

Flyers Creek wind farm, Modification 4

The Department of Planning needs to enforce its policies.

On Page 1 of the Wind Energy Guideline (December 2016) we are advised:
the NSW Government's intention is that this Guideline becomes the key reference document for decision-making on SSD wind energy development in NSW.

Later, on Page 4, we are advised that *The Guideline also applies to applications for modification to an existing wind farm approval*

In Flyers Creek wind farm, Modification 4,

Where is the evidence of community consultation? Distributing a newsletter (Appendix L of the EIS) which left out the key change, swept area increase, in the same month you plan to submit this modification can in no way be defined as consultation?

Where is the evidence that Infigen's actions *facilitate meaningful, respectful and effective community and stakeholder engagement across the development assessment process, from pre-lodgement to post-approval?*

Where in the EIS are the *details of community consultation undertaken, including any steps taken to check that the views and input of potentially affected people and groups have been faithfully and accurately captured and considered, and / or explain how their views and inputs have been taken into account?*

Where in this modification, or indeed in the history of the project, is there evidence that *supports the consent authority in making a decision that balances the broad range of social, environmental and economic considerations applying to each project? The decision-maker is also required to consider the public interest.*

Where is the evidence of *benefit sharing*, especially with those residents within 2 kms of a turbine who will be impacted much more severely by turbines with a swept area increase of 56%?

Where is the evidence that the Department has applied, for any wind farm, and for this one in particular, *consistent implementation of best practice assessment techniques to ensure wind energy projects are appropriately designed and sited?*

Where is the *description of the measures that will be used to avoid, minimise, mitigate or otherwise manage impacts associated with the project?* If Crudine Ridge was the benchmark and 23 or more unassociated residences remain within 2 kms of a Flyers Creek turbine, where is the consideration of voluntary acquisition, particularly in light of the massive increase in swept area?

Where is *the analysis of the project against the performance objectives as well as photomontages showing the impacts at highly affected dwellings?*

Where is the evidence available since the original EIS, for instance the findings of the recent AAT Waubra decision, provided in this modification EIS that would assist the assessor to *continue to monitor contemporary scientific research outcomes to ensure its position reflects robust evidence on any health effects?*

Where is the evidence that the proponent has *considered existing dwelling entitlements on land within the vicinity of the wind energy project*, a requirement confirmed by Secretary McNally?

I have highlighted but a few of the considerations raised in the Guidelines, none being adequately addressed if at all.

It is imperative that this modification is assessed as broadly as possible under the 2016 Guidelines, as the original project was assessed by a department at the height of its disrespect for rural communities.

In response, the department will probably give us an answer we have heard before:

“It’s only a guideline”