

I object to the siting of the Jupiter wind turbines.

Before I explain my reasoning, I'd like to provide you with a little of my background. With my husband, I moved to Mt Fairy 8 years ago, seeking a more environmentally sustainable lifestyle. We live on 100 acres and manage it via Holistic Management (HM) principles. Both of us have committed 2 years studying Holistic Management and my husband has put in the additional yards to become an accredited HM teacher and TAFE teacher. He is currently teaching courses in Braidwood. We run cattle, chooks, grow our own vegetables and have a fruit orchard. We support renewable energy and solar panels heat our water with more panels awaiting the completion of a shed. We are involved in the community - I am part of the Braidwood Garlic Growers Group and am developing my skills in garlic growing. We are active in the local Rural Fire Service Brigade, both holding executive positions. I explain the above to you, as I'm aware many of the officers in the Department of Planning are city folk who are in favour of renewable energy and those in the PAC may be similar. As such, you may think those who oppose Jupiter are climate change deniers and do not support renewable energy. This is not our position. I oppose Jupiter for other reasons that I'm about to detail.

Wind turbines of the height proposed by EPYC (173 m) or, as Department of Planning officer, Mike Young explained *'40 metres higher than the Sydney Harbour Bridge'* (7/12/16), should not be placed in close proximity to people. According to the EIS, there are 140 residences within 3 kms of the wind farm and a further 133 within 5 kms. The landholders on these properties value quiet, views and the country lifestyle. The Department of Planning and Environment recognises this when its officers publicly admit the siting is at the *'high end of the [density] spectrum than in other areas'* (Young, 7/12/16). EPYC have been operating in our area since 2012 and must have known how many people live here.

The Department of Planning rejected EPYC's initial EIS. In the letter of rejection it read: *'...the EIS contains insufficient consideration of: the suitability of the site, paying particular attention to the growing rural-residential character of the surrounding area'* (Kitto, 16/10/15). If EPYC were to sufficiently consider the growing numbers of people establishing their homes in this area, what adjustments would EPYC be making? To date, my understanding is that EPYC is talking vaguely about visual mitigation in the form of trees and benefit sharing. It does not take outstanding intelligence to recognise that trees (whether seedlings or advanced size) cannot shield the view of 173m high turbines from all the vantage points on a 100 acre property. Benefit sharing appears to be a form of compensation for the discomfort caused by the close proximity of turbines. Interestingly benefit sharing also legally requires the beneficiary to refrain from complaining – in some quarters this is referred to as gag money. Neither trees nor benefit sharing can change the fact that the proposed Jupiter wind complex has been located too close to people. Had Jupiter been planned for a sparsely populated area, we would not be having this discussion. This location is as inappropriate as would be a wind farm in Mr Stokes' Pittwater electorate. It must be rejected.