

Objection to the Jupiter Wind Farm Proposal

Barry O'Neill

I live at 113 Roseview Rd which is designated residence J10 in the EIS. I object most strongly to the Jupiter wind farm proposal on the following grounds:

- The visual impact will be so high as to completely change the character of our lifestyle and render our continued residence untenable;
- There is a very high risk that we will be severely impacted by noise from the development;
- There is a high risk that our television and mobile phone reception will be degraded;
- There is a risk that the environmental impacts of the proposal have been understated, particularly in respect of the movement of the Glossy Black Cockatoos;
- The construction noise, dust and traffic will reduce the amenity of the area and pose a safety risk for other road users;
- A wind farm so close reduces the effectiveness of aerial bushfire fighting in the area;
- The combined impact of the proposal across all the assessed impacts magnifies the full effect of the proposal.

Visual Impact

Even the proponent's EIS rates the visual impact on our property as High. From our house we will have views of between 70 and 80 wind turbine generators (WTG).

We have chosen to build on an elevated site on the ridge line to the west of the project area. We have constructed our house to take in extensive views from north to south along the valley and hills to the east. We can clearly see Lake Bathurst to the north. From elevated parts of our block it is likely that every WTG will be visible.

Because of our elevated position we will stare directly at the 32 WTG in the northern part of the project area, with our house at approximately the same elevation as the hubs of the WTGs.

This will completely destroy the reasons we had for coming to the area and building the house as we did.

Noise

We are concerned that the noise modelling does not fully take into account two factors which are unique to this wind farm proposal: it is to be constructed on the floor of a valley with elevated ridgelines to the east and west paralleling the northern precinct of the project;

and the design of the project which has the WTGs clustered in groups rather than spread out along a ridgeline as for other wind farms.

These factors lead us to believe that the noise impact on our property will be high due to the concentration of the WTGs in front of our house and because more noise energy will reach us due to our elevated location.

TV and Mobile Phone Reception

The EIS says there is some risk of degradation of our TV reception from the project. It rates this as low. We are at the limit of acceptable reception as it is and require an amplifier for the antenna. Any degradation of the signal will have a severe impact on our TV reception.

Similarly, we are concerned that mobile phone reception, which is already marginal in the area, will be downgraded as has been caused by windfarms in other areas.

Due to the inadequacies in general of the EIS we have no confidence in the modelling showing the impact is likely to be low or non-existent. As usual with windfarms, once it is in place the locals have no option but to put up with the detrimental effects which they were assured would not eventuate.

Environmental Impacts Understated

We are concerned that the EIS does not fully set out the environmental risks of the project. It seems likely that 88 rotors, each 126 metres in diameter, will have a major impact on bird and bat mortality.

We are part of a Greening Australia project designed to encourage the migration of the endangered Glossy Black Cockatoo between the south coast and the Snowy Mountains region. We have planted 220 casuarina trees on our property as a food source for the Glossy Black Cockatoo to encourage this migration. It seems to us to be counterproductive to encourage Glossy Black Cockatoos to the area when there is a high risk of them flying into spinning wind turbines.

Misleading Issues in the EIS

The Tarago Show Ground is ignored in the EIS but should have been taken into account as a public viewpoint. It is a community facility and gathering place for local communal activities. It is much closer the project area than the recreation ground which is the only community viewpoint in Tarago considered in the EIS.

In general the visual impact assessment is inconsistent and misleading. Even when the words generally can be considered accurate, by the time the overall ratings are concocted

they rate the impact as lower than the words would lead the casual reader to assume would flow from the description.

For example the visual impact on the Goulburn - Braidwood Road is rated as moderate but the description says: "The JWF development is in close proximity to Braidwood/Goulburn Road and Kings Highway. The turbines will be highly visible from sections of these roads, where views are not blocked by roadside vegetation. If constructed above-ground, the transmission line will run parallel to and be visible from sections of these roads, although the preferred option is for the line to be underground."

In fact, the turbines will loom over the Goulburn - Braidwood Road for a distance of 13 kilometres and views of turbines 173 metres tall are unlikely to be significantly blocked by roadside vegetation. The impact cannot be anything but High.

When travelling on the Bungendore/Tarago Road just out of Bungendore, one is presented with a panoramic view of the Capital and Woodlawn wind farms. The nearest turbines are about 8 kilometres way by road. By any reasonable standard these turbines have a dramatic visual impact and alter the character of the entire landscape.

These turbines are 49 metres shorter than those proposed for the Jupiter project.

No assessment mumbo jumbo can alter the fact that turbines 173 metres tall would destroy the character of any rural landscape.

The photomontage is not representative

The photomontage alleged to be representative of the view from our residence is completely misleading. We offered on two occasions for EPYC to take photos from our residence for the purposes of photomontages. We did not place any restrictions on this offer. Instead the photomontage was taken from our gate, which is 800 metres from our house and at least 50 metres lower.

Notwithstanding the fact that the consultants had not been within 800 metres of our house they rated the visual impact as High. However, in their subjective opinion, not influenced by any facts or evidence, they consider that the planting of trees could 'mitigate' the High visual impact to Moderate. We strongly object to this as:

- mitigation is not our responsibility;
- screening our view would destroy the main benefit we sought to achieve in siting our residence where we did;
- in our case tree planting would be completely impractical as the topography means that trees would never grow tall enough to screen the view of such massive turbines;
- screening, in any case be ineffective in the life of the windfarm as trees do not grow overnight; and
- screening would substantially increase the risk of the destruction of our house by bushfire.

We also do not agree that a refusal to consider screening suggests in any way that we accept the visual impact of the proposed wind farm.

Cumulative Assessment of All Impacts

The EIS treats each impact as a separate issue and assesses each as being not severe enough to prevent the project being approved. However, if taken as a cumulative whole they add to a total impact that is so severe that the project should not be approved.

I consider that the cumulative impact of the acknowledged risk factors in respect of:

- noise;
- visual impact;
- loss of economic opportunities in the local area;
- construction disturbance;
- environmental damage;
- television reception;
- mobile phone reception;
- blade flicker;
- reduced bushfire fighting capability; and
- the cumulative impact of multiple wind farms in the area,

taken as a whole, mean that the full impact of the proposal on the local area is too great for it to be approved.