



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1038470

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING

RE: CROOKWELL III WIND FARM

PANEL:

**PETER DUNCAN
PROF ZADA LIPMAN
ADRIAN PILTON**

ASSISTING PANEL:

DAVID WAY

LOCATION:

**IPC OFFICES
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**

DATE:

2.48 PM, THURSDAY, 13 JUNE 2019

MR DUNCAN: So good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal people. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present a decision notice to the elders from other communities who may be here today.

5 Welcome to the meeting. Crookwell Development Pt Limited, the applicant, is seeking approval for construction and operation of the Crookwell III Wind Farm including 23 wind turbines and associated infrastructure in the Upper Lachlan Council area.

10 My name is Peter Duncan. I am a chair of this ICP panel. Joining me are fellow commissioners Zada Lipman and Adrian Pilton as well as David Way from the Commission's secretariat. In the interest of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a full transcript will be provided and made available on the Commission's website. This
15 meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of the process and will inform one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision, and I should note that we have already had a public meeting and site inspection and meeting with council as well.

20

It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing which we will then put also on our website. I
25 request that all members here today introduce themselves before they speak for the first time, and for all members to ensure that we do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. With that, we will now begin. Hand over to you.

30 MR ALONSO: Thank you very much thank you very much to all members of the panel. So, well, first of all, a – an initial introduction on members from our team, we've got Mr Pedro Serrano which is the head of development for this region from Global Power Generation in Spain and also the chairman of Global Power
35 Generation Australia. We've got David Santo Tomás which is our project director, already have successfully delivered Crookwell II Wind Farm in the past, last year. We've got David Moir which is our visual consultant for this - independent visual consultant for this project and myself Guillermo Alonso, engineering and development manager for Global Power Generation Australia.

40 MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MR ALONSO: So, well, our idea was to start with these presentation. I will deal with the, well, general introduction of the project, a number of – well, some
45 information around our corporate information about the company, the previous developments, the project, the current situation and some other considerations, and then I will hand over to David to discuss the visual – the main visual impacts and

matters related to visual impacts. So just, first of all, an initial introduction to the project. Maybe we could go to the third slide. Can I actually - - -

5 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Just the up and down button.

MR ALONSO: Just the scroll. Yes. It's this one. Yes.

10 MR DUNCAN: I think you have to go – put the cursor down to the bottom. They're our forward and reverse arrows on the - - -

MR ALONSO: Yes. I couldn't see.

MR DUNCAN: That's it. That's it. Yes.

15 MR ALONSO: Well, that's the general introduction of our presentation today. So I'm just going to straight move to the – to – well, an initial introduction to the project details that everyone will know at this stage. So, well, Crookwell III Wind Farm is a proposed wind farm. As part of our current application would consist of 23 – up to
20 23 turbines. It's adjacent to the Crookwell II windfarm which is – has been in commercial operation since late 2018. The region is the New South Wales Southern Tablelands.

It's, well, approximately 25 ks north-west of Goulburn and 20 – sorry – 17 ks south-east of Crookwell, and as we all know, it's arranged currently in two separate
25 clusters, six turbines in the southern cluster just west of Crookwell Road as we saw the other day during the visit and the – 17 in the eastern cluster east of in terms of the dimension and envelope of the turbines, we're looking at a maximum deep height of 157 metres with a rotor diameter of a maximum size of 130 and a height of 95. At this point in time, the expected unit rating is 3.83 megawatts per turbine which –
30 well, focusing on the eastern cluster for the 17 turbines would give a total capacity of around 65 megawatts.

At this point in time and after a thorough measurement and wind monitoring campaign lasting for many, many years, probably 10 years, we're confident that we
35 could get around 220 gigawatt hours of production on the average year. That represents around 70 per cent of the yield that we are – we will be getting on an average year from Crookwell II. Actually, with 60 per cent of the turbines in Crookwell II in terms of numbers, this gives an idea of the efficiency of this project and the – probably the quality of the wind resource even compared to Crookwell II
40 which is already a pretty good project in that sense. We also wanted to highlight the fact that there won't be additional overground electricity transmission infrastructure required for this particular project.

We all know that there's already a 330 KV substation in the area that is being utilised
45 for Crookwell II and has been dimension to avoid any new grid transmission infrastructure. So moving on to – sorry. Can barely see this. Well, we are all familiar with this layout. Obviously, the blue area is Crookwell III both eastern and

southern cluster. We will discuss a little bit later and a little bit more detail our proposal for the removal of the southern cluster. It is there, leaving the eastern cluster – the – composed of 17 turbines at this point in time, and, also, we will deal – or we will comment a little bit more in detail about our commitment to use the
5 southern access point which is the – well, the current preferred option by the council and also would resolve some problems with the – some neighbouring landowners whilst as well minimising the traffic impacts in the cluster of residences around the Woodhouselee Road

10 MR DUNCAN: Is it the only way to move the slides forward?

MR ALONSO: No. It's all right. That's fine. All right. So the first – the next section of the presentation is a little bit of a, well, corporate information, who we are, how Global Power Generation fits within our parent group – parent company group,
15 etcetera. So basically, we are part of a – we're part of a large gas and electricity integrated utility, a company called Naturgy Group. It – that's our ultimate parent company. This is a company with 175 years of experience since the early, you know, gas lighting in the city of Barcelona in Spain, and we've been operating since then as a – well, through several mergers, etcetera, as an integrated gas and
20 electricity utility mainly since from 2009 when the last merger took place between two companies that currently form Naturgy Group. So this means – and it's an idea that we would really like to highlight here – we have an idea of permanence in every single country where we operate, probably more than 30 countries at this point in time in the whole company, and it's in the DNA of the company to obviously
25 develop but also own and operate the assets in the long term. Australia is not an exception. We are already doing that with Crookwell II. We're now starting the construction of another project in Victoria, and hopefully we will be able to replicate that story with Crookwell III.

30 So just below Naturgy Group, which is the ultimate parent company, as I was saying, we have Global Power Generation, which is basically the vehicle within Naturgy Group in charge of developing and managing – developing and operating international generation capacity, so from greenfield projects, projects that we develop, towards some others that we already operate. So at this point in time,
35 Global Power Generation has in its portfolio close to 4000 megawatts of power generation capacity, mainly renewable energy technologies, mainly wind and solar, and – well, Crookwell development is a subsidiary – well, actually, Global Power Generation Australia is the Australian subsidiary of Global Power Generation Spain.

