



18th Jan., 2015

RE: Select Committee on Wind Turbines

Dear Senators,

Please find enclosed my submission to your Inquiry into Wind Turbines.

Unfortunately, I do not have the time to prepare and type up a worthwhile submission specific to your Inquiry. Therefore, I have supplied copies of two Presentations that I made to N.S.W. Planning Assessment Commission hearings into the Flyer's Creek and Gullen Range wind farms in 2014.

In relation to the "economic impact" of wind turbines in rural areas, both my Presentations focused strongly upon the negative impacts on the saleability and therefore value of nearby properties. The Flyer's Creek paper lists overseas research findings, as well as local anecdotal evidence from the Cookwell area, and the Gullen Range paper provides more local evidence of this loss of value.

State Planning bureaucrats claim that this is not a Planning matter! I ask, why not? As both my papers show, overseas governments recognise this immoral effect and have legislated compensation schemes in place.

It is heartening that the Gullen Range

Commissioners, in their Report (p.6), did not dismiss the issue when they said it

"... notes the Department's advice that property value is not a planning consideration. It is the Commissioner's view that this issue should be further investigated as it appears that many affected, non-associated property owners may suffer a financial devaluation of their asset in the future."

In relation to "regulatory governance" of wind turbines, it is my view that it scarcely exists at all. Indeed, as my Fuller Range paper instances, the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure in 2013 and 2014 failed miserably to ensure that the developer complied with a whole number of consent conditions ranging from hours of work and construction noise all the way up to arbitrarily re-siting 69 of its 73 turbines, many much closer to non-host residences.

Another example of what has seemed to be a pro-developer bias on the part of successive N.S.W. State governments relates to the Wind Farm called Crookwell II. The original approval in 2004 was for a period of five years. By 2009, nothing had happened so the developer applied for an extension, but the regulations required a "substantial" start to have been made before this could be granted. Conveniently, this was changed to a "physical" start, the developer put a few sheds on site, the Department accepted this as a "physical" start, and the

extension was granted. More pointedly, no time limit was placed on the extension. Today, all but one of the sheds have gone, not a sod has been turned, and near-neighbours have had uncertainty hangover them for 11 years.

Finally, I doubt that I will attend any of your Committee Meetings should they be open to the public, but am willing to answer any questions you may have from my two papers by phone

Yours faithfully
Malcolm Barlow