

Below are two concerns regarding the Hills of Gold Wind Farm Amendment, a development which I object to.

### **Morrison's Gap Road upgrade**

In my initial objection to the Hills of Gold Wind Farm (HoGWF) made two years ago, I highlighted the lack of detail provided for the proposed upgrade to Morrison's Gap Road which was of great concern for a number of reasons, two of which included the amenity & safety of the road. The road is the only access to my property and my in-laws property.

Appendix G Landscape & Visual Assessment Addendum to the Amendment Report (no 2) includes assessment information of the amendments to Morrison's Gap Road. The report states:

*"Morrison's Gap Road is a low use road...The road is characterised by dense patches of roadside vegetation and generally has an undulating character."*

There are three pictures to highlight the general area for proposed upgrade. It is of great concern that there are no further details in what the actual upgrade involves, only a few words mentioning a "reduction" in upgrade. An upgrade is still proposed yet there are no visuals or detail highlighting how much vegetation will be removed or change to the road width to accommodate the upgrades or how that will affect the adjacent landowners.

I would like to also note that this report has highlighted that this road is a low use road and was one of the positive attributes helping us to make the decision to live there. I am not confident that we would have made the same decision had we been looking for land after an Industrial Wind Farm development had established itself in the area. The proposed upgrades to the road will certainly be detrimental to the amenity of the adjacent properties.

### **Screening for Visual Impacts**

Development proposals in NSW are required to assess the compatibility of the developments to that of the existing surrounding land uses. This is the likely reason why neighbours to this development were offered a neighbour benefit/financial incentive as the development is not considered to be compatible with the neighbouring land uses. Compensation is offered to encourage people to 'put up with it' and for the possible devaluation of their property, which I acknowledge is a process which the current legislation facilitates. When assessing the compatibility of such a development, is it reasonable to rely on existing vegetation on neighbouring properties (such as that for NAD\_12) to be the mitigation measure for the purpose of developing the land next door? This is what is proposed as the mitigation measure for the visual impacts to NAD\_12 as stated in the above-mentioned report.

Surely this is restrictive to the owners of NAD\_12 and how they wish to manage their land in the future and surely placing the burden on adjacent landholders to provide the mitigation measures for such a project is considered onerous and unreasonable. It is irrational to expect the adjacent landholders to manage their land in a way that benefits the neighbouring land use. Another example justifying how unreasonable that expectation would be expecting to develop your own land so long as the neighbouring property remove their trees to assist in the creation of an Asset Protection Zone for your development, with no benefit to them, only burden.

The matters raised above are but two of the many concerns I have regarding the proposed HoGWF development. I reiterate from my initial submission, please don't allow this attempt to save the environment at the expense of the environment.