

I wish to lodge my objection to Capital II's request to extend the consent time allows for the wind farm to be built.

It is immoral for this project and the surrounding community and it is immoral in principle for the wind farms while the Government is reviewing the community's view of the wind farm guidelines and any changes it makes to them. The results of those guidelines should be applied to any new proposals and any requests for modifications/extensions.

The original consent included a very extensive period of five (5) years to build the wind farm but there is no suggestion that it has been delayed by any act of God or frustrated by the NSW Government. The failure to build Capital II is down to either the incompetence of the managements or a bad commercial judgement they initially made. There is no reason to believe either will change and the Department should not be rewarding either incompetence or bad commercial judgement – and should not be at the expense of local communities.

The Clean Energy Council (CEC) in its recent submission to the Department on the draft wind turbine guidelines, it stated that *"while approved projects have statutory approval to be constructed, some may never have an adequate economic case for construction."* Capital II were vying for a contract with the ACT Government for renewable energy and despite it being in close proximity to the ACT it failed in its bid to other wind farms in other states that could provide cheaper power. It may be that Capital II is one of those projects the CEC believes will never have an economic case for construction.

Granting Capital II an extension encourages other speculators to propose economically negligible wind farm projects in the hope that at some undetermined time in the future, conditions may change to their advantage while they tie up huge tracts of land – both of potential hosts and adjacent areas which are removed from alternative developments because of the potential impact of the wind farm should it ever be built.

This project should be rejected outright. It is not an administrative change but an attempt to tear up one of the most critical conditions of the original consent.

From the statement the Department placed on its website, it would appear the Department has expressed a view in favour of the extension – this is before receiving responses from the public! How can it do that? How can the Department describe the matter as: "...This extension will preserve the renewable energy and economics benefits of the approved Capital II wind farm and allow sufficient time for the CWF2PL to review the approved Capital II wind farm in line with changing turbine technology and market circumstances". Even Blind Freddie can see that this is an advocacy statement by the Department and indicates it cannot be regarded as acting impartially in reviewing the proposal of the extension. It is also obvious to many that the application is exhibited only six (6) weeks before the current consent lapses. Since the timing has always been known to the proponents, it is fair and reasonable to presume they believed it would be a matter of rubber stamping by the Department prior to 1 November 2016.

This must, and I emphasise, must be referred to the PAC for a decision and not left purely for the Department to determine.