

9
Crookwell 3 IPC Meeting 6th June 2019

John McGrath

Ph [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

1. Standard Reason that have been put forward that DPE Refused Crookwell 3 on, bar extra visual "pollution?"

Goulburn Post article May 6 2019

"DPE Draft Instrument of Refusal"SSD6695

- Unacceptable impacts on landscape character and significant landscape features
 - Unacceptable direct and culminate visual impacts on residences, public viewpoint, and the surrounding landscape
 - The majority of the submissions from residences in the local area object and Upper Lachlan Shire Council maintains residual concerns about the impacts of the project;
 - The project is not constant with local land use zoning provisions.
2. Crookwell 3 is owned by Crookwell Development Pty Ltd Global Power Generation and will invariably change hands throughout the lifetime of the wind farm, with no NSW Legislation in place reliance on in the end "\$2-00 shelf companies" to decommission wind farms is pipedreams?
3. Charlie Prell's reasoning for Crookwell 3 is that it's an extension of an existing wind farm, a similar to cancer?
3 towers reduced in size since 2010 "and once they (neighbours) understand the benefits" are willing to sign neighbour agreements?

Pitt Street Farmers the main objectors, I query that?

4. Water bodies and flight path of water birds to and from Pejar dam

Fire accumulative affect, fact is that aerial water bombardment will not take place through smoke and wind towers.

Some Rural Fire Brigades have already made a decree that they will not be attending fires started by wind farms.
Remember the majority of NSW Rural Fire Service fire fighters are volunteers.

9