40 The key expansion markets or the key focus markets for Global Power Generation at the moment are definitely Australia and Chile, and in terms of the shareholders that form part of Global Power Generation, we have a 75 per cent Naturgy Group, which is our – has been our parent company, historically, plus a 25 per cent from the Kuwait Investment Authority through Wren House Infrastructure Management,
45 which is the largest sovereign fund in Kuwait. So another idea that we would like to highlight in this particular matter and being part of this large company is that GPG, as a subsidiary of Naturgy – we share the same values and we have extremely high

standards in terms of corporate/social responsibility, health, safety and environment and operational standards, and that long-term view in every country where we invest and where we are present.

5 At the end of the day, it's becoming – it's about becoming a good corporate citizen and also engaging with the communities in the long term, not being just – just a developer that goes there and sells a project and stays there for a few years. So just moving on, just to give a few more details about Global Power Generation Australia. So this mouse is not - - -

10

MR DUNCAN: Is not working?

MR ALONSO: - - - really great.

15

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Just see if the keyboard – does the up or down arrow work on the keyboard?

MR ALONSO: Yes, it seems to - - -

20

MR DUNCAN: That's – that's it.

MR ALONSO: Yes, yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, that's easier.

25

MR ALONSO: Much easier.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

30

MR ALONSO: Thank you. Thank you. So moving on to Global Power Generation Australia as the Australian subsidiary of Global Power Generation, you may probably remember our previous name, which was Union Fenosa Wind Australia. That's pretty much a branding name – branding change, basically, to be on par with our power – Global Power Generation Spain. We've been operating in Australia since 2008, when the company saw an opportunity here to acquire a wind farm portfolio – several wind farm projects in several stages of development, none of them built. We've been, basically since 2008 till 2016, trying to develop these projects in terms of getting the approvals and hopefully securing some offtake agreements.

35

40

However, we will know that those were the – probably the most difficult years, in terms of political uncertainty for the level, in terms of renewables. But that gives us probably the idea of our commitment with the country and with that investment, because, well, the company stayed there and, yes, probably 2016 was the turning point in this case with our first success with the Crookwell II project – was we were successful in the ACT renewables auction, while that meant that we started building the project in 2017 for a successful completion by late 2018. Global Power Generation, of course, owns 100 per cent of the shareholding of Crookwell

45

Development Pty Ltd, which is the vehicle – the SPV for this particular project, for Crookwell II. We will have a separate one for Crookwell III as well.

5 And just to give you an idea of the – I guess the size of our assets here in Australia, they are currently valued at \$463 million, including, obviously, wind farms in construction with wind farms already constructed and some other assets. To give
10 you an idea of the size of the current portfolio of Global Power Generation Australia, we're looking at 1400 megawatts in different stages. Basically, operation and construction, we have 271, which basically is Crookwell II already operating, plus the Berrybank stage 1 in Victoria, which we are building at the moment, as it was
15 successful under the VREAS auction last year. Then we have a separate tranche of project, which is, well, those ready to be built. Basically, Ryan Corner and Hawkesdale in Victoria, the second stage of Berrybank, and the Crookwell III, which are, well, very close – well, all of them with planning permits, except Crookwell III
in this case. But in advanced degree of development. And our final tranche of the –
of our portfolio capacity is 632 megawatts that are in early development stages.

20 So moving on to Crookwell III Wind Farm and its history. We all know that – well, we've prepared a timeline – we've prepared a timeline of the planning process. I would probably focus more on the most recent years, whilst the – while the original
development application for – sorry, 29 wind turbines was originally recommended
25 for approval by the Department of Planning, that was subsequently referred to the Planning Assessment Commission. There were a number of issues or matters raised that will trigger, in turn, further review or further reconfiguration of the project, and
also due to the fact that the – at that point in time, the wind turbine technology was
evolving towards more effective machines or turbines, we decided to, well, submit a
revised development application in 2016.

30 And yes, that consisted of – well, just basically to give the responses – or to provide responses to some of the questions or issues or matters previously raised by the PAC. We came up with a reduced number of turbines, 23 in total, to mitigate those
impacts, mainly in terms of noise, visual and some other residual concerns. This
project was publicly exhibited in late 2016. We responded to this – to those – well,
35 to the received submissions by early 2018, and just literally after that, the Department of Planning and Environment sent us a request or a letter to provide the latest information in terms of additional neighbour agreements that we could have
been securing during those last few months, for those agreements to be also
considered in their final report – final assessment.

40 We provided that in – within one month, roughly, so May – sorry, the end of March 2018, and by then, well, the Department of Planning continued with their assessment, and that assessment has been recently received, probably a little bit later than we
expected originally. So during that time, I guess we secured four additional
neighbour agreements that I'm happy to discuss later, if you have any particular
45 questions on those, and we've already continued to proactively engage with additional neighbours, especially those surrounding the eastern cluster. But initially, some of them rejected the neighbour agreements, but we can confirm at this stage

that we are very close to secure two additional agreements, probably within the next week or so.

5 So moving on, I would like to briefly touch on a number of key aspects of the projects – of the Crookwell III projects at the moment in terms of its readiness for construction and some of the key commitments we currently have at this point in time. So first of all, we would like to really highlight and transmit this idea to the IPC and to the panel that this is a – this would be for us a committed project, a real project that can happen right now, subject to, obviously, the development concern being granted. Reasons for this is, first of all, we have finalised the negotiation of an offtake agreement with Alinta, one of the key retailers in the country, for 50 years. That would definitely and make the project viable, so that's a very important and key matter for us from the commercial side of things.

15 Then we also have in place a number of agreements with all the – well, the key contractors or the key suppliers from the turbine supplier and all those contractors involved during the construction of Crookwell II. So those agreements that were in place for Crookwell II would be easily extendable for Crookwell III in the event that the project can proceed, and obviously, they are aimed to maximise the local investment. We also believe that the incremental impacts from these projects – specifically, we focus on the eastern cluster – will be minimised because there will be plenty of existing infrastructure, especially that agreed connection infrastructure for Crookwell II already in place, so nothing new would be needed, especially in terms of electricity transmission.

25 And also we would like to highlight the nature of the terrain and the topography in the area, which would lead definitely to reduced earthworks, probably, as opposed to other projects in the area, because here, the topography is gently rolling, and we believe that lends pretty much pretty well with the landscape, and we have the previous experience in Crookwell II, which is just around the corner, basically. So we are very confident that those civil works impacts will be, as well, very, very well minimised. My apologies. Then, moving on to our key commitments, probably the first or the key one is the reduction on the overall number of turbines from 23 to 17. We've officially mentioned this. We've officially notified this to the council s well, and this obviously, we believe, will provide a significant reduction of those cumulative impacts and also those concerns about impacts on Pejar Dam and the surrounding area, St Stephens Church, and as well, specifically, on the mobile communication, radio, TV reception, etcetera. So that's something that we're definitely committed to do, and officially we can confirm that.

