

# INQUIRY INTO IMPACT OF RENEWABLE ENERGY ZONES (REZ) ON RURAL AND REGIONAL COMMUNITIES AND INDUSTRIES IN NEW SOUTH WALES Hearing:

16 May 2025 SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

Mrs Jane Hegarty, Chair, Cassilis District Development Group  
Mrs Linda Gant, Committee member, Cassilis District Development  
Group

## ***Traffic, Infrastructure and Safety***

1. ***You outlined serious concerns with the traffic management plans around the Golden Highway. Has there been any formal safety audit conducted in response to community concerns?***

The only formal safety audit we are aware of is one we requested from the Upper Hunter Road Safety Officer to put some monitors on the Old Coolah Road so we could determine the speed of traffic travelling outside the Cassilis Public School. This is the proposed route for Energy Co to travel on for the northern transmission line developments. The results re-enforced our concerns that this road with limited warnings for school children to cross, and the expected increase in traffic would become unsafe. This was reinforced by the data collected as the majority of vehicles were speeding in the vicinity of the school zone. See results below.

Old Coolah Road just west of 40km sign (September/October 2024)				
Traffic Volumes				
Avg 24hr AADT Weekdays	Avg 24hr AADT Weekend	% Light Class 1 & 2	% Medium Class 3 to 5	% Heavy Class 6 to 12
68	64	84.9	12.2	2.9
Speed Statistics				
Speed Limit (km/hr)	Mean Speed (km/hr)	Mean Exceeding	85% Speed	
50	53.2	61.1	65.9	
Light Vehicles are all cars, vans, utilities, bicycles and motorcycles, including trailers Medium Vehicles range between 2 axle trucks or buses up to 4 axle trucks Heavy Vehicles are 3-6 axle articulated vehicles, B doubles and double/triple road trains				

2. ***Do you believe that developers are prioritising cost over safety when it comes to their freight routing and intersection upgrades?***

The lack of local knowledge around road intersections and the issues local residents have as they enter the Golden Highway do not appear to be considered effectively. Transport NSW have road determinants such as Level of Service (LoS) which they are using to make decisions about

the Golden Highway. However these measurements are not fit for purpose on the Golden Highway. It appears that the cost of ensuring that residents who use the highway daily have safe intersections to join the highway is not considered. The only intersections being redone are those that have OSOM vehicles turning off the Golden Highway. The lack of knowledge around what local businesses are using what intersections and how safe they are has not been considered and this was very evident with the decisions made about the Ringwood Road intersection (outside CWOREZ but situated on the Golden Highway west of Merriwa) jointly decided upon by Transport NSW and BP Lighthouse. It is an inherently unsafe intersection for people turning right onto the highway but rather than fix this problem and provide some legacy infrastructure for the community long term they have decided upon another solution that now increases the safety issues for residents who have to turn onto the highway at the Idaville Rd intersection. The local community cannot understand how such a decision was made that now has resulted in the potential for further safety issues and has not fixed the original safety issues. Why would government sanction such a decision unless it was to save money?

**3. *What consultation, if any, has the local community had with Transport for NSW regarding the freight plans tied to REZ construction?***

There has been one meeting in Merriwa held with the Merriwa Progress Association discussing the Golden Highway and the main street of Merriwa where all the traffic will travel which I attended. Minister Atkinson was also present. Transport NSW were asked about what the daily number of OSOM vehicles would be and what was the time interval between them. They did not know and still have not answered this question. They did stipulate that OSOM vehicles had to be out of the urban precinct of Newcastle/Hunter Expressway before the daily mining traffic commenced. We know that that means they will arrive at Merriwa during our school bus route time and when people in our shire are commuting to work etc. The lack of consultation about this and the consideration for our communities of this impact appears to be absent.

**4. *Has there been any attempt to measure the potential impact on school routes or emergency response times due to increased heavy vehicle traffic?***

Not that we are aware of. The community knows that if an accident occurs with a fatality or serious injury on the Golden Highway the Accident investigation team from Newcastle needs to travel up to our area (3 hours to 4 hours currently). Ambulances are generally ½ hour away if they are coming from Merriwa or Coolah longer if they have to travel from further afield. As there are no passing lanes on the section of the highway from Merriwa to Merotherie it does make it difficult to access accident sites for emergency personnel. During previous accidents traffic has been held up for approximately 9 hours on the highway often in areas where it is difficult to turn around. School children and preschool children who were in Merriwa had to wait till the highway was reopened to be picked up resulting in stress for local residents. To date there appears to have been no studies on the potential impact of the increased traffic on travel times for school buses and emergency vehicles that we know of.

