

ISSUE: VISUAL IMPACT

We requested a photomontage of the visual impact of the turbines from our property, Alston, (NAD 70) which we received at the end of October 2020. This followed the first conversation/engagement we had had with the Proponent in May 2020, when I was told “there would be no visual impact on our property”. The Proponent had never seen or visited our property up to that date and I considered this to be an ill-informed and baseless comment.

The photomontage clearly shows that we will have prominent vision of at least 17 turbines. Moreover, the photomontage we received is not representative of the true visual impact and we have seen all other photomontages dealt with in a similar manner by the Proponent. Nearby terrain is given a prominence in the foreground, which it does not have. This strategy of digital editing has been done to minimise the real visual impact to allow the the Proponent to assert there is no or limited visual impact.

We requested this photomontage from our residence as there had been none taken from this southern side of the development at all to give any indication to the Timor community of the visual impact of this Project. This means the Timor community has not seen any visual representation of the wind farm/turbine layout to make any informed comment about its visual impact on them and the potential detriment to the region’s character.

I object to this Project based on a lack of any study of the visual impact on the Timor community.

ISSUE: NOISE AND VIBRATION IMPACT

There was no noise or vibration monitoring undertaken on the Timor side of the development proposal. (See Appendices E.1 & E.2.) The noise level monitoring was done at 6 dwellings and 1 community location over a 6 week period in 2020 (dwellings AD2, NAD5, NAD11, NAD12, NAD33, NAD74, and Nundle township).

Additionally, the distance deemed to be affected by noise is not adequate. At this very moment there is an extensive sleep study being undertaken by Flinders University in South Australia on wind farm noise, especially including sub-noise. They are testing noise impact up to a distance of 10 kms. Given this is occurring it presupposes that sub-noise has already emerged as an issue to be understood as a real impact of wind farms and as such this Project should not be approved unless this issue is understood for the health of the communities it potentially impacts.

This Environmental Impact Statement is incomplete as it provides no data at all on the impact of noise and vibrations on the residents of the Timor community. It cannot make claims of noise not being an issue as it has not researched sufficiently or accurately.

I object to this Project based on a lack of any study of the noise and vibrational impact on the Timor community.

ISSUE: OBSTACLE/NIGHT LIGHTING OF TURBINES

In a number of places within this EIS the issue of night lighting on the turbines is downplayed with statements that the Proponent's assessment does not think they will be necessary. The document refers to this being something the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) would determine. In fact on P 44 and section 11.3.9 P217 it is clear that the Proponent is aware CASA has required lighting on turbines in every Wind Farm in NSW that exceeds 150m in tip height.

The EIS shows images of an unrelated wind farm "Biala" with night lighting, but given they are well aware lighting is highly probably if not certain, they did no photomontages of this Project's turbines alit at night on the ridgeline. This is a deliberate lack of vital visual information being withheld from the many communities affected.

Moreover, within Appendix D of the BDAR, P 251, section 8.3.3, it states *"Aviation hazard lighting is not expected to have an impact on nocturnal fauna using the habitats within and adjacent to the development footprint"*. This is an extraordinary given the same section states *"The majority of the threatened fauna that have been identified to be potentially impacted by the project area nocturnal..."*.

There is the ubiquitous statement that measures to manage noise and light, including night lighting from both the 24 month construction phase and operational phases at night will be implemented. But the disturbance to the nocturnal pattern and life and breeding of the threatened and other animal species cannot be mitigated – lighting that was never in their habitat will now be in their habitat, irrespective of design measures.

I note there is no mention of any assessment study of the impact of constant lighting at night on the 13 exact threatened species identified in the habitat this Project seeks to alter.

I object to this Project based on the fact that there is no site assessment on the impact of night lighting for the Timor and other surrounding communities.

I object to this Project based on the lack of any adequate assessment on the biodiversity impacts of night lighting on the threatened species, the majority of whom are nocturnal.