



PCU064754

Department of Planning  
Received  
31 MAR 2016  
Scanning Room

"Lachlands"  
619 Redground Rd  
Crookwell 2583  
27th March, 2016

The Executive Director  
Resource Assessments, etc  
Dear Sir / Madam

RE Revised Community Consultative  
Committee Guidelines (Feb, 2016, Code 3.3)

I wish to make the following comments/suggestions  
as feedback on the new C.C.C. Guidelines.

As an introduction, I am a Councillor on Upper Lachlan  
Shire which has 10 wind farms operational, approved or in  
the pipeline. I have served on the old quite unsatisfactory  
developer-dominated Committee for Crookwell II/III project  
for years, and am also familiar with the operation of a  
number of other 10-called Community Consultative  
Committees in the Shire particularly Ratch's "Forum" in  
Collector. In my comments below "impacted area" means  
within 10km of any turbine in a Wind Farm

First, the guidelines are generally very good and for  
the first time give impacted residents an official forum  
in which to air their complaints and receive answers  
to their questions. I propose two modifications that  
would make the guidelines even more acceptable to the  
majority of residents unfortunate enough to become near  
neighbours of these projects

(a) The composition of the Committees, as proposed on  
p.3, is weighted in favour of the developer, with three



Company reps and, excluding the independent chair, we could have an "environmental" rep. and a host landholder as two of the "three to five" community reps, which leaves only one to three non-associated community reps and a Councilor in a clear minority.

A fairer composition that would more accurately reflect the widespread views of the local impacted community would be

- (i) One independent chair
- (ii) Two company representatives
- (iii) One representative of a registered and relevant "environmental" group
- (iv) One council representative (and an alternate)
- (v) Four to five community representatives from the impacted area, but excluding any host landholders or "associated" residents.

This gives a total of nine or 10, and with domination by the developer avoided.

(b) Host-landholders and "associated" residents should be excluded. They are bound by contract not to criticise or speak out publicly against the project, and they have received substantial financial benefits already so any suggestions they make that in any way benefit them would constitute a conflict of interest. As mentioned above, their membership also weighs Committee membership in favour of the developer.

Also, it is common for a level of ill-will to exist between impacted non-associated neighbours and host landholders, and this would have the potential to make committee meeting difficult and testy.



Second, these possible guidelines should be made retrospective so that all projects and their impacted residents operate under the same set of conditions. The idea that these rules are "only for going forward" is a complete cop-out.

To apply this reasonable (especially if amended as above) set of rules to all wind farm projects involves no financial penalty to any pre-existing project, and will help impacted residents at long last to have an official forum in which to ask their questions and air their grievances.

This applies particularly to the Collector project where Ratch's pre-existing "Forum" has now morphed into a Community Consultative Committee without going through the proper establishment process outlined on p. 3 of the Guidelines. Thus we have the same community representatives that Ratch had on its friendly "Forum" now sitting on the re-named Community Consultative Committee with two exceptions:

- (a) Frank Ross was a vocal member of the "Forum" but resigned in 2014 due to its malfunctioning - see his letter of resignation attached.
- (b) Richard Stacey, originally refused membership by Ratch, but now a member and has similar complaints - see his letter of this year attached.

No doubt the Department is aware of the Stollznow Survey of 9/2012 whereby residents living within 10km of the project were asked for their view, and 81% of the vote was against the project, 13% for, and 5% undecided. This view is certainly not represented in the "forums" proceedings.



Any developer/owner of an existing Wind Farm who opposes setting up a Community Consultative Committee for its project according to the model in the Guidelines (hopefully as slightly amended) must have an ulterior motive for that opposition. There is most likely to deny locally impacted residents the chance to have an independent but official forum in which to ask questions and receive real answers, to air their complaints and grievances and expect some ameliorative action rather than being ignored, and even to offer praise or suggest sensible modifications to the operation of the project that might deal with its unwanted impacts.

Finally, I commend the Department for at last producing a generally acceptable model for the establishment, composition(3), and operation of Community Consultative Committees for Wind Farms.

