

ROSEVIEW ESTATE RESIDENTS GROUP

SUBMISSION ON JUPITER WIND FARM PROPOSAL – OBJECTION TO PROPOSAL



View from the top of Roseview Estate –showing 9 of the Roseview properties

All residents and soon-to-be residents of Roseview Estate, Mt Fairy, are strongly **opposed** to the Jupiter Wind Farm proposal lodged by EPYC Pty Ltd. Our properties are identified in the EIS as J257, J134, J130, J135, J19, J10, J93, J33, J65, and J272.

Two Roseview properties have not been included in the EIS. One of those properties has recently had a home built on it, and the other has an approved Development Application in which a house site has been selected. At this stage, there is only a shed on this property because the owners have had to temporarily move overseas for work purposes.

Although Roseview Estate properties are discussed often throughout the EIS and regarded by the Department and referred to in the EIS as highly impacted by the Jupiter proposal, Roseview Road is not shown on several of the EIS maps. For effective and accurate visual representation, we have requested on a number of occasions that Roseview Road be included on maps, but this has been ignored for some maps.

Roseview Estate is a relatively new subdivision. The first residents to buy at Roseview did so in 2006. It is a subdivision comprising 12 hobby farms ranging in size from 25 to 100 acres. The population of Roseview is made up of young families, singles, retirees, and tree-changers. We are all still in the process of establishing our homes and lives in Roseview.

We chose to live at Roseview because of the lifestyle offered – quiet, peaceful, family orientated, country lifestyle values, safe for children. We did not choose to live in an industrial area.

Until the Palerang Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2014 came into effect on 31 October 2014, all Roseview properties were zoned as RU2 Rural Landscape. From that date most of the land within Palerang Council boundary was moved to RU1 Primary Production, including several rural/residential subdivisions made up of hobby farms.

Roseview residents have voiced their reasons as to why this area is not suitable for a wind farm via emails and telephone calls to the NSW Department of Planning and Environment and EPYC. A comprehensive and extensive history of communication from Roseview property owners exists and these communications should be considered with this submission.

A summary of our major issues follows.

LIST OF MAIN OBJECTIONS

1. The Jupiter Project Area is the wrong place to put a wind farm

The project area and the affected surrounding area is made up of several rural/residential subdivisions: Barnet, Roseview, Lakeview, Boro, Mulloon, Mt Fairy, Dog Rock Close, Duckfield and Bobbaduck Valley (a new subdivision). The EIS states there are 170 dwellings within 1-3km of a wind turbine, and 273 dwellings within 5km of a turbine. Surely these statistics show that it is a predominantly rural/residential/hobby farm area rather than an agricultural area.

The terrain surrounding the site makes it unsuitable for a wind farm.

The ground on which the turbines are to be placed is up to 200m below the level of the surrounding ridgelines which will mask all the turbines in the northern precinct from the prevailing winds from the west and the east which represent 62% of the wind resources of the area (see p21 of Appendix L). The EIS implicitly accepts this in section 2.6.1 where it states “Average wind speeds vary throughout the project area depending on topography affecting local wind conditions’.

The EIS does not consider any other sites so the community cannot place any value on claims that this is a suitable site for a wind farm with 88 turbines.

The design of the layout of the turbines proposed for the Jupiter proposal is extremely inefficient. Due to site constraints the turbines are clustered together in such a way that they will interfere with one another, reducing the effectiveness of turbines shadowed by those in front. The close proximity of the turbines will also

concentrate the noise emissions, crowd the visual field of view and increase the risk of bird and bat strikes.

The EIS admits that the reason for the choice of this site is easy access to the 330kV transmission line. In section 2.6.2 it states “The distance to nearby transmission networks is a factor that influences the commercial feasibility of wind farm projects, and being able to connect to the immediately adjacent TransGrid network within the project area was a significant factor that informed the selection of the project’s location.”

2. Devastating Visual Impact

The proposed wind farm will have a devastating effect on the visual amenity of all Roseview residents. Around 30 turbines will tower above some properties and the hubs of those turbines will be at the same height as some Roseview homes.

