

Thursday 6th June 2019

G'Day Everyone

For those of you who don't know me, my name is Steve Ward. My wife Kylie & I own the property [REDACTED] which is a direct neighbour to Crookwell 3 South. I am a member of the Crookwell 2 & 3 Community Consultative Committee & have been since it was established in early 2013. I am opposed to the Crookwell 3 development for many reasons, the main reason being the cumulative impact of these huge turbines destroying our once beautiful rural landscape And now dominating the ridgeline.

The purpose of today's meeting is to talk about the Department of Planning's assessment report, so here goes.

The 1st application for Crookwell 3 was lodged in February 2010 for 30 turbines. In February 2015 the Department of Planning recommended to the PAC to approve the development with the provision that 8 residences in close proximity to the turbines be granted voluntary acquisition from the developer. My property 'Narangi' was one of these properties. The PAC had concerns with the application back then, & these were:-

- The proximity of Turbines to non- associated private residences.
- Visual & noise impacts
- Problems with neighbourhood agreements
- Road maintenance
- Access to Site
- Decommissioning of the Turbines at completion of their useful life.

As a result, an amended DA was submitted in September 2016, with 23 Turbines 157 metres tall, 17 turbines in the East sector & 6 turbines in the South sector.

The Upper Lachlan Shire Council were concerned about the following items:-

- They opposed turbines within 2km's of a residence
- Damage to roads
- TV Interference.

The Office Of Environment & heritage had concerns for the Birdlife & bats.

Water NSW were concerned about the water quality entering the Sydney catchment.

Terry O'Hanlon from O'Hanlon Design, who attended my property with Mike Young & David Kitto, from the Department Of Planning wrote "these turbines will have an unacceptable impact on the Landscape". Terry O'Hanlon is the visual expert working for the Department of Planning. I will repeat his words again. "These turbines will have an unacceptable impact on the landscape. I & the majority of people I talk to in Crookwell share his views.

The Department Of Planning now considers that the potential benefits of the project are outweighed by its predicted impacts.

Here are some of the Statements made by the Department Of Planning in their 64 page summary.

Page 6

Overall, the Department considers the local landscape already has limited capacity to absorb further change from wind farm projects, and the particular location and layout of the project would result in material impacts on local landscape values and features.

Visual Impacts on Residences

The *NSW Wind Energy Framework* recommends that turbines of 157 m in height should not be located within 2.1 km of private residences unless there is clear justification to do so. This is similar to the *Upper Lachlan Development Control Plan 2010*, which specifies that turbines should be located more than 2 km from non-associated residences.

Given the close proximity of the majority of turbines to non-associated residences, the resultant magnitude and significant direct visual impacts predicted, together with the predicted significant cumulative impacts, adequately mitigating the residual visual impacts of the project would require removing the vast majority of proposed turbines.

Once the modified DA was submitted & the 2 closest turbines to my place were removed the voluntary Acquisition of my place was cancelled.

[Back to the summary](#)

While the Department acknowledges that the significance of these impacts may not warrant acquisition in all cases, acquisition should only be considered where the broader benefits of the project are so significant or important that they outweigh the potential impacts on local residents. In this case, the Department considers that the benefits associated with developing a maximum of only 23 turbines are not so significant from a public interest perspective that the provision of voluntary acquisition rights to landowners would be justified.

By removing 2 out of 8 turbines in the South cluster & increasing the height of the other 6 turbines, if this project was to proceed I will still expect & deserve the right to have voluntary acquisition of my property enforced upon the developer.

[Back to the summary](#)

Page 7

Land Use Zoning

The Department notes that 70% of the turbines (all of the eastern cluster) are prohibited under the current Local Environmental Plan as they are located in an E3 Environmental Management Zone. While it is still open to the

Neighbourhood Agreements

Page 8

to acceptable levels. The Department acknowledges the agreements secured by CDPL, however there are still 17 non-associated residences within 3.1 km with high or moderate-high visual impacts that CDPL has not secured agreements with despite having had several years to do so.

The Developer in my opinion has showed a total lack of effort or interest in securing a neighbourhood agreement with kylie & I.

[Back to the summary](#)

Page 8

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.

3.3 Local Populations

There are approximately 90 residences within 5 km of the site.

