

To Matthew Todd-Jones

Hi Matthew

I made a brief submission to the PAC meeting in Boorowa last week and wish to follow it up with something in writing.

My point relates to the recommended conditions of approval related to Appendix 3 – General Terms of Applicant's VPA Offer.

In the introduction to the details in the Table, it is said to be 'with a focus on funding community projects in the area surrounding the project site'. This is far too imprecise and is being interpreted by the Hilltops and other Councils as within 20 kms of the turbines but I think this is far too wide. In Rye Park's case, this would include Boorowa. Many people in the area think that 10 kms is the appropriate limit. I am happy with the word 'focus' being included as it would be inequitable for all the Community Enhancement Fund money to be spent within 10 kms of the turbines. The imprecision is followed through to the Payment details where it says a proportion of the funds will be allocated to' local' education assistance. That does 'local' mean in this context. Discussions with Council have not led to any clarification on this. Hilltops is now such a large Council area with Rye Park on the extreme edge that 'local' could mean anything. Council could well argue that the whole Hilltops Council are is the 'local' area.

What the Appendix 3 does not cover is how the Fund is to be managed. Under the present

wording of the agreement reached between Councils and the Developer, there is only one 'community' representative on the committee, and it is not necessary for this representative to come from Rye Park. There is no mention of how the community representative is to be chosen, but it seems to be assumed that this is a function of the Council. The management is already dominated by Council from where there are 2 representatives. I strongly believe there should be 2 Rye Park representatives on this committee.

Hilltops Council took no notice of community submissions on these 2 issues and now continually tell us the arrangements are finalised. We know that TILT has not yet signed the agreement on which the VPA will be managed and had themselves put on the management committee to try to avoid the funds becoming nothing more than Council general revenue funds. Thus, the VPA is NOT finalised. I strongly believe the funds should be spent on meeting community needs in general and NOT just community needs on functions that are the responsibility of local government. What if community needs were greatest in functions funded by the State (eg main roads) or the Commonwealth (eg telecommunications). What if the greatest needs of the Rye Park community were assessed by the community to be the responsibility of a neighbouring Council? What we can be sure of is that Hilltops would be most unlikely to transfer funds to a neighbouring Council for work to be done outside the Hilltops area.

I see these issues as being basic to the concept of the Community Enhancement Fund and would like to see the Minister overcome my concerns in any final approval of the Rye Park Windfarm.

Yours sincerely

Bob Searle

 \cap

From: PAC Enquiries Mailbox [mailto:pac@pac.nsw.gov.au]

Sent: Thursday, 9 March 2017 11:26 AM

To: PAC Enquiries Mailbox <pac@pac.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: Rye Park Wind Farm

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please see the attached letter notifying the forthcoming Planning Assessment Commission meeting on the above proposal for your information.

Please don't hesitate to contact us if you have any questions on the Commission's process on (02) 9383 2100.

Kind regards,

Aaron Brown | Project Support Officer Secretariat

NSW Planning Assessment Commission Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street Sydney NSW 2000

e: aaron.brown@pac.nsw.gov.au | p: 9383 2112 | f: 9383 2133 | www.pac.nsw.gov.au