40 Also we're committing to – well, use the southern access point, via Grainwood Siding Road, which is the preference from council; upgrade that road properly, for the benefit of the council and the surrounding community, and also minimise some of the concerns the northern neighbour, the adjoining neighbour to the north of Crookwell III eastern cluster, would have with the use of Road, which wouldn't be used. And I can confirm as well that today we've confirmed in writing to this particular landowner that this is our intention.

Well, that's pretty much what we have in terms of a commitment to minimise those impacts and those concerns. Probably I would like to just briefly talk about the submissions, and the analysis we make of those submissions. We know that we've received 66 from the general public. There's a few more from other agencies and other organisms. From private people, we've received 66, with majority support of the project: 49 versus 17 objecting, so 49 in favour, 17 objecting.

But if we were to target this analysis in particular to the two-kilometre radius around the turbines, it's really interesting to see that originally we had two submissions supporting the project and four objecting, but actually, with the time, actually one of those objectors has entered into a neighbour agreement, last year, with us, and one of the other objectors would only be affected by the southern cluster.

So if we move into that scenario that we're committing to of sacrificing those six turbines, there would only be three supporters – sorry, there would be three supporters and two objectors within two kilometres of the project. What is more, one of those objectors, actually the one that submitted one of those submissions last year, has sold her property. And now the new owners – we're engaging with them to actually get an additional neighbour agreement.

MR DUNCAN: So one of the two objectors has sold the property.

MR ALONSO: Correct. Correct. And the new owners – actually we're engaging with them.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR ALONSO: In addition to the two additional ones that we will be getting agreements with, there's this one that we're also trying to negotiate. So that's additional to the two that I mentioned before. We could get additional ones. And just finally, another, I guess, interesting fact in terms of the – well, the associated residences – we could say that if we focus the analysis on the eastern cluster, we have 15 residences between – within this two-kilometre radius. At this point in time, and considering these two extra neighbour agreements, we could have 12 of them being either associated residences – we have 12 of them being either associated or hosts, which is basically 80 per cent of people being part of the project or associated residences. I believe it's a very significant figure in this particular case.

In addition to that – and that's probably one the key commitments. We're of course prepared, as I've said, to reduce the number of turbines and just go for the eastern cluster only. But we're prepared to maintain all our commitments with landowners that were part of even the southern cluster. All those neighbours that obviously haven't really accepted yet neighbouring agreements – we will keep engaging with them to try to get them.

And as well we're prepared also to honour our commitments with the council in terms of a voluntary planning agreement that would be – would receive a payment –

would receive a payment or we would be prepared to make a contribution as if the project was 23 turbines instead of 17. So that's a clear commitment from us that we make too. And just finally, before moving on to the visual aspects of the project – let me see if I can - - -

5

MR PILTON: The down button. No?

MR DUNCAN: Down button.

10 MR ALONSO: Yes. Yes. That's all right. I would like to briefly talk about, well, the key benefits of the project, both in terms of, well, environment, job creation, and also, well, financials, or investment, and returns for the area.

15 So a key benefit that we will expect from this project, based on, well, other project that we've already built, etcetera, based on the experience from Crookwell II, we would expect to displace – and this is more from the environmental aspect, or point of view – we would expect to displace 22,000 tonnes of greenhouse gases per year, which is basically the equivalent of more than 50,000 cars taken off the road. This is based on usual ratios of, you know, a typical coal-fired power station generating a
20 megawatt-hour of electricity. And – well, as I was mentioning before, we would be generating around 220 gigawatt-hours of electricity per year: enough to power up to around 34,000 average household.

25 We will be injecting 106 million in the Australian economy. And during construction, we would expect to create 40 full-time direct jobs – I mean, there will be more things indirect in the region, linked to the hospitality, accommodation, some other things, so on, and supplies – but just full-time direct jobs during construction, and six during operation. And then the – obviously the VPA, the VPA as I
30 mentioned before: our commitment remains for a contribution as if the project was for 23 turbines, despite the fact of this removal that we're committed to of the six turbines.

35 So yes. Well, finally, obviously, the project would get the advantage of a site with a very, very good quality wind resource; the access to the existing grid connection, as I've mentioned before, avoiding duplicity of unnecessary transmission infrastructure; and, obviously, the fact that we have this support agreement, or offtake agreement, with Alinta, with the tier 1 retailer, already negotiated. And they are extremely interested to grow their customer base in New South Wales.

40 Just a few figures, just to give an idea of the contribution to the local economy, or to the – I guess, the projected – thank you very much, David. That's extremely – that's extremely helpful, yes. So while we've – out of the 106 million investment during construction, we – I mean, we have these – these are real figures, based on already received proposals from balance of plan contractors. We estimate 12 million, mainly
45 in the space of the civil works – construction, excavation, supply of concrete, and some other supplies that could be sourced locally – we would be looking at \$12

million during construction. There will be as well – I just wanted to use the pointer, but – 18 – sorry – \$800,000 - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

5

MR ALONSO: - - - would flow into the council, in terms of the upgrade of Grainwood Siding Road, for – as the main access to the wind farm, as I mentioned before. Then there would be, well, \$350,000 paid to landowners in terms of lease or licence payments during construction; 90,000 to neighbours during construction; 10 and then over 800,000 to the community, flowing into the community, in terms of improvements of that network of communications – mobile reception, new receptors, infrastructure for TV and radio reception, etcetera. So all those improvements. So that leads us to at least \$40 million flowing into the local area just during construction, just during one year, pretty much.

15

Then we would have the operational phase of the project, during the 25 years, and, well, the key aspect here is probably the lease payment flowing to the landowners: close to 10 million, as we can see in that table. A significant amount as well, over the 25 years, for benefit-sharing agreements that we already have in place with 20 neighbours, and hopefully we will get a few more, as I was mentioning before. So 3.26 million: that's the current projection.

25

Then we will contribute, as part of the voluntary planning agreement with the council, for local improvement projects, local infrastructure, and community projects. That will mean 1.43 current dollars over the lifetime of the project; obviously the contribution per turbine per year is – obviously we apply CPI every single year, so that's just a current dollars figure. And yes, for other contributions to the council, in terms of, you know, maintenance of infrastructure, etcetera, etcetera.