The project has 3 host or 'associated' landowners (representing 4 residences), who own land on the project site.

I can't imagine why this development should be approved, when so many people & properties will be adversely affected, to the financial benefit of such a minority.

Back to the summary

Page 21

Non-Associated Landowners

There are 76 non-associated residences within 5 km of the site including (see **Figure 4**):

- 28 residences within 3 km;
- 31 residences between 3 km and 4 km; and
- 17 residences between 4 km and 5 km.

Many of these residences have the potential to experience significant direct and cumulative visual impacts given they are located between, or with extensive views of, the Crookwell 3 turbine clusters and the Crookwell 2 Wind Farm.

Page 40

Pejar: South-western group

This cluster has 8 residences and is predominantly located along Pejar Road and Dawsons Creek Road around the southern turbine cluster with most viewpoints at elevated locations. Almost all residences (7) have a moderate-high to high impact (R2, R3, R4, R6, R7, R8 and R19). The residences have the nearest turbines between 1.1 km and 3.2 km.

Navangi - Wombat Hollow

In particular, R8 and R19 to the north of the southern cluster would have a high visual impact with the closest turbines located 1.7 km and 1.1 km from these residences respectively, and all 6 turbines in the southern cluster (A28, A29, A30, A31, A32 and A33) located within 3.1 km. In addition, these residences would have impacts from Crookwell 3, Crookwell 2 and Gullen Range wind farms, resulting in wind turbines being visible within the horizontal view in more than 4 sectors (i.e. over 240° views of turbines) (see **Figures 10** and **11** for photomontages from R8 and R19).

The photo montages supplied by Union Fernosa/ Global Power Generation have managed to hide a 157mtr tall tower behind a shrub from my property R8 'Narangi'. This is pointed out by O'Hanlon Design in Figure 10. This tower is 1.7klm's from my house, yet is barely visible in the photo. Words from the department - "Turbine A29 appears missing or hidden by foreground foliage". Another one of my neighbour's property is "Wombat Hollow", which is a non host property, has a 157mtr tall tower hidden from view behind a 12mtr tall timber power pole. Amazing considering this turbine is 1.1klm's from their house & otherwise un-obstructed.

These photomontages supplied to the Department of Planning are disgraceful & have deliberately tried to mislead the department on what the actual view would indeed be.

Back to the Summary
Community Submissions

~~Of~~ The majority of submissions in support of the project came from residents beyond 15 km of the project site (as shown in **Figure 6**).

In this regard, approximately 80% of submissions within 15 km objected to the project, while 90% objected within 5 km and all submissions within 3 km objected (with the exception of 2 submissions in support from host landowners for the project).

The Department also received a petition with 169 signatures objecting to the project, with many of these individuals residing in the local area including some in the immediate vicinity of the project.

Key Issues Raised in Submissions

Approximately 80% of objections raised visual impacts as a key issue.

In particular, concerns were raised in regard to the visual impact on surrounding residences; cumulative visual impacts from the presence of several wind farms in the area; loss of scenic value; impacts of industrial structures in a rural landscape; proximity of turbines to dwellings; the height and number of turbines; impacts associated with night lighting and shadow flicker; misleading photomontages and the validity of the methodology used to determine visual impacts.

6-4-2010, Unearthed, 2010, 11

Finally, The Department Of Planning Recommendation

Page 54

It is recommended that the Independent Planning Commission for NSW, as delegate of the Minister for Planning:

- **considers** the findings and recommendations of this report, noting that the Department considers that the application should be **refused**;
- if the Commission determines to ~~refuse to grant consent to the application~~, **signs** the attached instrument of refusal (Appendix I).

Recommended by:

15 April 2019

Iwan Davies

A/Team Leader

Resource and Energy Assessments

Recommended by:

18 April 2019

Nicole Brewer

A/Director

Resource and Energy Assessments

I could of have read the entire Summary to you all, as the whole 54 pages all have the same point of view, & lead to the same conclusion & that is that the Department of Planning considers that the Application should be REFUSED.

The people of Crookwell think the application should be REFUSED.

Common Sense & Decency say that the Application should be REFUSED.

Thanks for your time.

Cheers

Steve Ward.