We purchased our properties because of the spectacular views of the mountains and rolling hills. We overlook pastures and see the sun rising above the mountains in the east. Sunsets viewed from Roseview are stunning. Our views are to the north, east and south of our homes and prospective homes and, to a lesser extent, to the west. The wind farm would be the predominant feature in the views of all Roseview property owners.

The EIS states that “39 turbines in the northern precinct may be lit and potential impacts were identified for individual dwellings, particularly those with elevated views. These dwellings will have clear views of the turbine lights, discernible in an otherwise mostly dark sky.” The view of the spectacular night sky from our homes will be destroyed if night lighting is used. Rural residents do not have night lighting of any description, easily overlooked by city people who are accustomed to neon lights and alike lighting their night skies. Country people appreciate the complete lack of artificial light in our night skies. It is one of those country traits sought after by people who appreciate it: ‘wide open spaces, no noise, no lights’.

Mitigation is not feasible as screen planting would block the views we chose and paid for, and which we love. Screen planting would pose a serious fire risk, particularly where large trees would need to be planted very close to homes.

Other mitigation offered by EPYC, was ‘benefit sharing’. This involves residents signing an agreement with EPYC to become ‘associated’ land holders and signing a letter agreeing not to oppose the wind farm. Roseview property owners were offered amounts ranging from \$5,200pa to \$3,500pa if they became ‘associated’ land holders. It is morally inappropriate to offer payment to landholders to try to stop them objecting to the project. This tends to highlight just how tenuous the value proposition of the project really is. The benefit amounts offered were based solely on the distance of the residence from a turbine, not the visual impact of the wind farm. We do not want to sell our views.



A view from Roseview Road looking west – 4 of the Roseview properties

‘Benefit sharing’ for a wind farm should be offered to all affected land owners, with no strings attached, if the wind farm is approved.

The methodology used by the consultants who undertook the visual impact assessment, Clouston Associates, is at best questionable. It may be suitable for projects in an urban area but definitely not for a wind farm in a rural area. Based on the contents of Clouston’s website, Matthew Knight’s CV, and his presentation at the Community Consultative Committee (CCC) meeting in Tarago on 13 December 2016, Clouston Associates lack the necessary experience and qualifications to assess the visual impact of a wind farm in a rural area. We believe this has resulted in some serious flaws in the visual impact assessment of the Jupiter project.

Mr Knight admitted to the CCC that the assessment was subjective but that he had had years of experience making these judgements. Roseview residents’ subjective judgement on the visual impact of the proposed Jupiter wind farm is that it will be Catastrophic.

The EIS gives the impression that the Jupiter visual impact assessment was developed within the relevant policy and legislative framework. However, Clouston’s methodology goes against some of the cited framework.

One particular concern is the fact that the consultants did not speak with residents in and around the project area about how we value our landscape. It is stated in section 1.2.2 (p.12 of the LCVIA/Annex F) that the LCVIA is consistent with the Wind Farms and Landscape Values National Assessment Framework (NAF) Methodology. Table 1.2 of the LCVIA sets out the key components of the NAF. Step 1A includes undertaking a preliminary assessment of landscape values, and Step 1B includes **involving communities and stakeholders in identifying landscape values**.

The community in and around the proposed Jupiter project area were not involved in identifying landscape values of the project. This was admitted by Matthew Knight of Clouston Associates at the CCC meeting on 13 December 2016.

Step 3 in the Table includes seeking community input to potential impacts. Did the VI consultants consult with any community members in and around the project area

to obtain their views on the potential impacts for them? If so, how were these people selected for this consultation. **No residents of Roseview Estate were consulted on this (or any other issue) by the consultants.**

Step 4 of the Table includes responding to identified impacts, including “Changes to location or siting of the wind farm or ancillary infrastructure”. At a meeting between Roseview residents and EPYC on 3 March 2016 we were told by EPYC that they were not prepared to make any alterations to their project as a result of our issues.

