

**Anna Timbrell - Crookwell 3 App 10\_0034**

---

**From:** "Janine Hannan" <janinehannan@bigpond.com>  
**To:** <plan\_comments@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 16/01/2013 1:33 PM  
**Subject:** Crookwell 3 App 10\_0034

---

**SUBMISSION TO DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE CROOKWELL 3 APPLICATION 10-0034**

**Major Projects Assessment**

Dept of Planning and Infrastructure  
 Sydney

Att Anna Timbrell

We object to this development and the EA. We have previously submitted objections regarding Crookwell 2 and can only re-state these same objections and hope that they will at least be looked at.

Crookwell 2 is not a viable wind farm as of this date, so we wonder how Crookwell 3 will connect to the grid via the Crookwell 2 substation, since it has not been built yet and no work has been started apart from some cosmetics such as minor road works.

Union Fenosa's legal advisor, Mr Thomas Mitchell has tried to assure us that we will suffer no adverse health affects from noise or visual as our dwelling is more than 2 kms from the nearest proposed turbine. Over the years more evidence has come to light that non-host dwellings of up 5 and even 10 kms from a turbine has had adverse health effects on residents.

We have concerns about the photomontages presented by the proponent as actual depictions of the visual aspects. We had a meeting with the Department of Planning last year and expressed our concerns that they were not accurate. However, it seems little has changed.

The proponent has stated that there will be no adverse effects to the underground water table, but with upwards of 1000 tonnes of cement under each tower, that would seem inaccurate. Many properties in the Upper Lachlan Shire rely on bore water for potable drinking water for their homes and also livestock.

The noise impact statement is overly complicated and uses outdated methodology for measuring noise and infrasound, newer information suggests DBA measurements are not good enough to assess all levels of noise.

With regards to the EIS on fire fighting, it is stated that no aerial support will be given on or near wind farm properties. This is unacceptable in a high fire danger area. Just this last week, a fire broke out on a property near Bannister that is proposed to have turbines, and if this had happened there would have been many lives, homes and livestock in jeopardy. Will the Department of Planning, as the consent authority of the development, i.e. Crookwell 2 and 3, be liable for any losses incurred if fire occurs and losses of life, livestock and homes happens.

The same applies to crop dusting. Farmers are required to manage weed control and without aerial dusting, which will not be available if these wind farms go ahead, will be penalised by local Councils if weeds are not controlled.

Regarding property values. In Victoria, devaluation of non-host properties in close proximity to wind farms has led to some Councils reducing rates to those property owners.

Most rural properties are family owned and run and have been in the same family for many generations. These properties are sometimes the family's only asset and to be devalued by wind farms is a disgrace.

Lastly, wind energy is not cost-effective. Turbines cost in the region of \$400,000 each in annual subsidies. We are all paying more for our electricity due to these subsidies and considering that wind is only an intermittent

source of power at best and cannot be stored, it would seem ludicrous to approve this wind farm on that basis alone.

Yours Sincerely  
Mr Norman and Mrs Janine Hannan  
"Rosslyn"  
1477 Woodhouselee Road  
Roslyn 2580  
16th January 2013