

②⑦
Independent Planning Commission submission by Grant Winberg

Crookwell 3

Public Meeting

Thursday, 6 June 2019 at 9.30, Crookwell RSL Club

Mr Cameron, Professor Lipman and Mr Pilton, thank you for the opportunity to speak at this public meeting to support the Department of Planning & Environment's recommendation to the Independent Planning Commission to not allow the Crookwell 3 proposal to proceed.

It is noted that the agenda has the director of the developer as first speaker and the representatives of the Australian Wind Alliance as the final two speakers. I imagine however that the majority, if not all, of the remaining speakers will be presenting their arguments to you to adopt the Department's recommendation.

We are assured that each of the IPC panel members has read and absorbed all of the written submissions to the Department regarding this development application and not merely those currently visible on the Department's website. We are assured there is no reason to repeat here any of the contents of those submissions. Please correct me if I am wrong.

To restate the Department's recommendation (which I unreservedly endorse) to ensure that I get the message across to the IPC panel present today:-

Quote

Ultimately, the Department considers that the environmental impacts of the project outweigh its benefits, and that the site is unsuitable for a large-scale wind farm on the following grounds:

- *the project would result in unacceptable impacts on the landscape character and significant landscape features;*
- *the project would result in unacceptable direct and cumulative visual impacts on residences, public viewpoints and the surrounding landscape;*
- *the majority of submissions from residences in the local area object to the project and Upper Lachlan Shire Council maintains residual concerns about the impacts of the project; and*
- *the project is not consistent with the current land use zoning provisions.*

Consequently, the Department considers that on balance the Crookwell 3 Wind Farm is not in the public interest, and should not be approved.

Unquote

For background, my family acquired our property twenty two years ago (unlike many who acquired theirs many years before, or inherited the land, some of whom have decimated that inheritance with these obscene constructions).

The Crookwell 3 application was lodged in 2010 in the final throws of perhaps the most controversial planning instrument in NSW history, which was repealed very soon after submission. We have had the prospective imposition of Crookwell 3 hanging over our heads for nine years – not unlike all those before it.

We have seen the particular injustice of the Gullen Range development. A sensible PAC committee decision was overturned by a subsequent PAC committee and we consequently quite understand that other residents would then accept 'don't complain' money for entering into confidential 'don't complain' agreements when they realise there is no way that the developer won't get its way anyway.

In brief summary of my involvement in this and other such proposals, I:-

- first heard about the precursor to this proposal, the Crookwell 2 proposal, in 2004
- became a member of the Friends of Crookwell, which transitioned to the Crookwell District Landscape Guardians
- held the offices of Public Officer, Secretary and Treasurer of the CDLG for various periods
- spoke at various public meetings and researched and lodged submissions with regard to the Crookwell proposals, the Gullen Range fiasco and other such proposals.

To conclude – a short story. A little while ago, I was advised by someone who was engaged to advise the ACT government in finalising the selection of preferred renewable energy supplier between Collector and Crookwell 2. If Collector had won, that development would have proceeded and not Crookwell 2. He noted that Crookwell 2 won because Collector was claimed to have more resident objections than Crookwell 2. Statistics.

That is why I am standing here. I'm a statistic. But please understand there are many more of us statistics who for various reasons cannot stand here today. They have written Object submissions over the last nine years. They have fears of subtle or direct community retribution.

I urge each of you to carefully consider the impact on this area of any more wind turbines and heed the advice of the Department.

Reject this development application.

PLEASE

Grant Winberg