The EIS talks about the Land and Environment Court Planning Principles, stating:

“Relevant [our emphasis] planning principles have been developed in visual assessment case judgments over the years to guide future decision-making in development appeals. These include separate but related principles for private and public domain views. The principles set out a process for assessing the acceptability of impact. The two most relevant cases to this site are:

- Public domain views – Rose Bay Marina Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council (2013)
- Private views – Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council (2004)

Overall, the Court Commissioners conclude that public domain views should be given more weight than private domain views due to the potential for visual impacts to affect a greater number of viewers.”

Planning Principles for Private views, from the Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council (2004) judgment, include:

- “water views are valued more highly than land views
- iconic views (eg of the Opera House, the Harbour Bridge or North Head) are valued more highly than views without icons
- whole views are valued more highly than partial views, e.g. a water view in which the interface between land and water is visible is more valuable than one in which it is obscured.”

These Planning Principles are not **‘relevant’** to a visual impact assessment for a wind farm in a rural/residential area.

The policy and legislative framework section of the EIS is misleading as it gives the reader the impression that Cloustone has followed a rigorous visual impact methodology, when they only used selected parts of the cited methodology.

Our subjective view is that the various layers of mountain ranges that we love, the rolling hills, natural grassland, farm animals, starry sky and comparatively little development, are our ‘iconic views’. We have chosen not to have views of the Opera House, Sydney Harbour Bridge or highly built up residential, commercial or industrial areas.

Our individual submissions will provide further comments on the misleading information and inaccurate statements in the LCVIA.



A view from Braidwood Road – 2 of the Roseview homes

3. Turbine Noise

The National Wind Farm Commissioner, Andrew Dyer, has said there is always noise from wind farms.

The NHMRC has said it is not possible to accurately predict wind farm noise.

Governments are unable to ensure wind farm operators do not breach noise requirements. Capital Wind Farm to the west of Roseview Estate has a noise complaint hotline and also has been forced to compensate residents for the noise they have heard. Department of Planning employees visited a resident who is impacted by the Capital Wind Farm in order to assess the noise her property was subjected to by the wind farm. Consequently Infigen double glazed her windows. This does nothing to the impact when she and her family are outside of their home. There **IS** noise, we speak to our neighbours, we are able to visit people at Capital Wind Farm, and we cannot simply accept that we will not be affected by noise from the proposed Jupiter wind farm.

We are very concerned about the possible effects of wind farm noise.

4. Disruption during Construction

If approved, during the construction period of the wind farm, there will be blasting for turbine bases, roadworks to enable the transport of large turbine components, heavy vehicle traffic, earthworks for access roads (between 30+ turbines across Goulburn/Braidwood Road) and turbine foundations (30+ across from Roseview), construction of temporary buildings and facilities for construction personnel/equipment (car parking, amenities for construction workers, laydown areas for the temporary storage of construction materials, plant, equipment and wind turbine components and temporary power supply for construction). There will be "Transport, storage and handling of fuels, oils and other hazardous substances for

construction and operation of wind farm infrastructure.” Where will all this infrastructure be?

It is claimed that “Construction noise impacts will only be temporary”. 18-24 months, 11 hours each week day and 5 hours on weekends, is too long to put up with when this work is happening around your home.

It is stated that “Construction noise levels will be reduced and impacts minimised with the **successful implementation** of these recommendations, **as far as is practically achievable.**” (Our emphasis) No certainty there, and again no consultation with property owners as to how they use their homes, or to establish an understanding of the impact noise may have on them while going about their daily activities.

We are particularly concerned about the wind farm traffic along Goulburn/Braidwood Road because of the number of school children from Roseview who travel daily on school buses along that road. Currently there are 12 children living at Roseview. These children, and the many other children living in Jupiter affected areas, will be using buses each day in an industrial area.

