

Department of Planning and Environment

23-33 Bridge Street

SYDNEY

Subject: Rye Park Wind Farm.

Within suspect distance from towers of the proposed Rye Park Wind Farm are properties which historically under different names have been worked by families for up to FIVE generations. The distance of the residences on such properties from the intended placement of towers is of great concern in regard to the long term effects of tower produced sound pulses or waves. The availability of information regarding this crucial matter of the influence of transmitted sound waves **definitely not** having a serious detrimental long term effects on people's health, **has not be presented as irrefutable.**

Surely unquestionable, definitive evidence, based on credible studies by accredited sources should be the basis for any decisions that will incur **irreversible changes once implemented.** Proceeding without abundant evidence makes one ask what has the higher priority, renewable energy or the rights of individuals to live in a safe environment as they have done for many years?

It seems ironic that over the decades such properties have survived natural disasters such as drought and bushfires but now are facing a man initiated challenge to their continuing chosen life style. The healthy life style and the scenic serenity, so long enjoyed, are undeniably at risk.

Most disappointing also is that the presence of towers so close to the boundaries of adjacent properties will strongly impact on any consideration of the present family owners to plan their futures in regard to developing their property further for It is an accepted fact that properties with towers nearby depreciate in value.

If at a future time damaging health outcomes are found to occur and the welfare of individuals and their future livelihood suffer, despite guarantees that this would not be so, there needs to be **legally documented accountability involving financial recompense.**

The question of the value of renewal energy sources is not under judgement, it is the decision to place towers so close to long established dwellings on commercially viable properties, when sites, where the impact presents no risk to human presence, are a viable alternative

Our country is not short of land expanses where wind farms would not be so intrusive. Why is there this need to gamble with the possible detrimental outcomes re people's wellbeing and life style?

Your Department has a responsibility of **huge proportions** as you consider justifiable outcomes regarding wind farm tower placements.

If it is ultimately found that your decision has resulted in families, who resided on adjacent properties, having their right to live unimpeded **sadly sacrificed,**

when WORKABLE, LESS INTRUSIVE ALTERNATIVE AREAS WERE AVAILABLE,

what a sad reflection that will be on the capacity of your Department, entrusted with guiding the best outcomes for our nation and its peoples.

Submitted by a long term Rye Park resident.