

I object to the Bowmans Creek Wind Farm.

I am a resident of Muscle Creek and own 120 acres at Lot 40 Muscle Creek Road. I have many concerns about the proposed development and the EIS that has been submitted by Epuron. I am very disappointed by the lack of transparency and the lack of communication by Epuron.

The EIS and Epuron have completely disregarded me simply because I do not yet have a residence on my property. I have always intended to retire to this property and build my dream home. I would not have purchased this property had I known that, in the future, a significant industrial development would be built here. I am now faced with a property that will only lose value if I am even able to sell it, which is doubtful. Epuron have said that because I don't yet have a house I don't count. That is just not fair. I do, however, have a building entitlement. When I raised this issue with Anthony Ko he responded to my email as follows:

From: Anthony Ko <Anthony.Ko@planning.nsw.gov.au>

Sent: Thursday, 22 April 2021 12:41 PM

Subject: RE: Bowmans Creek Windfarm concern

Hi Clint,

Thank you for bringing your concerns to my attention.

The Bowmans Creek Wind Farm project is currently on public exhibition until **11 May 2021**, and I would encourage you to make a submission detailing your concerns on our Major Projects website at <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/project/11691>.

As outlined in the NSW Government Wind Energy Framework

- <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/-/media/Files/DPE/Guidelines/wind-energy-guideline-for-state-significant-wind-energy-development-2016-12.pdf> the Department will consider the following in the assessment and determination of wind energy projects:

- Existing development in the vicinity of the wind energy project, including dwellings;
- Approved development within the vicinity of the wind energy project, including dwellings, that are approved but yet to be constructed or are under construction;
- Development within the vicinity of a wind energy project for which a development application has been lodged, including with councils, but a determination is yet to be made; and
- Existing dwelling entitlements on land within the vicinity of the wind energy project.

It would assist us with our assessment of the project if you could provide details on the location of your property and proposed dwelling and its status. By making a submission, Epuron will also be required to formally respond to the matters raised in a Submissions Report which will be published on our website.

Where wind energy development is permitted with consent, an applicant can lawfully lodge a development application to the relevant consent authority to consider on its merits. In this instance, the Department is responsible for assessing the merits of the application and I am happy to listen to your concerns on the proposal.

Further information on what is considered when assessing the merits of a wind farm development application can be found in the Wind Energy Framework (linked above).

Kind Regards

Anthony Ko
Team Leader, Energy Assessments

Energy, Industry & Compliance | Planning and Assessment
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
T 02 8217 2022 | E anthony.ko@planning.nsw.gov.au
4 Parramatta Square, 12 Darcy Street, Parramatta NSW 2150
www.dpie.nsw.gov.au



Planning,
Industry &
Environment



Subscribe to our [newsletter](#)



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

Appendix A – Schedule of Land to which this EIS Applies. This is a listing of all lot numbers and DPs. My lot number is Lot 40, DP1094039. My property is not included in this list.

My entire property is 3km or less from the nearest turbine at best. Why do I not to have any rights and why am I not considered in the EIS? How many other landowners are in the same position and have been overlooked?

The building site that I have selected will have a clear view of 28 turbines according to the photo montage that was taken. The cumulative impact of the noise of 28 turbines as it funnels down the valley will be severe. Noise travels in extraordinary ways in this valley but this is not an issue that has been addressed by Epuron. Why would Epuron provide me with photo montages of the project but then exclude me from the EIS?

Given that the EIS is very difficult to follow and the maps that have been provided are worse. I cannot properly determine how many turbines I will see as it differs from the maps to the photo montage. Which is correct please? Are any of them correct?

This development will destroy my property. I have exceptional views and the surrounding landscape is more than “moderate” as stated in the EIS. This is not a moderate landscape. It is stunning in its own right. Who decides how a landscape is rated? Obviously, I liked it enough to want to live out here and I should add that anyone who visits always comments on how peaceful it is and how beautiful the views are.

