents a very small fraction of agricultural land in the region and the Department has recommended conditions to maintain the agricultural capability of the land following decommissioning. Sheep grazing within the site would continue during the operation of the project which is supported by DPI Agriculture.

30 Traffic and transport. One of the key reasons for council's original objection to the project was the proposed use of Glenellen Road as part of the heavy vehicle haulage route. To address council's original objection the applicant amended the proposed haulage route in consultation with council and conducted a revised traffic impact assessment. Importantly, the revised haulage route no longer includes the use of Glenellen Road and in light of this, council withdrew its original objection to the project.

40 The EIS includes two road haulage routes. Assuming that site components would be delivered from the Port of Newcastle the route follows the Hume Highway, then via Jindera and Walla Walla Jindera road, Lindner Road and Ortlipp Road. The second route would be required in the instance where site components would be delivered from a port in Melbourne. In this instance, components would be railed from Melbourne to Ettamogah rail hub - Ettamogah rail hub, then transported to site. The majority of roads along these routes are B-double-approved and able to accommodate the proposed traffic movements. However, some road upgrades would be required in order to improve the safety and efficiency of the road network.

The road upgrades required to facilitate construction of the project include upgrades to local roads and the site access point including intersection upgrades and road widening. In addition to the road upgrades the Department has recommended conditions of consent restricting the number of vehicle movements during all stages of the project, limiting the use of local roads and preparing and implementing their comprehensive traffic management plan.

Regarding visual impacts. Concerns about visual impacts in public submissions included the proximity of the project to surrounding residences and potential impacts on the scenic quality, landscape and rural outlook of the locality. The Department visited the site and nearby non-associated residences to assess visual impacts and to further understand resident's concerns. Due to the relatively flat nature of the local landscape the buffer distances between project infrastructure and local roads and the retention of remnant native vegetation views of the project would be limited beyond its immediate vicinity. Public views of the site would be limited to local roads with a low frequency of use that run adjacent to the project boundary including Ortlipp and Drumwood Roads.

10

It's worth noting that we sought clarification around the visual impacts described in the EIS on a number of occasions during preparation of our assessment. This included confirmation of the level of visual impact in accordance with the Department's 2022 Large Solar Energy Guideline. The final assessment results are detailed in the applicant's letter detailed the 13th of October, '23 and available in the package of additional information provided with our referral.

20

The final assessment concluded that all residences within two kilometres of the site would experience nil to low visual impacts. The proposed onsite vegetation screening which you can see in blue and dark green in between the erase on the figure would further reduce views from these residences. The applicant has also committed to consulting with 10 landowners to implement vegetation screening at their property to assist in reducing residual impacts. As I mentioned earlier, the applicant amended a number of aspects of the project design to assist in minimise the visual impacts associated with the project.

30

In relation to glint and glare impacts, the applicant's analysis identified there may be low impact to nearby residences and road users; however, if impacts were experienced they would be temporary depending on the season, time of day and location of the receiver. The existing intervening vegetation along with the proposed vegetation screening would shield or minimise views of the development from surrounding receivers including views of infrastructure with the potential to create glare or reflection. The Department has recommended a condition that offsite lighting impacts of the development are minimised, external lighting is installed as low intensity lighting except for safety purposes and it does not shine above horizontal.

40

Regarding biodiversity and heritage impacts. The site has been subject to decades of clearing for agricultural use and is comprised predominantly of paddock trees with exotic pasture. A total of approximately 8.7 hectares of native vegetation including paddock trees would be cleared for the project and nothing this was reduced from approximately 11.4 hectares in response to submissions received on the EIS. Potential impacts of three threatened species would be offset via species credit offsets and the Department considers that there is unlikely to be serious and irreversible impacts to any biodiversity values.

The Department has recommended a number of conditions to mitigate the residual impacts including retiring the relevant biodiversity credits prior to carrying out any development that could directly or indirectly impact on biodiversity values in

accordance with the New South Wales Biodiversity Offset Scheme and preparing a biodiversity management plan in consultation with the Biodiversity and Conservation Division include measures to protect and manage vegetation and fauna outside the approved disturbance area.

10 Regarding Aboriginal cultural heritage. Surveyors identified three stone artefact sites within the development footprint. All items are assessed to be of low significance. These would be salvaged and relocated in consultation with registered Aboriginal parties and prior to the commencement of construction. If Aboriginal artefacts or skeletal material are identified during construction of the project all work would cease and an unexpected finds procedure would be implemented.

