

I object to the proposed Jupiter wind farm on the grounds that the noise issues have been poorly explored. The impact of noise on health is a particularly tricky impact to predict ahead of the placement of turbines, so it's even more important that EPYC and the Department ensure affected people are protected.

E.12 - "Predicted operational (wind farm, WTG) noise levels were above the compliance limits established to achieve the SEARs...The mitigated scenarios (Scenario 2 and Scenario 3) achieve full noise compliance at all receptors for all conditions but implementation of these scenarios is contingent on potential negotiated agreements with affected landholders and the detailed design of the Project that may achieve full compliance for the unmitigated Scenario 1."

These sentences caught my eye, partly because I had so much trouble understanding it, and partly because I realised 'negotiated agreements' are probably another way of saying 'benefit sharing' which, for the landholder, means waiving rights to voice opposition to any aspect of the project.

I do know that EPYC has been having difficulty drumming up custom for 'benefit sharing' which is not surprising as most of us around here are aware of how vulnerable signing up for it could leave us. Imagine, in the case of noise, if you found, once the proposed turbines are built and operational, that you are badly affected by the noise or infrasound. Imagine you had signed a 'benefit sharing' agreement and are earning a couple of thousand dollars a year, but you cannot live with the noise because you experience headaches and nausea and you cannot sleep. You didn't know it, but you are one of the people susceptible to infrasound. You're caught between a rock and a hard place. You have no recourse to the company as you've signed a legal document that states you cannot oppose the project. You don't want to move as this is your home. And in any case, the property has devalued due to wind turbines, so selling is not financially viable, unless of course the 'benefit sharing' makes up the difference – if you're lucky enough to sell.

I do not believe 'benefit sharing' is of benefit, nor designed to be of benefit to the landholder. I believe it is a way of gaining more supporters for the project and gag money. If the project were totally benign, perhaps that wouldn't matter, but 88 x 173m high wind turbines in a rural area in which 'The number of residents within proximity to the wind farm is at the high end of the spectrum compared to other wind farms in NSW' (Minutes, Dept of Planning Info Session, 7/12/16*), is not benign.

*[https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/public/a1aa2b119149e798e4ea19c1faf3ca27/Community%20Information%20Session%20-%20Summary%20of%20Issues%20\(7%20December%202016\).pdf](https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/public/a1aa2b119149e798e4ea19c1faf3ca27/Community%20Information%20Session%20-%20Summary%20of%20Issues%20(7%20December%202016).pdf)