

Letter re: Thunderbolt Wind Farm

My Name: Catherine Margaret Woof

Address: 'Balmoral'
1264 Green Valley Rd

Bendemeer NSW 2355

Resubmitted due to
lack of complete Director
address on page
①. First submission
dated 16 May 2022.

Application Name: Thunderbolt Wind Farm

Application Number: SSD-10807896

To: Director, - Energy Assessments, Development Assessment,
Department of Planning and Environment,
Locked Bag 5022, Parramatta, NSW, 2124

Dear Director,

18 May 2022

This letter constitutes my objections to the Thunderbolt Windfarm. I object to both Stages I and II of the proposal.

My property is a contiguous neighbour to both hosts for Stage I, and I reside on the property.

I have made NO donations to any political party.

Grounds for my objection.

1/ The community consultation was inadequate and didn't occur until negotiations with hosts was well advanced. Although a contiguous neighbour of both stage I hosts, and to be reasonably affected visually and by noise ~~£~~; the first time I heard about the project was from an acquaintance living to the South of the New England Highway,

~~to~~ in late January 2019 and at a meeting during February 2019. There was no contact from NeoEn. NeoEn staff drove across my property to contact Loanga, yet when I asked Ms Joanna Murphy of NeoEn why

She hadn't contacted me, she claimed ^{that} she didn't have my name or phone number. She could have asked for my name; my landline is publicly listed.

As a result, the news of the proposed Windfarm came as a shock; within a month of the severe drought ending, in January 2019, and just after the black December fires, during which my partner, Mr Stephen Johnston, averaged less than five hours sleep for the month while caring for our remnant stock, working fulltime at a physically demanding job, and fighting the many local fires from dry thunderstorms. We were both exhausted, shocked and dismayed, Covid19 restrictions then meant a properly organised community response against the proposal couldn't be organised.

At the fires, I was disappointed to notice the hosts ~~barely~~ had attended very few, showing I thought little community concern during Black December. ~~the~~

When the publicised Community Consultative Committee was formed, it was clear it was made up of pro windfarm representatives who were seeking to smooth out public relations.

The same can be said of Dr Sara Bell's report from Umwelt in which my major

statement, that \$100 000 pa with NOT MEND the rifts in the community that this highhanded, insensitive conduct from NeoEn has caused.

The Department needs to be aware that volunteer RFS members have stated they will not fight fires on host properties as a result of community division in other parts of the state. NeoEn must respond to the potential for this to happen at the Thunderbolt Wind Farm which is located on fire prone country. WHAT WILL THEY DO IF RFS IS UNAVAILABLE, AND AS STATED BY HELICOPTER AND FIXED WING PILOTS THAT THEY WILL NOT FLY NEAR THE TURBINES (this from those ^{pilots} with "skin in the game") not the PAID PRO-GOVERNMENT POLICY UPPER ECHELONS!! Yes, daily I see the hills, real lightning attracting, covered in many dead trees, turbines proposed to be between our property and the ONLY water sources available in 2018, and I am angry and fearful. Community consultation by Mr Paradise and his team is a sham under such potentially life threatening situations.

My second objection concerns threats to wildlife and biodiversity. In the Neoen Submission, negotiations are stated to have begun with Kyabra in 2018. Umwelt investigators have noted the degraded nature of the property, but do mention that threatened areas of native grassland exist. In January 2018 extensive spraying out of iconic native grassland pastures ^{on Kyabra} started, being replaced with exotic high performance pastures. Mr Johnston photographed a helicopter doing the work as spray drift killed vegetation on our farm. The area was then grazed heavily during the drought. The previous owners managed the ~~pe~~ native pastures for over 25 years, most recently with cell grazing.

These extensive spraying activities beg the question - was approval given to spray out these pastures? How much 'clearing' may have been done through spraying, heavy stocking practices and should this be "rewarded" through taxpayer subsidised renewable energy schemes? If this occurred, it seems counterproductive. I need to know whether approval was sought and granted by the Environment Protection Agency for this work on Kyabra.

(4) of (7)

Turbine No 28 is situated very close to our boundary. Indeed, the so-called "biodiversity corridor" will be exploiting our land as a buffer. Within a few hundred metres of this proposed site, on our property 15 December 2021 a koala was seen, and reported to Landcare. In addition, I have seen koalas on the Green Valley Road near turbines 26 & 27 throughout my 17 years on our property. Frequently I see eagles flying over the area where No 28 will be, hunting over the extensive valley below. We also see hawks, the small eagle, and hear powerful owls and the masked owl in the vicinity of this turbine. I am concerned that Umwelt seems to have minimised the existence of predatory birds ^{that could be hurt or killed by the turbines.} and My background includes a Zoology degree with First Class Honours from the ANU, and I pay attention to wildlife and vegetation on my farm.

The turbines Nos 23 & 24 & 25 will be sited on habitat similar to that of the location of eagles and birds of prey on our farm. Also Numbers 24 & 25 are very close to the headwaters of Molong creek.

These ridges are similar to a nearby ridge on our farm ~~is~~ That is designated Old Growth Forest. How close is Old Growth Forest to the turbines on Looanga? Unlike our property, Looanga has only comparatively recently become freehold, after being listed as a forest, and I am concerned that pockets of surviving original forest on ridges may become endangered by windfarm construction on Looanga. I have a lack of faith in the independence and adequacy of Umwelt's environment assessment, given the deficiencies in locating predator bird species.

A third objection is noise. We didn't have noise monitors on the farm. There are 8 turbines that will affect us. Since monitoring by Neoen's contractors turbine 28 has moved to its current location. The report in the submission is NOT relevant to the current ~~can~~ layout and design of the turbines. I cannot see how EIS approval can be given on an inadequate and outdated report. It is as if this matter, the subject of recent successful litigation in Victoria,

is being glossed over. The noise will have particular implications for mustering on horseback near Turbine number 28,

Visual impact. - Fourth grounds - 8 turbines are visible from the Farmhouse. It is ridiculous to suggest a screen of vegetation will provide adequate mitigation for the visual impact. I have driven by windfarms near Yass, Crookwell and Glen Innes and find the turbines visually distracting. I believe flicker and noise will affect the safety and concentration when working stock on the farm, particularly from turbines 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 23. Work is usually done on horseback, aided by work dogs.

Respectfully submitted.