

IPC Submission Crudine Ridge Windfarm Modification 1

June 2019

Further to the submission made by myself and Ralph Price on June 11 meeting I would like to add the following points:

1. I am an architect/ town planner with a Masters of Environmental Advocacy through UNE, completed within the last 5 years; so my information and experience are current. Four years ago I went on a study tour, looking at Windfarms and Industrial Symbiosis planning, with a friend who is a member of the Greens, throughout northern Europe- Holland, UK, France, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Estonia and Norway; I have done my research and am informed on the subject.

Much as I am aware of the threat of Climate Change and the necessity to address it, there are ways and ways. Most notable in my travels is that although there are windfarms throughout Northern Europe, none are of the height and scale of those proposed at Crudine Ridge unless they are located offshore, like the London Array off the mouth of the Thames, or the Gemini Array off Amsterdam.

Also, if Europe is the pattern book for such development, the methods of agriculture differ, as free-range grazing as we do, is not practiced there due to the severe winters. Animals are housed in insulated barns, and the land hayed during summer. Houses are insulated and double glazed, so they are not so subject to the cold or to noise pollution. Here, many of the residences around Crudine Ridge were constructed in the 1920's to 1940's of uninsulated fibro and single glazed windows, using natural ventilation. These points need to be taken into consideration, when considering any modifications to the approval already in place for the Crudine Ridge Windfarm.

2. In a meeting at the Dept of Planning about two years ago I pointed out to their Michael Young, in front of his Director, that the "Independent" acoustic report that they had commissioned was 'not worth the paper it was printed on' due to the disclaimer on the second page that the equipment used did not register noise levels below 20dB. This skewed the whole report to look like the noise levels were much higher, than in reality. This report was not re-done but used as the basis for the 35dB(A) that they think is fine to have within a residence on a farm where the usual overnight noise level is about 15dB. I know this because I live on a

farm there. It might be very well be said that people- like me- have lived in cities, so will get used to the noise at night; but my partner, his parents, our neighbours and others who have lived in near silence all their lives, will not become used to these noise levels, and will suffer from disrupted sleep and stress. This has been proved long term to cause hypertension, domestic violence and other associated detrimental health effects resulting in a shortened lifespan. Please reduce the levels of accepted noise in non-associated residences to no more than 25dB(A) overnight in this modification. A truly independent monitoring of noise levels is necessary and a way forward to hold the proponent to reduced noise levels is necessary for the whole community.

3. I will not go over the submissions already made by the Hundy family or Owain Rowland-Jones but will restate that CWP has repeatedly taken a Machiavellian stance to planning approval, has lied to a Federal Minister as to the extent of clearing required while having already negotiated with landowners to expand the area of clearing adjacent to Aarons Pass road six months prior, and even to yourselves within the last month. This is all recorded in the transcripts available to the public. It was stated that regrowth was occurring along the cleared area of Aarons Pass road, but CWP sprayed the regrowth with herbicide to enforce the area cleared, although still subject to your yet to be granted approval. CWP have no respect for the planning process. Please do not give them credit for being 'on the side of the angels' as to climate change; they are driven by profit and expediency, not idealism.
4. Contractors being out of pocket due to investment in plant to upgrade Aarons Pass Road. If they have a contract for this work, there should be a clause for damages due to the contract not proceeding. This is an irrelevant claim. Non-associated farmers will be out of pocket due to reduced land values caused by windfarm noise. No-one cares about that, so let's be fair.
5. In our other submission I stated that biodiversity offsets would not succeed due to the extremes of climate and lack of rainfall. If there is any doubt to this, you can examine our orchard planted at 'Bindawalla'. There are fruit trees that are 60-80 years old, some in poor condition but still fruiting, and there are the fruit trees planted some 6-7 years ago. Although these trees have been watered and fertilized, looked after well especially in summer, they are still the same size as when they were

initially. There have been some losses, in that 20-30% have died over the years and been replanted. If endangered flora is relocated, and reafforestation depending on tube stock is envisioned, it just will not work. The plants would need constant care for even the slightest chance of survival. It might look good on paper but even if reafforestation of the pasture that is allocated as an offset was successful, it would take some 50 years to be of sufficient scale to replace the lost Endangered Habitat. If Threatened Species do not already thrive on these offsets, why would they in future. Offsets and Bio-credits, in this case, are only conscience appeasement and of little practical application. Please take this into consideration when approving further removal of this Endangered Ecological Community. White Box, Yellow Box, Blakeley's Red Gum Woodland is now only 3% of its original range. We cannot afford to reduce its area further.

6. Anyone who lives in the Aarons Pass, and Pyramul area would agree that Aarons Pass Road needs an upgrade. Currently it is in good shape; better than Sallys Flat Road which is our main access to Bathurst. However, it is a question of scale. Upgrade for heavy traffic does not require it to be made into a 3-lane highway. A 6-7meter wide carriageway would suffice particularly if it saves the remnant forest. An all-weather surface would be more desirable if CWP is to use this road as its main access. Oversize loads of windfarm blades (that have been extended in length by the DEP without consideration of environmental repercussions) can easily be dropped into place by helicopter as they would be for offshore installations of a similar scale in Europe. There are only 3 X 37 oversize blade trips- 111 trips that require CWP to clear fell 22km of remnant Endangered Ecological Community. Get CWP to bite the bullet and drop the blades in by helicopter, even if it cuts into their profits; the cost to future generations is far too high to approve this scale of clearing.
7. Water access. If CWP needs to reduce the scale of their development due to reduced dam levels (Burrandong Dam less than 6%, June 2019) due to the current drought; this should also apply to access to bores and ground water. We have not had proper rain since May 2017, and we are still not in El Nino. Please do not let CWP reduce the community's water table further; it is needed for farming.
8. Buying out non-associated farms. If it is no longer bearable to live close to windfarm noise, CWP should clearly be buying out the entire farm-

the whole box and dice- not just the residence and curtilage. It is not possible to run a large farm responsibly while living an hour's drive away in a town. If it is necessary, farmers should be fully bought out so they can move their operations elsewhere. This is not made clear in Modification 1.

9. Who is responsible for demounting and making good redundant wind-towers and their associated infrastructure, should they become damaged or at the end of their lease. This is not clear and needs to be resolved in this Modification 1. Is it CWP, the operator to whom the approved scheme is on-sold, or the landowner who gave CWP the lease? Can an insurance policy be required, as is in the case of mines, to cover future site rehabilitation? Please clarify these issues in your approval of Modification 1.
10. Above all, can we please have an independent body to monitor compliance of CWP's operations. Clearly self-assessment is not appropriate for an operation that possibly suffers from either Project implementation mismanagement or Machiavellian intent from management. Please also make an appropriate fine for non-compliance that will act as an effective deterrent to CWP's cowboy tactics.
11. All in all, please do not pass this Modification 1 of CWP's approval for 37 windfarm towers in its current form.

Ingrid Saywell

BSc. Arch., B. Arch., G.D.U.R.P, M.E.A. and farm resident.



Pyramul NSW 2850.