

**GULLEN RANGE WIND FARM MODIFICATION 1,  
UPPER LACHLAN SHIRE  
SUBMISSION TO THE PLANNING ASSESSMENT COMMISSION  
ON THE ASSESSMENT REPORT PREPARED BY THE  
(DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT) DP&E WITH  
RECOMMENDATIONS TO APPROVE THE PROPOSAL SUBJECT TO  
CONDITIONS.**

**THURSDAY, 11 JUNE 2015, CROOKWELL NSW**

I AM DISMAYED WITH THE RATIONALISATIONS UNDERPINNING  
THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM THE ASSESSMENT  
REPORT PREPARED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND  
ENVIRONMENT (DP&E).

THE RECOMMENDATIONS COMPLETELY FAVOUR THE PROPONENT  
OF THE GULLEN RANGE WIND FARM (GRWF) AND CONTINUE TO  
DISADVANTAGE LAND OWNERS.

AS A RESULT, THIS HEARING, FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, IS ABOUT  
ADDRESSING THE INJUSTICE TOWARDS LAND OWNERS.

IT IS ABOUT THE NSW STATE GOVERNMENT IGNORING A LAND AND ENVIRONMENT COURT RULING AND OVERTURNING A PAC DETERMINATION IN FAVOUR OF A LARGE CHINESE MULTINATIONAL.

“SOCIAL JUSTICE MEANS THAT THE RIGHTS OF **ALL** PEOPLE IN OUR COMMUNITY ARE CONSIDERED IN A FAIR AND EQUITABLE MANNER”. MICK DODSON, SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMISSIONER 1993.

“SOCIAL JUSTICE IS ABOUT EQUALITY AND FAIRNESS BETWEEN HUMAN BEINGS. IT WORKS ON THE UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES THAT GUIDE PEOPLE IN KNOWING **WHAT IS RIGHT AND WHAT IS WRONG.**” FSG AUSTRALIA

THERE IS **NOTHING FAIR, EQUITABLE OR RIGHT** IN HAVING INDUSTRIAL WIND FARMS CLOSELY SITUATED TO HOMES. IT IS CLEARLY **WRONG.**

I DO NOT ACCEPT THE RATIONALISATIONS OF THE PROPONENT IN SEEKING APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT -

- COST OF MEETING THE DRAFT ORDER, I.E. \$12MILLION

- LOSS OF MEGAWATT HOURS OF RENEWABLE ENERGY.

I BELIEVE IN THIS WOULD NOT BE AN ACCEPTABLE DEFENCE IN A COURT SITUATION.

SIMPLY PUT, THE PROPONENT IS NOT COMPLYING WITH THE LAW AND THE GOVERNMENT IS ALLOWING THAT TO CONTINUE.

IT IS CLEAR THAT THE PROPONENT AND THE GOVERNMENT DO NOT UNDERSTAND THE MEANING OF **‘WHAT IS FAIR AND WHAT IS RIGHT’**. AND THEY CLEARLY DON’T CARE ABOUT BEING **‘UNFAIR AND WRONG’**.

DESPITE THE PROPONENT PUBLICLY STATING THAT THE PAC DETERMINATION WOULD BE **“FINAL”** AND WOULD BE ADHERED TO, A STATEMENT WAS IMMEDIATELY ISSUED THAT THE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION (DA) HAD BEEN FOLLOWED AND NOTHING HAD CHANGED. SO, NOW, WITH THE IMPRIMATUR OF THE GOVERNMENT, THEY DEFY A COURT RULING AND A PAC DETERMINATION.

THE MINISTER STATED THAT ONLY NINE OF THE 69 TURBINES REPRESENTED A PROBLEM. THE SELECTION OF THESE NINE TURBINES SEEMED TO LOCAL RESIDENTS COMPLETELY ARBITRARY AND *AD HOC* AND ALSO SEEMED TO BE SELECTED FOR THE PROPONENT'S CONVENIENCE.

BY INCORRECTLY SITING THE TURBINES THE PROPONENT, ARROGANT IN THE EXTREME, ASSUMED THAT THEY COULD END-PLAY A MALLEABLE AND INEFFECTUAL GOVERNMENT INTO APPROVING THE RELOCATION OF TURBINES AND FROM THESE RECOMMENDATIONS THEY ARE SUCCEEDING.