The EIS contains a statement that *“A review indicates that no public bus services run along Braidwood-Goulburn Road. However, a school bus service operates between Goulburn and Lake Bathurst. It is understood that the school bus routes in the vicinity of the site are reviewed on an annual basis (dependent on the distribution of student households) and are subject to change.”* (Our emphasis) Information about school bus services and our concerns about this were provided to EPYC in a meeting of Roseview residents on 2 occasions (16 October 2014 and 3 March 2016). We know from our inquiries that there are 5 separate bus services operating in the proposed Jupiter wind farm area on Braidwood/Goulburn Road, 28 bus stops and around 150 children on these buses.

In addition to the disruption and discomfort on humans caused by the blasting of ground in preparation for the turbine bases, the noise and vibrations can be very distressful to those animals kept by the hobby farm owners of Roseview. There are many hobby farmers with horses in and around the Jupiter project area. Our estate alone has a racehorse foaling property, and 3 other properties who compete their horses. Horses are ‘flight’ animals. Noise and blasts from earthworks such as noted in the EIS are likely to highly impact the welfare of these animals. News reports have stated that firecrackers let off near a horse paddock shocked a young girl’s horse to death.

5. Decrease in Property Values

We are aware of claims that property values do not go down when wind farms are built near them. However, the views from Roseview properties are spectacular and are one of the main reasons for us choosing to live here. Potential buyers of

Roseview properties will not have that attraction, the wind turbines will remove the appeal and saleable feature that is Roseview Estate.

We are convinced that the value of our properties will fall dramatically if the wind farm is approved. This will affect those residents who find they can no longer live in the area because they will have a view of an industrial facility instead of their natural rural outlook, or they do not want to put up with wind turbine noise. Our options to purchase in another location will be narrowed. Also, our properties are an investment for our families' futures.

In addition, the locking up of land under the turbines and the impact on the value, both financial and aesthetic, will reduce the attractiveness of the whole Tarago/Mulloon/Mt Fairy/Lake Bathurst area for future development.

6. Appalling Consultation

Property owners from Roseview have met with EPYC as a group on 2 occasions. At a meeting on 16 October 2014, we asked EPYC and ERM what the purpose of their visit was. We were told it was *'part of the process, to understand concerns and alleviate them and understand where necessary to place turbines'*. We told them of our many concerns but they gave us very little information about the project. We also asked for regular updates about progress on the project. EPYC agreed to provide a nominated Roseview representative with updates on a monthly basis. To date, our representative has not received a single email update.

At another meeting on 3 March 2016, we asked if EPYC would consider making any changes to their project as a result of our consultation. They replied 'No'. The EIS has not addressed any of our concerns. Our concerns remain the same. In reply to a heartfelt statement by one resident about the devastating visual impact the wind farm would have on her, the reply was simply "I'm sorry you feel that way."

EPYC Newsletters have been sporadic and have not addressed key concerns of individuals or the community. They rarely gave any new information. The provided timelines for the lodgement of the EIS were never met. Public information meetings by EPYC were not very informative. The information we desperately wanted and asked for was not provided. A frequent response received was that the details we wanted were not yet decided on and we would have to wait for the EIS.

EPYC's view of 'consultation' appears to be speaking to concerned property owners, listening to our concerns, providing the smallest amount of detail about the project possible, and telling us the project will go ahead as proposed no matter what our concerns are. What they gave back to us was the offer to plant trees to block our views and put us in danger of bushfires, and small amounts of money in an attempt to entice us into agreeing to become 'associated' landowners and thereby stopping us from objecting to the Jupiter proposal.

The desperately wanted information was also sought through the community representatives on the Jupiter CCC. EPYC was very reluctant to pass on any real information, and what information we did get through that process took a long time coming, and did not include much of what we needed. We had to wait for the EIS.

7. Effect on income/business

One Roseview family runs a small thoroughbred racehorse breeding business. At all times there is at least one young foal on the property. As is the nature of horses, the foals become very nervy and panic when faced with large movements and noise. The property owners fear that the foals will accidentally hurt themselves with loud construction works and when they see 30+ huge wind turbine blades spinning within 2-3km of them. Each foal is the result of an investment of thousands of dollars. Again, consultation and questions asked about how we use our properties would have brought these issues to light. Any small amount of research into equines would educate a person on these issues. It is in country areas with quiet surroundings that people breed and spell horses.