The Hunter River Times (Issue 1, 19/06/20) featured an article on Strathclyde House owned by Ross Clydsdale. This property is within the project boundary. The article states that the property includes “4000 acres in the head of a **naturally stunning valley**, the property comes complete with **remnant rainforest**, naturally flowing waterfalls and crystal clear pools, soaring escarpments and giant **grass tree forests**.” This is an example of a landscape that is better than “moderate”. “Stunning” is the word that is used.





Epuron has failed to communicate with the community and affected landowners from the beginning. If I had not requested, repeatedly, for a photo montage to be done, it would not have happened. I wish I had not asked. The photos are devastating. I have attended the two community meetings that were held at the Muscle Creek fire hall. Epuron failed to answer any questions that were asked. In the EIS Epuron acknowledged that the project was causing stress but that the Proponent *“will continue to engage in and maintain transparent, evidence-based and ongoing dialogue with concerned landholders and other community members, based on the results of the Environmental Impact Statement.”* Epuron have only met with me on one occasion and that was only because my partner requested a meeting. They have not contacted either of us since and there has been no “ongoing dialogue” or “transparency” on their part. There is a very long list of affected landowners that Epuron has never approached. Their mail updates are inadequate and not helpful and if you aren’t on the list you don’t receive anything. Epuron should have made the effort to ensure that every resident in the affected areas received every newsletter or meeting notification. They have not done this. The DPIE managed to inform every resident that the EIS had been lodged. Why couldn’t Epuron do the same?

Zoom meetings were held during Covid-19 restrictions. Most people were unaware that these were happening since minimal advertising was undertaken. I believe there was one announcement on the local ABC but not everyone listens to that station in that time slot. The timing of the meetings meant that most people were still at work and would be unable to attend and, in addition, many local residents simply do not have the technology needed to participate. Consequently there were less than a dozen people in attendance at each meeting.

There were additional community meetings held on release of the EIS. These were limited to Hebden and McCullys Gap despite the fact that Muscle Creek has a perfectly adequate hall that has been used before and has the largest affected population in the area. The timing of these was also scheduled so that most people would have difficulty attending due to work.

Overall, the EIS has raised several questions:

- The EIS is biased and incorrect throughout. Shadow flicker is listed as “theoretical”. The developers know which model of turbine will be installed and they will know the actual shadow flicker that will occur. The facts need to be provided. What will be the actual, accurate shadow flicker?
- Why is Strathclyde House not included in the EIS as an historical home? According the article quoted above it was built in 1850.
- The above article also states that a *“plan will create a refuge for the other residents of the property such as kangaroos, wallabies, quolls and koalas and other native birdlife and important species such as native bees”*
Given the destruction from the bushfires and the drought why is this project being contemplated when there is even a hint of koalas in the area? Please explain.
- There is also a registered airstrip that runs parallel to Inglewood Road. This airstrip has been excluded from the EIS. Why?
- Please also explain why aviation lighting has not been addressed in the EIS? It would appear that lights will be required.
- Blasting has not been addresses in the EIS. How can you complete an environmental impact statement and leave out blasting?
- The EIS refers to smaller turbines than will be used at Bowmans Creek and it also refers to turbines located on flat land not 300 metre ridgelines as is the case here. Not a single photo has been included in the EIS of turbines as large as these.

The Bowmans Creek Wind Farm is causing me a great deal of stress and it has caused significant division in the community. I have had to put my life plans on hold regarding my life and property and financially it has the potential to wipe out everything I have worked for so far. It is affecting my health now and it has not even been built. I can't imagine what living with it will be like.

It does appear that everything is biased towards Epuron. The EIS downplays or dismisses the impacts of noise, the visual effects and the impacts on biodiversity of this project. Epuron has had two years to prepare the EIS and uses multiple experts to assist. The community only has 45 days to respond and no extension was granted. The community is not made up of experts whose sole focus is on the EIS. We all have other obligations.

My personal conclusion is that the Bowmans Creek Wind Farm will have a devastating effect on this region and Epuron know this. That is why they have not been forthcoming with landowner's requests for information.

This project should not be approved. It is in the wrong location and will affect too many people and plants and animals. It will destroy the landscape and the homes of many people.