



ABN 81 011 241 552

Upper Lachlan Shire Council

All correspondence addressed to the General Manager, PO Box 42, Gunning NSW 2581

Crookwell Office: 44 Spring Street, Crookwell NSW 2583

p: 02 4830 1000 | f: 02 4832 2066 | e: council@upperlachlan.nsw.gov.au | www.upperlachlan.local-e.nsw.gov.au

Gunning Office: 123 Yass Street, Gunning NSW 2581

p: 02 4845 4100 | f: 02 4845 1426 | e: council@upperlachlan.nsw.gov.au

Taralga Office: Taralga Community Service Centre, Orchard Street, Taralga NSW 2580

p: 02 4840 2099 | f: 4840 2296 | e: taralgacsc@ceinternet.com.au

Our Ref: F12/51

Your Ref: SSD 6693

1 July 2014

Resource Assessment
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Diana Charteris

Dear Madam

RE: RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS – RYE PARK WIND FARM – (SSD 6693)

Reference is made to the invitation to provide a written submission to the Rye Park Wind Farm proposal – Response to Submissions further to Council's original submissions dated 1 July 2014.

The proponent has stated that approximately 25 turbines are proposed within Upper Lachlan Shire Council (ULSC), 11 for Yass Valley Council (YVC) and 73 for Boorowa Council (BC). Council still holds concerns as the reliability of this statement by the proponent, given that the proponent cannot guarantee the location of 6 turbines in either ULSC LGA or YVC LGA.

In accordance with the provisions of the Director General's Requirements (for the original EIS) the proponent is required to consider any relevant statutory provisions, including any relevant development control plans. The proponent's response to this requirement and subsequent response in the RTS are considered inadequate with the statement *"As the project is SSD, the DCP does not apply to it. Nevertheless, consideration of the requirements of the DCP is set out in Section 6.1.10 of the EIS"*.

The following is a summary of Council's interpretation of the proponent's lack of response in the RTS to Clause 9.5 Wind Farm of the Upper Lachlan Development Control Plan 2010:

- **Turbines shall not be located within 2.0 kilometres of any dwelling not associated with the development or from any lot upon which a dwelling may be constructed. The 2.0 kilometre setback proposes utilising a precautionary principle in addressing perceived visual and health concerns;**

The proponent had originally stated that consistent with corporate requirement set out In Epuron's Community Consultation Framework and in consideration of the Draft NSW Wind Farm Planning guidelines that they have focused their efforts on the

uninvolved landowners identified to have a dwelling within 2km of a proposed wind turbine.

Under Clause 7.2.2.3 (page 116 of the EIS) the proponent has stated that there are **22 uninvolved** landowner dwellings that have been identified as being located within 2km of a proposed turbine.

There are **26 involved** landowners what have been identified as having a dwelling within 2km of a proposed wind turbine.

There are also **66 uninvolved** landowners that have been identified to have a property but no dwelling within 2km of a proposed turbine.

To date, the proponent has again failed to indicate if agreements between the 22 uninvolved landowners that have existing dwellings located within 2km of a proposed turbine have agreed to the proposed placement in accordance with the Draft NSW Wind Farm Planning guidelines. Until such verification is provided:

Council strongly recommends that turbines within 2km of an existing dwelling shall be deleted.

TRANSPORT AND ACCESS

In Section 4.1 the proponent advises that he wishes to discontinue his proposal to use the urban streets of Yass as a route for Overmass and Overdimension vehicles and redirect that traffic to the route through Boorowa.

Whilst this has not been stated, the proponent also intends to divert some of that traffic to the site via Jerrawa Rd and Coolalie Rds. As Coolalie Rd has significant accident history (there is one identified "Blackspot along the road) and the pavement of Jerrawa Rd is showing significant signs of distress, ULSC requires both roads to be reconstructed and sealed before they can be used to access the project by any vehicles.

It should also be noted that there is a causeway on Coolalie Rd will be almost impossible to cross with transporters carrying 63m turbine blades. This causeway must be replaced with culverts.

General comments made by the proponent in the response indicate that they are seeking to delay making a commitment to upgrade roads that obviously will be used by any type of traffic that might be involved with the development.

ULSC considers that this approach is unacceptable as all types of traffic associated with the development have the potential to damage the fragile pavements in the area and

compromise the safety of the existing road users. It is quite clear that there will be a desire by the developer's contractors, staff, and subcontractors to use the entire ULSC road network in the general area of the project.

