

I object to the Rye Park Wind Farm a number of reasons.

Firstly I must say we have been offered to host towers in the early days, up to 7.

I am a very factual person, fair and just. I don't let sentimentality get in the way of business decisions. I let the facts speak for themselves.

So the more investigations I have done, the more questions I have asked, the more I know how bad they are and how bad this whole project is. Anyone with half an idea that reads the information and sticks to the facts will have the same opinion.

I have worked all my life to buy a property out of town for my family to get away from the daily grind, and finally 8 years ago had the opportunity to buy Wattle Vale. Now, all that I have worked for and why we live there can potentially be taken away from us. The peace and quiet and the views from the hilltops are priceless.

We purchased this property as a "Lifestyle block", not as a rural enterprise. There are a lot of people that have moved into the area for the same reason we have, and this makes the land more valuable and more inhabitable.

The closest tower will be 500m from our boundary fence, 3.6 km from our house. Everything I read asks what is within the 5km distance - why? Does this mean we are going to be affected within the 5km distance?? If we are who is responsible, and who do we seek compensation from??

We can already see other Wind Towers from our property:-

~ Gunning	31 Towers	31 kms away
~ Cullerin	15 Towers	36 kms away
~ Grabben Gullen	73 Towers	39 kms away

All are easily visual from our farm NOW!!

They are older ones that are smaller (132m?) than the ones proposed at Rye Park which are 157m tall.

With Rye Park (109 proposed), Bango 122, Conroys Gap 15, Coppabella 82, Gunning 31, Cullerin 15, Grabben Gullen 73, Crookwell 84 and Rugby 54, when it is discovered that they can hook onto one of the other proposals we will have a total of 585 Wind Towers in my area, mostly within 3.6km distance, and 10-30km radius from my house!!

That would be TOTAL SATURATION AND VISUAL POLLUTION that could only be measured after it is too late. The area is too populated and too valuable for this type of industrial proposal.

Upper Lachlan Shire Council Mayor John Shaw can be quoted from the Goulburn Post back on 12th July, 2013 saying the following:- "It's getting towards a bit of a saturation point now", "Wind Farm over load", "Land Values in the Shire have actually decreased because of the amount of Wind Farms in the area". "We don't really want to get to the point where we would have a Wind Tower on every hill, but it is starting to get to that stage". "I suppose I'm asking when is enough actually enough?" he said.

Remember this is the Mayor of the Upper Lachlan Shire Council, and I agree, when is the Department going to realise that we have already ruined enough land with the visual impacts of these towers.

I have people come and stay at our house and the first time they see the view they fall in love with the place, I can only imagine the distress people are under, living in closer proximity to the towers and non involved like R47, 48, 50, 53, 324. And all the others on Fig. 8-6 (page 131). They will all be affected a lot worse than I, and I can't imagine the stress they would be under at this time.

Even in the Department of Planning and Environment's draft South East and Tablelands Regional Plan, it states that the area proposed is "High Environmental Value" in Fig. 4, 26 & 27. Why you would consider putting such a large amount of Infrastructure that can cause such destruction and have such a high visual impact from up to 50kms + around is beyond me, and in noted "High Environmental Value areas" is unbelievable.

You should be proposing Solar Farms like Royalla, then you would have a different response. We don't want our landscape ruined for such a short term project and a long term loss for everyone that is not involved..

I am sure that if you asked the host of the Wind Towers to let them put them on their land for free because it's so "green" we would have a vastly different outcome.

It worries me that our Government is chasing Co2 – Co2 is only .4% of air and Australia only contribute a small margin of that .4% of air. If the Government wants to put our money into renewables to tick the green box we should be looking at more long term returns on our investments. Wind is only good for 20 years, that's not long enough on such a large investment. Solar or Hydro has to be more beneficial and more environmentally friendly than this disaster they are proposing here.

The environmental impact will be unsustainable and unmanageable in our area with the unstable erodible soils we have.

To propose to clear virgin timber, estimated 190 acres and call this project green or sustainable – it is not.

This type of power generation affects the power grid and still needs to be backed up with Coal fired Power Stations.

Solar now has Battery back-up, and is affordable for the home owner to put into place without the massive Infrastructure and Environmental destruction proposed here.

Proposed ~ 109 Towers, 157m tall, 3MW +. All data is on 1.5MW Towers!! Nothing should be approved until we have proper Data on all areas of concern on the size and MW output on these towers. We need the data to determine the safe set backs, otherwise we are approving something we know nothing about.

Powerlines, the 330v line installation alone will be a massive job. The environmental and visual impact that the project will have on all of us will be with us forever.

The visual impact this project and others like Bango (192m tall, 8km away) is going to be devastating to the whole landscape and the total impact will not be able to be quantified until it's too late.

In the RTS it shows 145 towers and 23 deleted – this leaves 122?? **Has this been cut and pasted from another proposal??** If there are 109 towers, when are we going to add the 6 monitoring towers to the total?? Is this like the ABC show *UTOPIA*??

We have 3 Wedgetail eagles that live just above our house on virgin timber, there is a tower proposed 500m off my boundary and I am very worried about the bird's welfare.

Access Tracks – they keep saying they have deleted some to lessen the impact. Yes – they have deleted 7 tracks. BUT they have moved them and installed 7 new ones in a different location, so the situation is unchanged.

Traffic – I am worried about the welfare of my family and myself trying to live on such a dangerous road with the proposed traffic movements for over a 2 year period with little to no improvements.

I am a member of the CCC, the meeting process from when I had my first meeting to now has been a very disappointing experience. From the first meeting with no minutes getting taken and myself being the only involved land holder, to now still not happy with the balance of involved/non-involved land holders, and with mostly no Council Representatives in attendance. It's like no one cares and thinks it's going to go ahead no matter what.

The VPA at \$2,500 per tower is a joke. Trustpower is offering neighbour agreements to people within 2km is just a gag clause, remember the Gare Family.

The way Trustpower conducted themselves at the Public Meeting at the Rye Park Hall was unprofessional and unforgivable. Who has bodyguards at a public open day in a small country town and then calls the Police because they feel threatened by an 80 year old man, and another man that has just had a knee operation?? Was this just to get some press?? The Department of Planning had an open night not long ago with no bodyguards and no issues.

Trustpower does a good job of prettying itself as "squeaky clean". With a little investigation the facts speak for themselves, look at South Taranaki Wind Farm Proposal and SA here in OZ.

Have Trustpower opened a \$2 shelf company – Rye Park Wind Developments?? which they can walk away from at any time??

Fire Risk – I am an active member of the Rural Fire Service and also operate heavy machinery at fires to assist in the containment of large or dangerous fires. The installation of towers increases the risk of fires starting from lightning strikes and tower failures. Map/fig 8/7 page 133 clearly shows the whole proposal is in a bushfire prone area. The topography of these areas means there is an increased reliance upon aerial support in a fire event. The aerial support will be required to fly 500 metres above 157 metre towers and will be largely ineffective, with the water dissipating and/or evaporating before it reaches the ground.

We are the only Country placing towers in fire-prone areas, we have too many fires in our area now, we don't need any more.

The Yass region is not the only area where towers can be plugged into the 330 KVA grid, there are other areas that are less inhabited and less intrusive to all involved.

I think if the Department took the time to send an Independent Consultant out and see what the locals really thought of this project, with the facts, they would see for themselves. Every poll that I have been involved with is a majority NO.

I thought Australia would learn from other mistakes, but we seem to follow in others footsteps instead of standing alone.

This is not an ecologically sustainable development, it is an irreversible Environmental disaster.

Andrew Field