THE PROPONENT THEN RELIED ON THE PREMISE THAT THE CHANGES WERE MINOR AND TO MOVE TURBINES WOULD BE A MAJOR AND COSTLY UNDERTAKING WHILST AT THE SAME TIME STATING THAT THEY HAD COMPLIED WITH THE DA.

THE CONTRADICTIONS ARE CLEAR.

WHEN ONCE I LIVED IN A BEAUTIFUL AND PEACFUL LANDSCAPE SETTING I NOW LIVE WITHIN AN INDUSTRIAL ESTATE,

SURROUNDED BY TURBINES AND AN ENORMOUS **SUB-STATION**  
LESS THAN 500 M FROM OUR PROPERTY.

THE GULLEN RANGE WIND FARM IS A PLANNING DISASTER.

I WOULD LIKE TO PUT QUESTIONS TO THE PAC.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESSES  
LEADING TO THE DRAFTING OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS?

DURING CONSTRUCTION, WHY WERE THE ILLEGAL RELOCATION  
OF 69 TURBINES IGNORED?

WHY IS THIS FORUM FOCUSING ONLY ON THE 9 TURBINES?

HOW DID THE MINISTER IDENTIFY AND REACH THE DECISION TO  
MOVE ONLY 9 TURBINES? JUST ALL TOO CONVENIENT FOR  
GOVERNMENT AND THE PROPONENT.

THE SITUATION BECOMES “CURIOUSER AND CURIOUSER”.



**POMEROY 1** WAS COMPLETELY OVERLOOKED. AND YET THAT TURBINE WAS ILLEGALLY MOVED A CONSIDERABLE DISTANCE INTO A FAR MORE PROMINENT POSITION. THE RELOCATION IS GREATER THAN THE MOVEMENT OF SOME OF THE NINE TURBINES.

**POMEROY 1** NOW LOOMS OVER OUR ENTIRE ESTATE AND IS CLEARLY SEEN FROM INSIDE OUR HOME. THERE IS NO ESCAPING THE UGLINESS. HAD **POMEROY 1** BEEN BUILT IN ITS APPROVED LOCATION IT WOULD HAVE BEEN PARTIALLY HIDDEN FROM OUR HOME BY A LARGE HILL COVERED BY NATURAL BUSHLAND.

WAS **POMEROY 1** MOVED TO APPEASE AN ALIGNED LAND OWNER WHILST IGNORING CHARLEY BARBER, AN UNALIGNED LAND OWNER? **POMEROY 1** SHOULD HAVE BEEN INCLUDED IN THE LIST.

WE ARE EXPERIENCING THE NOISE OF TURBINES, IN PARTICULAR **POMEROY 1**. THE RUMBLING/WHINING NOISE BECOMES OVERWHELMINGLY IRRITATING. HARDLY COMPARABLE WITH THE NOISE OF A HOUSEHOLD FRIDGE. WE ALSO EXPERIENCE LOUD NOISES FROM THE **SUB-STATION**, ESPECIALLY WHEN THE

POWER GOES DOWN AND A GENERATOR THE SIZE OF A SHIPPING CONTAINER IS FIRED UP.

WE NOTE THAT SOME LAND OWNERS, ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY THE MOVEMENT OF TURBINES, WERE FINANCIALLY COMPENSATED BY THE PROPONENT WHILE OTHER LAND OWNERS EQUALLY ADVERSELY AFFECTED, OR WORSE, RECEIVE NO COMPENSATION.

YOU CAN SURELY SEE THE INJUSTICE AND UNFAIRNESS HERE?

THERE IS A BELIEF THAT NO OTHER LAND OWNERS ARE ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY THE LOCATION OF THE 60 TURBINES. THIS IS UNTRUE.

THE PROBLEMS FOR US REMAIN.

NO AMOUNT OF VEGETATION SCREENING WILL HIDE **POMEROY 1** OR THE **MASSIVE SUB-STATION**. SUCH A RECOMMENDATION TO PLANT TREES IS DESIGNED TO APPEASE US.

IT DOES NOT.