30

In addition to these, obviously, there will be additional funds flowing into the local economy, mainly in terms of operation and maintenance: maintenance contractors, for example, maintaining the access roads into and out of the wind farm, and some other aspects that are usual during the operation of a wind farm. So we're looking at close to 60 millions in current dollars, out of a total capital investment of 106 35 million, as mentioned before.

40

And then I would like to move into, well, the key aspects that were raised by the assessment by the Department of Planning, and we will move into the visual aspect of the project. So, well, first of all, we all know that DPE recommended the IPC to refuse the project, based on those four grounds: impact on landscape, cumulative impacts on residences – and David, in a few minutes, will address those – some other matters related to planning, in particular an inconsistency with the land use – the alleged inconsistency – with land use zoning provision; and some other residual concerns.

45

So for these particular matters we've engaged two consultants, Andrew Darroch, which is the town planner – planning expert; and David Moir, here present, which is

our expert landscape architect. And I will probably hand over to David so that he can basically walk us through his analysis of the department's report and his conclusions.

5 MR D. MOIR: Okay. I see you've got some of my plans there. My presentation
- - -

PROF Z. LIPMAN: Yes.

10 MR MOIR: - - - didn't make the screen.

MR DUNCAN: We have it here.

15 MR MOIR: But there should be one that's Assessment Review, and that's got the map at the start.

PROF LIPMAN: This one here?

20 MR MOIR: Yes. So that has got the – yes, starting on that.

MR PILTON: It's upside down.

25 MR MOIR: Yes. And, look, I do have these in A1s, that – if we need to – if you find anything difficult to see. And I think that might be particularly important as we get to, sort of, house – receptor number 69. And so we've done some montages from the site that we visited the other day.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

30 MR MOIR: I might start by saying, too, that we had a very good day for – as far as visibility is concerned. The previous time we went there, you will see from some of the photos that have been in our that it was very cloudy, and we - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

35

MR MOIR: - - - had a lot of low cloud, so it was quite difficult to capture photos. But I think, from the cumulative perspective, it was a really good day to be assessing that and getting a sense of that, because I think that you can see – and I will go into that a little bit more about the other wind farms and their impact on – their
40 cumulative impacts on the areas surrounding Crookwell III.

45 So what I'm going to do is, really, just move through the justifications for refusal, on visual terms, by the department. The first of those is the unacceptable impacts on the broader landscape due to cumulative impacts with other wind farms; the impacts on key landscape features in the immediate vicinity of the wind farm; the limited capacity of the landscape to absorb further change; and direct and cumulative impact upon the nearby residences.

So it's my opinion that generally the assessment overstates the visual impact on the landscape character, and on the impact of the landscape features and cumulative impacts of the proposal. I think the landscape character within the viewshed of Crookwell III can already be classified as windfarm pastoral. I think it's – you can see, there's another map on the next page there – that really the views – sorry; that's on the presentation – is there one that's not there?

MR DUNCAN: Not this one?

10 PROF LIPMAN: Is it this one?

MR MOIR: So in – yes, that's the one. Yes. So that has got a - - -

15 PROF LIPMAN: Just turn the whole thing over.

MR MOIR: Yes, yes. It's on both sides of the page. So really we found that there's about a 15-kilometre stretch of Crookwell Road – so we're talking here about the impact on the public domain and the landscape character – and it's quite contained, the character, within that view. And I think what's interesting, too, is that along that journey, the views to Gullen Range are within that catchment as well. So I would say that within that zone, it's – the character of the landscape is definitely, sort of, wind farm pastoral. And I think that, on your arrival, from about 10 kilometres out of Crookwell, you don't actually see the turbines, and then once you've passed that Woodhouselee Road intersection, they really don't become part of – or a character within the – a character element in the landscape. So from that perspective, I see that as quite contained. So from the perspective of the broader landscape, I actually don't see that the introduction of the Crookwell III, particularly with the removal of the southern precinct, as being a considerable addition to that. The – yes – I think the EIR, which is the O'Hanlon Design – the independent expert review – said:

30 *The key elements of cumulative impact created by Crookwell III are an increase in the overall extent of the wind farm pastoral character and the sense of enclosure created by the proposed turbines in conjunction with the existing approved turbines at Crookwell I, II and the Gullen Range.*

35

I think, realistically, as a wind farm, I think, the addition of the 16 turbines - - -

MR P. SERRANO: 17.

40 MR MOIR: 17 turbines; sorry – with Crookwell III will appear as a continuation of the existing Crookwell II wind farm. As a wind farm there, the – we've got 53 turbines, I think, between Crookwell I, II and III, and as far as wind farms go in the area, that's sort of an average size wind farm. So if we look at that as one unit, as much as they've been developed successively, I think that, from that perspective – and they're quite contained, too, again, within that view – I think, the only area where you're really going to have a new impact is views east of Woodhouselee Road, where you can get – so if your view is to the east, you don't really actually

45

have any wind turbines within that view at the moment. So I think that's going to be as far as impacts goes, but they're more direct impacts, as opposed to cumulative.

5 So, from the perspective of the public domain, I think that those – as an increase of our pastoral wind land – pastoral wind farm character, I don't agree that that is actually going to increase that. And in regards to the additional wind farms – so Gullen Range – I think we had actually had a very good view of Gullen Range in the – that day, and I think that, once again, that is actually a view contained within that same viewshed. The other wind farms surrounding the site are all beyond 15
10 kilometres away. So from Crookwell Road, we're looking, sort of, eight to 10 kilometres to Gullen Range. From the lot – house number 69 that we went to - and we stood up where the cattle yards were - we were approximately sort of 15 kilometres away at that point or 12 kilometres away at that point.

15 The other windfarms are sort of Biala would be sort of the closest away that. That's not built yet, but certainly to the east, you would have the Taralga Wind Farm which is approximately 20 kilometres away and then the Cullerin Range and also the Gunning projects as well. And they're all sort of beyond 20 kilometres. So they weren't actually I guess, the point being about how good a day it was to see and
20 the distance we could see. You couldn't actually discern those other windfarms in the landscape. You could see the Gullen Range one, but beyond that, you couldn't actually discern the other ones.

And then, I guess, too, the other point on that is the point that Hanlon makes about the - O'Hanlon makes about the sense of enclosure. The extension is to the east
25 only. So there's no extension to the south or north. So from perspective of views to those areas, it's - it is solely, really, to the east and west that the extent of the windfarms carry within that catchment. Also, too, the Gullen Range Wind Farm is directly to the west of the Crookwell II. So, I guess, I don't agree either with the
30 sense that you're going to get an enclosure of windfarms from that perspective. The other issue I found with the - look, the other point I would make too is that the bulletin - the New South Wales Visual Assessment Bulletin states that beyond eight kilometres that they diminish beyond, you know, becoming an issue or an influence on the character.