The proposed composition needs to be modified to ensure that the developer and like-minded representatives do not have a majority, and so hosts and "associated" residents should be excluded but also on the grounds of required bias and obvious conflicts of interest.

Also the Guidelines need to be retrospective so as to apply a common set of rules for an official body so that all impacted neighbours of wind farms, at long last, have a genuine forum in which their views can be aired and taken seriously.

Yours faithfully  
 Malcolm Barlow



*Friends of  
Collector  
Collector  
W. F*

Frank Ross  
22 Church Street  
COLLECTOR NSW 2581

Ms Deborah Cameron  
Chair  
Collector Windfarm Forum

**Resignation from the Ratch Australia Collector Windfarm Community Forum**

Dear Ms Cameron,

I hereby resign from the Forum. Thank you for the opportunity to participate over the past two years.

I believe in climate change and renewable energy and had hoped that Ratch Australia would effectively engage with the Collector community. Unfortunately, much of Ratch's engagement has been characterised by false and misleading information: people have been reported to be at meetings when they have not been there; to have supported positions and roles which they have not agreed to; and points of disagreement or where tangible commitment has been required have been either ignored or evaded by clever words. It has become apparent that looking good for Government stakeholders is clearly a higher priority for Ratch than honest communication with the Collector community.

The recent Collector community petition where over 80% of the townspeople call for the ACT Government to reject Ratch's wind auction tender, confirms its failures in this area. Two years of clever, empty promises and meetings is enough: there are better things to do! People here want more than public relations spin in return for destroying our visual amenity, real estate values and community harmony.

Yours sincerely

Frank Ross  
6 August 2014



## Malcolm

---

**From:** "Richard Stacy" <richard@richardstacy.net>  
**Date:** Wednesday, 9 March 2016 11:49 AM  
**To:** "Deborah Cameron" <d.cameron@kjassoc.com.au>  
**Cc:** <james.mckay@govlawtech.com.au>; <poile@ipstarmail.com.au>; <marthatruelove@gmail.com>; <jshaw@ulsclive.com.au>; "Sharon Swincer" <sharon.swincer@outlook.com>; <walsh.anthony@hotmail.com>; <johnhoskins@bigpond.com>; <Brianmorl@bigpond.com>; <anthony.yeates@ratchaustralia.com>; <thomas.mitchell@ratchaustralia.com>; <nicole.brewer@planning.nsw.gov.au>; <elle.donnelley@planning.nsw.gov.au>; <mark.fleming@environment.nsw.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Re: draft minutes for checking and comment

Dear Deborah

I make the following comments

1. I believe Meeting Minutes should be about recording issues and OUTCOMES — rather than action items.
2. Out of respect to members past and present and the process of consultation it is important to record outcomes such as where there are differences and the main reasons for them. This is because many issues are recurring or related, and this recording of differences and reasons for them actually provides a foundation of understanding for better decision making, less repetition, reinventing of wheels as well as transparency. However it means Ratch has to be more accountable, transparent to members and interested in outcomes than just having a talking shop for the sake of appearances- and she/they may well not want that.
3. In simple terms you follow whatever Policy & Procedures you wish, record what you like. It is a Ratch Committee, you are paid by Ratch so you had better do as instructed.
4. I would ask the question — Is this Committee legal?
5. I go back to when I first applied to be a member and looked what happened — not suitable — the qualifications needed ? blah blah blah
6. I believe Ratch missed out on the ACT Wind auction.? So what is the Corporate game now ??
7. Going back to the start of all this i.e..Transfield and the change of ownership and how all that was conducted — this whole affair does not have a very good record of Community Engagement, Corporate Social Responsibility, Corporate Governance and Corporate Bullying — in fact if I were an executive of Ratch I would hang my head in shame.
8. Perhaps Ratch should get with the times— try Solar as I think all the hot air has gone with the Bolted Horse.  
Nuclear
9. Back to the recording of minutes it is obvious my comments do not fit the so called Community Engagement process.

I look forward to reading the new revised minutes?

Yours sincerely

Richard Stacy