

Dear Planning Commission,

Firstly, this new transmission line project should not be considered in isolation, it forms part of a much larger proposal outlined in the government's TREAP policy document. If the TREAP's ambition is fulfilled the proposal will have state wide implications for Tasmania's landscape character and significant impact on its natural values. If each part of the TREAP proposal is considered in isolation the cumulative impacts of the TREAP will not be realised.

We are custodians of Tasmania's landscape, its character is important to many of us as a source of great pleasure and as a contributor to our sense of what it is to be a Tasmanian. It also constitutes a significant economic resource, indeed the State itself has recognised that the perception of our island as being 'beautiful and unspoiled' underpins our 'brand' and is a major visitor attractor. Tasmania's landscape values also form the backdrop to the other components of our economy being associated with attributes of 'clean, green (in both senses of the word), unique (flora and fauna), small/niche, intimate, and restorative'. Unprocessed and processed food, fish, beer, wine, spirits production are all underlined by this foundation.

I accept that Tasmania, along with the rest of the world, has an obligation to become carbon neutral, I do not accept that Tasmania's landscape resources are best exploited by using them to become a net energy exporter. I believe hosting windfarms and their associated above ground transmission infrastructure in excess of our own requirements will not enhance but be detrimental to our community's long-term wellbeing. No one wants to look at or live near a windfarm or its high voltage transmission lines. Windfarms are no longer a visitor attraction, they are becoming ubiquitous. Beautiful landscape absent of windfarms will become more and more attractive.

The TREAP, as far as I am aware, has not come from a discussion with the Tasmanian community about what we want for our landscape, it has come from corporations (some foreign) engaging with a Tasmanian GBE. They have conceived something that suits them both with seemingly little or no consideration given to how the rest of us feel about where we live.

Tasmania's state government bureaucracy has a reputation for being sneaky, what was the mechanism that saw the New Hampshire to Staverton UPC transmission line reported in June 2019 becoming a TasNetworks 'upgrade' by August of the same year? Does TasNetworks have its own special legislative status that eases development? If so it is based on the presumption it exists to serve the fundamental utility needs of the entire Tasmanian community?

This proposal is designed to provide a benefit for the proponent, to enrich the owners of the UPC. For projects that supply basic services to the community we accept that we must bear some of the downside. However, when a for-profit project is being considered we must ensure the proponent bears all the costs associated and doesn't socialise the negative consequences of their development.

Wherever there is a negative impact, those impacted should be compensated, for example where the transmission line degrades the view field from a property compensation should be paid in the form of an annual payment to the property owner for as long as the line exists.

Where the woody matter currently sequestered in what will become the easement corridor and be permanently lost, its loss should be compensated for at the rate of \$70 per tonne (the reported current cost of taking CO2 out of the atmosphere).

The loss of habitat in the easement clearing will result in the loss of individuals of the many species that currently inhabit the easement, including many that are on the threatened, endangered and critically endangered list. Each individual has value beyond money but seeing that this is after all a business proposal, a monetary value should be calculated for each individual lost and paid by the proponent as an annual fee paid to the state, indexed for inflation, until the habitat is restored and the individuals restored to it.

It's only when these and other matters are appropriately priced that the true cost of the proposal can be tabulated. Without this it is not possible to make a comparison with the cost of the proponent burying the cable underground along its route on a considerably narrower less unsightly and damaging easement.

Regards

Geoffrey Lea  
3 Mt Stuart Rd  
Mt Stuart TAS 7000  
geoffreylea@mac.com