

# INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING

## PROPOSED CROOKWELL III WIND FARM

(Thursday 6th June, 2019)

### 1. PERSONAL COMPLAINTS RE THIS HEARING

See separate written statement.

### 2. MY PERSONAL DETAILS

My name is MALCOLM BARLOW, and my wife and I own a small cattle-fattening and hay-growing farm north of Crookwell.

I speak to you as a resident/patepayer, as a one-time Councillor (2008-2016), and as a long-time opponent of the invasion of our Shire by subsidised wind farms since 2004.

### 3. MY FIRST OBJECTION (Mainly to CIII South)

This proposal ignores a basic tenet of good land-use planning which is not to juxtapose antipathetic functions,

For example:

3.1. Do not place garbage tips or sewer works next to a hospital.

3.2. Do not allow brothels next to churches or temples.

3.3. Do not build hotels next to schools or kindergartens.

3.4. Do not allow aged Care Homes adjacent to noisy industrial estates - or cemeteries?

AND

3.5. Do not build giant bird-killing machines near a major bird habitat and breeding ground.

Any planning authority that would allow such an inimical proposal to proceed has clearly forgotten their planning principles lectures and should be relieved of their role.

#### 4. MY SECOND OBJECTION

Panelists, I have no doubt that you are aware that a wind farm developer was, and hopefully still is, required by the Department of Planning to consider whether or not their proposal would constitute an excessive cumulative impact upon the landscape especially if there are pre-existing wind farms in the area.

Already with Crookwell I (8) and Crookwell II (30) operating on adjacent properties, there are some turbines in the immediate vicinity of this proposed project. Whilst Modification 2 reduced the number of turbines in Crookwell II from about 50 to only 33, their height was increased by over 15% to 152m - if anything, the visual impact has been increased especially along the busy Goulburn-Crookwell Road over which four giant structures tower quite menacingly. If the 28-30 proposed turbines of Crookwell III are approved, there would be about 74 such huge industrial structures crowded into a triangular piece of land of about 55-60 square kilometres - a density of 1.3 turbines in every square kilometre.

Even the huge, and ugly, Gullen Range Wind Farm, with much smaller turbines, has its 73 turbines stretched out along a strip of

ridgeland covering about 200+ square kilometres at a density of only "36 turbines in each square kilometre.

The developer's own application (p. 100) admits that Crookwell III would create "... a moderate to high visual impact ..." on 29 residential sites but then strangely states "... there is unlikely to be a significant increase in visual impact arising from cumulative impacts." This denial, apart from being contradictory, is nothing more than unsubstantiated assertion by this greedy developer.

Attachment 1 is a map that shows this potential forest of turbines and their associated structures that will flank the very busy Goulburn and Woodhouselee Roads and overlook Pejar Dam. It does show the original number of turbines in CII and CIII before the modifications.

5.0 MY THIRD OBJECTION

The proposal for Crookwell III is inconsistent with Council's State-approved L.E.P. in relation to developments that may be allowed with consent in an area zoned as E3-Environmental Protection. Land use details for this zone are specified below.

- 5.2. Permitted Without Consent:  
Environmental protection works; Extensive Agriculture; Human Occupations(?)
- 5.3. Permitted With Consent:  
Dwelling Houses; Roads.
- 5.4. Prohibited:  
Industries; Multi-dwelling Houses;

Residential-flat Buildings; Retail Premises; Seniors Housing; Service Stations; Warehouse or Distribution Centres; Any other Development not specified in 2 or 3 above (my emphases)

I emphasise to Panelists what is prohibited in E3 Zones -

"Any other development not specified in items 2 or 3 above."

and wind farms are not so specified.

Panelists, are we to have the quite ludicrous and unacceptable situation where a State-approved Planning law with which Council and other developers must comply over-ridden today by an I.P.C. Panel in order to facilitate an overseas developer's attempt to gain more subsidised profits?

original EA  
Arch 2010

Of course, the developer will argue that its original application for Crookwell III was lodged when the 1994 Crookwell Shire L.E.P. was the local planning instrument and the area concerned was then zoned differently. But as Council argued in its submission on Crookwell III (See Item 902, Dec 2012 Council Meeting pp 95-125), its new L.E.P. was gazetted in July 2010 and the proponent's final application was not lodged until July 2012

new L.E.P.  
July 2010  
final EA  
July 2012

I might add that Council's submission to the Dept pointed out that the Crookwell III proposal failed to meet Council's prudent D.C.P. on wind farms in a large number of matters including set backs, impacts upon neighbours, and noise monitoring.

6. FINALLY

Panelists, there are perhaps another dozen reasons that I could give to you as to why this or any wind farm should be stopped.

I do not have an hour or more to elaborate on and substantiate these reasons though I have in the many many detailed papers that I have presented to earlier P.A.C.'s and one I.P.C.

But let me just list them before I sit down:

1. Wind Farm nacelles are a potential source of fire
2. Wind turbines reduce aerial fire-fighting capacity
3. Wind Farms reduce aerial agricultural practices
4. Wind Farms destroy social cohesion in rural communities.
5. Wind Farms produce audible and inaudible sound wave emanations that impact the health (mainly through sleep deprivation) of many near-neighbours
6. Wind Farms, as many studies have shown, lower the value of nearby properties. Note the governments of Denmark and the Netherlands have compensatory schemes in place
7. Wind Farms kill untold numbers of birds
8. Currently, there are no enforceable measures in place to pull down outdated turbines - see Hawaii and California.
9. Wind Farms subsidised by consumers through the R.E.C. market are a major cause of our damagingly high electricity costs

(6)

Panelists, for all of the reasons that I have just presented to you please support the recommendation by the Department of Planning and me, to deny this application for Crookwell III Wind Farm.

Malcolm Barlow

(B.A. [Hons], M.A., Dip. Ed [P.A.], FNAS)

ATT. 1

