

Our Ref: TGH:

6 March 2018

Mr Tim Stuckey
Planning Officer
Resource and Energy Assessments/Planning Services
NSW Government Department of Planning & Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001
BY EMAIL: tim.stuckey@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Tim

Re: Submission in relation to Modification 6 White Rock Wind Farm Stage 2

1. I wish to state my interest in this matter, I am the owner of the property "Sugarloaf" upon which Glen Innes Wind Power proposes to erect three turbines.
2. I have been provided with two submissions dated [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] objecting to Modification Number 4 for Glen Innes Windfarm (GIWF).
3. I note that others have also lodged objections to GIWF Modification 4. It is obvious that a number of those objections are orchestrated presumably by [REDACTED] as objections in similar terms to [REDACTED] objections have come from as far afield as Belgium.
4. Meanwhile [REDACTED] has an interest in White Rock Wind Farm (WRWF) and in particular [REDACTED] (together with other turbines). I object to the erection of those proposed turbines.
5. On a recent visit to Glen Innes I noted while driving south from Deepwater towards Glen Innes on the New England Highway that as one drives over a rise to the west of Glen Innes golf course, in the distance that part of the WRWF already erected was very obvious on the south western skyline for a distance of about a kilometre while travelling along the New England Highway. Thus WRWF was obvious from New England Highway at a distance of (estimated) 25 km.

In terms of overall visual impact assessment, what will be the effect of additional turbines in the WRWF development?

Is the visual impact in relation to those and other turbines including GIWF and

the proposed Sapphire development by virtue of severe numbers overwhelming, or will the combination of the turbines from all three developments form part of a total area devoted to the generation of renewable energy by wind power being an obvious but acceptable visual impact, confined within an area which I understand will include solar farms.?

6. If WRWF modification 6 is to proceed, I suggest that [REDACTED] be used as a template to determine whether Modification 6 is also to proceed.

My contention simply, is that if [REDACTED] objections to GIWF Mod 4 are to be considered, the considerations he raises should equally be applied to WRWF Mod 6.

7. It is my understanding that the Department accepts that there has been practical commencement of GIWF and accordingly a large part of his submission of 30 September 2017 is irrelevant.
8. In [REDACTED] submission of [REDACTED] paragraph [REDACTED] states "As per Green Bean Design (GBD) the Modification 4 request by GIWF seeks consent for :
- A hub height increase of 21 metres from 89m to 110m – a 24% increase.
 - A rotor diameter increase of 18 metres from 122m to 140m – a 15% increase.
 - A tip height increase of 30 metres from 150m to 180m – a 20% increase.
 - A sweep area increase of 3434 sq metres from 11960 sq metres to 15394 sq metres – a 32% increase.

[REDACTED] also criticises the visual impact report prepared by GBD.

9. Returning to the Visual Impact Assessment for WRWF stage 2 Modification 6 one finds that the Visual Impact Assessment dated November 2017, also prepared by GBD states at page 8 "Previously approved and largely constructed ancillary wind farm infrastructure would not result in a significant change in levels of visual impact from surrounding key receiver locations due to the changes involved, the low height of ancillary facilities and locations of these facilities that are often concealed by topography and vegetation screening."

At page 7 GBD states "This VIA has been prepared to assess the potential visual effect of the WRWF Stage 2 and includes for two potential wind turbine models with an increased wind turbine dimension as follows:

- Maximum blade tip height up to approximately 200 metres (150 metres for existing Project Approval)
- Wind turbine rotor diameter up to approximately 140 or 170 metres (100 metres for previous VIA)
- Wind turbine blade length up to approximately 85 metres and
- Hub height up to approximately 130 metres, but dependent on selected rotor diameter.

The above dimensions which GBD support should be compared with the dimensions referred to in [REDACTED] submission of the [REDACTED] 7 at paragraph 7.

The increases criticised in paragraph 7 of the [REDACTED] submission are considerably less than the increases recommended by GBD in its report of November 2017 on WRWF stage 2 at page 7 the benefits of which will ensure to [REDACTED] other WRWF landowners.

As a matter of consistency the Department of Planning and Environment should not permit the WRWF stage 2 to exceed any limit applied by the Department to Mod 4 requested by GIWF.

Yours sincerely

HARTMANN & ASSOCIATES

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. Hartmann', written over the company name.

Terry Hartmann

Enc.