35 In regards to the cumulative impacts on the residents and looking at the conclusions drawn by the independent expert O'Hanlon Design, the application of the 60 degree sector tool, I think, is actually misleading. I think that the - there's no description of that methodology in his report of how that's applied or the origin of that. The only
40 thing I can assume it is is the 60 degree sector tool that's in the bulletin, and that 60 degree sector tool is actually a preliminary assessment tool. It's based, really, on a 2D assessment of how many turbines you can see in a 360 degree view cut into 60 degree sectors. So the assertion to me that they're going to - the residents are going to see four sectors of turbines or three sectors of turbines, if I'm assuming correctly
45 that he's using that methodology is overstating – or he is overstating the amount of turbines you would actually see from each residence because it's not actually accounting for topography, agitation and other aspects in there. So without that

description of that – the application of that methodology in his independent expert review, I can't see how that actually is – the accuracy of those assessment, I question. And I think, too, that from the perspective of being on site as well and our experience on site, the – what you can actually – and even travelling along Howsley Road and that experience, there isn't a continual view of turbines.

It's – the land does undulate quite a bit. I think the department said from a mitigating – use of mitigation perspective, that it would be very difficult to grow large trees there. I think there was evidence that there were significant windbreak plantings that were quite large. Obviously, they're quite old, but they're primarily Scots pines, I think, that are there. And I think that the fact, too, that the nature of the site being a very windy site, there's a lot of windbreak planting along the road edges and also along paddock edges and also around houses. So I think the cumulative impacts that are there – and I will go into that too with number 69 as well of some of the views we've got from there.

The impacts on the significant landscape features as well, I think, I disagree with – on – for a number of reasons on those. I think the – or talking about these features too as being high quality features. I think, particularly, Pejar Dam within the landscape. And, once again, there's no methodology of how that was achieved or how that rating was achieved. I think, in my experience as a practitioner, that there's sort of – the benchmark for assessment is really the British Landscape Guidelines for a visual impact assessment, and I think that that provides an – then that's what Green Bean has applied. It's an assessment methodology, so – and by following that process, you have a quantitative approach, to some extent of, the rating of landscapes.

And in that context, I think that the significance of these elements, Pejar Dam, for example, was overstated, and the quality of that as a element in the landscape was overstated, and also to – referring to – I think, particularly St Stephens Church and, also, this E3 zoning as significant landscape features, I think, is overstating that as well. I think they – St Stephens Church is potentially sensitive from a viewpoint perspective, but in regards to actually being a landscape feature, it's actually very difficult to discern – because it's so well screened. And the E3 zone is – again, it's not something that is a landscape feature that you can actually see.

It's not something that the boundaries of it are defined by any particular vegetation or anything along those lines or ridgelines or – so – and, obviously, we're aware that the purpose of that was the protecting of the catchment. So I think that that's the – the significance of those elements, I think, is overstated, but in saying that too, I think the removal of the southern precinct sort of negates those as an issue because the eastern precinct isn't visible from any of those areas. So in regards to – I guess the other thing I just wanted to raise was the impacts or the landscape's ability – or its limited capacity to absorb further change arising from the introduction of additional turbines, and I think that's an interesting assertion.

I think that – it’s – there’s no methodology about how that has been reached as an outcome. The department actually say that, on the advice of O’Hanlon Design, that they’ve come to that conclusion, but I couldn’t find anything in the independent expert review that actually states that or how that has been – that opinion has been
5 reached. So, look, I think that, from my perspective, I think it’s a – how you actually gauge when a landscape has hit saturation of a particular element or when it shifts from being wind farm – pastoral or wind farm pastoral, I think is something that’s probably very open to debate, and I think that – as a basis for refusal, I think it’s a bit
10 tenuous.

MR DUNCAN: We just need to probably check the time.

MR MOIR: Yes. Well, look, that’s really covering - - -

15 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR MOIR: - - - all my points.

MR DUNCAN: So I think we can go a few minutes over, but I’ve got to do
20 something else at 4. So - - -

MR MOIR: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - it’s just your choice what you want, time-wise, to - - -
25

MR MOIR: Yes.

MR ALONSO: Yes to look at the photo montages.

30 MR MOIR: Yes, look, I think that if we go to the presentation document. If we go through that, I think it’s really probably number 69 which is probably one of the most impacted - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes. It’s the one we – the one that we visited - - -
35

MR MOIR: - - - and that’s that one there, sorry, Adrian, at the back there.

MR PILTON: This one?

40 MR DUNCAN: The site that we visited as well. Yes.

MR ALONSO: Yes yes.

MR MOIR: So the top photo there is the photo to the west.
45

PROF LIPMAN: Which page?

MR DUNCAN: Which page are we looking at?

MR PILTON: It's page 6.

5 MR DUNCAN: 69.

MR PILTON: It's near the start.

MR ALONSO: That one there.

10 MR PILTON: Wait a minute.

MR MOIR: Sorry.

15 MR PILTON: It's just before the report.

MR MOIR: Yes, it should actually be about three pages in.

PROF LIPMAN: Okay.

20 MR PILTON: This one.

MR MOIR: Probably the last page there, maybe?

25 MR PILTON: That one.

MR DUNCAN: It's not far in.

PROF LIPMAN: Okay. Yes.

30 MR MOIR: No, no.

MR PILTON: No.

35 MR DUNCAN: It's got 69 at the top. Maybe - - -

MR MOIR: Yes.

MR PILTON: bind these together. I got them wrong.

40 MR DUNCAN: There we are.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

45 MR MOIR: Yes, there we go. So it's flipped about. Yes, look, it's probably very difficult to see there, from the perspective of the – just the scale of the photos and the size of the photos, and I can bring them up on the screen to you and zoom in as well,

but – so the top view is the view to the west from that first position we stopped at where the cattle yards were, and the second photo down is the view to the east from that position where the existing windbreak pine plantings there actually conceal the view to the eastern precinct. And then the bottom photo there is really just showing
5 the turbines in relation to where we were, and I said that we were looking at that in quite a bit of detail there where we were looking at the two silos and tanks there and how they relate to the view. So it's probably a bit clearer on that to see the relationship to that and the view.

10 My only point with that is, yes, there will be an impact, and it's quite clear, there's nothing really obscuring the view to those, but the only other point I would make is that you don't actually – from this perspective, you can't see any of the other turbines related to Crookwell II or to Gullen Range. And in the context of the view,
15 that photo is about 180 degree view and that's the portion of the view that we will have wind farms in it.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

20 PROF LIPMAN: Can I just ask a quick question here. Has there been any success with negotiating a neighbourhood agreement with these people at 69?

