5/12/23

Dear Assessor,

I would like to object to the wind farm due to the following concerns:

Visual

Our property is indicated as a "lot with a dwelling entitlement" under appendix F6 LVIA. The report has indicated that we will have views of the project and will be visually impacted.

Our property is significant and has magnificent views over the dam and proposed project area. Our family have always wanted to build houses for the children/grandchildren on any of the many lots that makes up the farm.

This area is known for being a quiet rural area with undulating hills and magnificent views. This is what drew us to the area and along with many others. This project will likely be an eyesore based upon and disturb our quiet enjoyment of the land.

We have spoken to many real-estate agents in areas that surround existing wind farms. The consensus was that wind farms have a significant negative impact on the value properties surrounding wind farms. Have any studies been carried out on this? How will this project affect the future value of our property and how are people being compensated?

Appendix F of the Landscape and Visual Assessment document (p43-45) shows that under the ZVI maps a decent portion of our property would be able to see 61-70 of the 250m turbines based upon the drawing key.

We would like a visual assessment done on several spots that we have earmarked for dwellings to a similar standard as the report, with wiring and photomontages to give us a better understanding and show us the visual impact of the project on our land (at the cost of the developer).

Decommissioning

As a farmer and landholder decommissioning is a risk that I do not feel safe about and if not done properly it would greatly impact the area, council and the community.

Is the significant amount of money that will needed for decommissioning for the Burrendong windfarm project sufficient and currently secured for the landowners via a trust, bond or bank guarantee?

The Australian Energy Infrasturucture Comissioner (AEIC) stated in his latest Annual report that:

- *Most planning permits state that decommissioning responsibilities rest*

with the project owner (i.e. the tenant). However, in the event of default by the project owner, the liability for decommissioning ultimately may rest with the landholder.

- *Some published decommissioning plans have calculated costs of about $400,000 per turbine. This cost could increase for larger turbines and could range up to $600,000 per turbine or more.*

- *If a turbine has a structural failure and is unstable, it could cost millions of dollars to safely remove the turbine from site.*

- *It is therefore possible that the cost to decommission a turbine could be equal to or greater than the total income generated for the landholder over the 25-year operating period.*

- *Some proponents/developers are offering to make ongoing deposits into a trust to fund decommissioning of the asset. However, generally they make these payments in the later years of the project, around years 15 or 20. The delay in commencing payments creates risk as the project owner is required to source significant funding in the declining years of the asset.*

- *The risk to the landholder would be significantly reduced if the developer commenced making deposits to fund the decommissioning from commencement of the asset's operations.*

- *the project operator may sell the project to another company over the course of the life of the project, which could easily result in the arrangement to fund the decommissioning being lost and the enforceability of the agreement being eroded over time.*

The new draft energy policy framework has a decommissioning calculator that reveals the astonishing costs to dismantle a wind farm. These are consistent with the AEIC's estimates.

The Australian Energy Infrasturucture Comissioner said it best in his annuals report:

- *As a minimum, there needs to be clarity surrounding who is responsible for decommissioning, who pays and how those funds are secured to protect the landholder from default and ensure the work is completed properly and in a timely fashion.*

Based on the information above we have the following concerns:

- Is there security with the longevity of the turbines being considered/used?

- What are the warranty/lifepans from the manufacturer in relation to the proposed duration of the lease. For example - do the turbines have a warranty that matches the duration of the lease eg 40year warranty for a 40 years lease?

- Is the significant amount of money (hundreds of millions?) that will be

needed for decommissioning for the Burrendong windfarm project currently secured for the landowners via a trust, bond or bank guarantee?

- When are the funds being secured or when will the money start being paid to the decommissioning fund eg year 1, 2 or from year 20 etc?
- Is what has been proposed best practice and addresses the issues raised above and by the AEIC? Is this enough to protect the landowners, council and community?
- The costs indicated by the government bodies are $400,000-600,000 per turbine or more. How much did the developer allow for decommissioning per turbine in the decommissioning fund?
- If a turbine has a structural failure and is unstable, it could cost millions of dollars to safely remove the turbine from site. Has a scenario like this been budgeted for with the funds secured?
- *Most planning permits state that decommissioning responsibilities rest with the project owner (i.e. the tenant). However, in the event of default by the project owner, the liability for decommissioning ultimately may rest with the landholder.* Based on the above statement If the project owner defaults and decommissioning cost rest with the landholder, what terms are in place if the land owner doesn't have the funds (i.e. $400,000 - $600,000 per turbine) to decommission the turbines. Do they become an indefinite eyesore on the landscape or does the government intervene?

I thank you for taking the time to read this and appreciate your response to alleviate my concerns in advance.

Best Regards

Jason