

## **Land use conflict and visual impacts remain:**

The proponent continues to ignore the potential for land use conflicts on neighbouring unassociated properties.

I will use one of my family's property interests at lot 9/DP 249183 for reference. NAD 12 is 1.38km to the closest turbine and is subject to 21 turbines at hub height. This property has been assessed to have a low visual impact due to the properties existing vegetation cover.

After a recent site analysis was undertaken to determine the existing dwelling for compliance with the NSW RFS Planning for Bushfire 2019 document, it was noted that a significant percentage of the existing "screening vegetation" should be removed to achieve an effective APZ to the property.

I therefore believe it presumptuous for the proponent to assume this property's visual impacts should be categorised as low.

Further to the above concern, is the future land use limitations and constraints that would be burdened by the occupiers of lot 9/DP 249183 should the closest turbines be permitted construction.

The current RU1 zoning of the lot allows for native vegetation to be assessed and cleared for agricultural purposes. The availability of the lot to be developed consistent with the land use of the RU1 zone is severely constrained should the HOGWF be permitted, as if the existing native screening vegetation was removed, the likely visual impacts would almost certainly be categorised as high and be unacceptable visual impacts to the existing dwelling. The lot is therefore having an unreasonable constraint imposed upon it without agreement nor compensation.

Finally, the proponents' amendments have failed to acknowledge and address future natural disaster events (raised in previous EIS objections) that may destroy the existing vegetation screening. There is a high likelihood of a severe bushfire or storm event that could render the existing screening ineffective for decades.

Given, the existing vegetation cover to lot 9 /DP249183 is currently a screening mitigation gift to the proponent, should the proponent be permitted to construct the WTG's in the proposed locations, we feel that a reasonable condition of consent requiring the proponent must negotiate and enter into a neighbour agreement before construction of any turbines within 3km of the dwelling on lot 9/DP249183 occurs.

Whilst I have only highlighted a property I have a direct interest in, the same logic should be applicable to other non associated neighbours.

Notwithstanding the above consideration, I still object to the HOGWF.