

Kayleen Deaves

21 Innes Street

Nundle 2340 NSW

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

20 January 2021

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RE: HILLS OF GOLD WIND FARM APPLICATION NO. SSD 9679

- I am attaching my submission to the above mentioned development application
- I OBJECT to the Hills of Gold Wind Farm proposal ID no. SSD 9679
- I have not made any reportable political donations in the previous 2 years



Signature

OBJECTION

I have been teaching primary aged children in Nundle since 2000 and have been involved with tree planting projects to restore the natural habitat for the duration of my time in Nundle. In 2009, I was one of the three organising members of the Riverside Planting Project, with one of its aims being to stabilise the banks of the river around Nundle. I have a thorough knowledge of the impacts of erosion on the waterways and am concerned that the proposed clearing on the ridge line will cause damage to the creeks and streams, and possibly undermine some of the efforts we made here in the valley.

I have been a member of Upper Peel Landcare group since 2013. We have planted many hundreds of trees in that time. My concern is that, although EIS mentioned the plans to replant some of the areas the developers propose to rehabilitate, where is the guarantee that an appropriate follow up and maintenance program will be in put place to protect young plantings? How are they planning to to protect and water the plants, especially in the likelihood of future droughts and temperature increases? There needs to be provision for this in the environmental statement.

On pages 161 - 165 in the table headed Mitigation Measures (EIS), it states that a private contractor will be appointed to oversee the implementation of the most of the mitigation measures. It doesn't seem logical that this responsibility be handed over to the contractors, whose primary interest is commercial, nor would they have the knowledge or the expertise for the task. I believe that an independent agency, who has the appropriate training and professional credibility, should be in charge and overseeing the rehabilitation process. In fact, they should be on site to oversee the entire project from the start of the process. My worst fear is that the main host who owns and operates a large earth moving business will be handed over the rehabilitation contract. This person is [REDACTED] [REDACTED], and is not the right person to be left in charge of rehabilitation. I believe that fully transparent selection process for engaging a suitable contractor/agent should be implemented.

With regards to endangered and vulnerable species, I feel strongly about the amount of emphasis we put on protecting the natural habitat in the course of teaching our school children, priming them for the importance of the protection of the endangered and vulnerable species, yet we stand back and allow this kind of destruction in our own back yard.

Many of the species listed in EIS are nocturnal and the impact of lights and noise on their habitat and hunting grounds has not been adequately addressed.

In many instances when I read the EIS I feel that they "hedge their bets", using terms such as " a suitable buffer", "as far as practicable", "as much as possible". It implies that they will do it if it's convenient and the priority of the project is not compromised and the financial outcome is not impacted. Basically, they will do it if it suits them.

Thank you for the opportunity to act on behalf of humanity and have a say in our future.

