

From: [Greg Hatter](#)
To: [SA Planning Commission](#); [EPA:Information](#); [Braxton-Smith, Tony \(DPTI\)](#); [Williams, Emma \(DPTI\)](#); [Jackson, Graeme \(DPTI\)](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Wind Farm - Renewable Energy Policy Planning and Design Code
Date: Monday, 2 September 2019 5:51:30 AM
Attachments: [Planning Ahead - Special Edition.msg](#)

Wind Farm – Renewable Energy Policy Planning and Design Code

To the State Planning Commission and other Parties,

I refer to the publications that were recently released by the State Planning Commission proposing to change the South Australian *Policy Planning and Design Code* concerning Renewable Energy and provide the following observations.

Changes to Wind Farm Height - Optics

The State Planning Commission proposes the following changes to the Code regarding Wind Farm developments in South Australia as follows.

Description	Unit Measure	Current	Proposed	% Increase
Wind Turbine Height	M	150	240	60%
MW Output	MW	2	4	100%
Proposed Setback for Rural Properties	KM	1	1.2	20%

Given the above:

- as the wind turbine heights that are proposed are to be increased by **60%** in height, why are the proposed setbacks only increased by **20%**, ie by only 200M;
- what **Science** does the State Planning Commission have available in support of such a disproportionate increase in wind turbine height and what details are available to calculate such a minimal setback;
- have representatives of the State Planning Commission visited a site outside of South Australia (overseas) to see the size of a 240M high wind farm in operation and assessed all its impacts, if so, what was reported; and
- under this new height limit with minimal setbacks farmers would be required to continue to be exposed to even more **uninvited risk**.

Irrespective of the above a 1.2KM setback for an industrial scale wind turbine at 240M in height is far too minimal for an on land application particularly when these units were originally designed for an offshore application.

Lessons Learnt – Given the above and irrespective of the distances proposed

it is questionable as to whether lessons have been learnt (if any) from the impacts that are currently being experienced by nearby property owners of Wind Farms in South Australia, ie: where property owners are experiencing noise, tonality and vibration impacts from as far away as 7kms. In excess of such a distance should be considered when revising setbacks for the Code.

Enforcement of Non Compliance - Dispute Resolution

In terms of a new Wind Farm built in a locale where noise levels, tonality or vibration exceed what is allowable:

- who will a farmer be contacting at the State Planning Commission to advise of such a Non-Compliance;
- save for any actions in a court of Law, in concert with the Code how does a wind turbine be immediately shut down and taken out of service due to its defective state (ie: just as a car with a loud exhaust would be seen as Non-Compliant and subsequently taken off the road); and
- who at the State Planning Commission controls the shutting down of wind turbines if they do not comply.

Enforcement of Non Compliance of any Code is only as good as the detail provided in same.

Liability and Indemnity

When a Wind Farm has been built two impacts will more than likely occur to adjoining neighbouring properties:

- a) any residence on an adjacent property will become untenable, as will be the case with our property that adjoins the proposed Non-Compliant Crystal Brook Energy Park; and
- b) the value of the property will decrease.

Which party ie Developer, State Planning Commission or State Government will be liable to the farmers, property owners and the like for such losses identified above. The Code should clearly address this issue and identify the responsible party. Developers may verbally state that there should be no decrease in property values due to the building of a windfarm, however, I am yet to see any written guarantees or the like provided by same to support such a proposition.

As a representative of a property that has a 1.1KM boundary with the proposed Non-Compliant Crystal Brook Energy Park I wish to represent our family's interests (and others) and as such I will be contacting your office shortly to discuss the manner in which the "formal consultation process" will

occur during October 2019 and how I will have certain involvement.
In the interim should you wish to discuss any of the above points that I have
raised please do not hesitate to contact me on [REDACTED].

Yours sincerely

Greg Hatter

Representative for

John and Joan Hatter

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Postal Address

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]