

My name is Robert(Bob) Worley. I own a property which is directly impacted by this proposal. It is less than 2km from a number of turbines. The property is my home and my workplace. I object to this proposal. I have taken a significant amount of time to make the proponent aware of my property and the DA that has been approved for my dwelling. The DA has been started with tanks in place and a survey complete.

Lot 175 DP 755335 is part of my property. The approved DA for a dwelling is located at -31.54142, 151.146275. Even though I have taken the proponent to this site and walked it with them, they continually refuse to place it on their maps and have not at any point dealt with this as an impacted DA. The DA is located approximately 500 metres north of NAD\_05. My property shares significant boundary with the project zone.

None of the following for my property or approved DA has been considered by the proponent:

- Noise
- Shadow flicker/blade glint
- Visual impact- individual and cumulative

The proponent has been given ample opportunity to do this. Engagement has been through me contacting them and not them making contact with me. It was a struggle to get them to show interest and they have not offered any solutions or mitigation. My Approved DA need to be added to the map, acknowledged and dealt with accordingly. I believe the proponent has intentionally left my DA out as it is in such close proximity to the development. The proponent was made aware from the beginning that the DA existed and was moving ahead. The proponent was shown maps and given coordinates several times as they lost them the first couple of times. The proponent was also given details of the approved DA.

As an Aboriginal man, the proponent has given no regard to my continuing connection with the land. This land is my country, it is my home and my workplace. The proponent does not recognise that the property in its entirety is my home and everywhere I go on my property is going to be significantly impacted by this development. The proponent has not noted any visual impacts from my property.

The proponent has suggested that the approved DA could be moved to a different location on the lot. This shows a lack of understanding of council bylaws and the fact the location of the dwelling was chosen due to road access and access to water. Again, the proponent has tried to offer simplistic solutions and paid no attention to laws or practicality.

Page 37, point 122 of the assessment report incorrectly states there are other locations for the dwelling. This is incorrect and continues to ignore the fact the DA is already approved and the site noted on the DA. The coordinates above give the site. The DPIH recommendation has been guided by the proponent who is continuing to ignore the fact that this DA exists.

I am also significantly concerned about the impact on the waterways my farm relies on. The property sits directly below the project zone and I rely on Nundle Creek and the tributaries for water. I have witnessed what happens to the creek when works above have taken place and the impact on other streams. The soil assessment has been shown inadequate. Page 4 and 5 of Appendix L- Constructability Advice identify significant issues that will impact my business and property, particularly unknown erosion impacts and surface water impacts.

I spend everyday on my property, monitoring stock, infrastructure and enjoying the amenity. This proposal will destroy all that I enjoy. Turbines 57 to 70 need to be removed, preferably, the entire project reused consent.

Bob Worley