

**CPR INC MEDIA ALERT CPR INC MEDIA ALERT CPR INC**

14 November 2008

The community is concerned that Mr Stanhope today suggested that it would be reasonable to move an Environmental Impact Study from one site to another because "the proponents had already spent over \$3 million commissioning studies at the original site".

This shows Mr Stanhope misunderstands the purpose and intent of an EIS and is deliberately mis-representing the intended protective measures within the Planning processes. Having a full and independent site-specific detailed and expert driven EIS has become legislatively incorporated as a necessity for specific planning proposals. These proposals constitute a recognised potential risk to the health and well being of the environment and the community from that specific development on that specific site. A gas-fired power station would constitute such a proposal. The intent of these mandatory requirements was to ensure that planning officials, the community and the proponents have all the necessary information on which to base the decision to proceed or not. They would make those decisions in possession of all the potential and real affects such a development will bring if proceeded on that site. Without such detailed site-specific information, sound planning and development decisions cannot and should not be made.

To suggest that a proponent should be allowed to move from one site to another, being given a waiver on having to complete the necessary protective studies, on the basis that they have already spent \$3 million on a failed development proposal highlights directly one of the many ways this government believes it can manipulate the process for the benefits of an elite few developers.

The community points out that pragmatically it accepts that moving, for example, a data storage warehouse proposal from Broadacre/buffer to Industrial land does not pose any dangers to the community. Industrial land is zoned for warehouses and is appropriate for such developments. Provided the development complies with the nature and intent of Industrial zone conditions, the community can see that "fast tracking" under these conditions does not breach the protective measures or intent of the planning legislation.

The same cannot be said of any suggestion to "fast track" the power station component of this project. It poses a threat and legislation demands this threat be quantified by a site-specific full and independent EIS.

We are disappointed that Mr Stanhope has chosen to misrepresent the intention and purpose of having an EIS to the community and that he clearly continues to place the needs and best interests of a particular developer above the health and well being of the community.

**ENDS**