

**Submission  
No 70**

**INQUIRY INTO FEASIBILITY OF UNDERGROUNDING  
THE TRANSMISSION INFRASTRUCTURE FOR  
RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS**

**Name:** Mr David Newbry

**Date Received:** 10 July 2023

---

To:

Director of Committees

My following letter is intended as a submission. The website would not allow me to send my personal details, so I am resorting to sending this submission, by email, through you. Please let me know if there is anything else that I should do. Thank you, David Newby

The Hon.Emily Suvaal,  
Committee Chair,  
Inquiry- Feasibility of under grounding the transmission infrastructure for renewable energy projects,  
Standing Committee on State Development,  
Parliament House,  
6 Macquarie Street, Sydney NSW 2000

Dear The Hon.Emily Suvaal MLC,

*Re the Feasibility of undergrounding the transmission infrastructure for renewable energy projects*

The Australian community supports action to mitigate the risks inherent in climate change. This leads to a commitment to rebuilding infrastructure designed to endure for the benefit of endless future generations.

Moving energy supply from fossil fuels to renewables thus has widespread community approval.

How this change will happen is not widely understood, other than that wind and solar are to be the major energy sources. But surely the community will expect the delivery of energy to itself be consistent with sound environmental practices, and be sustainable over time.

I appreciate that the extraordinary expenditure inherent in delivering the required infrastructure cannot be amortised over an indefinite period, so much of the cost burden must be borne by a few generations of citizenry , including ours.

However, it seems absurd that the chosen methodology for infrastructure delivery should be primarily based on the immediate cost, ignoring the environmental impacts and the longer term expense of an inferior and shorter lived approach. Completely inconsistent with the very long term ambition of managing the challenges to our climate.

Australians understand value for money, when properly explained to them. Ask any successful commercial enterprise. Governments should share what they know on the cost benefits of different infrastructure methodologies.

My belief is that there would be overwhelming community support for using underground transmission for electricity delivery if the facts were outlined. City dwellers would not expect their countryside to bear environmental risks that can be avoided by a superior , if more costly up-front, transmission system.

I am aware of other submissions being made on the HumeLink project, in similar form to my attachment. I wholeheartedly support those submissions.

I farm some nearly 4,000 acres in the Southern Highlands and Tablelands. Surrounded by wind farms, supportive of many plans for solar, I support those initiatives as strongly as I oppose the proposals to rely on overhead transmission for energy delivery .

The right course is to go underground, and to share with the community the excellent reasons for doing so. A government doing so will be recognised for its wisdom.

Sincerely,

David Newby