Objection

I wish to express my objections about the proposed Bango Wind Project – Application number SSD6686 and the impact on my quality of life that the neighbouring turbines will have

These concerns cover a number of areas.

History

Our aim and purpose in obtaining our property was to set up and commence our retirement plan.
The property was chosen after many years of careful consideration and thorough investigation of

- Location, Brookdale was selected as it was close to our family in both Canberra and Yass (25 minutes) as well as for shopping, doctors, rural suppliers
- Financial considerations and life style requirements.
- Ability to regenerate and encourage native flora and fauna
- Close to farm experienced relatives.
- Privacy

One major reason for purchasing the property was the fact that there are 2 building permits available. Our son intends to eventually take over the running of the property and to use the second building site for himself to erect a home. The second site is closer to the turbines than our present house and as such will deny us the right to future develop that asset as well as devaluing the entire property.
See attached house sites

Negotiations

The initial contact was undertaken in a state of disbelief. The consultation process commenced in 2011 and was intense Thorough and up front and we were made aware of our rights as neighbours to the project and any negotiated entitlements.
See attached *Bango heads* of term and *bango130320BAN hedges heads of term*

Then we were informed in 2014 that Adrian Maddock's who we were dealing with was leaving and that the negotiations would be taken over by others.

This lead to one meeting **in late 2015** where it was stated that everything had changed all previous negotiations/offers etc were void and one offer of $5,000 a year.
A suggestion was made that they could pay for the fencing and roads on our property. There has been no communications since December 2015.

See attached Email Isherwood

I feel as the project had advanced to the display stage and the year of no communications from CWP was a tactic to forestall any commitments or offers from them.
The lack of sincere negotiations was designed to stall us to a point where the proposal was well on the approval track.
From the following evidence I find it impossible to accept their wind farm submission as a professionally produced document that can support the proposed windfarm project.
To add to the failings of this submission is the decision by the proponents to use the fact that their submission was lodged prior to the new government Windfarm Guidelines where the mandated distance of wind turbines to dwellings was extended from 1.6 kilometers to 2 kilometers.

The proponents are now proposing to install larger turbines than the ones proposed in the submission. These turbines have not been commissioned or assessed in Australia. Surely this would make the data collected on the original proposed turbines void.

It is obvious that CWP has availed it self of all loop holes that have been made available to them under the old guidelines.
I request that the new guidelines limit of 2 kilometers be enforced.
As presumably under the old guidelines the data collected for our site but not on our site is acceptable.

The draft Guidelines incorporate noise guidelines, which include a statement that the predicted 10 minute interval noise level for a new wind farm should not exceed 35 decibels or 5 decibels above the existing background noise (whichever is greater).
While other variables **(such as measurement location)** will be important, the draft Guidelines describe their criteria as "the most stringent in Australia and amongst the most stringent in the world".

The draft Guidelines are expected to apply to all new wind farm proposals, and (to the extent possible) to proposals which are currently being assessed. **The Government will also discuss with wind farm operators the possibility of applying parts of the Guidelines to existing wind farms.**

EIS Appendix 8 a letter to Siobhan Isherwood states," The maximum rotor height diameter of 144m will not be increased and the final tower and rotor dimensions will sit within the 200m blade tip height envelope."
How can the proponents of this project assume to have the benefits from old regulations and expand their submission with bigger untested equipment?

Also as I have stated before the style and lack of negotiations with involved residents has brought into question the integrity of the proponents.

Information Errors

Bango Wind Farm EIS - Main Report.pdf
Page 149- Shows residence ID 238 as Neighbourhood Agreement under Negotiation. With no contact for 12 months that is not negotiating.

Also I state that there is no written agreement with us and them.

Following page Titled Figure 8.31- Visual Significance Rating shows Neighbourhood Agreement under negotiations. This implies ongoing negotiations.

Page 334 Table 20.1- Neighbourhood Agreement under Negotiation, no shadow flicker and no noise exceedance. As one of the closest dwellings to a turbine there has not been any communication on these issues with us or recordings of sound at this location. It also appears that the negotiators from CWP have not communicated with the visual and sound engineers about our house site, the fact that there is more than one structure on site and that there is a house almost complete as well should raise some issues.
Bango Wind Farm EIS - A3 Figures - Part 3 Visual.pdf

Figure 8.31- visual significance. States a Neighbourhood Agreement for PM22/23. There is no Neighbourhood Agreement.

Bango Wind Farm EIS - Appendix 08 - Landscape & Visual Assessment Part 1.pdf

Page 23 and 24- Desktop study and 3 days of field work. No field work was undertaken on our property and the satellite google search was Inappropriate.
Figure 2- Wind turbine options does not show our buildings.
Figure 3- Bango wind farm turbine cluster does not show our buildings.
Figure 5- Topograghy nil buildings.
Figure 6- nil buildings.
Figure 20- House is displayed as an uninvolved residential dwelling within 2 Km and 5 km of wind turbine.
Figure 22- Dwelling identified as 238 within 2Km of Bango windfarm (subject to agreement).
Figure 26B- as above
Page 82- which one is us?
Figure 27- shows 10 – 30 hours of flicker.

Bango Wind Farm EIS - Appendix 08 - Landscape & Visual Assessment Part 2.pdf

Figure 77 Photomontage PM22- state the nearest turbine is 851 meters

Bango Wind Farm EIS - Appendix 08 - Landscape & Visual Assessment Part 3.pdf

Figure B7- Cumulative landscaping and visual assessment residential dwellings. We are not represented on this map.

Bango Wind Farm EIS - Appendix 10 - Noise Assessment.pdf

Why do pages run 39 1 then the pages 40 to 44 give incorrect coordinates of easting and **easting**.

Page 43- states BANO238 house **Neighbourhood agreement.** False

Surprisingly the maps showing Bango 1 and 2 layout not one location exceeds 30 decibels. My residence is given the same Db as others that are up to 5 times the distance away.

Bango Wind Farm EIS - Appendix 11 - Low Frequency Noise Assessment.pdf

This appendix is titled: Low frequency Noise and Wind turbines (Technical Annex) British Wind Energy Association, 2005

Surely that heading screams out British and 2005?
Do we not have relevant Australian information and data not more than 11 years old?

An example of use of irrelevant location data and old information can be shown by the example of the proposed Canberra Data Centre and gas fired power station at Hume ACT where data from the Wagga Wagga airport for air plume prediction and old historical records of population and economic outcomes.
When the data was tested against relevant new information the project failed.

Objections

- **Process** has been flawed inaccurate and one sided.
- **Misuse of old guidelines** that allows proposed placement of turbines within 2 kilometers of my house and proposed future house based on inaccurate and deceitful processes. I request that the new guidelines limit of 2 kilometers be enforced.
- **Negotiations** have been manipulative extended and designed to facilitate CWP's plans with no regard to community or individuals.