

I object to the proposed Jupiter wind turbine and request that the Department of Planning and Environment consider my personal situation. I live in the dress circle of the proposed project area. As such I'll experience multiple effects, destroying much of what I value about living here.

I object until such time as your Department has provided evidence that will stand up in court, that the proposed wind farm will not adversely affect the view from our property or surrounding areas and will not in any way, such as noise, harm our sleep or health or harm our amenity on this property or in other ways harm our lifestyle, including reception for tv, radio, mobile phone or Internet, or reduce the value of my property, and that it will not increase the bushfire threat to my property or increase the difficulty of protecting my property from bushfires.

### **Visual**

The most obvious effect on me will be visual. While the closest proposed turbine will be 1.85km away from my house, the EIS notes there will be 11 turbines visible from my house.

However, looking at the 12km extended ZVI map ('Extended Figure 4.4 - Number of turbines visible at blade tip height (173m) and below'), my place is in the red zone for 79-88 turbines. And even in 'Extended Figure 4.5 - Number of turbines visible at hub height (110m) and below' we're on the boundary between orange and red zones ie 70-79 turbines.

And this is only from my house, not from other places on my property. We run cattle using Holistic Management principles and this means we move the cattle daily. We're moving around the property on a daily basis so what was previously a peaceful, rural setting could be like an industrial setting. Not the reason we moved here.

### **TV reception**

We are one of the 288 residences where tv is likely to be disrupted, to say nothing about cb, mobile phone and internet coverage which were not modelled in the EIS. We have spent considerable time and money ensuring we get good tv reception. The proposed wind turbines could put paid to that effort. I do not wish to be another Taralga guinea pig.

### **Noise pollution**

I am unsure how much sound I'll hear from the proposed Jupiter wind turbines, but with the nearest being only 1.85km away, I imagine I'll hear something. In particular I'm thinking about the the eastern sea breeze that cools us down during the late afternoons in Summer. We open all our windows and the house soon cools. We often eat dinner on the eastern verandah. We leave all our windows open overnight so we can sleep in the cool. This is the time when the night sounds are spectacularly clear. I imagine the noise from the proposed wind turbines would also be spectacularly clear. I do not want to have to close the windows to block the noise from the proposed wind turbines (if indeed that would work), in order to sleep, and buy air conditioning to cool my bedroom.

### **Infrasound health effects**

Infrasound is damaging to human health according to an academic researcher who visited our area last year. Wind turbines are a major generator of infrasound which is below the

normal human hearing range - the intensity of this effect may vary between people, and we have heard of some people who cannot use rooms in their house from this effect.

The EIS minimises the impact of infrasound. And yet, in the NHMRC Information Paper, it states:

“It is not yet possible to predict the complex and highly variable characteristics of wind farm noise (e.g. amplitude modulation).” pp15-16

How can the EIS disregard the eminence of the NHMRC?

### **Community disruption**

EPYC, the company proposing the build 88 turbines in my area, have deliberately divided the community between ‘hosts’ and ‘non-hosts’. Hosts and potential hosts receive special attention from the company including of course the annual stipend for hosting turbines. For non-hosts, not only have we had to divert huge on-going effort to fighting the proposal over the past 4 years, we are also subjected to disrespectful one-way so-called consultation by the company. One of our close neighbours has moved away from our area, so worried are they about the impact of the proposed turbines on their children. EPYC officials have never provided us with a copy of the benefit sharing contract to read, but they did say that signing of the contract would mean that we could never (yes, never) complain about any aspect of Jupiter (construction, operation, noise, equipment failure). For a company that claims to have improved their consultation post first rejected EIS, this is unbelievable. I understand that at the recent (Feb) meeting called by EPYC, an EPYC officer was discussing with Tarago residents, funding things in Tarago. Tarago will be affected by the proposed turbines but arguably less so than other areas. Tarago residents have been badly affected by other developments in and near their village, so I can understand if they want some benefit from EPYC. However, the point is that EPYC is continuing with their divide and conquer strategy, playing favourites with those who are least affected.

### **Property devaluation**

I am worried that if we cannot adjust to the impacts caused by the proposed wind turbines, we may be forced to move. And while the EIS claims there is no impact on property valuations, this is not borne out in the lived experience. I continue to hear of people who cannot sell their property as well as people who have recently bought property in the area and not been told by their estate agent of the EPYC project. A quick look at Allhomes.com advertisements of properties in the area including neighbouring areas with wind turbines, reveals not one mentioning the view of wind turbines. They know that for many prospective owners, wind turbines on the horizon is not a desirable rural view.

### **Bushfire impact**

The EIS casually addresses bushfire risk of the proposed Jupiter wind turbines. Our experience with the Currandooley fire in January 2017 and the Boro fire a couple of weeks earlier, is anything but casual. The fire burnt 3,300ha of our local area with destruction of property, livestock and endangering lives. This fire originated in some way from the Capital Wind Farm and the RFS (both my husband and myself are members of the RFS so involved in fighting this fire), has been dealing with the resulting fires for nearly two weeks. The EIS admits that aerial support for firefighting will be excluded from the Jupiter area. Use of the DC10 water bomber was a key factor in saving our property from the Currandooley fire and seeing it operate lower than the Jupiter meteorological testing tower, I can understand why

a pilot would steer clear of a wind turbine project area. It is my view that the Jupiter wind turbines would greatly increase the risk and danger from more frequent fires in our community.

### **Traffic hazards**

Traffic along the Goulburn/Braidwood Road is fast moving. As a resident on that road, I take great care negotiating the fast and windy road. The proposed wind turbines will further complicate the traffic, particularly during construction. The school bus collects and drops off children on the Goulburn/Braidwood Road. I am worried that the proposed turbines will cause more accidents on the road and I don't want to be a casualty nor do I want to have to tend to MVAs via my role in the local Rural Fire Service.

### **Wrong location**

I am yet to understand why the NSW Department of Planning did not advise EPYC at the outset, that their proposal would affect a lot of people. It is only during the EIS exhibition period that officers from the Department are publicly stating that this proposal is located in one of the most densely populated areas in NSW of any so far considered, with at least 59 residences located within 2km of a proposed wind turbine. Clearly the location was chosen because of the wind and the main 330kV electricity artery, but the profits of the (mostly foreign owned) company are being given precedence over the multiple impacts on the population. I do not believe that wind farms should be located in densely populated areas.

I look forward to the provision by you of fully researched analysis, in relation to my particular property, to establish there will be no harm and, in the absence of such evidence, register my objection.