

**John L. Hegarty**

Solicitor

Unit 1003 "Highgate"

127 Kent Street

Millers Point, NSW 2001

M: 0468 649 809

---

20 November 2015

Neville Osborne  
Department of Planning & Infrastructure

Email: [neville.osborne@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:neville.osborne@planning.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Mr Osborne,

**COLLECTOR WIND FARM  
RATCH MODIFICATION PROPOSAL OF 20 SEPTEMBER 2015 (MODIFICATION  
PROPOSAL)**

I understand that you are the person to whom objections to the current Modification Proposal on behalf of Ratch to vary the existing consent to its proposed wind turbine estate at Collector should be directed.

Accordingly, I advise that I object to the Modification Proposal on a number of grounds, as follows:

1. Failure on behalf of Ratch to engage with the Collector community. This has been a recurring problem with Ratch and the Collector wind farm proposal.

Notwithstanding that this point was powerfully made at the original PAC hearing, Ratch has apparently learned nothing and still refuses to engage in a collaborative manner with the Collector community. Its conduct in this regard is high-handed and dismissive and one could well suspect that Ratch knows in advance that whatever proposal it puts up is going to be approved by the Department. I sincerely hope that this is not the case.

2. Opportunistic timeframe for community review. This objection is a variation of, or further example of, the above.

The documentation here is some 500 pages long. It does contain a mass of material from the previous documentation which apparently has no real purpose other than to bulk up the document and discourage people from reading it.

The document was not made available in Collector until last Friday, the schedule closing date of its public exhibition. After protests from interested parties, the Department apparently arranged for an extension of the time, but only for a further 7 days.

On any view of things, this is unsatisfactory.

3. Failure to consider the effect of the larger blades.

It is my understanding that, apart from anything else, the Modification Proposal involves a significant increase in the size of the turbine blades. One does not need to be a technical expert to conclude that this must have consequences of significance in a number of areas. There has been no proper consideration of this aspect of the matter. They should be referred to an independent expert for his opinion and a report to the Department.

I am not a resident of Collector. However, I do have a friend who has a property there and I have spent many weekends and other times at this property which is immediately adjoining the site of the proposed turbines. I would have thought that it was incumbent upon the Department if it is to properly discharge its duties and to be fair and even-handed to ensure that any modification to the existing proposal is properly scrutinised and this certainly does not appear to be what is happening in relation to the Modification Proposal. I accordingly press my objections.

Sincerely,



John Hegarty  
email: [jhegarty@bartier.com.au](mailto:jhegarty@bartier.com.au)