

NOT IN MY BACK YARD, NOR MY FRONT YARD EITHER

When reading the Jupiter EIS, one only needs to afford the Executive Summary a cursory glance in order to determine that the EIS is a victim of ineffective consultation. Closer inspection and analysis with other surveys completed by the same consultants reveals that the EIS executive summary (as do the majority of EIS annexes) consists of a number of “motherhood” statements that are plagiarised from one EIS to another, resulting in less and less relevance to the actual project area.

Take for example, the following text from the Executive Summary:

“Farm land within the PA is predominantly used for commercial grazing with isolated lots used for personal cropping.” Also, “A number of other protected National Parks and Nature Reserves are also located within approximately 3-5 km from the PA.”

Using the EIS’S boundary of 3-5 Km as a reference point:

There are at least **250 RESIDENCES** that reside within this 3-5 Km boundary of the proposed development, along with at least four private airstrips, a number of school bus routes, and the village of Tarago itself. This is hardly what a reasonable person would expect to find in an area that was **“predominantly used for commercial grazing with isolated lots used for personal cropping”**

The Queanbeyan/Palerang Council have placed on record their assessment of the project area as **Rural/Residential**.

In the “Draft Palerang Rural Lands Strategy 2016-2036”, Rural Residential land is describes as having (but not limited to) the following possible features:

- Estate style development;
- Boutique agriculture;
- Lots no more than 15 minutes from local shops and a public primary school;
- Local community infrastructure such as a community hall, playground, tennis courts and skate parks are within a short car drive/bike ride or reasonable walking distance;
- The land is class 4 or 5 agricultural land;
- Sustainable ground water supply which may be used for residential purposes;
- Tourism land uses that involves low traffic volumes;
- Lots which would contain structures are not on a visually prominent ridge.

Might I add that nowhere in its description of Rural Residential characteristics does QPRC describe:

- Large (180m), visually intrusive moving structures;
- Large (180m), noisy intrusive moving structures

Moreover, QPRC is at pains to ensure that lots within a rural/residential area **should not contain structures that are visually prominent**.

The suggestion that an industrial complex the size and style that is proposed is suitable for this project area is absurd. 88 turbines the height of Centre-point tower, each spinning 3 blades the length of a jumbo jet in no way conforms to the definition of the rural/residential nature of the project area. No amount of micro-siting or turbine modification or deletion will change this (unless the deletion is 100%).

This proposal is totally unsuitable for the project area and must be denied, given the number of significantly negatively impacted residents. The Department of Planning and Environment has both a moral and civic duty to protect the residents, despite the risk of possible criticism from a fanatical but vocal minority.