8. Misleading Information in the EIS

There are many instances of incorrect and misleading information in the EIS. We will be developing a detailed account of misinformation in separate submissions on the EIS, and submissions to the Planning Assessment Commission.

9. Effect on bushfire fighting efforts

Fires are a particular worry for us, and the many voluntary RFS personnel who live in and near the Jupiter wind farm project area.

The 'feasible' mitigation of tree planting to block our views of turbines is a fire hazard, particularly where large trees would need to be planted very close to homes.

We have recently been in a situation where a wildfire has raged out of control and threatened to destroy our homes. Those residents who were away from their homes when the fire began were prevented from returning for almost 2 days. Fortunately, no homes at Roseview were harmed by this fire. The outcome of this fire would have been very different if it was not possible, due to 88 wind turbines 173m high, hampering the work of 13 aircraft flying over the area for 2 days and dropping water and fire retardant. Roseview residents who were at home during the 2 days watched these aircraft flying in airspace and at tree height and below which would be filled with 30+ turbines if Jupiter is approved.

It has been reported that fire investigators found that the cause of the Currandooley fire was a low-flying bird. "The fire started as a result of a bird flying close to high-voltage powerlines, igniting and landing in dry grass on the 17 January 2017", the NSW RFS fire investigation report read.

This fire somehow started because of high-voltage powerlines which are part of wind farm infrastructure (Capital Wind Farm). If the fire did start in the way reported, it is because of the wind farm. It should not be possible for a bird to ignite simply by flying too close to wind farm infrastructure.

The Hon Pru Goward MP, Member for Goulburn has written to the Attorney General and the Minister for Emergency Services outlining the community's concerns about the Currandooley fire. She has sought a coronial inquiry in the absence of any other means of establishing a full, independent and transparent inquiry. It has been noted that there is a history of fires and bird deaths in the area and Ms Goward is of the view that these other incidents probably need to be looked at as part of the coronial inquiry.

Hopefully, the inquiry will result in stopping fires such as the Currandooley fire occurring in the future.

The Currandooley fire shows that wind farms can be fire hazards. It also shows that even with mandatory conditions on wind farm operators, such incidents do happen.

In summary, the proposed Jupiter Wind Turbine Project has significant detrimental impacts on all of the residents of Roseview Estate. These include but are not limited to visual, noise, safety and lifestyle. This is a rural residential area and should be treated as such.

Many of the residents have already taken their own actions to reduce their energy consumption and greenhouse impact by installing solar panels yet here we are being further penalised to support people in major cities.

We are not against reducing greenhouse gases and increasing renewable energy we just want the related developments to be constructed in a way that does not impact residents of an area of unspoilt natural beauty. The proposed area is not the site for a large scale industrial development.

Please consider our views and concerns.



A view to the Jupiter Project Area from the top of Roseview Estate



This is the view we are afraid we will have if Jupiter is approved

Submitted by all Roseview Estate Property Owners:

Phil Lingard - J257

Leonie Southwell – J130

Tom Phillips – House at planning stage, shed being built, house site selected

Laura Jackson - House at planning stage, shed being built, house site selected

Rexine Dryden – J19

Chris Dryden – J19

Barry O'Neill – J10

Denise O'Neill – J10

Martin Welsby – House at planning stage, house site selected

Bruce Saunders – J272

Chris Saunders – J272

J Johnson – J65 – Approved DA, have yet to commence building

J65 - Have yet to commence building, house site selected

Jack Francis – J135 - Currently only have shed, approved DA, including house site

Nicole Francis – J135 – Currently only have shed, approved DA, including house site

Duncan Briggs – J33

Karena Briggs – J33

Emma Tubman – J93

Phil Tubman – J93

Jacqui Henderson – J134

Noel Henderson – J134