

I object to the proposed Bowmans Creek Wind Farm.

### Visual

My property is identified as E17-3. The photo montage of my property clearly shows that at least eight turbines will be visible from my house. And from the rest of my property. Appendix H for dwelling E17-3 states that *“whilst wind turbines may be visible the potential for visual impact is not significant and largely mitigated by distance.”* This is not correct. The turbines dominate the horizon and can't be missed. It also states that screening will be offered to the landowner in accordance with the consent conditions. This is complete nonsense. I have had one discussion with Epuron and they conceded that vegetative screening would be completely ineffective. Turbine 66 will have a base height of 497m and therefore a tip height of 717m according to Appendix D. Please advise how vegetative screening can even be considered as an option here? I don't know of any tree that will grow tall enough in my lifetime and hide an object with a height of over half a kilometre.

I enjoy the views here and I bought the property because of the beautiful landscape. I do not want to hide it.

I suspect that the photo montages have been manipulated to minimize the impact the turbines will have on the landscape. I am certain the reality will be much worse. I did not purchase this property to have an industrial view and be subjected to the associated noise.

I query how the EIS has concluded that this is a “moderate” landscape. I haven't had anyone visit my home who didn't comment on the beautiful view and landscape.



## Noise

Noise monitoring was undertaken at limited sites

I am not confident in the modelling that has been conducted to support the project. I have not seen any actual data that has been collected nor have I been asked if I would like noise monitoring at my property or that of my partner. Sound travels very effectively along this valley and I believe that we are going to struggle to live with it.

Noise monitoring was undertaken at limited sites and monitors were inappropriately placed (i.e near shrubs).

Further testing and consultation by an must be undertaken in this area.

## Blasting and Vibration

Blasting is going to be required but it is not addressed in the EIS. This will be very disruptive for residents and animals in the vicinity.

Blasting is also going to create more dust. How will this be managed? Using water from private dams?

## Property values

Property values will **decline** significantly. The EIS refers to a review by Urbis which says that there is *"no impact or a limited defined impact of wind farms on property values."* but extensive work has been done on this subject by Nigel Wood and it supports the fact that property values drop. The decline affects both associated and non-associated landholders. This is a huge concern. A home is the single biggest asset most people make in their lifetime. This project wipes out that asset for affected landowners.

Who is going to compensate landholders for their losses?

Who is going to compensate landholders when they must relocate because their homes are no longer liveable due to noise or some other issue(s)?

Why is it okay to impose this development on ordinary people who do not want it?

My partner owns a property which is 3km or less from at least 28 wind turbines (per the photo montage). He has been told that he does not count because it does not have a residence on it. This property has been left out of the EIS. He has not been approached by Epuron except when I requested that they meet with us both. There has been no follow up. The plan is to build a home on this land and live there. Those plans have been put on hold. Why would you build when your perfect view is going to be filled with industrial wind turbines.

If a piece of land is not fit to build a home on what is it worth? If you can't live in that home what is it worth? It becomes worthless.

This supports the research mentioned above stating that property values **decline**. That is, if you can even find a buyer.

He is not the only landholder in this situation.

Mandatory acquisition on approval should be offered for every affected landowner.

## Economic

The Economic Impact Assessment states that the IO analysis identified the following:

During the first Construction year of the project (Year 1) the total contribution to the economy is estimated at:

### Regional

209 direct and indirect jobs

### NSW economy

494 direct and indirect jobs

Even with a multiplier effect can you please explain how the *"156 full time equivalent jobs during its 18 month construction period"* turns into a total of 703 (209 regional plus 494 NSW)?

It also states that the project will contribute to the economy for 25 years during Operations and it is estimated that this effect will be:

### Regional

30 direct and indirect jobs

### NSW economy

58 direct and indirect jobs

Again, the introduction gives a much lower figure of *"15 full time equivalent jobs over its operational life."*

I note that this employment requires those 15 people to have the skills and be the right fit for the project. Also note that this is 15 jobs **across** the 25 years of the project and not **continuously** through the life of the project.

