

**Neighbourly Committee No 4**  
Incorporating Neighbourhood Forum No 4  
Executive Committee  
Co-Convenors: Bradley Chapman and Paul Evans  
Secretary: Brad Chapman  
Acting Treasurer: Paul Evans  
Contact: Convenor– bradleyc@ozemail.com.au



**NF4 Tuesday, November 7th, 2023 Hybrid Meeting:  
In Person Meeting @ Towradgi Community Hall  
Plus a ZOOM connection if needing to attend *virtually*.**

**Topic:** Neighbourhood Forum 4 November Zoom Link

**Time:** Nov 7, 2023 - 07:00 PM

**Join Zoom Meeting:**

<https://uca-nswact.zoom.us/j/95981529962?pwd=Q0FYZDVxektSajQyOGZidTVUWm1KZz09>

**Meeting ID:** 959 8152 9962

**Passcode:** 560282

**AGENDA**

**Open Meeting-** 07.00pm

**Apologies –**

**Minutes of Previous Meeting-** Distributed via email

**Business Arising from Minutes-**

**Current DAs:**

**DA-2023/816 - Development Application - 2 Lawson Street FAIRY MEADOW NSW 2519**

**Secondary Dwelling - 8 November**

**DA-2023/837 - Development Application - 39 Sturdee Street TOWRADGI NSW 2518**

**Demolition, Tree Removal and Resident Construction - 15 November**

Other matters from the floor:

**• Correspondence In –**

1. CCAG Items for Coke Works Submissions
2. Copy J Groves submission re: Escarpment Block DAs.
3. Copy NSW/DENP Gateway Determination on Escarpment DAs.
4. WCC Response Report on Balgownie Mountain Bike Trail Planning
5. Copy of email regarding Wind Turbine Proposals

**• Correspondence Out –**

1. NF4 sub-Balgownie DA-2022\_781A Request for Information - No Reply.
2. NF4 sub-R@ rezoning near Escarpment
3. NF4 sub Cokeworks
4. NF4 sub-Street Trees and Visibility Underwood St/Russell St Corrimal
5. NF4 sub-E-scooters/bikes on South path, Towradgi Rd. - Response in Media only.

## **Reports:-**

### **Community Campaigns:**

• **Corrimal Community Action Group**

• **East Corrimal Open Space Committee**

## **General Business:**

### **Other items:**

Neighbourly Forum 4 meets the 1<sup>st</sup> Tuesday of the month at Towradgi Community Hall, Corner of Moray Road and Towradgi Road Towradgi at 7pm

**\*\*\*\*All Welcome- No cost\*\*\*\***

### **Attachment:**

**COPY of Email from Maree Rhem, [Received 14 October 2023.]**

Dear Convenor

As a resident of Balgownie, I write to you with a deep concern regarding the proposed offshore wind turbine farm to be placed off our coast from Wombarra to Gerringong. The industrialisation of our pristine coastline with monstrously large turbines, close to the shore (closer than other regions worldwide) with flashing lights at night is disturbing. Far from being a 'green' energy source, the impacts on the marine environment required to install and maintain these are seriously alarming.

The officials at the recent community forums had no answers to many of the valid questions from attendees, saying that the company who gains the tender will complete their own studies regarding environmental effects, maritime usage etc. Surely basic environmental studies should be done by the NSW government **prior** to calling for tenders.

There are a number of risks and issues that need to be addressed:

1. No scaled modelling or concepts have been provided. This is essential to being able to make an informed opinion.
2. Turbines would be up to 280m in height, yet no visual impact studies are available. How can the community make sound considerations when these studies are not offered?
3. Environmental and marine studies were not available. These would be done and paid for by the successful turbine tender. I can only imagine these studies will be skewed towards the operator and not be an independent study especially since they have already been granted the tender.
4. No other impact studies were available, such as, the effect on tourism, housing values, fishing, shipping and mental health - all supposedly to be done by the successful tenderer. Once again this is not an independent study and will be skewed towards the tenderer.
5. No information regarding indigenous consultation and impacts on cultural heritage and values - to be done by successful tender (see my comments above)
6. Limited and vague information regarding end of life of the turbines and impacts from fire or oil spills - more information to come from successful tender (see my comments above). The turbine life is reported at 30 to 40 years per turbine. However other information suggests far less working life - e.g. 15 years particularly in the harsh ocean environment. Surely that is a short time frame for such a costly endeavour? Recycling/ disposal information is vague.
7. No benefits purported for the community's ever increasing energy costs - the output will go to steel making and the hydrogen gas power plant.

8. Effects on surfing in the area - unknown

9. Effects on hang gliding (Australia's birthplace of flying) from Bald Hill. Hang glider operators' ability to make a living will be greatly diminished and the thousands of gliders from around the world may no longer attend Bald Hill.

10. Effects on investors and tourism/hospitality at developing Shell cove Marina - unknown.

Further concerns I have include: loss of tourism along the South Coast and loss of income, high use of oil (per turbine) - approximately 200 litres of oil each, which will require constant servicing, the destruction of our bird life, as, especially at night, birds will be annihilated as they fly through the turbines.

The advocates of the wind farms state there will be 3,000 jobs for construction, and 300 jobs following installation. This is such a specialised role; I am of the opinion that installers will be fly in fly out people. Job creation, if any, will be minimal and could easily be outweighed by job loss, especially in the tourism sector. As for the argument that this will save jobs in our steelmaking sector by supplying them with the energy they need to continue running, it was suggested by an employee of BHP recently, that the energy supplied not be sufficient to meet operational needs.

There are many lessons to be learned from wind farms currently operating overseas, yet our NSW government seem to ignore these. Some operators are reporting increasing costs thus making them no longer a cheap form of energy. There are many reported effects on the ocean habitat which are too many to go into here, however these are dismissed as anecdotal or unscientific. I would suggest that there is not enough evidence to claim these effects aren't real either. The research has not been done in an independent or scientific way at all.

A proper and independent risk benefit analysis must be conducted by our government **before** proceeding to tender.

It appears that the many in the community are still unaware of this proposal. They therefore are denied the opportunity to 'have their say'. They were unable to attend the consultations, through lack of awareness of the project and the scale of impact. It is therefore considered that due processes and diligence is not being met.

I believe the NF4 could assist in this regard by reaching out to residents and businesses in area and directing them to the government page at minimum (phone calls or letter box drops). Another idea would be to invite speakers 'for' and 'against' the proposal at a public forum, promoted on TV or radio.

I strongly urge you not to indicate your support of this project until you have an indication of the wishes of the majority of residents and businesses in the NF4 catchment, only then can the forum confidently state representation of them.

Regards  
Maree