### ***Agricultural Impact and Land Use***

**5. *You raise concerns about the loss of arable land. Have developers or EnergyCo provided any long-term modelling of the impact on agricultural productivity in your region?***

Energy Co's EIS stated how much Land would be used for easements and transmission lines. It did not reference the cumulative impact of the 40 odd proposed developments in the CWOREZ. At no stage did the EIS look at the long-term impacts on removing farm land from cropping and how that will impact on the local rural supply merchants in Coolah and Dunedoo. These are the long-term indirect costs that communities are very concerned about. Will these businesses continue to be viable? The EIS did not really appear to understand what the loss of productive

land does to individual farmer's production and then the total impact on the region. They did not appear to understand that when your farm is cut in half by a transmission line that the extra time to travel with equipment on an alternative route adds time, often means that new gates, tracks etc will have to be put in to provide an alternative route etc. These costs were not looked at and were also not permissible in the Just Terms Act for compensation as it is just based on land value.

**6. *Has any compensation or planning offset been offered to account for potential long-term economic losses in the cropping and agribusiness sectors?***

The Just Term Act is not able to offer farmers compensation for these long-term economic losses as it is based on land value. There has been little willingness from Energy Co and consultants to change transmission routes to make some of these potential losses or costs minimal for farmers even when they cannot explain dog legs or the reasoning behind the route they have chosen. To date I do not know of any planning offset or compensation offered.

**7. *Do you believe there is a deliberate pattern of targeting prime agricultural land for REZ development? If so, why?***

Prime agricultural land has many forms. Traditionally it has been viewed solely on soil and topography and classified according to classes. It appears that good agricultural land has been targeted as it is covered with fewer trees and is flatter and easier for developments to occur there. This is very frustrating for farmers who are compulsorily acquired as they have no say in what land is removed for development and in some cases it is their better cropping country. Land owners who enter an agreement to install renewable energy developments on their farms have the opportunity to place these on their less productive land so see it as an alternative source of income. They have entered this arrangement as an equal negotiator and have the right to say no if the plan does not suit their enterprise. This is very different for compulsory acquired land owners who feel they have no say over location or any way to be an equal partner in the negotiation process.

When Tilt Renewables was looking for a Temporary Workers Accommodation site, they would only consider cultivated or cleared land. Tilt viewed cultivated or cleared land as a degraded landscape, not prime agricultural land. When offered suggested sites that would reduce traffic on local roads and in close proximity to development sites they were refused as they would require environmental offsets.

***Have you seen any evidence that decision-makers have weighed the agricultural GDP contribution of the area against the renewable infrastructure footprint?***

Land acquired and isolated for environmental offsets should also be accounted for in the renewable infrastructure footprint GDP calculations for agriculture.

No real evidence has been shown. Agricultural enterprises have been supporting the smaller communities for years and providing GDP income for NSW and Australia. There appears to be little evidence of how a renewable energy development will support our GDP other than provide electricity to urban areas. Local businesses do not appear to benefit from this development for the long-term.

The agricultural footprint has a much bigger financial impact on local communities than the long-term renewable energy developers. We know from early information that they are gearing up to place their long-term employees in larger centers like Duboo and Mudgee. Agriculture supports the community it is near. Families send their children to local schools, buy farm merchandise from the local supply merchant, volunteer for the local sporting clubs and are generally committed to making the community they live in a better place to be. Renewable energy developers are not really interested in the smaller communities like Dunedoo, Coolah

and Cassilis. They are keen to throw a few dollars at them but not really engage in long term benefits that will make those communities more liveable and sustainable. Unfortunately government policies around centralisation of health and amalgamation of local government has also made it more difficult for smaller communities as the decision making and priority focus is on the bigger centers. These centers do not really have good knowledge about their smaller communities unless some of the management personnel lives in one of them. This will be the same for the renewable energy companies who will be living in Dubbo or Mudgee and they will have little understanding of how they have impacted a local small community.