MR ALONSO: Not till now, but we've – well, as I was mentioning before, we've confirmed that we want to use that road, so I think that will be a very, very positive step in trying to reach something, and we will keep our commitment open to them in
25 terms of the

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. So - - -

MR ALONSO: - - - but not till now we haven't

30 MR DUNCAN: So this is one - - -

PROF LIPMAN: That was one of – sorry.

35 MR DUNCAN: Yes, this is one of the two that you still haven't reached agreement with?

PROF LIPMAN: That's right.

40 MR ALONSO: That's correct.

PROF LIPMAN: And just the other issue was I thought you gave that woman a guarantee that there was no – the road they planned for isn't going to be used at that
45 stage.

MR ALONSO: Yes, that's what we've confirmed today in writing.

PROF LIPMAN: Right. So - - -

MR DUNCAN: In writing. Yes.

5 MR ALONSO: Yes. Yes.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. So the road that's going to be used, is that a distance - - -

MR PILTON: This one.

10

PROF LIPMAN: - - - away from 69?

MR PILTON: It's this one down here.

15 PROF LIPMAN: It's that one there. So it's not - - -

MR PILTON: That's the road you're looking at.

PROF LIPMAN: It's not - - -

20

MR PILTON: That – the northern one.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. Yes.

25 MR PILTON: Yes.

MR ALONSO: And we will be using the southern access.

30 PROF LIPMAN: So has that person been made a sort of voluntary – given the offer of a voluntary acquisition or just a neighbourhood agreement?

MR ALONSO: Neighbourhood agreement. The voluntary acquisition would be, I understand, part of a potential draft instrument of approval with conditions - - -

35 PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR ALONSO: - - - but, yes, from - - -

PROF LIPMAN: No, but I mean has it been considered by you or put to them - - -

40

MR MOIR: Yes.

PROF LIPMAN: - - - as a possibility?

45 MR ALONSO: We will. Yes, we will.

PROF LIPMAN: Thanks.

MR SERRANO: If the policy is approved, we will keep the offer of the neighbourhood beneficiary agreement that they didn't want to sign now, and also we will offer the option to acquire the land, if they require that.

5 PROF LIPMAN: You haven't discussed that possibility with them?

MR ALONSO: The voluntary acquisition?

10 PROF LIPMAN: Yes, in the event that it's approved or - - -

MR ALONSO: Not but we're definitely happy to do so.

MR SERRANO: The answer is we haven't discussed - - -

15 PROF LIPMAN: Haven't addressed it yet.

MR SERRANO: - - - it with them, because, usually, it's a condition that is imposed by DP&E - - -

20 MR ALONSO: In the development approval.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

25 MR ALONSO: Yes.

MR SERRANO: - - - but if it's required to discuss with them - - -

MR ALONSO: Yes.

30 MR SERRANO: - - - we are open to discuss with them.

PROF LIPMAN: Right.

35 MR DUNCAN: This is the property that is the most – has the new turbine – proposed turbines the closest to them.

MR ALONSO: That's correct.

40 MR DUNCAN: At 1.3.

MR ALONSO: 1.3-ish. A couple of them. And the others just close to two kilometres.

45 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR ALONSO: But yes, there's

MR DUNCAN: Okay. And the other property that's – that you haven't reached agreement with yet, the number?

5 MR ALONSO: That would be – that would be Cottonwood, number 62.

MR DUNCAN: 62. And is that within – they're all further than two kilometres away?

10 MR ALONSO: That's – no, that's within two Ks.

MR DUNCAN: As well. Yes.

MR ALONSO: That's within two Ks, yeah.

15 PROF LIPMAN: Have you got the diagram from 62?

MR MOIR: We should have one from – it won't be – it will be a wireframe from 62.

20 PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR MOIR: Sorry.

25 MR ALONSO: That was actually one of the objectors last year, but that person now doesn't own the property, so we're opening a new - - -

MR DUNCAN: That's the - - -

30 MR PILTON: That's – okay.

MR ALONSO: We're opening a new negotiation line or – yes.

MR DUNCAN: That's the particular one that has been sold.

35 MR ALONSO: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: And I assume during the sale process they would have been aware of proposals surrounding them. I would assume. I would assume.

40 MR ALONSO: I'm sure. I'm sure they were.

PROF LIPMAN: Maybe just getting back to that, we just wanted to confirm that they were actually living in that house in '69, on the property.

45 MR ALONSO: '69.

PROF LIPMAN: The one that green - - -

MR ALONSO: It's our understanding that they don't live there. They don't live there. That house is derelict.

5 MR PILTON: That's what I thought. I was surprised.

MR ALONSO: Is derelict.

MR DUNCAN: Is that right?

10 MR ALONSO: Yes.

MR SERRANO: That is our perception.

15 MR DUNCAN: Sorry?

MR SERRANO: This is our perception.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

20 MR PILTON: Yeah. They – that's what they think, just by looking at it.

MR SERRANO: Yes. That's what we think. But we don't know if they live there. What we know is they have their cattle, cattle farm, you know.

25 PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

30 MR SERRANO: But apparently – we think that they live in Goulburn.

MR ALONSO: And that has been confirmed by neighbours that know them, adjoining neighbours.

35 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

PROF LIPMAN: Thank you.

40 MR SERRANO: That's the reason why we understand that the biggest concern is the road, the access road.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

45 MR SERRANO: And that's why we were let's say assessing if we can change the access road, and once we have confirmed that we can do it, due to that is also one concern from the council, we decide to enwide, commit that we will move the access road to the other side.

PROF LIPMAN: Right.

MR SERRANO: Just in order – because we understand that this property is affected, that it's something that is real.

5

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR SERRANO: The only thing that we can do is trying to mitigate that impact. And in this regard, what we are offering is two things – (1) to move the access road, first thing, and second thing, to give and to maintain the offer to sign a neighbourhood beneficiary agreement.

10

MR DUNCAN: Right. Yes.

MR SERRANO: If the project proceed, we will not retire that offer. We will maintain.

15

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR SERRANO: And if we let's a condition to the line, we will be open also to the line. Our understanding is that they don't want to sell the land because they have their own business.

20

MR PILTON: Yes.

25

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR SERRANO: But we are also open to offer that.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. I think, given time, are you happy if we ask some more questions?

30

MR ALONSO: Absolutely. Absolutely. Of course.

MR SERRANO: Absolutely.

35

MR DUNCAN: Yes. So I think we have one or two other questions.

PROF LIPMAN: You go.

