Action 1 A

A copy of the site plan for the location of the proposed solar panels and other features for which development consent is sought. The plan is to have a unique date of production and description.

The Final Site Plan prepared by Allied Consulting Engineers, dated 14 April 2026, has been submitted. It has a unique date of production and description, which the Panel requested. The array of solar panels and development across the site, is consistent with other documentation lodged.

To address the Panel's concerns relating to how a fire would be dealt with inside the compound, the plan shows:

- 2 x 10,000 L firewater tanks with a 65mm RFS storz fitting, located near the entrance, each permanently filled with water (supplied under an existing water access licence and entitlement for the site; and
- a water cart, for the suppression of fire.

While the likelihood of fire inside the compound is relatively low, fire risk increases with more vegetation inside the compound there to soften views of the solar panels that might be afforded above the 5m high perimeter fencing and through the landscaping buffer. It is submitted the tanks and water cart are RFS compliant.

Condition A1 has been updated to reference the Final Site Plan prepared by Allied Consulting Engineers, dated 14 April 2026. This would be endorsed and form part of the consent.

Action 1 B

A revised Acoustic Report that addresses the location of the proposed solar panels and other features for which development consent is sought. The revised Acoustic Report is to include a diagram indicating an arc from each of the identified residential receivers where the 45dBA level is achieved during the construction phase without any mitigation measures, and an equivalent diagram for operational noise. The revised Acoustic Report is to specify what mitigation measures are proposed, including details of any temporary acoustic fencing, that can be used to ensure that each residential receptor achieves the 45dBA level during all construction phases, and during operation. The revised Acoustic Report is to have a unique date of production and description.

In summary, the Panel requested a revised Acoustic Report to include:

- a diagram indicating an arc from each of the identified residential receivers where the 45dBA level is achieved during the **construction phase** without any mitigation measures; and,

- a diagram indicating an arc from each of the identified residential receivers where the 45dBA level is achieved during the **operation** of the facility, without any mitigation measures.

The Panel asked that the revised Acoustic Report had a unique date of production and description, and specify the proposed mitigation measures and details of any temporary acoustic fencing used, to ensure that each residential receptor achieves the 45dBA level during all construction phases, and, during operation.

To address this request, the applicant has uploaded:

- a Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (NVIA) prepared by SoundIN (Report No. 17322 Ver 1.1) dated 14 April 2026;
- an accompanying cover letter prepared by Nic Hall, dated 14 April 2026;
- an email from John Wassermann, Technical Advisor for Noise, at the NSW EPA; and a construction timeframe gannt chart providing a detailed construction timeframe for the proposed development.

Firstly, the Acoustic Report has a unique date of production and description, which the Panel requested.

Secondly, the Acoustic Report (appendices) provides diagrams for the **construction phase** without any mitigation measures and, during the **operation** and 40 year lifetime of the facility, without any mitigation measures.

Thirdly, and to address the Panel's concern about residential receptors achieving a 45dBA noise level during all construction phases and during operation, the Acoustic Report confirms that it is only the piling component during the construction phase, where noise levels would exceed that level. And so, while the Panel asked that the revised Acoustic Report ensure that each residential receptor achieves the 45dBA level during construction and operation, it is evident that this cannot be fully achieved.

Moreover, the documentation confirms that the 'worst-case scenario' during the construction phase (aka the *noisiest 15 minute periods during the various construction activities*) are the noise levels at the sensitive receivers which are predicted to exceed the standard 45 dBA noise management level (NML). However, it is submitted that that 75 dBA, which is considered to be the "highly affected noise level", would not be exceeded. And it is submitted that even during that time, the construction noise level would be generally in accordance with the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG).

The email from John Wassermann, Technical Advisor for Noise, at the EPA support this. It confirms the intent and application of the ICNG, as a guideline.

The applicant has attempted, as far as practicable, to manage noise levels and reduce them down toward the NML. They have sourced a GPS piling technique which is currently used across NSW for similar projects, and they are considering the use of on-boundary screening / screening of the piling rig itself.

The GPS piling technique will reduce the length of time for the piling around the site perimeter from 15 days to 4 days. This reduces the off-site amenity impacts to adjoining properties, compared to the originally submitted DA.

