

DAVID WINTERFLOOD  
LAVERSTOCK  
N.S.W. 2582  
TEL: 02 6227 2855

Attention: Director - Resource and Energy Assessments  
Planning Services  
Dept of Planning and Environment ,  
GPO Box 39 , SYDNEY  
NSW 2001

19/12/2018

REGARDING : CRUDINE RIDGE WIND FARM MODIFICATION 1

APPLICATION NUMBER : SSD 6697 MOD 1

Dear Sir or Madam ,

I wish to object against the above proposed modification for the the above named windfarm at Crudine Ridge.

Generally , all of these wind turbines :

1. are a vast waste of money .
2. They permanently scar the landscape and drainage systems in what are otherwise productive agricultural settings and locations.
3. They do not save or reduce CO2 levels for ten years at least due to the enourmous amount of CO2 released in the production of the tower / mast steel , the cement production and mix , the reinforcement steel in the base , the toxic processing of the electricity generators in the turbine and the fuel used to ship all the components from overseas to Australia and then from the ports to their ultimate locations.

In relation to this particular modification process I am very concerned at the ecological harm that could result from the developer continuing to remove , as they have already done , far more trees than they were originally allowed to remove .

It seems that they , the developer , now wish to install much bigger wind turbines with much longer blades. Are you aware of this ?

Continued on page 2

2.

With regard to this modification and more specifically it is my opinion as well as others whose observations and opinions I value that :

1. The proposed modification will cause major additional harm , at least along the APR , and should be rejected accordingly.
2. Many of the other assertions in the proposal document are questionable .
3. Any evaluation of environmental impact must only compare the proposed modification with the 37 wind turbines approved by the Federal DOE ; because that is the only thing the developer now has a legal right to build.
4. The developer must be required to lodge a formal modification for it's intended increase in turbine power (N apparently more than 50% ) and blade length , and include proper arguments for both as compared to and with the approved project .
5. Given the history of environmental misinformation which has accompanied the project and caused the shambles to date , all ecological assessment must be by aries with no financial or supervisory relationship with the developer or the DPE.
6. The modification must be rejected until the developer is able to provide a precise statement of all that will be done on the site with a full evaluation in advance for the IPC to consider and the IPC should not approve anything to be supposedly worked out " on trust " .

There are many other reasons to oppose the modification but all the above points are I believe to be pertinent .

Signed by :



DAVID J WINTERFLOOD J.P. , NTAA .