

**SUBMISSION TO DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & INFRASTRUCTURE  
CROOKWELL 3 Application No. MP 10\_0034**

11 January 2012

**Grant Winberg**  
Personally of:-  
65 Darnley Street  
GORDON NSW 2072

AND  
As Director of  
Winberg Trading Co. Pty. Limited  
Suite 3902  
88 Phillip Street  
SYDNEY NSW 2000  
AND  
'Highland Park'  
3077 Middle Arm Road  
ROSLYN NSW 2580

**Major Projects Assessment**

Department of Planning & Infrastructure  
GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY NSW 2001  
Attention: Anna Timbrell

We have received from the Department of Planning & Infrastructure ('the DPI') our notification (dated 24 October 2012) of the exhibition of the Crookwell 3 Environmental Assessment ('the EA'), 'updated to reflect the Draft NSW Wind Farm Planning Guidelines'.

We object to the project, details of which are presented in the Environmental Assessment dated July 2012 prepared by Tract Consultants Pty Ltd on behalf of Crookwell Development Pty Ltd ABN 53 106 800 480 ('the Proponent'), which company acted on behalf of the following land owners in respect of the Major Project Application on 17 March 2010:-

- Donoghoe
- Rabjohns
- Blewitt

The Director-General's Key Assessment Requirements (in the approval issued 7 April 2010 and required to expire 7 April 2012 – curiously the EA wasn't drafted by the proponent's consultant until July 2012) are stated to include coverage of the following key issues:-

- Strategic justification
- Visual Impacts
- Noise Impacts
- Flora & Fauna
- Indigenous Heritage
- Traffic & Transport
- Hazards/Risks
- Water Supply and Waterways
- General Environmental Risk Analysis

Readers of the EA would have to assume that the DPI has reviewed the EA for compliance with these requirements, including in terms of content and accuracy.

For individuals, without the training or financial means to match consultant with consultant, it is a daunting task for us to dissect it and prepare a technical critique.

This submission objecting to the project is not intended to be critical in itself of the proponent's consultants, AECOM Australia Pty Ltd, Anderson Environmental Consultants Pty Ltd, Aviation Projects Pty Ltd, Coffey Geotechnics Pty Ltd, Futureeye Pty Ltd, Garrad Hassan Pacific Pty Ltd, Green Bean Design Pty Ltd, SLR Consulting Pty Ltd and URS Australia Pty Ltd. However, in just a cursory reading of the multitude of EA documents, inaccuracies are evident.

For example, the inaccurate diagrammatic representations in the EA (eg in the Appendix 11 Telecommunications Impact Assessment, our house is depicted as being in the middle of Middle Arm Road, much further away from the turbines than in reality – and all other residences are equally misplaced ). This inaccuracy, purposeful or otherwise, throughout, will go untested by any local government or state government or authority.

Further impact admitted by the consultants - it is clearly stated in Appendix 11 that our digital television and mobile phone (we have no landline) reception will be adversely impacted, as many others are shown to be.

And for example, the EA argues away any serious visual impact and yet the relevant consultant says "...The Crookwell 3 East site would have a potential High or Moderate to High visual impact on 19 residential view locations within the Crookwell 3 wind farm 5km viewshed, and that the South site would have a potential High or Moderate to High visual impact on 10 residential view locations within the Crookwell 3 wind farm 5km viewshed...".

The wind turbines, according to the EA on exhibition, will top out at 152 m. I have temporarily come out of retirement and have an office in the Sydney CBD located on the 39th floor on a ridge (Phillip Street) looking west down onto George Street. But this is a major city. The proposed Crookwell 3 East turbines on the ridge overlooking our house, from a greater height than does my skyscraper office, will have a totally devastating visual impact.

The veracity of some of the consultants' conclusions has to be questioned with comments like "...The report concluded that there are adequate ground-based fire-fighting methods available..." to compensate for the reduced likelihood of aerial bushfire fighting. Even the current headlines bark of State Government funding reduction for the RFS (are there any other ground-based fire-fighting methods available?). One would have to expect that the local RFS members will not put themselves unreasonably in danger without surety of aerial support being available.

Using the EA figures, our house (104) is 2.6 km from the Crookwell 3 East wind turbines. Victoria has legislated against turbines being constructed within 2 km of residences and the Draft NSW Wind Farm Planning Guidelines comment similarly. This would be for good reason. Our neighbours, and many other non-host families, are within that 2 km. We have read enough to know that 2 km is a minimum and at 2.6 km we will be at significant risk to our health.

We have in the past been given assurances by the proponent's representatives that it was unlikely that we would ever hear the wind turbines and have recently unsuccessfully requested confirmation of that previous assurance. But whether they do or do not, we are now amply aware of the risk to our health from inaudible sound and pressure from the turbines.

The wind turbines, according to the EA on exhibition, will top out at 152 m. I am semi retired but have an office in the Sydney CBD located on the 39th floor on a ridge (Phillip Street) looking west down onto George Street. But this is a major city. The proposed Crookwell 3 East turbines on the ridge overlooking our house from a greater height than does my skyscraper office, like all of those proposed at Gullen Range etc, etc, will have a totally devastating visual impact.

And the EA talks of the cumulative impacts of Crookwell 1, 2 & 3. I have seen diagrammatic illustrations of additional wind farms to our north. Then there is Golspie, and Taralga, etc – not to forget those to the further south and west of Crookwell. Let us consider the cumulative effect of not 100 wind turbines, but 1,000 or more wind turbines.

Our objection to the project is therefore based on measurement against the Director-General's Key Assessment Requirements ('KA R'):-

- Strategic justification – there is none
- Visual Impacts – 'Moderate to High visual impact'
- Noise Impacts – contentious issue analogous to the decades of denial regarding asbestos
- Flora & Fauna – a quick google of this issue would convince any reasonable person of the impact of wind turbines on birdlife in particular
- Indigenous Heritage – the media has presented on the inadequate approach to this issue
- Traffic & Transport – the proponent has confirmed that all turbines will be imported and transported from the coast to Goulburn and then along the Crookwell/Goulburn Road where there are no passing lanes. Similarly Woodhouselee Road. An issue for the local Council, RTA or other institutions to resolve.
- Hazards/Risks – Health (sound, pressure, etc. etc), Fire fighting, Additional aerial site connecting wires,
- Water Supply and Waterways – the DPI to assess and be accountable
- General Environmental Risk Analysis – the DPI to assess and be accountable

Grant Winberg

Residence:- 3077 Middle Arm Road, ROSLYN NSW 2580

Postal:- 3902, 88 Phillips Street, SYDNEY NSW 2000

Email:- grantw@roslyn.com.au

Mobile:- 0419290850