40

MR DUNCAN: No, I'm fine at this stage, Zada.

MR PILTON: Just – you talk, I think, about upgrading Grainwood Siding Road. What sort of upgrade is it? Widening?

45

MR ALONSO: More than widening it is probably flattening it, because it's got some gradients. There are some topography and slopes up and down, just to make it

feasible for the transport, the major components of the turbines, etcetera. But from the point of view of width, that corridor is wide enough. It's about 20 metres wide, so - - -

5 MR PILTON: We didn't go down there when we were on – last week.

MR ALONSO: Yes. I think we didn't have time, but yeah.

10 MR PILTON: Did we? No, we didn't.

MR DUNCAN: So that - - -

MR PILTON: I mean, are there a lot trees or anything down there?

15 MR ALONSO: No, no.

MR PILTON: No.

20 MR ALONSO: It's a corridor. It's bound by two fences between the two properties.

MR PILTON: Yeah. So there won't be a lot of tree removal. That's what I'm asking, really.

25 MR ALONSO: And that's a full clean 20 metres wide corridor.

MR PILTON: Okay. Yeah.

30 MR DUNCAN: So much like that top road that we drove along. There's not much vegetation there.

MR ALONSO: That's correct.

35 MR SERRANO: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR ALONSO: But in that case you have two boundaries, and that's partly grown.

40 MR DUNCAN: Yes. So the other question I had was the second site that we looked at and you showed us that the turbine on top of the hill – can't think of the number.

MR PILTON: 12.

45 PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: 12.

MR PILTON: Yeah.

MR DUNCAN: And a couple of - - -

5 PROF LIPMAN: 10 or 12?

MR PILTON: 12.

10 MR MOIR: It was 12.

MR ALONSO: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: 12. And a couple of the others close to woodland. With the others
15 – we can talk 12 in a moment – are you amenable to micrositing those to get best
outcomes?

MR MOIR: We are.

20 MR ALONSO: We are.

MR DUNCAN: And - - -

MR ALONSO: Probably 12 is the one that is probably close – I mean, more in the
25 centre of the wood area. The other ones are just marginal tangent.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. So the siting of those could be microsited.

MR ALONSO: Absolutely within the

30 PROF LIPMAN: Without going closer than two kilometres to the – of course.

MR ALONSO: Of course. Yeah, yeah, of course.

35 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

PROF LIPMAN: And that one that – on top of the hill, number 12 - - -

MR ALONSO: Yep.

40 PROF LIPMAN: - - - are you amenable to removing that? We don't like the whole
idea of the access up the hill being – you know, that's going to be difficult. That's
going to involve a lot of clearing and - - -

45 MR DUNCAN: Or relocating. Moving or relocating.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes, or relocated off the hill.

MR ALONSO: Probably relocating would be a – relocating would be an option.

PROF LIPMAN: Off the hill.

5 MR ALONSO: I'm absolutely confident that with the 100-metre allowance, we could get that out of or at least sort of midway through the side of the hill.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

10 MR ALONSO: We believe there's still a – well, a good clear corridor that would allow not to cut a lot of trees or clear more trees. And we would be also happy to consider some other options during the assembly of the turbines, like deliver a component just in time, to avoid additional impact in terms of civil works, hardstands, etcetera. But, again, happy to consider that option.

15

PROF LIPMAN: I think one of the worries – yes.

MR SERRANO: In fact, in Crookwell II we did it. You know? We had an allowance of 100 metres, that we can move slightly the turbines and try to implement in the border of the woodland. You know?

20

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. Yes. Micrositing. Yes. I'm aware of the – yes.

MR ALONSO: That's correct. Yes. Yes.

25

PROF LIPMAN: It just would have to be in a location where you don't have birds flying out at that level; otherwise, it's - - -

MR SERRANO: Yes.

30

MR ALONSO: Yes. Understood. Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Other questions?

35 MR PILTON: Just about the – as I understand it, the bottom of the rotor is about 30 metres off the ground. I'm just wondering where there are trees and things that – were there any studies about bird-strikes or bat-strikes?

MR ALONSO: Yes. There's - - -

40

MR PILTON: There's so many papers. I haven't read them all.

MR ALONSO: Yes, there are. And in this case we're talking about a more than reasonable clearance, ground clearance. We're looking at – if you give me one second. I need to make a quick calculation. But - - -

45

MR DUNCAN: What is it? 30 metres?

MR ALONSO: No. It's probably more.

MR SERRANO: More.

5 MR ALONSO: No.

MR SERRANO: It's more.

10 MR ALONSO: It's probably more.

MR SERRANO: It's 35.

MR ALONSO: Because we're looking at a – it's 92 minus – yes. It will be a little bit more than 30 metres.

15 PROF LIPMAN: 30 metres. Yes.

MR ALONSO: Yes.

20 PROF LIPMAN: The average bird would sort of fly below that. But does – the Wedge-tailed Eagle is always a problem with them, because there has been quite a lot of studies done on that and the strikes that are encountered as a result.

MR ALONSO: Probably we would refer to the experience we have in Crookwell II, with similar-sized turbines, exactly the same location, or basically one or two kilometres down the road. We're not having any major problems with collisions at the moment. And there's no – I mean, we haven't been imposed any particular ground clearance at that particular wind farm. So - - -

30 PROF LIPMAN: So you're not really aware of any major flocks of eagles in that vicinity.

MR ALONSO: No. No. Not at all. Not at all.

35 MR DUNCAN: And you have - - -

MR SERRANO: In fact, we are tracking in Crookwell II the birds population, and if there are any bird that is affected by the wind farm, we have to collect it accordingly with the DP approval. Yes. Yes.

40 MR ALONSO: Yes. Of course.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. Yes.

45 MR PILTON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: There's a condition of consent there.

PROF LIPMAN: That's right.

MR DUNCAN: That's right. Yes.

5 PROF LIPMAN: The condition – yes. Consent.

MR SERRANO: And we have a in the wind farm.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

10 MR SERRANO: And we collect it.

MR ALONSO: Yes.

15 MR SERRANO: And I think that the rate that we have is very small.

MR ALONSO: Yes. Yes. In any case – yes.

MR DUNCAN: And does that recorded and reported?

20 MR SERRANO: Yes.

MR D. SANTO TOMÁS: Yes.

25 MR ALONSO: That's correct. Yes. We have an obligation.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: So the EPA or somebody would collect that information.

30 MR SANTO TOMÁS: Yes.

MR SERRANO: Yes. That's correct.

35 MR SANTO TOMÁS: No. No.

PROF LIPMAN: Because the Taralga wind farm had quite a few.

