



Name: Ben Beattie

Submission date: 19/05/2025

1. Reduce the cost of meeting carbon targets

1. What could be done to improve the cost-effectiveness and alignment of policies to reduce emissions across the industrial, electricity and transport sectors?

Make decarbonisation currency fungible and denominated in \$/tonne CO₂e. Eliminate the multiple other carbon taxes including safeguard mechanism, renewable energy target, capacity investment scheme, rooftop solar subsidies - all of it.

Consider the electricity system decarbonisation cost difference between Tasmania and Victoria.

- Tasmanian electricity is mostly old hydro with sunk emissions
- Victorian electricity is mostly brown coal

Subsidising rooftop solar and large-scale renewables into Tasmania INCREASES total emissions, because the rooftop solar with its new emissions displaces the hydro with its old emissions.

The same inconsistency can be identified across the economy.

Additionally, the nuclear ban needs to be repealed, because why would you limit your options...?

2. Are there gaps in the emissions-reduction policies in the industrial, electricity and transport sectors which should be addressed?

Spread decarbonisation effort across the economy and link to consumption. This attributes the true cost of emissions reduction policies to the activities generating emissions. Linking to consumption ensures consumers will redirect their expenditure to lower cost items.

3. Are there any duplicative emissions-reduction policies in the industrial, electricity and transport sectors which could be streamlined?

Safeguard mechanism, emissions reduction targets, rooftop solar subsidies, renewable energy target, new vehicle efficiency scheme - all these are carbon taxes in one form or another, and they all have an overhead, not least by multiple departments administering the schemes.

2. Speed up approvals for new energy infrastructure

1. Are planning and approvals processes for large energy infrastructure taking too long? If so, what causes the most delay?

No, treat all projects the same and review them appropriately according to the environment and social license.

2. How can planning and approvals processes be sped up without unduly compromising regulatory standards?

No, treat all projects the same and review them appropriately according to the environment and social license.

3. Should clean energy projects be treated differently to other projects for the purpose of environmental and other approvals? If so, how?

No, treat all projects the same and review them appropriately according to the environment and social license.

4. What can be done to build local community support for new energy infrastructure projects?

Building community support is up to the local councils and developers. The federal government should be largely removed from energy project approvals.

5. Please outline any evidence showing the productivity benefits of faster approvals for energy projects.

There is no pathway for a high renewables system to reduce consumer costs or improve productivity. Every additional intermittent generator must lower the efficiency of the electricity system. There is no benefit to approving more and faster wind and solar projects.

3. Encourage adaptation by addressing barriers to private investment

1. What are the barriers and enablers impacting decisions by owner-occupiers, landlords and developers about how housing is built and updated over time so that it is resilient to the effects of climate change?

The irony is that as cities become more congested and house blocks shrink, more people are made dependent on electricity to cool and heat their homes. Natural passive solutions don't work when you need to close the windows in summer to create privacy from your neighbours. This reality actually increases energy consumption, exactly the opposite of the desired policy effect.

So planning rules should begin to limit congestion, allow larger house blocks, and create (instead of limit) opportunities for efficiency improvements.

2. What information do people need to make decisions about where to live, how to build and how to upgrade their homes to appropriately factor in climate change?

As I said above, allowing greater congestion defeats all other efficiency initiatives. I'm not aware of anybody interested in spending money today to make their home better suited for climate change in 50yrs time. Planning rules that impose stringent efficiency codes increase costs and make it less likely for consumers to willingly adopt them.

3. What are the most cost-effective retrofitting options for improving the resilience of Australia's existing housing stock? What are their costs and benefits?

For hot regions: thermal insulation in walls and ceilings, whirly gigs on roofs, tinted windows, ceiling fans, shade trees, clearances around the house to allow breezes, avoid large windows facing west and east, large eaves that shade the walls, shaded verandahs

For cold regions: thermal insulation in walls and ceilings, central fireplace, skylights

4. What role might minimum standards play in ensuring the resilience of Australia's housing stock?

Not much.

5. The impacts of climate change are being factored into the regulation of where and how houses are built in different ways around Australia. What does leading practice look like? Where is there room for improvement? Are there lessons we can learn from other countries?

Families want a house with spaces and a yard. Planning should attempt to make those ambitions a reality by limiting the number of blocks that can be split into tiny yardless boxes.