### ***Fire Risk and Emergency Preparedness***

***8. You noted that local fire services were not consulted. Have you raised this with EnergyCo or government agencies, and what was their response?***

NSW RFS personnel attended our NSW Farmers Renewal Energy TASK Force meeting in Dubbo in February 2025. They stated that to date they had not had any contact with Energy CO re the CWOREZ fire services. This may have changed by now. I did raise this at a CWOREZ Community Reference Group (CRG) meeting and they assured me that they had been consulting with RFS Head Office to determine their Fire plan and they would then meet with local brigades to discuss the plan. I am not sure if this has happened yet as the Cassilis brigade certainly has not had a discussion to date. Once again the centralized body based in Sydney is making decisions about the design of this plan without local input. This is a particularly sensitive issue for the CWOREZ region as the communities of Dunedoo, Coolah and Cassilis were devastated by the Sir Ivan Bush Fire in 2017. They feel that there is no real understanding of the speed and devastation of fires in this landform and there certainly appears to be little understanding of the need for personnel, equipment stationed strategically in the REZ and training for all renewable energy personnel with local brigades on fire fighting to provide a sense of commitment to supporting local communities if this potential disaster was to occur again.

***9. Given your knowledge of historic fire activity in the region, do you believe REZ infrastructure will increase fire risk or complicate fire response?***

REZ infrastructure will certainly provide a more complicated fire response. There is some evidence around batteries causing fires (Victoria) and the Gobang fire was started by transmission lines so the community is concerned. There has been no communication around how a local brigade can fight a fire that, rather than being vegetation (which they know), is now a mixture of vegetation and industrial structures. What are the long-term implications for soil, water catchments etc when a solar farm is engulfed by fire? No one can tell us? How will the transmission lines hinder aerial fire fighting? How will wind turbines hinder fire fighting? Will they delay a response which will enable a fire to become out of control before fire fighters can access the ground? These are all questions we still do not know.

Land acquired for environmental offset should also be considered for fire risk response. Historically, lands acquired for environmental offset require fire plans. These plans are developed without community involvement and are unrealistic. There appears to be no provision for the allocation of human or material resources to the local community fire brigades. Terminology such as *assist the RFS, NPWS and emergency services as much as practicable if there is a fire in the vicinity of the site* does not actually commit any human or firefighting resources to the local RFS.

***10. Do you support undergrounding of transmission infrastructure as a realistic fire risk mitigation strategy in your region?***

There are many reasons to consider underground transmission infrastructure as a preferred option, including fire risk mitigation.

Undergrounding of lines would seem logical in this day and age even if it is more expensive. With the increase in natural disasters and their ferocity undergrounding would limit the repair bill after these events. It would also be more likely that households would recover more quickly as they would be without power for shorter periods rather than the days that were experienced after the Sir Ivan Fire.

Climate extremes, unprecedented windstorms, excessive rainfall and lightning strikes can disrupt power supply networks, as the Victorian town of Moorabool discovered in 2021.

Replacing the six 500kV towers destroyed by windstorms near Moorabool in January 2020 cost \$26 million, a cost that would not have been made if the transmission lines were underground.

**11. Have rural fire services or brigades received updated training, guidance, or resources specifically to deal with REZ-related emergencies?**

Not to my knowledge at this stage.

## ***Community Consultation and Confidence in Process***

**12. You've described community consultation as poorly handled; do you believe this is due to deliberate avoidance, capacity issues, or lack of accountability within agencies?**

I think there are a few areas around community consultation that need to be addressed.

- Often personnel involved do not have the answers the community wants. They have taken emails to answer questions at a future date but this does not happen in many cases.
- Consultation does not seem to change the outcome but is rather a show and tell with little opportunity for the community to be involved in the decisions being made.
- There is a lack of a holistic approach where the personnel that carries out initial surveys in the community are not involved in the community consultation process so how they reached certain conclusions cannot be explained to community members.
- Times are often provided for community consultation that are not appropriate for working people who are giving up their work time while consultants are paid to be there. Often the night or early morning breakfast times are much more suitable around bus times or school times but these obviously do not suit the organisations doing the consultation.
- I think there is also a misunderstanding around the meaning of consultation as the community initially saw it as a chance to have some input into the decisions being made that impact them but over time they now view it as a box ticking exercise.
- Consent conditions rely on community consultation; however, communities are fatigued by the consultation process and feel disenfranchised due to not being heard. There are a lot of competing projects (not only renewable energy infrastructure) that require the proponent to "consult" with the community.
- The opportunity for communities to come together and collectively hear proponents' plans is avoided by proponents. It is very hard for our community to get feedback on community views from the way the consultation process is being done at present.
- Proponents are required to have Community Consultation Committees with community representation. With over forty renewable projects planned for the Central-West Orana REZ, it's a huge draw on time and resources for community representatives to participate, in an unpaid capacity, in the consultation process. Keep in mind that it is not only the renewable energy projects that are required to have community consultation committees. Local

