

I am writing to object to the proposed Jupiter wind farm. I am an owner of the property at 268 Barnet Dr., Mt Fairy NSW.

My objections are detailed below.

1. I have operated aircraft from the above property on a 780m long airstrip for 15 years and continue to do so. ***The proposed windfarm will pose an unacceptable hazard to safe flying.***
  - In prevailing north-west winds, the windfarm's currently proposed towers & turbines, and possible sites that the proponent might build towers if approved, ***will provide an obstruction for landing*** for the downwind, base and final approaches on landing onto my airstrip. These occur at elevations of 3500'asl to 2400'asl (ie. 1000' above the ground to the ground).
  - In south-east winds (which seem to be increasingly becoming more frequent with climate change), ***the windfarm's towers etc will pose an extremely dangerous hazard during take-off*** to the south east.
    - ***The windfarm towers and turbines will be in direct conflict with aircraft flightpaths*** with the flight direction for both aircraft capable of high performance climbs and aircraft that climb slowly.
    - ***The turbulence created by the windfarm will make it unsafe to fly***
    - ***The windfarm towers and turbines will make it more dangerous to take-off in the south east direction because it will sterilize the land for an emergency landing*** should an engine fail on take-off (note with an engine failure on take-off the safest strategy is to land straight ahead, into the wind)
  - ***The windfarm will encroach into class G airspace and this will substantially reduce the airspace available for recreational aircraft to fly safely within.***
    - The area where the windfarm is proposed is in an area where class G airspace goes from the ground to 6500'asl. Above this altitude is airspace controlled by airtraffic control at Canberra airport and which is used predominately by commercial airlines. This 'controlled' airspace is not available to most recreational aircraft. With the turbines reaching 600' above hills that are around 3000'asl and having a 1000' safety margin above ***the turbines will concentrate recreational aircraft to around 1500' of class G airspace, and this will make it more difficult for aircraft to maintain a safe separation from each other.***

- It should also be noted that ***the area of the proposed windfarm is a place of significant air traffic volumes. The construction of the wind turbines over this area will substantially reduce the availability of aircraft to make emergency landings safely.***
  - It is in an area of class G airspace where aircraft arriving from the north wait for airtraffic control clearance prior to entering the controlled airspace around Canberra airport.
  - It is on a common route available to aircraft to travelling east and west, from central NSW (such Goulburn, Cowra, Temora, Cootamundra, Parkes, etc) to the coast (such as Moruya (via Braidwood & the Araluen Valley) for recreational aircraft (and others) that need to avoid controlled airspace around Canberra and conflict with commercial airline traffic and which also provides suitable emergency landing areas (as opposed to large expanses of forest as is the case further north and south).
  - It is on a route taken frequently by many military aircraft from Fairburn (Canberra) to Albatross (Nowra) and many of these trips are at around 1000' above the ground in rotary wing aircraft.
  - I note the proponent 'assessed' that the proposal would have little impact on aeronautical activity in the area and that this was based on their inspection of the CASA database of 'ALA's (Approved Landing Areas or Aircraft Landing Areas). ***The use by the proponent of ALAs as a measure of aeronautical activities impacted by the proposal is extremely misleading.*** ALA's are effectively obsolete and are largely irrelevant in assessing impact on aeronautical activity in the area. Last century it was an offence for an aircraft to land other than at an ALA or licensed aerodrome (except in an emergency). ALAs had to meet certain standards. However, this was abolished last century and replaced with a rule requiring each pilot to satisfy themselves as to the suitability of an area to land. While the database of ALAs is still maintained it is rarely used (except perhaps by proponents wishing to make misleading statements and I think some insurance companies) and many of the entries are well out of date. For example, my airstrip and the others in the near vicinity (such as the ones on the Cootes property, on Kalbilli, and on Kalbilli Close) are not on the ALA database. There is simply no rational reason for us to agree to the entry of our airstrips on the database. And in any case, the four airstrips in close proximity to the proposed windfarm are clearly observable to anyone flying over and indeed from Google photos.

2. ***The windfarm will substantially depreciate the financial and personal investments I have made in maintaining my airstrip*** and hangerage for aircraft. This has included many weeks of personal labour in maintaining the surface of the airstrip so it is suitable for aircraft movements.
3. ***The windfarm will substantially eliminate the benefit I obtain from operating my aircraft*** at 268 Barnet Drive.
4. ***The windfarm will also reduce the benefits to other users of the airstrip*** including by friends and others who operate their aircraft, and land and take-off, on our property.
5. ***The windfarm will create additional risk and frequency of wild fires.***
  - As we have seen recently, the windfarm and its associated infrastructure at Currindooly caused the recent fire which burnt approximately 25% of our property (And this is still true if the ignition of the fire was caused by the interaction of common fauna with the infrastructure and not unlawful activities of windfarm maintenance crews).
  - The proponent's comments on bushfire risk are extremely misleading because it fails to address ***the known added risk of the windfarm infrastructure starting a fire and the increased frequency of such fires.*** It may be true that the access roads will make it easier for ground based crews to fight a fire that is already burning, but this does not alter the fact of increased numbers of fires caused by the infrastructure and/or workers. Nor does it address the fact that the ***access roads are unlikely to be of a great use to fight a fire started from the tower, the road, or power lines (because, by the time crews arrive, the fire will have moved with the wind AWAY from the roads/towers etc.*** As was learnt from the Currindooly fire, the roads would only be of assistance for a fire started upwind of the towers, not from the towers, roads etc themselves.
  - The proponent's comments on the windfarm not preventing 'ground based' units fighting a fire is also misleading because it ***ignores the fact that the wind turbines will substantially reduce the ability of the RFS to use aircraft, particularly large aircraft like the DC10 which was instrumental in fight against the recent Currindooly fire*** which was started by a windfarm.
6. ***It is not possible to purchase alternative property with an airstrip***, as it is extremely difficult to find land that has mature natural ecosystems and habitat for native fauna & flora and which is also suitable for aeronautical activities.

Importantly, ***our involvement in the property is not just a financial investment (as it is for the proponent), but also an 'investment' in the 'place' and 'community'. This is being taken away by the proposal.***

We have made considerable investment of time, money and effort – we have put our hearts and souls into our property to exclude feral animals and weeds and to encourage the regeneration of the natural bush. We have been supporting the growth in the local *Wallabia bicolor* population, the brown *Antechinus*, our wombats & nesting wedge-tail eagles, and the various snakes & lizards, as well as encouraging the development a rich understory of understory forbs by keeping hooved animals off the property.

If the windfarm proposal is approved it ***will substantially diminish the value we place on the property.*** It is no wonder that we live in a time when individuals and families feel that governments do little to protect and support their investments (financial, social and otherwise) as opposed to corporate investments and their financial returns. We understand why people are increasingly turning to alternative candidates in elections and away from the established political parties.

7. ***The proposal is also quite damaging to the local community and is socially divisive.*** Over the years local social networks have developed and people can rely on others for support and help. This is now threatened by the proposal with some people feeling pressured to support the proposal with others strongly opposed. It is just an unnecessary destructive proposal.

Mark Dunstone  
268 Barnet Dr  
Mt Fairy NSW 2580