

Objection to Proposed Modification to Flyers Creek Wind Farm

I object to the modification proposed for the Flyers Creek wind farm.

I was actively involved in the community objection to the proposed Jupiter wind farm, so I am familiar with the windfarm assessment process. The Jupiter proposal was withdrawn, largely due to the sustained and well justified objections to it by the local community.

The current process for assessing wind farm proposals in New South Wales has many procedural faults and is unfair to local communities. One of the unfair aspects is the ability of the developers to seek substantial modifications to a proposal after it has received approval but prior to its construction.

This is the case for the Flyers Creek wind farm proposal.

The wind farm was approved in March 2014. The local community has endured uncertainty and disruption of for several years prior to that and yet the wind farm has still not been constructed and is seeking further modifications. Three modifications have already been approved.

The proposed modification will significantly change the project by:

- increase turbine height from 150m to 160m
- increase blade length from 56m to 70m
- increase swept area by 56%
- increase av turbine power from 3.0MW to 4.2MW (40%)
- provide a different connection to the grid than originally approved.

Affected members of the local community are continually faced with uncertainty in the peaceful enjoyment of their properties.

There should be no change to an approval in terms increasing the number of wind turbines, the height of the towers or the length of turbine blades.

In addition, developers should have a fixed period from the date of approval in which to construct the wind farm. I would suggest that four years would be generous. No further construction should be allowed after the four year time limit. Modifications should be limited to minor technical amendments.

The ongoing increase to the scope of the project further reduces the amenity of the local community and provides a windfall benefit to the developer. The Department should not be a party to such behaviour.

