

I am writing to oppose the windfarm proposal as the location will be detrimental to the surrounding natural environment.

The location for this site is not suitable as it is harmful to the existing native fauna and flora.

For this project to proceed existing roads require upgrades and new roads will need to be made including clearing trees which works against preserving our natural green environment.

This area is already home to many endangered native animals and the erection of this windfarm will disturb their natural habitat by way of clearing, noise and dangerous blades etc.

In addition to this I believe that the information provided is misleading. After looking at the document supplied named '**Letter of Designation Community Engagement**' under **Schedule 2**, the proponent does not list the affected land owners consulted but lists the lot and DP's of a select few of land owners consulted.

The way this information is presented is misleading as the impression given is that a significant number of owners have been consulted as 159 properties (Lots/DP) have been listed, however there are many owners that own property with more than one lot and DP for example, Robinson with approximately 23 lot and DP's, Sylvester with approximately 11, Linich with approximately 5 etc.

Also listed are properties that are not affected by the proposal, these properties are 1-2 hours away from the subject site examples include 13/DP27346 Muswellbrook, 2/DP1097368 Tighes Hill, 51/DP1134671 Buchanan etc. Why are these properties on Schedule 2 if they do not meet the criteria? I do believe it is to bulk up the numbers to create a false and misleading representation of the true number of Schedule 2 owners consulted.

My parents and family own an adjacent property which falls under schedule 2. Their property is not listed on this document as they have not been consulted because they are against the project.

The proponent makes claims that the majority of the community supports this proposal however it is clear from just examining this one document that this statement is untrue as the affected community has not been consulted or included in their final count.

This act is deceptive at such an early stage of this project which sets the tone of the proponent's character to be untrustworthy.

The environmental reports presented are desktop reports based on speculation and not factors specific to the site. How can this proposal proceed if the information provided is not reliable or truthful.

I note that due to time constraints during the holiday season I have not been able to peruse all documents provided. If such large discrepancies have been found on the one document (referenced above) I'm positive that many more will be detected once I have the time to look over all documents.