In terms of the acoustic screening suggested by the Panel, the documentation confirms that while temporary / portable acoustic screening is often used to manage construction noise impacts, it might not be practicable for this project. This is due to the length of the screen required and the need to keep move it throughout the 4 day period which (Council assumes) could lengthen the 4 day timeframe for the piling stage.

While documentation states that the applicant is investigating the feasibility of attaching temporary acoustic screening to the piling rig itself, it confirms that this would only reduce the receiver noise levels by 5-8 dBA, which would (apparently) be noticeable to most people, however it demonstrates that even by doing this, the noise levels associated with the piling would still exceed 45 dBA NML.

The documentation recommends having "respite periods" thereby limit piling to specific time periods. And the construction timeframe gannt chart while labelled as "indicative", provides the Panel and residents / submitters with a detailed, transparent timeframe for all steps of the construction stage.

While a condition of consent could require a combination of methods (in other words, it could require a temporary / portable acoustic screen to be used over the 4 day piling period, with details of a typic screen to be submitted for approval prior to works commencing; require an acoustic screen be fitted to the piling rig; require the consent holder to liaise with all affected properties within a specific timeframe of piling works taking place, etc) the challenge with any condition trying to balance certainty and flexibility, is its enforceability.

Therefore, based on the documentation provided, Council does not recommend an additional condition, just an updated Condition 1A to reference version 1.1 of Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment prepared by SoundIN, dated 14 April 2026. Officers support the exceedance of 45 dBA NML during the piling component of the construction stage, due to the following:

- The documentation confirms that the exceedance of 45 dBA NML is only during the construction stage and at all other times noise levels will be below 75 dBA, which is considered to be a "highly affected noise level".
- Within the construction period, piling is the only activity which would exceed 45 dBA NML and using a GPS system, piling would be reduced to a 4 day period, only.
- Piling is fundamental to the installation of the development.
- Once construction is complete, the noise levels associated with a solar panel compound is relatively low. For the 40 year lifespan of the development residents will be subject to minimal off-site amenity impacts.

Action 1C

A revised Landscape Plan that increases the width of landscaping to a minimum of 7.5m wide in those locations that do not impact on the solar panels and where trees of a mature height of more than 5m are able to be planted to provide a range of landscaping. Full details are also to be provided on the initial planting, early-stage maintenance, ongoing maintenance for the life of the project and the replacement of dead species. The revised Landscape Plan is to have a unique date of production and description.

The landscaping plans prepared by Site Image landscape architects Job Number SS25-5539, have a unique date of production and description, which the Panel requested. There are 5 sheets, namely drawings:

- 000, C
- 100, C
- 500, A
- 501, B
- 601, D

The package shows a 7.5m landscaped buffer along the road frontage, as requested. This increases the buffer width by 2.5m (from 5m to 7.5m) and the plan shows the planting of trees capable of growing to a 7m height at maturity. An additional 2.5m of landscape buffer along the perimeter fencing will facilitate additional and increased mix of vegetation, ranging from low shrubs to 7m high trees. This would appear adequate to soften the interface and the visual appearance of the development perimeter. And it would further screen any vantage views of the solar panel arrays inside the compound, from the surrounds.

The specifications on drawing 500 A, provides details of initial planting, early-stage maintenance, and ongoing maintenance. It references a watering system and 52 week maintenance period and replacement, where needed. This plan and its specifications are considered appropriate for the development, and condition 1A has been updated to reflect it.

The question of approving landscaping as part of the development and technically needing to be removed after the 40 year lifespan of the development, so that the site can return in full to its former agricultural use, needs to be answered. While Officers don't want to hinder the agricultural use of the land or its development potential, a 7.5m wide landscaping buffer with 7m high trees that are 40+ years old (depending on their maturity level at the time of planting) needs to be considered. Should the Panel want to consider this, and how it could be dealt with via a condition of consent, please contact Council.

Conclusion

Council officers believe that based on the documentation submitted with the DA and during the assessment stage, the site is suitable for the proposed development and lifespan of 40 years, and all off-site amenity impacts and concerns raised by submitters have been fully considered and can be appropriately mitigated, through conditions of consent.