

Comments on representations made at the Issue Specific Hearing 18 March 2026

The use of BMV Land

- This proposal blatantly flouts Nation Policy as to minimising of the use of BMV land unless there are compelling reasons. The applicant offered no details of any assessments of alternate non-BMV sites they have undertaken, nor the reasons for the rejection of any such sites. Indeed, they failed to answer any of the challenges made to disclose their criteria for acceptance and rejection of land. They merely kept referring, over and over, to the sketchy and wholly inadequate information in their original reports.

- The applicant proposed deferring far too many matters to their planning at the post consent stage, thus avoiding any public scrutiny and challenges.

Traffic Management - Construction Phase

- The applicant showed an appalling failure to demonstrate how traffic management during the 3 year construction phase would be monitored and how their “rules” would be enforced. Every challenge to their traffic plan was dismissed without any attempt to address concerns.

- Their prime tool for traffic management appeared to be “encouragement” with the suggestion that “3 strikes and you are out” would be a sufficient deterrent. There was no indication of how they would monitor and enforce such a lax regime.

- Their car sharing ratios for site workers were totally unrealistic and they had no answer to preventing drivers using their GPS to use the shortest route.

- Their proposal was that HGVs and abnormal loads would exit the A1 only from the south and return only to the north bound A1. Such a scheme would be a logistical nightmare and they disclosed no means of enforcement.

- They had used out of date traffic accident statistics.

- Their purely desk-based modelling meant that the applicant had no understanding of the nature and dimensions of the B and C class roads involved and the inevitable impact of the very high levels of HGV movements on small villages, local traffic, road surfaces, junctions and verges. The applicant attending the meeting had never driven the proposed route until the actual day of the hearing!

Traffic Management - Operational Phase

- The applicant has no detailed plan concerning the volume of traffic that would continue during the 40 years of the operational life of the plant. All equipment, including solar panels, support structures, transformers, inverters, the BESS and fencing will need to be replaced over the lifetime of the plant, yet the applicant appears to think this would result in only very little traffic movement. The applicant failed to accept concerns as to ongoing damage and disruption to local B & C grade lanes and the resulting costs to local councils, and increased risk to other road users.

- The applicant was totally dismissive of any comments as to the impact of the construction and operation of this scheme on the very rural nature of the area and its tiny villages. All such challenges on these critical aspects were glossed over and not addressed.