

## **TILT Renewables lack of community information and transparency**

John McGrath  
"Yowerweena"  
Black Range Road  
Yass NSW 2582  
Ph. 0408268173

[kiamba1953@gmail.com](mailto:kiamba1953@gmail.com)

3<sup>rd</sup> June 2020

I object to SSD 6693 Mod 1 on the fact that **from the very start of this project TILT Renewables have lacked community information and general transparency,** on Rye Park wind farm.

I will cite my objections in 1 submission whilst it could easily extend to at least 2 submissions.

TILT Renewables claim community consultation, yet when I attended an information day on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2020 hosted by the Rye Park Action Group, at Rye Park so many people came in "off the street" that knew so very little about this project that alone where they aware of the Rye Park wind farm Mod. 1 being on exhibition.

Many were immediately distressed when delivered factual information on Rye Park wind farm and its proponent TILT Renewables, that alone how to go about delivering a submission with their thoughts on Mod 1 SSD 6693.

Rye Park Action Group is a group I assist whenever I can to assisting them in informing the affected community of what the likely outcomes for the Rye Park and broader community from this project.

Therefore item 1 real lack of community engagement and information dissemination by TILT Renewables of the Rye Park and Boorowa communities. Whilst TILT Renewables ran a series of **inadequately advertised** "Information Days" 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> November 2019 were TILT Renewables promoted everything about wind farms as "rosy" which is a fact far from the truth, as the detrimental affects associated with wind farms are known to be numerous and well documented and the broader thinking community can see why these installations are of little benefit to the members of the community that are heavily taxed via their electrical power bills to subsidise an ineffectual intermittent generation source.

Item 2, and here I cite only 1 incidence of lack of information delivery to the broader community I have a relation who has been involved with the Rye Park district for much of his life and owned substantial rural property there for much of that time.

We have crossed paths at 2 recent family related funerals and there in conversation I asked my relation "What he knew of the Rye Park wind farm?" Quick response was "Won't affect me" to which I responded "Where your property is, is were the largest cluster of now proposed 200-meter towers is to be erected above"

"Now you have me worried" was his reply.

**To send the message to the NSW Department of Planning Environment and Industries, my relation's property is surrounded by hosts for Rye Park wind farm, whereas the hosts are in regular written/electronic, verbal and face to face contact with TILT Renewables with the close of the exhibition for Mod 1 SSD 6693 hours away he is yet to tobe contacted by TILT Renewables.**

**This approach by the proponent TILT Renewables who claim community engagement and transparency is a trend too often followed during the development of these projects.**

Regards John McGrath



## Visual Impact

John McGrath  
"Yowerweena"  
Black Range Road  
Yass NSW 2582  
Ph. 0408268173  
[kiamba1953@gmail.com](mailto:kiamba1953@gmail.com)

---

3<sup>rd</sup> June 2020

Too whom it may concern

I wish to submit an objection against Mod 1 SSD 6693 and future construction of Rye Park wind farm for the following reason.

On the grounds of massively increased Visual Impact, by both increasing the tip height to 200 meters of wind towers and increase of 43 meters and increasing the footprint of the Rye Park wind farm to almost double its size so many more of the community, many unsuspecting community still in so many cases due to TILT Renewables total lack of proper community consultation.

Overall, the Visual Impact will be 27% greater not less as seems to be indicated by the Rye Park wind farm proponent TILT Renewables.

Reading the section of TILT Renewables attached where is the fairness in waiting until five years after construction commences for an affected, non-associated residence's occupants within 4 kilometres of any tower to make a request for assistance from the developer?

When its blatantly obvious that the proponents for Rye Park wind farm TILT Renewables expect to have complaints and are offering visual impact mitigation measures including vegetation screening.

I challenge the proponents for Rye Park wind farm TILT Renewables to find an instant tree, that alone a line of trees of such magnitude that screens towers 60 stories in height. Calculation on nearly 60 stories high with support towers, which can now be up to 100 meters, or nearly 30 stories high from base to nacelle. With then a tip height of 200 meters.

Visual Impact implicated by a project such as Rye Park wind farm "beggars' belief?"

Regards

John McGrath

With TILT Renewables citing visual impact mitigation below:

### **Condition 3**

visual

(Visual impact mitigation)

For a period of 5 years from the commencement of construction, the owner of any non-associated residence within 4 km of any wind turbine may ask the Applicant to implement visual impact mitigation measures on their land to minimise the visual impacts of the development on their residence (including its curtilage).

