



NEWS

Wind farm substation "four times larger than approved"



A 330kV substation on the Gullen Range wind farm, proposed to cover 7.5 acres, had finished up at about 25 acres.

This claim was put before the Planning Assessment Commission sitting at Crookwell last week by nearby Bannister resident Mr. Charlie Barber.

"It was 30,000 square metres, and now it's over 100,000.

I would consider that to be a significant modification," Mr. Barber said, in a lengthy presentation to the sitting, which is considering whether the wind farm should be required to rectify factors in the final construction which differed from the original approved development.

The enlargement of the substation was one of Mr. Barber's principal complaints.

He told the Commission: "My point is that this constitutes a de facto modification from the original DA.

"No-one I know envisioned that the substation would be this

imposing, this confronting and this overwhelming."

Mr. Barber said the original recommendation from the State Government had been that there was no problem for him as the substation is about 1.3 kms from his residence.

"However, the substation is only approximately 400 metres from my back boundary. Who are they trying to kid?

"The greatness of the land is gone. Hundreds of square kilometres have been converted to an industrial site. That's a fact.

"And the dream of my property has effectively ended.

"It is the presence of the substation that I, the visitors to my property and prospective purchasers find disagreeable and unpleasant.

"There is no way that such an installation can be screened."

Mr. Barber added that he was the only resident who could complain about the substation – all the others had received some type

of remuneration for the "imposition and inconvenience" – he had not.

On the offer to provide trees to screen his residence, Mr. Barber responded: 'Hilarious. And it's cheap for them to throw a few trees at me. Expensive for me who has lost hundreds of thousands of dollars.'

Mr. Barber was also critical of the limitations placed on the Commission, and that there was no Government representative called to explain why only nine turbines were deemed to be outside the parameters of the original development application.

"Sixty turbines seem to have been taken off the table. Why? How? By whose authority?

"If an altered turbine layout was of such supreme importance, why didn't the proponent apply for a modification in the first place?"