Government 355 committees, mining proponents, offset management schemes are just a few that operate in our small local community

**13. *Were there any examples where feedback from your community was either ignored or contradicted by final development decisions?***

Feedback around the social impacts and long term impacts for our community was provided to a range of consultants. However there has been little acknowledgement of community concerns and of this feedback in the EIS provided by Energy CO. An example of this in the EIS is that they still state that the increase in traffic will be negligible for local residents. How did they make this decision and have they actually looked at what it is like currently to follow a heavy vehicle on the Golden Highway between Merriwa and Merotherie? With the total number of projects being planned and the number of heavy vehicles and OSOM loads travelling on the highway even Mike Young (previous Energy Co Manager) stated at a meeting in Dunedoo that the impacts would be significant particularly for towns like Merriwa.

**14. *What effect has the lack of timely, consistent information from EnergyCo had on landholders' ability to make informed decisions?***

Landowners have been unable to plan long term and make timely decisions as they cannot get the information they need from Energy Co around the compulsory acquisition of land. No business I know would make long term plans about enterprises without knowing which parts of their property are being impacted, whether infrastructure had to be moved, whether vehicles will be driving through the farm at critical times like lambing and calving. Also biosecurity is a shared responsibility according to the legislation yet Energy Co's biosecurity plan has not been shared with farmers to date to my knowledge. None of this information required has been put in writing so how can a farmer make a decision before this is done? Farmers have to make decisions about lambing and calving times the year before as joining determines this but they have no information.

**15. *Do you believe EnergyCo's memorandum of understanding with NSW Farmers has delivered any meaningful change for local engagement?***

I was of the understanding that the memorandum between NSW Farmers and Energy CO was to enable an improvement in communication. I do believe that the communication between head Office NSW Farmers and Energy Co has improved however it has not improved the grass roots communication between Energy Co personnel and individual Farmers,

### ***Decommissioning and Long-Term Legacy***

**16. *You raise the lack of decommissioning bonds, have any developers shared their end-of-life plans with your community or Council?***

Not to my knowledge.

**17. *Would you support a national licensing scheme for renewable developers that includes mandatory decommissioning bonds, as you've suggested?***

Yes. It is extremely worrying that we are utilizing large portions of land in the CWOREZ for solar and wind farms without any long-term strategies in place in the event of the necessity to remove industrial infrastructure. Why should farmers have to pay the cost as the current landowners if they are not putting the infrastructure there. As a country we have not done the research to the long term implications of this infrastructure on soil health, salinity, micro climates, productivity and at this stage we have not put in place any recourse action for the multi-national corporations to care for our environment in the manner we would expect. They are in it for the dollars that these developments will provide in profit for them and are not taking into account the possible negative impacts on our environment and the long term costs. Decommissioning bonds would be an insurance for some of these issues.

**18. Are you aware of any projects in your region being sold or transferred to smaller operators, raising concerns about long-term financial security?**

In the planning and development phase we have already seen the initial application from Epuron sold to Tilt Renewables for the wind farm nearby.

**Compensation and Taxation Clarity**

**19. Do you believe the current transmission compensation structure is fit for purpose, especially considering infrastructure will remain for much longer than 20 years?**

Transmission compensation appears to be inequitable when you look at the payments being provided for renewable generators. Transmission lines will remain for many years until the need for energy is reduced or other forms of energy are developed closer to the urban centres that require it. Consequently it seems unfair that those land owners who have been compulsory acquired for easements for transmission lines are not compensated for the life of the infrastructure.

**20. Has any government body or developer provided clear, written guidance on the tax treatment of compensation payments?**

To date the government has not provided clear guidance to the tax implications for compensation payments. It appears that compensation payments will be taxed which reduces the benefit of the payment when it is meant to be compensation for the infringement of development on productive land. This does not seem equitable as these farmers did not want this.

**21. Would your group support a standardised, legislated compensation model that includes tax exemption status for affected farmers?**

A standardized compensation model for all farmers across Australia for compulsory acquired land is difficult. The compensation payments for the life of a project could be standardized with an annual payment for the life of the project on a landowners land. However the similarities between land and its value across different regions could not be standardized as different factors affect its value. The Just Terms Act is not fit for purpose in this area which has become evident during the planning stages of the CWOREZ.