Upon receiving such a written request from the owner of these residences, the Applicant must implement appropriate mitigation measures (such as landscaping and vegetation screening) in consultation with the owner.

These mitigation measures must be reasonable and feasible, aimed at reducing the visibility of the wind turbines from the residence and its curtilage, and commensurate with the level of visual impact on the residence.

All mitigation measures must be implemented within 12 months of receiving the written request, unless the Secretary agrees otherwise.

If the Applicant and the owner cannot agree on the measures to be implemented, or there is a dispute about the implementation of these measures, then either party may refer the matter to the Secretary for resolution.

*Notes:*

- *To avoid any doubt, mitigation measures are not required to be implemented to reduce the visibility of wind turbines from any other locations on the property other than the residence and its curtilage.*

- *The identification of appropriate visual impact mitigation measures will be more effective following the construction of the wind turbines. While owners may ask for the implementation of visual impact mitigation measures shortly after the commencement of construction, they should consider the merits of delaying this request until the relevant wind turbines are visible from their residence.*

*The Modified Project will not impact the ability to*

Towers can now be up to 100 meters, or nearly 30 stories high from base to nacelle. T

## **Water Usage and footing size upgrades.**

John McGrath  
"Yowerweena"  
Black Range Road  
Yass NSW 2582  
Ph. 0408268173  
[kiamba1953@gmail.com](mailto:kiamba1953@gmail.com)

---

3<sup>rd</sup> June 2020

I wish to submit an objection against Mod 1 SSD 6693 and future construction by TILT Renewables of Rye Park wind farm for the following reason:

### **Calculated water usage, and no known source of water supply and footing information by TILT Renewables**

I asked TILT Renewables the following question regarding the increase in concrete and reinforcement need to upsize the footings need for a 157M tipped tower to that of a 200M tipped tower as one of many I submitted to them in writing

#### **11. What is the increase in amount of concrete and reo needed to build obviously much larger footings for a 200-meter tower from a 157-meter tower?**

The variance of each hardstand footprint depends on the surrounding topography and subsequent earthworks required. However, on average the design optimisation process has used the following assumptions.

157m tip height turbine (assumes 350m<sup>3</sup> foundation) – 1722 tonnes of dry material (aggregate, sand, cement)

200m tip height turbines (assumes 800m<sup>3</sup> foundation) – 1756 tonnes of dry material (aggregate, sand, cement)

You will see here for yourself that TILT Renewables expect to upsize footings in cubic meters from 350M<sup>3</sup> for their 157M tipped tower to 800m<sup>3</sup> for their 200M tipped tower yet they have only allowed and increase of 34 tonnes of dry material for an extra 450m<sup>3</sup> I wonder what sort of calculator TILT Renewables "number crunchers" are using.

34 tonnes extra for 450m<sup>3</sup> of concrete whereas they quote 1722 tonnes for the first 350M<sup>3</sup>?

Massive discrepancy?

## Calculated water usage

I have done some research and calculations see below on wind farm wind tower footings.

I will concentrate here on water need to construct a footing highlighted.

At a minimum just for water to batch concrete on a conservative estimate if multiplying 80 footings by 118 tonnes of water, conservatively 9,440 tonnes of water for batching concrete for footings only.

No water allowance for dust suppression, machine wash down etc.

**Letting the DPIE know, at this date TILT Renewables are anticipating construction of a \$700M project in Rye Park wind farm and they do not know where they are sourcing water from.**

Footings data for 1 X 200 metre tipped wind tower

Base 21 meters diameter, excavation 25 metres wide 3.7 meters deep.

Each footing requires 590 cubic metres of concrete equals 100 truckloads-concrete batched on site.

Water required 200 litres per cubic meter of concrete equals 118 tonnes of water per footing.

57 tonnes of reinforcement per footing

8 to 10 hours to pour a footing

Footing designed to last 25 years

**Even if wind farm is decommissioned the footings are never removed.**

Thus, I am asking the DPIE not to approve Mod 1 SSD 6693 TILT Renewables of Rye Park wind farm for the following reason, as it been shown and shown again regarding TILT Renewables their competency is lacking from a company that proffers it has built multiple wind farm across different countries has trouble with simple calculations where will approving this project go?

Regards

John McGrath