Regarding historical heritage. There would be no direct impacts to any world, national, state or locally-listed historic heritage items. The nearest locally-listed heritage item is Drumwood Homestead and its outbuildings with its curtilage being approximately 30 metres south-east of the site. Based on the outcomes of the visual assessment, visual impacts on Drumwood and its curtilage are expected to be low.

20 Regarding cumulative impacts. There are three approved SSD solar farms within 50 kilometres of the project as previously outlined being Jindera Solar Farm, Walla Walla Solar Farm and Culcairn Solar Farm. The Department has considered the potential cumulative impacts of the project with all other projects that have been approved and not yet constructed as well as those currently under assessment and proposed. The key cumulative impacts considered were potential impacts on agricultural land, traffic and visual impacts.

30 Regarding land use. The total development footprint of this project and all other operational approved and proposed SSD solar farms in the Riverina-Murray region represents only 0.09 per cent of the 9.1 million hectares of land currently used for agricultural output. It would result in a negligible reduction in overall agricultural productivity of the region.

Regarding traffic. There would be no reduction in the level of service on any roads along the haulage route even if the peak construction periods for the project overlaps with that of Jindera Solar Farm.

40 Regarding visual. While there is potential to view the project and Jindera Solar Farms simultaneously from a static viewpoint there opportunities are limited. Existing intervening vegetation would largely screen any potential views of both projects simultaneously and both projects have committed to further mitigate visual impacts with additional vegetation screening. Noting that no residents would have views of the project given intervening vegetation and proposed landscaping there would also be minimal cumulative glinting and glare impacts. The project would not be visible from other solar farms in the LGA and the setback of the project prevents any opportunities to view solar farms in quick succession along the travel routes.

Regarding decommissioning and rehabilitation. The operational life of this project is about 20 to 30 years but there is potential for it to operate for a longer period of time if

solar panels are upgraded over time as permitted under the recommended conditions of consent. The large scale solar energy guideline identifies four key decommissioning and rehabilitation principles for circumstances where an applicant ceases operating the project which are that the land must be returned to pre-existing use, infrastructure including underground infrastructure must be removed if operations cease.

10 The land must be rehabilitated and restored to pre-existing use and the owner or operator of a solar energy project should be responsible for decommissioning and rehabilitation. With the implementation of objective-based conditions and monitoring requirements the Department considers that the solar farm would be suitably decommissioned at the end of the project life or within 18 months if operations cease unexpectedly and that the site be appropriately rehabilitated.

Regarding decommissioning bonds. It is the New South Wales Government's policy that financial assurances should not be required by conditions of consent and any financial assurances should be dealt with in the commercial arrangements outside of the planning system.

20 Regarding other issues. The Department also consider a number of other issues in its assessment of the project. For the purposes of this briefing I'll focus on the items outlined in the Commission's agenda.

30 Regarding water supply. The project would require around 17.5 megalitres of water per annum during construction for dust suppression and other construction purposes. During operation the project would require up to 1.8 megalitres of water per year which includes water for landscaping. The applicant has confirmed with council that the water usage required during the construction and operational phases can be provided from the council village water scheme. In response to comments regarding drainage impacts on the neighbouring properties a small inundation area in the south-eastern part of the site would be recontrolled to prevent any backfilling inundation into adjacent properties.

The Department's water group did not raise any concerns regarding the applicant's ability to obtain sufficient water entitlement and access to viable water supplies. The landscape plan would include a proposal for ongoing maintenance and watering of plantings to ensure their survival during drought conditions. Subject to the recommended conditions the Department considers that the project would not result in significant impacts on water resources.

40 Regarding bushfire risk. Portions of the site and its surrounds are mapped as bushfire-prone land and the Department consulted with Fire and Rescue New South Wales and the Rural Fire Service throughout the assessment process. To actively manage bushfire risk the applicant would implement a range of management measures including, but not limited to, establishing a 10-metre asset protection zone around all project infrastructure, complying with the requirements of RFS's planning for bushfire protection guideline and standards for asset protection zones. Providing four 10,000 litre water tanks at locations agreed with RFS for the sole use of fire protection and to prepare an emergency plan consistent with the recommendations of Fire and Rescue New South Wales.



Regarding socioeconomic impacts. The project would provide benefit to the community by providing 200 construction jobs, expenditure on accommodation and businesses in the local economy by workers and goods and services. Council originally raised concerns that the local economic benefits of the project would largely be realised in nearby towns rather than within Jindera given the limited availability of accommodation in the township for construction workforce.