**Tourism and Local Economy**

**22. You note tourism will likely suffer from landscape industrialisation. Has the government acknowledged this risk in any formal economic assessments?**

Tourism has not really been acknowledged in our area with the main impacts being on visual amenity and access to some areas for campers and bush walkers. In areas like Mudgee and Pokolbin there is a real problem with the potential impact of an industrialised landscape. People travel to the country to see rural landscapes not industrial landscapes so this impact has not been really addressed effectively as it is an unknown at this stage.

**23. Has your community been offered any form of offset or support package for potential lost income tied to visual amenity and agritourism?**

The only offer of compensation for the loss of visual amenity has been through the Community Benefits Grant program where we have to apply for funds. There has been no offers of tree planting to date to our community and it appears farmers have to actually ask for this to occur if they feel they are being impacted. Once again it is not automatically offered but is part of the negotiation. How this would work is unclear but it appears that farmers would still be responsible for maintenance of trees even when tree lots they have planted are being bulldozed.

**24. What kind of tourism now operates in the Cassilis region, and how will transmission lines or wind farms change that experience?**

Tourism in Cassilis is around visitors coming to camp, bush walk and attend individual workshops or festivals organized by communities and tourist providers. At busy periods accommodation is fully booked so there is no capacity for worker accommodation. The Coolah Tops National Park camping was fully booked in advance for the Easter break etc. The Drip walking track, in Goulburn River State Conservation Area, a popular local tourist attraction, will be visually impacted by transmission lines. There is potential for a renewable energy information/education site to be set up that may boost tourism.

### **Voluntary Planning Agreements (VPAs)**

**25. You suggest communities are left out of VPA negotiations. Should VPAs be required to include sign-off or input from affected local groups like yours?**

VPS's should be required to include input from affected local groups.

In the case of the Liverpool Ranges Wind Farm, the VPA was intended to benefit communities within a specified distance from the windfarm footprint, including the transmission line to connect to the grid. The footprint is situated in three shire councils. The VPA is now only being negotiated by two, the Upper Hunter Shire Council and the Warrumbungle Shire Council, omitting the Mid-Western Shire and the impacted Turill community. The Liverpool Ranges Windfarm Community Consultation Committee has not been included in any of the VPA negotiations, nor been privy to any information around the VPA since The Liverpool Ranges Windfarm obtained consent.

DCG who are building a gravel quarry in the Cassilis region to supply TILT Renewal gravel for roads and developments have contacted the Cassilis District Development Group and have asked Council to write into that agreement that all spending of funds has to be done in consultation with the Cassilis District Development Group. We are still to see a written copy of this agreement to verify that this request is actually in place.

**26. Have you ever been consulted during VPA discussions between Council and developers? If not, why do you think that is?**

The Liverpool Ranges Wind Farm CCC, with assistance from the Office of Environment and Heritage, spent considerable time looking at various VPA models being developed or operating worldwide, so we could come up with an effective, fair VPA model for the Liverpool Ranges Wind Farm. Unbeknown to the non-council affiliated CCC members, two of the councils within the Wind Farm footprint were involved in confidential negotiations to establish guidelines for the VPA to be administered by Council under 355 Committees. This led to mistrust of Council and Proponent relationship by the non-council affiliated members of the CCC and made a mockery of the consultation process.

Only the developers have spoken to us. Council tends to only discuss VPA's once they have been negotiated. This was evident when Upper Hunter Shire was negotiating a VPA with BP Lighthouse for the Merriwa region.

**27. Would you support legislation that ringfences VPA funds for use in directly impacted towns, rather than being absorbed into general council budgets?**

Definitely as it is one of the few opportunities that a community being impacted has to direct funds to mitigate some of the impacts that arise from our changing landscape.

### **Cassilis District Development Group - Mrs Jane Hegarty**

**28. Your group has recommended involving community members directly in the EIS process. What kind of structure — such as advisory panels or working groups — would ensure local knowledge is incorporated effectively?**



The withdrawal, amalgamation and privatization of government, semi-government and statutory bodies from rural and regional areas has led to a lack of government personnel living and working in rural communities. The ability of government organizations to feed *on the ground* non-bias, non-pecuniary interest information into the EIS process has been lost with the withdrawal of these personnel.

