

Table 6-16 Sound Power Levels: Normal Operating Mod

My number one objection/concern to this project currently as it stands, is the sound emitted from WTG's

As can be clearly seen by table 6-16 of the EIS it covers a wide range in terms of frequency. The a Commissioner has received noise complaints according to the EIS . The burden of proof had been placed on the complainant, who would be neither qualified or nor able to prove the complaint. This in my opinion in no way negates the validity of the health effects claimed, but rather conveniently leaves causality open.

I have experienced the noise effects in Victoria on much smaller WTG's and it is not pleasant. The proposed WTG at 149m hub height are 36.3% higher than anything we currently have in this country and as far as my research indicates the turbines also differ from anything we can test. Therefor we rely on computer modelling rather than operation in the local or Australian environment. We know from other modelling, the weather modelling for instance, that it is not always 80% accurate. In this case the modelling would rely if not completely, partially on the technical data provided by the company .

My concern is that the 6.5km distance to the nearest WTG may well have health consequences for the population of Walcha, such as nausea, vomiting and headaches which have been recorded in other jurisdictions. The population of Walcha which is an ageing demographic and maybe at more risk.

There have been studies to suggest that in the daytime the noise generated from the WTG may travel 20km under various conditions .

Willshire, W., and Zorumski W. (1987). " Low-frequency acoustics propagation in high winds," in *Proceedings Noise-Con*, Vol. **87**, pp. 275–280.

If this is correct, which we assume it is, as it is a published scientific study, then Walcha population could be at risk at 15km let alone 6.5km. Therefor the nearest WTG should be relocated at least at the 20km limit.

Whereas the effects have been noted under night time conditions at 90km from the source.

Marcillo, O., Arrowsmith, S., Blom, P., and Jones, K. (2015). " On infrasound generated by wind farms and its propagation in low-altitude tropospheric waveguides," *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* **120**(19), 9855–9868, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD022821>.

I realise that I have quoted only two studies, where there is many available. I would put it to you that if it was your family living in Walcha you should be concerned for their welfare.

With reference to 6.2.3.6 Traffic and Transport Noise.

I wish to object on the level of transport noise and traffic density on two points .

I note you have stated in the above reference vis ;

"The NSW Road Noise Policy criteria for "Local Roads - Existing residences affected by additional traffic on existing local roads generated by land use developments" are equivalent (LA_{eq}, 1hour) noise levels of no greater than 55 dB(A) during the day-time (7 am to 10 pm) and 50 dB(A) during the night- time (10.00 pm to 7.00 am). This noise level is to be achieved outside, at a distance of 1 m from the façade of a dwelling and at a height of 1.5 m from the floor. The traffic noise assessment considers the noise at the closest (worst case) dwelling to any road/track, understood to be a setback distance in the order of 25 m from a highway and 10 m within the townships along the access route."

Your document further states the following. "Notwithstanding, during the peak of construction the number of vehicles associated with the wind farm development using the preferred access route is predicted to exceed the above traffic volumes. During this time, morning traffic levels are expected to reach 105 light vehicle trips (workers accessing site) and 32 large vehicles within one hour. For this level of activity, a noise level of 60 dB(A) is predicted at 25 m from a highway and 62 dB(A) at 10 m from the road within a township. For other roads or tracks where dwellings are located further from the road, the above number of vehicle movements can double for every doubling of the distance between the road and dwelling". Note my underline!

(1) I would point out because of the terrain and the start time a resident will experience more than the 55dB limit legislated, for a approximate period 14 hours 30minutes a day Monday to Friday and 12hours thirty minutes Saturdays as the vehicles have to first reach the work site. This could indeed be a conservative estimate when there is snow or frosts on dirt work tracks.

I personally think this is over the top for a minimum of 10 months with an fairly fluid estimated 30 months to completion given the EIS study statements.

One must ask if this would tolerated in Canberra, Bondi, or other Sydney well healed suburbs? **It will certainly have a major detrimental effect on my families environment and well being.**

My house is located at 109n Derby St Walcha which apart from the through traffic is only approximately 400 meters from the major intersection of Derby and Jamerson Street which will be the major entry point from the Oxley Highway to the work sights according to the EIS.

So on top of and extra 558 trips a day , (Fig 6.19 EIS) **which incidentally would be approximately 560% increase in traffic past my door over the norm**, there would be the associated vehicle noise of trucks turning at in low gear at the intersection. 996 vehicles in total of which 288 would be heavies. (Fig 6.19 EIS) A sort of Port Botany - tree change scenario!

These figures would no doubt be a best case estimate - like nothing would break down or need to be maintained or repaired on a project this size - necessitating extra trips , would they? .

(2) With reference to Derby Street and the extra vehicle traffic! (fig 6.19 EIS)

We have had the resealing and alignment work on the to do list with Council for 8 years to my knowledge. It is currently in very bad shape and has had two lots of expensive works due to water damage and subsidence, done to the tune \$500,000, which has delayed the planed \$1.2 million upgrade. I personally think that if this work is not carried out prior to the construction start it will be a pot holed dirt track within thirty days.

Of-course it will be argued that this will be done "maybe" prior to the construction. Promises are cheap.

The council will have no doubt have to pick up the tab for all the additional work required at the completion of the project, as community contributions do no cover road work at the completion of the project. Thus we the rate payers will be contributing for some overseas entities project and have to put up with a minimum 10 months loss of personal environment quality.

I also note that although the Uralla solar project has been plugged into the grid there have no reductions to local electricity prices. Could this be an omen of things to come ?, if so would this cause us to be somewhat cynical of the Justification statements vis (7.1 EIS); "The wind farm will deliver renewable, low-cost energy to the national grid and contribute to the NSW Government's net-zero emissions target by 2050."

We know where the profits will go, and it appears the savings may or not be passed on, the tax payer will have to fund the foregone tax revenue, for the yet un-stated tax offsets to be provided by our government to the "for" profit entity. Some deal!

My final objection to the project is the use of water as per mentioned in the following;

“Water Supply Options

Preferred water supply options for use during the development of the Project have not been determined. It is anticipated that these will be identified on the design has been finalised and prior to the construction phase of the Project.

The project has identified four secure options for supply water during the Project’s construction period

have been identified and include:

- ♣ Surface water collection from existing (or new) dams;
- ♣ Groundwater pumping from bores;
- ♣ Water abstraction from a nearby permanent water source; and
- ♣ **Tanking water to site from Council supply (including treated wastewater) or other local Water Access Licence (WAL) owners.”**

The EIS states that it will use 116ML , at the meeting in Walcha Mr Dough Landfear 29/9/22 indicated 220ML and now many locales think it would be double Mr Landfear’s comment.

I note with very grave concern that the council’s water supply is in the mix according to the EIS.

We have not long ago gone through the worst drought since 1955, in which the locales were not even able to flush their toilets for the very real fear of running out of the town water supply. The council has secured funding to build a new dam capacity of 300ML this is not completed. It has barely started and the EIS obviously has their eyes on it to start the project. **This is unacceptable, and I object strongly to this water grab.** Our water source is the MacDonald river which can be very low much of the time. If the EIS is considering taking water from there it will deprive local towns of their “only” water supply.

In conclusion the above objections are only the major objections I have to the project . There are a few others such as the dangers to aerial spraying, visual impact, damage to the tourist industry, that I have not mentioned in the interest of brevity.

No thanks! I choose the “do nothing option” referred to 2.2.1 of the EIS.