10 To address this concern the Department has recommended conditions requiring Trina to develop an accommodation and employment strategy in consultation with council which are deemed to maximise the use of local accommodation, local businesses and workers within the Greater Hume LGA in the first instance before looking further afield. In addition, the applicant would enter into a VPA with council providing contributions of \$2.5 million. There would be broader benefits to the state through an injection of 250 million in capital investment into the New South Wales economy.

20 The applicant has offered neighbour agreements to 10 properties neighbouring the project as an additional means of acknowledging that minor residual impacts may still occur. These agreements would take the form of a one-off financial contribution and seek to pre-emptively share a portion of the financial returns from the project with neighbours.

In summary, electricity-generating works on the site are permissible with consent in accordance with the infrastructure SEPP. Although the site is located on land currently used for grazing it is all class 4 land with moderate to severe limitations. The site has good solar resources, direct access to the road network and direct access to the electricity network. The project has been designed to largely avoid site constraint including remnant native vegetation, onsite water courses, farm dams and BASL land while maintaining its ability to utilise the existing electricity infrastructure and road network.

30 The project would assist in transitioning the electricity sector from coal and gas-fired power stations to low emission sources and is consistent with New South Wales policy. It would generate over 440,000 megawatt hours of clean energy, clean electricity annually to power approximately 76,000 homes and save over 420,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year. The Department considers that the project achieves an appropriate balance between maximising the efficiency of the solar resource development and minimising the potential impacts on surrounding land users and the environment.

40 Through job creation and capital investment and the planning agreement with council the project would also stimulate economic investment and renewable energy and provide flow-on benefits to the community. On balance, the Department considers that the project is in the public interest and is approvable subject to the recommended conditions of consent. Thank you and happy to field any questions.

DR COAKES: Thank you, Iwan, for that overview. I guess I'll just - and that's a very comprehensive overview and I guess we can see that there's been quite significant change to the project based on some of the feedback. Just in relation to - obviously the project, it was lodged with the Department prior to the introduction of the new SIA

guidelines of State significant development - and you mentioned that the Department has held a recent information session in the area with the community – so, just really wanting to ask, you're satisfied with the sort of extent of engagement that's been undertaken? We understand the project obviously has a history, it was with a previous applicant and then it was sold to Trina over the term. Obviously the guidelines didn't apply at that time and we recognise it was obviously quite a difficult period there with Covid in terms of ability for the applicant to do further engagement but just interested around that. Yes, thank you.

10 MR DAVIES: Yeah. Thanks, Sherrie. So in summary, yes, we are satisfied by the level of engagement undertaken by both the Department and the applicant. Yes, having said that, we do appreciate that the project has changed ownership and that perhaps impacted the level of engagement or at least the consistency of engagement throughout the assessing noting that, you know, this project has been on foot for a number of years now and noting that the SIA guideline wasn't in place but all the same, the Department still had strict requirements for community consultation and overall is satisfied with the level of consultation undertaken.

20 DR COAKES: OK. Thank you. And just a further one from me before I open up to Adrian and Bronwyn but - so, I guess, from the time the EIS was submitted and obviously in response to submission report, there's obviously been some change in terms of the visual assessment. I just note in previous - in the original VIS there was a couple of ratings for landholders that were more high than moderate so that change in visual assessment rating I presume are as a result of the changes in the project, maybe relocation of the substation. What are, I guess, the main reasons? There was only a handful of properties but, yeah, just interested in your comment.

30 MR DAVIES: Yeah. So, I think, that's - that's a good question and it's a fair question too. I think it's fair to say that the Department did request - as noted in my presentation we did request additional information on a number of occasions regarding the visual impact assessment. Ultimately the original, I think, 2016 solar energy guideline applies to the project but noting that the 22 guideline was published clearly last year. The Department did at least consider what the visual impacts would be against that guideline too given that it represents a contemporary assessment that is published and in the public domain.

40 Ultimately the Department's assessment considers that there are either nil or low visual impacts to surrounding residences. I would perhaps encourage you to - or the Commission to - that may want to ask the same question of the applicant but ultimately we are - we are comfortable with the assessment level that we have undertaken being that there are either low or nil impacts on surrounding receivers.

DR COAKES: Thank you. Thanks, Iwan. Over to Adrian and Bronwyn, any further questions?

MR ADRIAN PILTON: Just a quick question which may be very naïve but on the visual impact diagram you have non-involved dwelling and involved dwelling. Does

that just refer to dwellings that have agreements with the applicant or - I'm not sure exactly what it means.

