

From:
To: [Portfolio Committee 4](#)
Subject: Re: Following up post-hearing responses from REZ inquiry - Mr Stuart Grills
Date: Monday, 8 September 2025 8:51:08 PM
Attachments: [image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image009.png](#)

Dear Margaret,

My response to the supplementary questions are as follows

1- In my experience the consultation from the developers has been very poor and what I would call consultation to tick the box in their aim to gain planning approval. I and our group (B4B) have offered alternatives and have been very open to negotiating with the developer only to have them not respond and not be willing at all to negotiate in what could be a solution for them to achieve some community support and social licence. They currently have neither.

2- Meaningful engagement requires developers to listen and respond to concerns with meaningful changes to the project to bring the community along with them in developing renewable energy. Currently the developers have meetings and so called drop in sessions with absolutely no intention of taking community concerns on board and making changes. I think they only do these sessions to tick the box.

3- One change that would actually make a difference to the New England REZ and landholders would be without any doubt a reduction in the size of the NE REZ from 8 GW to 3GW. This REZ at 8 GW is simply too big for this area with many small holdings and lifestyle blocks. There are so many people affected and as more development comes online, these numbers will dramatically increase along with the opposition to renewable energy. The NE REZ is the biggest in NSW and this simply does not make any sense. There are other REZ zones with much larger holdings and less people that would be more suitable for 8GW.

Kind Regards

Stuart Grills

On Fri, 5 Sept 2025 at 13:40, Portfolio Committee 4 <PortfolioCommittee4@parliament.nsw.gov.au> wrote:

|