

Attachment 2

Submissions - Community Engagement Findings: Solar Farm Proposed Lease

Consultation Dates: 27 May- 19 June 2022

Contribution ID	Do you support or object to the lease proposal between Nillumbik Shire Council and LMS Energy Pty Ltd for Council owned land at the Plenty landfill site shown on the Plan to operate a solar farm? (Please tick one)		Please specify your reasons for this
	Support	Do not support	
20704		Do not support	The rent amount - I do not understand why Nillumbik is leasing the land for a ridiculously low fee of \$2000.00 year plus GST. I understand and agree with the importance of having a solar farm however, LMS energy will be making hundreds of thousands of dollars a year and a measly sum of \$2000.00 per year is ridiculously low. There is no commercial sense as to why we should agree to this when our own community/residents pay way more to rent a council hall or other facility. Why are we putting the interests of a commercial business above that of our own community? Nillumbik council is there to serve and support the community, not corporate business!
20702		Do not support	I need more information. (1) You have not advised what cost you are paying for the electricity (this would be via a PPA). (2) You should advise the residents what costs you are paying for the 3,300 solar panels. Is the price you are paying been benchmarked - is it reasonable? (3) The amount you pay should only cover the cost of the capital once? Not for the project life of 25 years? (4) Operating costs seem to be a pass through - why aren't you also limiting these to CPI? (5) A lease term of 25 years seems excessive to me. You should limit to 15 with +5 x 3 options; At council option (6) It is also confusing when you state this will reduce the council's power requirements for street lighting. This is not certain - so is a mis-representation; (7) You have not provided any insights into the development capability of LMS? How many farms have they done before? What is their track record of delivering on a budget? You have given us no comfort here. (8) Are you locking LMS into a 'turn key' price? If not, why not? (9) Who is responsible for the dismantle/clean-up at the end of the lease? What provisions have you built into the agreement so the abandonment cost is placed into a trust prior to the end of the terms to ensure the residents are not liable? (10) And dismantle/abandonment cost is not a residents cost - when you have paid them a return on the development? Just some initial thoughts. I'll revert with more in due course. Regards
20674	Support		Great use of an area which is difficult to use.
20671	Support		I have lived on land abutting the Plenty landfill site for 36 years. I was not happy that the landfill was still operational for more than half of that time and worried that the site might be developed when it closed. I think the proposed solar farm is the perfect use for the land, especially as it is so close to the high voltage power lines. I can forgive them in my view if they are being fed by renewable power sources. I want a sustainable future so am pro renewables in all ways. I have an electric car on order so envisage using the solar powered charging station. I strongly support the proposed solar farm.
20670		Do not support	The duration of lease and the cost per annum for the area concerned would seem to be low based on property prices in the local area. How was the \$2000 per year developed and the increase per annum based on CPI does not align with increase in property prices. In the next 25 years there will be many new technologies that might make solar power redundant but this land will be tied up. A 10 year contract seems reasonable.