

INTRODUCTION

My personal situation and therefore my interest in this proposal is as follows. My husband and I own and reside full time at our farming residence, Alston. Under this Project, Alston would have a direct view of at least **17** of the proposed wind turbines. Alston is listed as a non-associated dwelling, NAD 70. (Figure 11-2)

We have owned this 294 ha farm since January 1996, having purchased it from my husband's uncle's estate. The farm has thereby been in his family for over 70 years and our attachment to this region is deep and our knowledge of it, extensive.

In 2015 we purchased the adjoining 438 ha property, Glen Dhu, the boundaries of which extend north towards Crawney. This property is closer to the proposed development but the EIS has failed to even recognise our dwelling on this property, and it therefore it has not been allocated any reference number and not considered for any impacts within the EIS.

We also purchased an additional 427 ha property in 2009, which runs over Mount Ivor, (situated on Alston and is a trig point in the area) on the Timor Creek Road.

It should be clear from these land holdings that our family is highly invested in and committed to this Timor/Crawney area. Our livelihood, and the future livelihood of our children and grandchildren, is reliant on it. Hence I am in strong opposition to the development proposal.

ISSUE: COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

We understand this project has been in preliminary planning for 8 years and has been in active in the community since at least 2017. In January 2018, the "Inclusive Engagement" company were employed to plan community and stakeholder consultation. (see Appendix C). To date no community forums of any kind have been conducted in the Timor locality and hence no information has been supplied to the community.

Because this Project is proposed to sit on a ridgeline it obviously faces North and South of that ridge. Timor residents on this southern side, have been largely ignored. The majority of Timor residents have received no information from the Proponent at all and this is a failure of requirements concerning engagement and consultation for any project of this kind. There was almost no reference to the Timor community, nor impact upon it, within the entire EIS. One that could be found indicates that Timor is 15 kms away, perhaps inferring it has no relevance to this Project. This is not the case as the Timor community is widespread and indeed at least 2 of the Associated dwellings, one a leasehold, are Timor residents. The Proponent managed to locate and cherry pick out these landholders early on in the process but ignored the majority of the community, many of whom live in closer proximity to this development than the Nundle community.

Our first engagement with the Proponent was in May 2020, 2.5 years after "Inclusive Engagement" had been hired and just 6 months before this EIS was submitted, which has given us limited opportunity to gather accurate information.

I object to this Project based on lack of any community engagement and consultation with the Timor community, as a whole, and I believe this to be a disregard of due process.

ISSUE: COMMUNITY SUPPORT

On Page 81 Section 4.4.7, the authors declare “...there is strong support from the residents within Nundle and Hanging Rock, visible from “Friends of the Wind Farm” support signs commonly viewed and as depicted in Figure 4-8”. Four photos are included to show the signage on local houses.

Not once in this section is it mentioned that there is also extensive coordinated community opposition, with many residences in the same locations (and additionally within Timor) hosting visible signage against the Project saying “Preserve Hills of Gold”, with a big red slash through wind turbines. This is not hard to interpret as an action depicting opposition.

There is a large and active local opposition group named “Hills of Gold Preservation Inc” (HOGPI) with 129 members. They have organised a Petition against this Project, which was delivered to MP Kevin Anderson in Sydney with over 300 signatures. Mr Andrews lodged the Petition with Parliament on 18th November 2020. There are additional signatures to add to the Petition which will be forwarded to Mr Andrews so the number of opponents is actually much larger. There is also an online Petition on “Change.org” that has over 3000 people raising their objection to this Project.

The authors and the Proponent are absolutely aware of this opposition group as they are listed as having a number of meetings with members of the HOGPI on multiple occasions since at least November 2019 and this is listed in Appendix C-2.

I note that at right at the beginning of the EIS the authors make a formal Declaration that “...information provided is neither false or misleading”.

The authors of this EIS have shown themselves to be biased and misleading in presenting an overarching picture of only community support and knowingly withholding information in this EIS about the strong, visible and known opposition to this Project.

I object to this Project based on misleading and biased representations of Community Support within the EIS.

ISSUE: MAPPING AND LOCATION OF DWELLINGS

The distance, and thereby the deemed impact on “non-associated dwellings” is determined by a method called “spatial join function” using the ArcGIS Mapping Tool.

The Proponents informed me and it is cited that by using this method, the distance DOES count for terrain – this means houses are able to appear further away, and supposedly not impacted, if you count every metre, by measuring the distance up and down every hill and dale. Frankly, this is another example of misleading information when to determine visual

impact, it is line of sight which tells the picture, and noise travels through the air directly. Thereby making the visual and noise impact far greater than cited in this EIS.

The strategy of using this type of distance measuring is clearly intentional by the Proponent and allows them to deny the impact of visual, noise, vibration effects on as many dwellings as possible, by listing them as existing outside a distance boundary.

I object to this Project on the basis of the use of measurement tools that give a deliberately misleading assessment of the distance of dwellings to the turbines for line of sight and noise and vibrational impact.