10 MR DAVIES: No, perfect, thank you. So the involved dwellings will be one of two categories. They will either be hosts of the project and ultimately have accepted the impacts of the project or they have signed a neighbour agreement where they have accepted certain impacts of the project and in this instance it would be where they have confirmed they have accepted the visual impacts of the project. The non-involved residences are those that are not hosts and have not entered into a neighbour agreement with the applicant.

MR PILTON: Thank you. And if I could just ask a question about traffic. Are all of the vehicles, like the majority of vehicles likely to be B-doubles or what?

MR DAVIES: Yeah. So the - we restrict the number of heavy vehicle movements in our conditions of consent. So there are - there's a limit of 45 heavy vehicle movements but then your larger vehicles that require escorts are limited to 11. I don't have the number of light vehicles in front of me in the consent.

20 MR PILTON: I was just interested in the larger vehicles, what the impact is likely to be.

MR DAVIES: Yeah. So ultimately in terms of the impact during construction there are clearly a number of road upgrades that are required to allow the use of the road network by those B-double vehicles including those that require escort and then any impacts beyond the road upgrades we have conditions that the applicant must survey the existing condition of all local roads on the transport route prior to construction and post-construction and make good any development-related impacts.

30 MR PILTON: Thank you.

DR BRONWYN EVANS: Just some clarification, if I may, Iwan. In the report there's three different assessments of how many houses will be powered. So in your presentation you mentioned 76,400, in clause - in 5.1, clause 60 it's 86,500 and in 2.3, clause 15 it's 76,500. Are they assessments that the applicant made or is this - there's two parts to that question. How is it determined what the - that sort of factor or how many houses could be impacted or powered by the site, is that your assessment or theirs?

40 MR DAVIES: Absolutely. So first of all, I apologise for any errors in our assessment report so I will take that on notice and provide you with the absolute final number. How it is assessed is not based on what the applicant has told us; instead, the Department has its own calculator that it's developed alongside other government agencies including those that have expertise in renewable energy generation and the formula has been constructed for all solar and wind farms in New South Wales so it's that - it's the internal or it's the New South Wales Government's calculator that we use to calculate that number and I will provide you with the final number in writing.

DR EVANS: Thank you. And just a second question. They've been able to remove 22,000 solar panels and still generate the same level of power. I assume that's because of changes in technology. Is it likely that they'll actually be able to reduce more if they go to the next generation of solar panels? Is that available to them to actually reduce the number - absolute number of panels and still generate 200 megawatts? Would they have to change their application? I'm just interested to know how they respond to technology changes.

10 MR DAVIES: Thank you. So they can absolutely build within the development - the approved development footprint so they could reduce their constructable area or the area that the panels take up should technology advance and it certainly is and hence why that 200 megawatt figure has remained and we see that on a number of projects now. Technology is advancing annually essentially so, yes, they could reduce the scale of the project or they could potentially, I shouldn't guess, technology advances but, yeah, there is certainly potential there for them to reduce and maintain that energy generation capacity.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

20 DR COAKES: And just on that, Iwan, just following on from Bronwyn's comment there is a proposed condition around, you know, the ability to upgrade panels and obviously they must provide those revised layout plans and details to be satisfied. Yes.

MR DAVIES: Absolutely, yes, that's right and we'd expect that many solar farms across the state would upgrade their panels after a number of years, likely 10 or 15 years more likely.

30 DR COAKES: Yes. And just a comment. I guess, the agri-solar piece is quite important here, I guess, given the nature of the surrounding community and am I correct in saying that the panels have been based - the width between panels is being increased?

MR DAVIES: That's correct, Sherrie, yes. So my understanding is that the width between the panel rows has increased from six metres to 9 metres to allow use of the land. There are also other matters perhaps for the applicant to talk to but, yeah, certainly spacing between panels, the height of the panels being sufficient to allow animals to pass through freely underneath and some dams have been retained on site to provide water sources for livestock.

40 DR COAKES: OK. Terrific. Lovely. So any further questions from you, Adrian or Bronwyn?

MR PILTON: Nothing from me.

DR EVANS: No, thank you.

DR COAKES: No? All good. Well, thank you all. Thanks, Clay, Iwan, Elisha, Joe, Iwan for the presentation and, yes, we will - I'll call the meeting closed. Thanks for your time this morning.

MR DAVIES: Thanks for your time. Thanks.

MEETING CONCLUDED