**POMEROY 1 AND THE SUB-STATION ARE SITUATED ON TOP OF A HILL AND FOR THE LIFE OF THE WIND FARM WILL CONTINUE TO BE CLEARLY SEEN AND HEARD FROM OUR HOME.**

**THE PREVIOUS PAC LISTENED AND HEARD US AND I AM ASKING THIS COMMISSION TO DO THE SAME -**

**FIRSTLY, REJECT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ASSESSMENT REPORT, AND**

**SECONDLY, RECOMMEND FINANCIAL COMPENSATION OR ACQUISITION, AS APPROPRIATE, TO ASSIST ADVERSELY AFFECTED LAND OWNERS. THE HON. ROB STOKES MP, MINISTER FOR PLANNING MUST, IN ALL CONSCIOUSNESS, APPROVE SUCH A RECOMMENDATION.**

**WE ASKED BEFORE, WE ASK AGAIN AND WE WILL CONTINUE TO ASK –**

**PLEASE RECOMMEND THAT OUR ONCE BEAUTIFUL PROPERTY, BANNISTER SPRINGS, BE LISTED FOR ACQUISITION BY THE PROPONENT AND ALLOW US THE FREEDOM, WITH SUFFICIENT**



FUNDS, TO MOVE AWAY FROM THE GULLEN RANGE WIND FARM,  
POMEROY 1 AND THE ENORMOUS INDUSTRIAL SUB-STATION.

MS ROSEMARY HOWE

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[www.bannisteramericansaddlebreds.com](http://www.bannisteramericansaddlebreds.com)

SUBMISSION TO THE NSW PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT  
COMMISSION –

PROPOSED CROOKWELL 3 WIND FARM–

4PM START - TUESDAY, 17 MARCH 2015 –

I WOULD ASK, FIRST OF ALL, WHY ARE WE HERE?

I HAVE BEEN HERE BEFORE.

I AND MANY OTHERS SPENT PRECIOUS HOURS PREPARING AND  
PRESENTING OUR VIEWS TO ANOTHER PAC. HOURS,WASTED.

ON 5 SEPTEMBER 2014 A PAC HEARING WAS HELD  
REGARDING A RETROSPECTIVE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION  
FOR THE MODIFICATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION  
FOR THE GULLEN RANGE WIND FARM.

IN THE COURSE OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WIND FARM, 69  
OF THE 73 TURBINES HAD BEEN BUILT IN THE WRONG  
LOCATIONS. DELIBERATELY. IT WAS NO ACCIDENT. THE  
PROPONENT DID THIS IN VIOLATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT  
APPLICATION APPROVAL AND IN DEFIANCE OF A LAND AND  
ENVIRONMENT COURT RULING THAT SPECIFICALLY FORBADE  
THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE TURBINES IN ANY OTHER

LOCATION OTHER THAN THAT SPECIFIED IN THE DA.

THE PAC DETERMINATION WAS PUBLISHED ON 2 OCTOBER 2014 AND THE RETROSPECTIVE MODIFICATION WAS REFUSED.

DESPITE THE PROPONENT PUBLICLY STATING THAT THE PAC DETERMINATION WOULD BE "FINAL" AND WOULD BE ADHERED TO BY THE PROPONENT, A STATEMENT WAS IMMEDIATELY ISSUED THAT THE PROPONENT HAD FOLLOWED THE DA AND NOTHING HAD CHANGED. SO, NOW THEY PLANNED ON DEFYING THE PAC DETERMINATION.

THE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT ON THE ADVICE OF HER DEPARTMENT ALSO IGNORED THE DETERMINATION AND STATED THAT ONLY 9 OF THE 69 TURBINES REPRESENTED A PROBLEM. THE SELECTION OF THESE NINE TURBINES SEEMED TO LOCAL RESIDENTS COMPLETELY ARBITRARY AND AD HOC AND ALSO SEEMED TO BE SELECTED FOR THE PROPONENT'S CONVENIENCE.

THERE WAS A CLASS FOUR LEGAL ACTION INSTITUTED IN THE LAND AND ENVIRONMENT COURT CHALLENGING THE "LEGALITY" (A STATE BUREAUCRAT'S TERM) OF THE PROCESSES INVOLVED IN REACHING THE DETERMINATION.

IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT SOME ACCOMMODATION HAS BEEN REACHED BETWEEN THE PROPONENT AND THE GOVERNMENT. THE MATTER IS NO LONGER WITH THE NSW LAND AND ENVIRONMENT COURT. IT MAY BE REFERRED BACK TO PAC USING "CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES". IT IS NOT DIFFICULT TO DEDUCE WHAT COMPRISES "CHANGEDCIRCUMSTANCES".

