Seite	1
-------	---

From:	Nicholas Rowe <nrowe2088@gmail.com></nrowe2088@gmail.com>
То:	"plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au" <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au></plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date:	6/02/2013 9:02 pm
Subject:	Crookwell 3 Windfarm MP10_0034

Dear Sir/Madam

We are landowners in Woodhouselee and as such write to object to the proposed wind farm known as Crookwell 3.

We farm our land, principally supplying major supermarkets with fat lambs and sell fine wool into the Sydney auction market. We also work closely with the Nepean CMA in a long term programme to regenerate native timber and woodland across our farm to both rebuild the native flora and provide improved habitat for native fauna, especially bird life.

We have taken the opportunity to review the submission placed on exhibition in the Department of Planning in Bridge Street Sydney. We object to the proposal to erect thirty turbines as Crookwell 3.

The area around Crookwell extending toward the west and toward Canberra has a very high level of actual and planned wind farms. Each windfarm has been separately assessed and the lack of any broader overall plan will result in a patchwork of separate wind farms covering much of the area and horizon with significant environmental and visual impact. These are industrial installations of close to 500 feet at blade tip, equivalent to higher than a thirty storey building and typically topped with airtraffic navigation lights. In essence, the turbines amount to industrial development imposed on a rural economy with little consideration of overall environmental impact.

With the proposed Crookwell 3, there likely is adverse impact on birdlife with the building of so many turbines in such close proximity. The area is home to a wide and varied bird population, especially parrots, and this is increasing as we and many other local landowners work with CMA to improve native vegetation.

What appears to be happening is effectively a "land grab" to gain approval for wind farms. Once approval is achieved the concession holder then appears to seek to increase the value of their "option" through extension of turbines or upsizing of individual turbine installed capacity.

Crookwell 2, approved some seven or eight years ago remains unbuilt, though subsequently it has been extended and individual towers revised such that the planned turbines are now both higher and more powerful. Subsequent guidelines as to siting turbines at least two kilometres from residential housing have been ignored despite the planned upgrades.

We would like to think that you will exercise your discretion to see that further industrial development through Crookwell 3 is curtailed.

Yours faithfully

Nicholas Rowe Pejar Park Wayo NSW

Sent from my iPad