

Neville Osborne

From: Douglas and Sarah Bucknell <d.sbucknell@live.com.au>
Sent: Thursday, 12 November 2015 10:16 AM
To: Neville Osborne
Cc: frank@collectorbooks.com.au
Subject: Collector Wind Turbine Development Modification Proposal

Dear Neville,

I understand you have recently been in contact by phone with Mr Frank Ross of Collector, in respect of this development and am informed that was a most useful and informative exchange – thank you.

For Action Today

Many in this community are unaware of this proposal which is currently set to close tomorrow. I understand the closest it has been displayed is in Gunning during working hours. Gunning is located 35km from Collector along one of the worst potholed dusty dirt roads in the country (trust me I live half way along it!). The other display point at the council offices in Crookwell is an additional half hour drive.

Many residents of the impacted area commute to work in the other direction being Canberra or Goulburn. Many of these individuals would not have been to Gunning for over a year – particularly during work hours. Collector is on the far extremity of this (ULSC) council area and has limited contact and commonality (both from a mutual financial and resource perspective).

I cannot think of a more effective process to avoid scrutiny than that currently being undertaken – if you do not receive the required number of objections – it will be because of the process undertaken not because the 80% of the impact community who are strongly opposed to this development don't officially object on this occasion.

I am willing to assume the department was unaware or overlooked these aspects however please be assured we are all too aware that Ratch has used similar tactics in other locations to bulldoze communities and government departments.

I am calling for the department to immediately extend the period for objections – legally and morally you have no choice – unless you are planning to take up the suggestion below a restart this whole application de novo.

This community is tired of this development that they don't want. The department's ongoing processes and requirements over many years have worn them thin. Add to this the financial impact of lower property sales in this community compared to surrounding towns over the last few years (it is very hard to disassociate this evidence from this development) and the disharmony caused with the few host landholders and you start to understand the duplicity of impacts. There are mental and financial strains being caused – but we are not done yet!

Declaration of Perceived Conflict of Interest

As an Osbourne, you need to be aware and declare a perceived conflict of interest in accordance with your department's policies on such matters. If you are not already aware, the Osbourne family have financial interests in the major wind farm on the opposing side of Lake George form Collector. This press release refers. [Operator of maligned wind farm is no fan of Joe Hockey.](#)

I have no information to suggest, you are in anyway connected with this Osbourne family but it is the perception that counts. Indeed, I may be as closely related to you as I am to this Osbourne family. I trust you understand the professional non personal nature of this issue. I am requesting that this correspondence be placed on that conflicts of interest file forthwith.

Objection

I am at a disadvantage in objecting to this amendment – because I haven't seen the documents. However just like the conflict mentioned above, lack of formal material/access to information should not be a bar to legitimate and strongly held concerns.

I and many in this community support renewable energy – distributed power production, solar with storage is welcome and within a few short years, these turbines if built, will only serve as a legacy to governments folly in poor planning and using subsidies to support nonviable endeavours.

To what extent does your department really still believe that coal fired power stations stop burning coal to heat water to drive their turbines, just because the wind starts blowing at Collector and some power is produced by these wind turbines?

These communities have been part of commissioning research by an international independent group Biospherica and Dr Joseph Wheatley, which studied the 5 minutes actual data in the NEM for 2014. Wind turbines are less than 78% effective in offsetting CO2 emissions and furthermore, the more turbines that are built, the lower the effectiveness becomes. The cost of this form of CO2 abatement, when properly measured, is unviable.

Ratch's proposed development is opposed by over 80% of the impacted community.

Ratch is in open conflict with the community and the Upper Lachlan Shire Council (over the administration of the proposed community fund).

Anger and resentment is high and building. RATCH's record of poor community consultation is continuing. RATCH is endeavouring through 'modification stealth' to effectively increase the scope of its wind farm by installing the largest turbine blades ever proposed for use in Australia. This is an unambiguous attempt by RATCH to significantly alter the scope and impact of the Collector Wind Farm well beyond the decision in December 2013 by the NSW Planning Assessment Commission to approve a reduced scheme of 63 turbines. The community was advised by just a few glib paragraphs in a community newsletter advising that it is lodging a project 'Modification Proposal' to the NSW Government. Sneaky not consultative.

We encouraged the Department to undertake de novo consideration of the Collector Wind Farm project given RATCH's proposal by to increase the length of the blades to 117 metres and the other proposed changes. No technical details of these new largest blades have been provided to the community, assessed or consulted upon. What are the 'flexibility characteristics of its noise signature and impact on inversion echoing (the Van den Berg effect)? What are the increased 'tip speed' impacts – on fauna (bats and birds), flicker and safety (including fire combined with flexibility characteristics)? Do they need this extra size to be viable with government subsidies? Will this viability issue be clear in their submission to you?

There are clear reasons for the NSW Planning Minister to take the Collector Wind Farm back to square one, and require a fresh application 'from the ground up'.

Kind Regards

Douglas Bucknell
0448111668