WHAT HAS CHANGED? THE TURBINES HAVEN'T MOVED AND THE PAC DETERMINATION SHOULD BE ENFORCED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT. BUT, I LIVE IN THE REAL WORLD, IT WON'T AND MY PREDICTION IS THAT NOTHING WILL BE DONE. NO TURBINES WILL BE MOVED AND THE STATE GOVERNMENT WILL RELEASE A NORTH KOREAN LIKE STATEMENT THAT JUSTICE HAS BEEN SERVED,

AND EVERYBODY, EXCEPT THE AFFECTED RESIDENTS, SHOULD LIVE HAPPILY EVER AFTER.

WHY INDEED ARE WE HERE?

I LIVE ADJACENT TO THE GULLEN RANGE WIND FARM.



THE SWITCH-SUB STATION IS LESS THAN 500 M FROM OUR PROPERTY BOUNDARY AND I LIVE SURROUNDED BY TURBINES IN AN INDUSTRIAL ESTATE.

THE ONCE PRISTINE BANNISTER LANDSCAPE, A BLEND OF FARMS AND BEAUTIFUL WILD BUSH SITUATED ON THE TOP OF THE GREAT DIVIDING RANGE IS ESSENTIALLY GONE. REPLACED BY A FACTORY AND 73 THUMPING, GRINDING MONEY-MAKING MONSTROSITIES THAT FUNNEL GREAT WADS OF CASH TO A MULTINATIONAL.

THAT IS THE REALITY. AND THE PROCESS BY WHICH THE LANDSCAPE HAS BEEN TRANSFORMED IS ONE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ALTRUISM, POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY, INCOMPETENT PLANNING, BUREAUCRATIC BUMBLING AND MEDIA HYPOCRISY. BUT I LIVE WITH THE RESULT. AND THE RESULT IS HORRENDOUS.

WE, THE RESIDENTS OF BANNISTER, PARKESBOURNE, MUMMEL, KIALLA AND GURRUNDAH DIDN'T WANT THIS. IT WAS IMPOSED ON US. ELEVEN LANDOWNERS AND A DEVELOPER CONSPIRED AND THEIR CONNIVING HAS DEVASTATED A COMMUNITY UNDER THE GUISE OF SAVING THE PLANET.

OUR PROPERTY REPRESENTS AN INVESTMENT OF YEARS, TIME, SWEAT, PRECISE PLANNING, OVER A MILLION DOLLARS IN CAPITAL AND LOVE. AND THE VALUE OF THAT INVESTMENT HAS BEEN UNDERMINED AND CORRUPTED BY THE WIND FARM.

MOST REAL ESTATE AGENTS SPEAK IN A LANGUAGE OF EUPHEMISMS AND SUNNY HALF TRUTHS.

"THERE WILL BE BUYERS WHO WON'T MIND THE WIND FARM." BUT NOT YET.

"A REDUCED POOL OF POTENTIAL CLIENTS".

I ACTUALLY LIKED WHAT ONE AGENT SAID, "I CAN'T SELL IT AND PLEASE DON'T ASK ME TO LIST IT. I'LL ONLY BE WASTING MY TIME AND YOURS." I DIDN'T LIKE THE NEWS. I LIKED HIS HONESTY.

TO SELL, WE WOULD HAVE TO ACCEPT A FRACTION OF THE PROPERTY'S WORTH.

A FIFTH GENERATION FARMER WHO EXPECTED TO LIVE HIS WHOLE LIFE ON HIS PROPERTY STATED THAT A VALUER HAD GIVEN HIM TWO VALUATIONS: ONE PRE-WIND FARM AND ONE

CURRENT. THERE WAS OVER A 30% DIFFERENCE AND THIS STORY IS REPEATED OVER HUNDREDS OF PROPERTIES IN THE DISTRICT. THE PROPERTY ON WHICH HE INTENDED TO DIE, HE WANTS TO LEAVE. HE'S HAD ENOUGH.

THE LOOMING PRESENCE OF TURBINES AND A SUBSTATION MEANS THAT THE PROPERTY SIMPLY CANNOT BE SOLD UNLESS IT'S FOR A BARGAIN BASEMENT, FIRE SALE PRICE. THE FAIRNESS OF THAT? THERE IS NONE.