Consultants who conduct the EIS are employed by the proponent. We, as a community, see this as a conflict of interest. Desk top audits and research appear to be done without much ground truthing to check data. There appears to be a lack of continuity with personnel within the consulting organizations, leading to a fragmented information base.

For an effective EIS process, it should be conducted by an independent body that relies on local knowledge and research. Data and reports should then become easily accessible public information.

Because local personnel who live in the regions are not involved in the initial planning stages of a development plan there are so many inaccuracies or problems with proposals when they get to the EIS stage. To date we have found rural homesteads that are in the impact areas missing on maps, inappropriate travel routes suggested for heavy vehicles, roads described as being two lane with speeds of 100 kms where it would not be possible to travel on them at this speed, busy intersections on the highway with businesses on those roads that will be impacted due to no turning lanes being provided. The list goes on because there is no local knowledge evident in the planning just desk top analysis from Sydney by consultants with little fact checking. The Planning Department believes what they read and also have no way of checking facts.

**29. *Regarding insurance concerns, have you had an opportunity to raise these formally with insurers or government agencies? What feedback or support have you received in response?***

No I have not raised these with an insurance company but have raised it at the NSW Farmers Task Force and asked them to investigate it on behalf of members. To date we do not have any clarity around this issue yet.

**30. *You mentioned that some CCCs have felt like box-ticking exercises. What changes would you suggest to make these committees more responsive, transparent, and impactful?***

I would like to see local personnel involved in the initial planning for a development which could mean that the Community Reference Groups are selected more on a skills based manner with relevant representatives for each community who have good knowledge and can have input into decision making,

Local councils have separate meetings around proposed developments and community members are not involved in these. This is a problem with amalgamated councils as their knowledge of outlining areas is often poor and decisions are made that do not reflect the wishes of a community. This occurred in Cassilis when Council offered a developer land for a workers camp within walking distance of Cassilis. It was to be positioned at the entrance to our town on Council land. Residents were very upset about the lack of prior discussion from Council and attended a meeting (that Council was not there for) and were able to explain all the problems with that site that the developer was unaware of. Due to that meeting the developer agreed to position their proposed workers camp at another site much more suitable. Council were upset with the community and said they did not understand the community's response. This highlighted the lack of understanding they had of our community and because they had not consulted with us we had no knowledge of why they made this proposal on our behalf.

**31. *You also raised issues with inaccurate mapping in consultant reports. Have you pursued corrections through existing channels, and do you believe stronger procedures are needed to fix such errors in a timely way?***

Yes there were a number of houses not included in the maps of impacted citizens. This was followed up at a Community Reference Group meeting, and followed up by one of our members directly, where they were informed about the missing homes. We are not sure if the maps were then resubmitted to the Planning Department with the additional homes added.

The maps are generally very badly done with few reference points for roads, rivers etc so it is often hard to get your bearings as to what is happening in your area. The areas that companies choose for visual photographs of impacts are often misleading also. East of Cassilis due to topography will be impacted but there are no photographs of what the Wind Farm will look like from this side as you drive into Cassilis.

Once again this could be fixed by local input into the initial planning of documents.

**32. *You spoke about community disenfranchisement. Do you see merit in the creation of an independent rural energy commissioner or REZ ombudsman to help restore trust and provide a fair voice for regional communities?***

I believe that this would just create another level of bureaucracy that everyone would have to deal with. Once again they would be positioned in Sydney without real knowledge of the areas being impacted. Taxation money would be used to pay them adding to the cost of a development. These developments need to be more locally planned with local people (and I mean local – people living in the communities that are being impacted, not Mudgee or Dubbo) employed to oversee planning ideas and it would remove many of the issues that corporations are now trying to deal with in communities where the trust in the decision making process has been dissolved.

**33. *You called for a moratorium on Stages Two and Three of the Central-West Orana REZ. What key issues would need to be addressed before development could proceed responsibly, in your view?***

I called for a moratorium on the current CWOREZ developments until there is a realistic picture of the cumulative impacts. The moratorium does not need to be long and certainly should not stop work happening just new developments. It just needs to be long enough so that the cumulative impacts of all projects proposed for the CWOREX (eg the 10 with access rights granted to date) be collated so we have a real picture of what this area, the roads, the housing, the health services, emergency services etc are going to look like.

Stage 2 developers could then be collated and Stage 3 collated so that there is some much needed long term planning rather than an individual developer saying lets fix this problem by doing this rather than looking at the whole area and coming up with a plan for the region that is sustainable, doable and much more realistic.