This will lead to a significant compromising of the safety of the community and significant damage to the communities' road assets. ULSC has had experience with this issue in the past which indicates that failure to deal with this issue by including it in the final consent will lead community unrest, the community being suspicious of the developer and his contractors and unnecessarily consuming time in compliance activities.

To deal with issue, ULSC requires that the following roads be reconstructed and sealed to the sealed road standard mentioned in response:

- i) Jerrawa Rd from the Hume Highway to Coolalie Rd.
- ii) Coolalie Rd from its intersection with Jerrawa Rd to the ULSC/Yass Shire Boundary.
- iii) Cooks Hill Rd from ULSC/Yass Shire Boundary to its intersection with Rye Park/Dalton Rd.
- iv) Blakney Creek Rd from Cooks Hill Rd to Access Point 13.
- v) Rye Park/Dalton Rd from Blakney Creek Rd to the ULSC/Boorowa Shire boundary.
- vi) Maryvale Rd from the ULSC /Boorowa Shire boundary to Access Point 3.

The proponent has stated that the intersection of Hume Highway and Jerrawa Rd is suitable for use by over mass and over dimension vehicles.

Whilst this situation is regulated by RMS, it is Council's experience with a similar intersection on the Hume Highway that (due to a lack of storage space in the Hume Highway median) right hand turns are not permissible for long vehicles. ULSC considers that that the proponent must obtain further, more specific advice from RMS in this regard.

Whilst the proponent has detailed route selections for Overmass and Overdimension traffic, the routes and plans to deal with general heavy traffic have not been dealt with at all.

Overdimension and Overmass traffic is more carefully controlled with permits and escort vehicles which carefully control the likelihood of pavement damage and collisions with other road users. Overmass and Overdimension vehicles also carry a smaller total tonnage of freight and make much fewer trips than general heavy vehicles. Unfortunately, the response fails to address the most significant issue in terms of pavement damage and road safety which is the impact of all heavy vehicle traffic.

There is little mention in the response documents in regard to heavy haulage of materials – i.e. the delivery of road base, concrete aggregates, sealing aggregates, sand, electrical cable, transmission poles and water etc.

ULSC considers that the routes to be used in the transport of these materials are identifiable now and that the proponent must finalise the Transport Management Plan for inclusion in the final consent that will be issued for the work.

There are a number of errors in Section 5.1 of the response documents – these are detailed as follows:

- a) There is conflict between Table 5.1 and the text of Section 5.1 regarding the definition of a trip. The view of ULSC is that a trip is the journey undertaken by a vehicle when travelling either to or from the site i.e. one delivery to the site consists of two trips. This means that the heavy vehicle trips involved in the project are 152 per day (not 76 as stated in the text) and light vehicle movements are 400 per day (not 200 as stated in the text) the description of the locations of these statements is difficult to describe as the pages are not numbered in Appendix E.
- b) In Section 5.1 the mass of vehicles delivering roads base, sand and aggregate is stated as being 32 tonnes with a description and photograph of the vehicle being provided in Table 5.1. The mass of the vehicle is stated incorrectly as the 32 tonnes stated is the payload of the vehicle and not the gross mass of it. The correct mass of the loaded vehicle should be stated as approximately 51 tonnes. This amount is 19 tonnes (approximately 60 percent) higher than stated.
- c) In Table 5.1 there is a description of a water tanker that is described as a 20t water tanker, this description is inconsistent with the illustration (the tanker illustrated will have a Gross Vehicle Mass of 14.5 tonnes with a payload of approximately 8 tonnes). This will have the effect of almost doubling the amount of traffic that will be generated by the cartage of the specified amount of water for the project.

The proponent has failed to provide information regarding the source of water for both dust suppression and concrete manufacture. ULSC has experienced significant

difficulty when sourcing water for road maintenance activities in the area. This is exacerbated during hot, dry periods during summer and autumn. As the project will proceed through almost two full sets of seasons, it is expected that this issue will become significant and must be resolved by the applicant.

For any further information or clarification please contact Council during office hours.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dodson', written in a cursive style.

Tina Dodson

Director Environment and Planning

For

JK Bell

General Manager

Upper Lachlan Shire Council