IN 2008, THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO) STATED:

“ENSURE THAT ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL POLICY RESPONSES TO CLIMATE CHANGE AND OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION TAKE INTO ACCOUNT HEALTH EQUITY WHILE ADDRESSING THE EXCLUSIONARY POLICIES AND PROCESSES THAT LEAD TO RURAL POVERTY, LANDLESSNESS, AND DISPLACEMENT OF PEOPLE FROM THEIR HOMES.”

WIND FARM DEVELOPMENT IS CREATING A NEW SOCIAL CLASS OF WIND FARM REFUGEES: MIDDLE AGED RESIDENTS, MANY OF THEM EITHER HOVERING AT THE EDGE OF RETIREMENT AGE OR BEYOND IT, WHO ARE BECOMING TRAPPED ON THEIR PROPERTIES, UNABLE TO SELL UNLESS THEY ARE WILLING TO

ACCEPT A PLUNGE INTO POVERTY.

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THESE RESIDENTS ARE TOO OLD TO  
WORK THEIR PROPERTIES?

ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION OF THEIR LAND AND THE  
EROSION OF THE WORTH OF THEIR ASSETS.

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THEY BECOME TOO OLD TO DRIVE?

HOW DO THEY LIVE, SHOP AND INTEGRATE INTO SOCIETY?

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THEY CANNOT COLLECT THE OLD AGE  
PENSION BECAUSE OF THE PERCEIVED WORTH OF THEIR ASSET  
WHEN THE ACTUAL WORTH IS NEXT TO NOTHING?

WHAT INDEED HAPPENS TO THEIR LIVES WHILE WIND TURBINES  
TURN MERRILY ON THEIR DOORSTEPS, THE MONEY POURS INTO  
THE PROPONENT'S COFFERS AND THE RESIDENTS LIVE IN  
DESPAIR AND GRINDING POVERTY?

THERE HAS BEEN A RUSH TO BUILD THESE DEVELOPMENTS IN A  
PANIC OF AL GORE INSPIRED DOOM.



I HAVE READ THAT THE ECONOMICS OF THE INDUSTRY ARE DODGY AND BASED ON A CONSUMER SUBSIDY, MUCH OF WHICH IS PAID BY ORDINARY AUSTRALIANS VIA THEIR ELECTRICITY BILLS. THE INDUSTRY APPEARS TO BE COMPLETELY UNECONOMIC WITHOUT HUGE SUMS OF GOVERNMENT LARGESSE IN A RATIO THAT SHOCKS THE AVERAGE MAN IN THE STREET WHEN HE REALISES WHAT HE IS PAYING.

THERE ARE ADVERSE HEALTH EFFECTS FROM THESE MACHINES AND COMPLIANT LEGISLATORS HAVE ALLOWED THESE DEVELOPMENTS TO TAKE PLACE WITHOUT INVOKING PROPER PRECAUTIONS TO SAFEGUARD THE WELL-BEING OF CITIZENS. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL STRESSES PLACED ON RESIDENTS ARE ENORMOUS.

WE CAN NO LONGER WORK IN OUR BACK Paddock DUE TO THE NOISE. WE EITHER WAIT FOR A CALM DAY OR GET IT DONE IN AN HOUR AND GET OUT. WE JUST CAN'T STAND IT.

IT'S AWFUL.

I WOULD RESPECTFULLY ASK THE COMMISSIONERS TO REFUSE THIS DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION.

LEAVE THE RESIDENTS OF CROOKWELL AND ROSLYN IN PEACE  
TO FARM AND PURSUE THEIR LIVES IN HARMONY WITH  
NEIGHBOURS, WITH THE ENVIRONMENT AND WITH THEIR  
FAMILIES.

THE SOCIAL DISCORD THAT A WIND FARM BRINGS TO A  
COMMUNITY IS DEVASTATING IN AND OF ITSELF.

PLEASE REJECT THIS PROPOSAL FOR ITS FOOLISHNESS, ITS  
AUDACITY AND THE IMPOSITION A WALL OF STEEL WILL MAKE  
ON THE BEAUTIFUL LANDSCAPE ON THE SOUTHERN  
APPROACHES TO CROOKWELL.

ROSEMARY HOWE

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[www.bannisteramericansaddlebreds.com](http://www.bannisteramericansaddlebreds.com)