MR SERRANO: Yes.

40 MR SANTO TOMÁS: Currently BLA is the company who is doing the
assessment.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

45 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR SANTO TOMÁS: And okay, we can show you any document from this company that's confirming what was the impact of the wind farm from the point of view of flora and fauna, birds, during the operation, no?

5 PROF LIPMAN: There's not at Taralga, which is – that's quite a distance away.

MR ALONSO: Yeah. Taralga is – well, easily 50 – well, 50 kilometres driving.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. Yes.

10

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR ALONSO: Probably as the crow flies it's a little bit less. But - - -

15 MR MOIR: It's quite vegetated as well.

MR ALONSO: It's a different environment.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. You're not heavily vegetated really. There's just sort of
20 clumps.

MR MOIR: Like, if you look on that front aerial there, you can see - - -

MR ALONSO: This area is more - - -
25

MR MOIR: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Open pasture.

30 PROF LIPMAN: More open pasture.

MR SERRANO: Correct.

MR MOIR: Yes. There's some quite vegetated ridgelines.
35

MR DUNCAN: So we do need to wrap up quite soon. But do you wish to do some closing comments and statements?

MR ALONSO: Probably a little bit of a conclusion.
40

MR DUNCAN: Yes. If you could.

MR ALONSO: Just wanted to mention that, well, similar to David's comments on visual impacts, we have a record for these by Merson addressing the concerns or the
45 finding from the Department of Planning on zoning. We're of the view that the E3 area is compatible because the main aim by that area was defined – was to actually protect the catchment area around Pejar Dam, but not necessarily related to any

specific or special ecological, cultural or aesthetic values. So that's discussed in more detail in that report.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

5

MR ALONSO: But we would be more than happy to take questions on that.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Thank you for the reports. We received them today, so we will read those - - -

10

MR ALONSO: Yes. Early this morning. Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

15 MR ALONSO: And – yes, probably – I would probably say just, like, a few final conclusions just to wrap up because, looking in terms of the additional objections or residual concerns, I think we've already discussed them at length in terms of the single access point, the preferred access - - -

20 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR ALONSO: - - - point to the wind farm, some of the things – I mean, the deletion of the southern cluster to avoid impacts on TV, radio, reception, etcetera, so we're absolutely committed to all that, and I believe we've discussed that at length. So probably just jumping into the final conclusion section.

25

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR ALONSO: We just wanting to highlight that. We don't really – necessarily agree with some of the conclusions of the assessment from Department of Planning. David has already commented on the visual impacts. Same with the zoning. As I've briefly discussed before, we believe also that being this state significant development, that protection figure, etcetera, wouldn't apply, actually, for this particular project.

35

And, yes, basically just insisting or repeating on the benefits of this project in terms of positive environmental effects, in terms of displacing of greenhouse gases, figures that we discussed before related to the investment in the economy and job creation, the minimisation or the mitigation of additional impacts by using existing infrastructure. The fact that we have a, obviously, a commercial arrangement pretty much in place with our retailer that would make the project viable, and we would definitely respectfully request the IPC to consider all these factors in making that final determination and, hopefully, won't – will - - -

40

45 PROF LIPMAN: Can I just ask a - - -

MR ALONSO: Yes.

MR PILTON: I noticed that your wind farms – you know, obviously, because of the height, you have to have night lighting, but the wind farms that I've been involved in, in the past, have used a sort of radar controlled facility so that the lights only come on when a plane approaches. Have you adopt – you haven't adopted that for
5 Crookwell II, as far as I can see. Is there any reason for that and is it – if this wind farm is approved, would that be applied?

MR ALONSO: Well, is the key reason was to follow the – the particular specifications that were mandated by CASA, at that point in time. If CASA changes
10 their stance or mandates that future wind farms will need to use this radar detection system, etcetera, we will be, obviously, absolutely - - -

MR DUNCAN: So you - - -

15 MR ALONSO: - - - happy with – to comply with that.

MR DUNCAN: So you're really following the standards that are set to you by - - -

MR ALONSO: That's correct.
20

MR DUNCAN: - - - CASA at this stage?

MR ALONSO: The permit and CASA. Yes, the plan permit and - - -

25 PROF LIPMAN: Yes, but the guidelines – you know, CASA is very amenable to having either in those cases, if you're prepared to install the technology for it.

MR ALONSO: Yes. We have a - - -

30 MR PILTON: My understanding was that CASA is the one – they specify what's required.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

35 PROF LIPMAN: They do specify, but in ones that I've been dealing with in the past, if the proponent requests and supplies the technology, they accept the radar - - -

MR DUNCAN: Maybe we can get some confirmation on that.

40 MR PILTON: Yes.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. Well, we've just

MR ALONSO: Yes. We will take that on notice and - - -
45

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. Yes.

MR ALONSO: - - - we will talk to our OEM or proposed OEM - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

5 MR ALONSO: - - - to see if they can - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

10

MR ALONSO: - - - actually supply that technology.

PROF LIPMAN: Because it probably would make the impact of the whole wind farm at I, II and III, far less, you know, unacceptable in the evening if you had that

15

MR ALONSO: Yes.

MR MOIR: Yes

20

PROF LIPMAN: - - - sort of

MR DUNCAN: All right. Well, we do need to wrap up and, as you would appreciate, things have sort of moved a bit through the process here, even in the terms of our involvement.

25

MR ALONSO: Sure.

MR DUNCAN: So we need to consider that. We may need to come back to you if more – we apologise we have to wrap up. We have another meeting at 4.

30

MR ALONSO: That's - - -

MR DUNCAN: I do, in particular. But thank you for that presentation, and I think you've covered everything that we require. There's no other question at this stage?

35

PROF LIPMAN: No, except that, probably, we've got something in writing on the agreements if the - - -

MR DUNCAN: We would like to know where you get to with the agreements, particularly if you can close that – the - - -

40

MR ALONSO: Absolutely. Once we can close these two, we expect that will happen in the next few days.

45

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR ALONSO: We will officially - - -

MR SERRANO: We will send you a letter.

5 MR ALONSO: - - - notify you. Yes.

MR SERRANO: Clearly with all the that we have explained. - - -

10 MR DUNCAN: David will be in contact with you about the detail of that because
- - -

MR SERRANO: Yes.

15 MR DUNCAN: - - - I think, as you probably noticed with the – even the council
process was they were very concerned or keen to see all the agreements in place.
Yes. Okay. Thank you.

MR SERRANO: Thank you very much.

20 MR MOIR: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Meeting closed.

25 PROF LIPMAN: Thank you.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

30

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[3.58 pm]