Again, can you please explain how *"15 full time equivalent jobs"* multiplies into 88 (30 regional plus 58 NSW)?

Construction of the project is estimated to cost \$569M and Epuron estimates that 43% or \$244M of that cost will be for the turbines and other components which are **imported from overseas**.

Interesting to note that the EIS states that lease payment to the project landholders are not included as part of "other value added" in the allocation of expenditure. The EIS states that "It was conservatively assumed that lease payments to Project landholders **were not reinvested in the region.**"

Is this because those landholders leave the region entirely and move away from the wind farm?

What else is include in the \$48M of "Other Value Added" besides Project landholder lease payments?

## Communication

The wider community is not aware of this project. There has been minimal communication in the media and very little effort made by Epuron to inform ALL members of the affected communities.

The last community meetings did not include Muscle Creek which has the largest population. These were restricted to thirty minute intervals. That is an insufficient amount of time to cover the EIS and respond to questions.

Epuron has hidden behind Covid-19 and has used Zoom during lockdown to conduct meetings. Many residents do not have the skills to access this and only a handful of people were even aware of the meetings. Again, these were scheduled during working hours so that there was limited attendance. They were also held over school holidays when people were away.

Mailouts have been few and far between and you do not receive these unless you register your interest with Epuron. It should be mandatory for Epuron to communicate with ALL landholders and residents.

### **Cumulative impact**

This project will add to the heavy burden of industry that Muswellbrook and surrounds bears. There are no other wind developments nearby but there are multiple mines, two power stations and multiple quarries. The area does not need any additional industrial development. Especially over what such a large area which so far has managed to escape. It should be preserved as it is for the future.

### **Flora and fauna**

I am very concerned for the wildlife that will be affected. It is not adequate to say that you will kill a few quolls or koalas here but that's okay here. Epuron will make up for this by purchasing an offset somewhere else or paying for credits.

Dead is dead.

I note that Australia has one of the most appalling records in the world for modern day extinctions.

There are many important species of plants and animals in the project boundary and in the vicinity and they should be preserved. The bushfires, floods and drought have highlighted the need to keep what is left. I also query the decision to locate these turbines so close to a national park.

### **Neighbour agreements**

You become a tenant on your own land. Neighbour agreements do not compensate landowners adequately and have clauses that take away the rights of the landowner.

### **Community**

There is definite ill feeling in the community between those who support and those who oppose the project.

Some members of the community have even said that if you have been here for a long time then you can do as you please without any consideration on the impact on others – your neighbours.

### **Fire**

Will aerial fire fighting be undertaken around wind turbines if required?

### **CCC**

- Meeting minutes not uploaded to Epuron website in a timely manner and extremely difficult to find

- No representative from Muswellbrook Council

### **Decommissioning**

Who is going to pay to remove the turbines and other infrastructure once it reached the end of its useful life? The DPIE has advised that these costs are tied to the land. So, ultimately the landowner will pay. How are they expected to finance the costs? What happens if the wind farm becomes defunct and cease to operate before its expected 25 year life? Will it be removed?

### **Health**

This project is causing myself and others a great deal of stress. It has not even been built yet and it is impacting on our health.

Noise is a huge concern and I believe it will be at unacceptable levels.

### **Summary**

I note that the people who do the studies and make the decisions around wind farms don't live anywhere near them and never will. Policy makers need to consult more meaningfully with the people that will bear the burden of their decisions. Compensation must be mandatory.

I am not interested in relocating. I love it here but I worry about how liveable it will be in the future if this project is approved.

Wind farms do not make sense. They will not save the world and I imagine that they will soon be superseded by better technology. This project should not be approved. The impact on the landscape, the flora and fauna and the health of people is too great. The financial impact that it will have on landholders' property values also cannot be ignored and nor can the rights of people be overlooked regardless of whether they live on their property or not. They own it, have paid for it and you cannot ignore them just because it's convenient.