

Neville Osborne

From: Bernadette O'Neil <bernieoneil01@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, 20 November 2015 4:42 PM
To: Neville Osborne
Subject: Fwd: Objection to Ratch Modification Application for Proposed Collector Windfarm

Bernadette O'Neil

22 Church Street

COLLECTOR NSW 2581

Mr Mike Young

Department of Planning and Environment

22-33 Bridge Street

SYDNEY NSW 2065

**Objection to Ratch Modification Proposal for Proposed Collector Windfarm. Your ref:
Application 10_0156**

Dear Mr Young,

I write to object to the Ratch Modification Proposal lodged with you on 20 September 2015. My objections are

Inadequate time for consideration of the Modification Proposal

The Collector community did not receive a hard copy of this document (some 500 pages long) until the end of the exhibition period.

Following protests from the Collector community, your Department arranged for an extension of the time for comments/objections to be lodged via this email address by this Friday 20th November. This did not allow enough time for community consideration.

Inadequate Community Consultation

The Collector community has noted that Ratch's Community Forum is made up of a small group of local individuals who do not represent any of the nine local organisations (with one exception) or consult with the community to represent a broader range of views. The Forum has been operating as a public relations body to manage the politics of Ratch with Government stakeholders. I have had extensive experience in these sorts of processes at NSW and Commonwealth levels and this process really does not have the hallmarks of genuine community engagement. Many members of the community, including me, are offended by the claims that this should even be considered as community consultation.

Based on this Ratch's consultation claims in its Modification Report and the original EA are not acceptable and should be referred to the PAC for consideration.

Damage to the Cullerin Escarpment

The Modification Report argues for an abandonment of the vegetation offset of hectare –based clearance limits approved by the PAC to be replaced by a "*Biobanking Assessment methodology*". This is due to the increased clearing of vegetation that will be required for the increases in roads, electrical cabling and project facilities as proposed in the Modification Report making the PAC model less suitable from a "management" perspective.

From this it appears Ratch wants a model which will allow them more flexibility to do what they please to the site while having offsets elsewhere. This would appear to be driven by cost cutting motives rather than looking after the site's environment as should be required by this process. This would benefit from independent examination by the PAC.

Conclusion

The Ratch Modification Report has a number of serious deficiencies and unresolved issues. In particular it is clear that the proponent is trying to circumvent the responsibilities of the conditions of consent set by the PAC in December 2013. Therefore the Report needs to be referred back to the PAC for re-assessment.

Yours sincerely,

Bernadette O'Neil

20 November 2015

0411885548