



ROSE PERROTT

SUPPORT

Submission No: 165533

Organisation:		Key issues: <i>Social and economic</i>
Location: <i>New South Wales 2354</i>		
Submitter Type: <i>I am a member of the local community who would be particularly and directly affected by the proposed development</i>		
Attachment: <i>Letter to IPC for Thunderbolt wind farm.pdf</i>		

Submission date: 3/24/2024 8:43:22 PM

Please find my submission attached

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to you in regards to the Thunderbolts Windfarm Proposal. I am a resident of the Kentucky, my eldest child is in grade 1 at Kentucky Public School, my younger two children attend Uralla Preschool, of which I am president and I am also the secretary of Kentucky Memorial Hall Committee. My husband's business is a local surveying business that has done, and currently does, work for the windfarm. I am also a process engineer and I have worked in both state and local government for over 10 years.

Personally I agree with the Thunderbolt Windfarm proposal. I strongly believe that climate change is an issue that must be mitigated quickly and wind and solar is the best way to reduce our CO2 emissions. It would therefore be very hypocritical of me to say "not in my back yard".

I also believe that the wind farm proposal will diversify the broader local economy, reducing reliance on the volatile primary production sector. Not only will farmers who have turbines on their property benefit but there will be a flow on effect through project employment and engaging local contractors. Some of these addition funds in the local economy will go to local cafes, mechanics and shops.

However, with projects such as these there is a big impact and the significance of benefit sharing for our community cannot be overstated. Kentucky is by far the most significantly impacted community from this proposal. The prospect of a significant proportion of the 1.5% of the capital cost coming into our community is huge. At the moment, there isn't much in our little village and what we do have is rundown and has been in desperate need for upgrades for many years. The sort of funding that will come available to the Kentucky community is more than has ever been available.

The developer proposed that the benefit sharing arrangement be split 50/50 between Tamworth LGA and Uralla LGA and delivered through a community benefit fund. Tamworth Regional Council has 90% of the turbines but, unlike Uralla LGA, there is no community directly impacted by the solar farm except when the turbines are being transported to site. I therefore believe that a 50/50 split of the funding between Tamworth and Uralla LGAs is a fair and equitable approach. This is the funding model I support.

However, without any public consultation let alone consultation with the impacted community, Tamworth Regional Council (TRC) and Uralla Shire Council (USC) have come to the agreement with the developer that the funding will be split with 60% going to Tamworth LGA and 40% to Uralla LGA. Of the portion allocated to Uralla LGA, 66% will be given to USC and 33% will go into a community fund. This information was only discovered when perusing the Independent Planning Commission website in preparation for the public meeting. The lack of public consultation in regard to this arrangement is astounding and the lack of transparency that has been demonstrated is hugely concerning for the future management of this funding. USC's own submission to the IPC, dated 11th March 2024, shows that there is no intention to consult with the public on the VPA. They have requested that clause A21, which discusses the VPA, be deleted "due to agreement between applicant and USC being

reached". This contravenes the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation, 2021 (NSW)*.

The community consultation done by the developer showed that the community overwhelmingly wanted the funds to be distributed by an independent entity not USC. I believe that the Community Enterprise Foundation will be able to deliver the funding to the community in an equitable fashion.

Uralla Shire Council, like many small local councils, is understaffed and struggles to deliver their own projects in an agile and efficient manner. If USC manage the benefit sharing funds, there will not be a priority placed on projects in the impacted community and Kentucky will be competing significantly more with other communities, as well as internal council projects, for the funds. USC's inability to manage a fund like this would mean there will be significant wastage of the funds on administration.

Ultimately, the lack of transparency and consultation with the impacted community in their negotiations with the developer for this funding is a failing of due process. This, along with their past track record with community consultation, understanding the needs of our community, transparency and project management demonstrates that Uralla Shire Council is not a suitable entity to be delivering the benefit sharing fund. Allowing the proposed Voluntary Planning Arrangement to go ahead in its current form would be the worst outcome for our community and it should not be recommended by the Independent Planning Commission.

Yours Sincerely

Rose Perrott