

I am Svetlana Vlasoff. I represent the multiple owners of lot 22 on Morrison's Gap Road, DP 1044936. We are all members of one big extended family and we have collectively owned this property for over 40 years.

Our Property is accessed via an easement from Morrison's Gap road or another one from Shearer's road. The dwelling on the property has been identified as NAD 8. The closest turbine, number 70, is only 1160 meters away and number 69 is only a few meters further. We share a boundary with the wind farm project.

Our children and grandchildren grew up camping, hunting, fishing and foraging on this land. With many owners and family members involved, the property is frequently used and occupied. This project will interfere with our enjoyment of our land.

According to the assessments, we will endure construction noise in close proximity and thereafter, visual impact, of over 30 hours of shadow flicker and noise emitted by the turbines for the life of the project.

#### Noise impact

The proponent used noise data from NAD 12 to estimate background noise on our property. Based on this estimate, they allow the turbines to generate higher noise levels at higher wind speeds because the background noise raises at NAD 12 as the wind gets stronger. NAD 12 is located on the ridge, our dwelling is in the valley; it doesn't get as windy here.

Even with this dishonest assumption they still have to operate turbines in noise reduced mode to keep it under the red line. The Applicant had offered us a Biodiversity agreement for their mitigation. It was rejected. They offered a neighbourhood agreement of only \$6,000 per annum initially, it was rejected. They have increased the offer to \$30,000 per year to allow the turbines to operate unconstrained, it was not accepted. It was also rejected. The Applicant has a financial incentive to exceed the noise limits as turbines generate less income in noise reduced mode.

The Department is approving these turbines very close to our property based on a guess of background noise and a promise to keep turbines quiet. If it turns out turbines are not compliant, will they remove them?

The visual impact by this project to our family will begin with travelling down Morrison's Gap road, where they propose to widen the road and remove all the beautiful trees and ferns. Then it is escalated as we have to travel through the construction site and for the life of the project drive around turbines.

The independent visual assessment review pointed out the following:

- Local roads located within 500m of the turbine array become the subject of VIZ 1 Performance Objectives.
- No public viewpoints have been selected and analysed in the LVIA along Morrison's Gap Road or Shearer's Road within the Project Area.

- The LVIA proposed significant roadworks along Morrison's Gap Road, these works would have resulted in significant tree removal which would have opened up views to the turbines along the ridgeline.
- In the area around turbines 65-70 adjacent to the Morrison's Gap/Shearer's Road intersection ... several turbines are potentially highly visible and would dominate the view catchment.... the turbines and associated works located within 500m of Morrison's Gap Road do not appear to comply with the Visual Magnitude Performance Objective.
- The letter from Moir Landscape Architecture dated 10 Nov 2023 acknowledges that the landscape character of the area will be modified. We consider the turbines from many public viewing locations along Morrison's Gap Road will cause more than a low-level modification of the visual catchment and therefore, those turbines along Morrison's Gap Road do not meet the VIZ 1 Landscape Scenic Integrity Performance Objective. The justification provided for the non-compliance is the low frequency road use combined with the short duration of exposure.

I disagree with the justification provided as it does not take into account future development in the area and the ever increasing tourism. This road is busier now than when we bought the property, and will be busier again in the future. The justification for non-compliance is merely the Applicant's opinion.

NAD 8 is the second closest dwelling to the proposed wind farm and should have received very thorough assessments and proper photomontages. Instead we only received desktop estimates. This is what they said: Desktop analysis indicates that the residence is surrounded by dense vegetation to the north, east and south, but with more open views to the west. The curtilage appears to be cleared for up to 50m to the west of the residence. The ground falls away to the west toward the Barnard River. Views of the turbines could be possible. Trigonometrical analysis indicates that trees beyond 50m from the residence and less than 20m high will not screen turbines 66, 67, 68, 69 and 70. Trees between 20 and 30 m high will provide partial screening. Full screening would be achieved for tree height in the order of 30m.

So based on the guess, that the trees are exactly 30 meters high, exactly 50 meters from the house, so close together that there are no gaps between them, and will remain in this configuration for the next 30 years, the Department allowed the siting of turbines in close proximity.

We wanted the actual assessment and the Applicant was supposed to call us back with a suitable date and time, they never did. Instead, they asked our neighbour to take them around our property, without our knowledge or our permission, but the neighbour declined to do so, not wanting to trespass.

The only way this could be acceptable is if you impose a condition that if turbines are not effectively screened, the developer should come back and remove them. Also at any stage during the life of the project if the trees are damaged by snow, wind, fire or drought, and the turbines become exposed, they should be taken down.

Additionally to NAD 8, there is an approved DA with a registered building envelope approximately 200 meters south west from NAD 8 located on the western side of the Barnard River. This approved DA is situated only between 40 to 60 metres from our border with the wind farm proposal.

Construction of this residence has been started. We have put in pier holes, footings are in place, they have been inspected and certified by a certifier for Tamworth council; but having this DA which now doesn't expire, is like having money in the bank.

It adds value to our property and it is important to preserve the possibility of finishing construction of this house in the future. The DA was applied for in my sister in laws name, I have spoken to her son and he has stated that he would like to finish the house in the near future.

I have notified the Department of the existence of this DA a long time ago, but they failed to mention it in their report.

I have attached aerial maps showing the position of the proposed dwelling.

I have tried to locate the paper work relevant to the DA, and couldn't find any, so I have applied to Tamworth Regional Council for the relevant information. They have told me that the expected time frame would approximately take 25 working days. As soon as the paper work is available I am more than happy to provide it to the Commissioner.

The proximity of the wind farm next door will interfere with the future development on our property. If the area of the approved building envelope is cleared for the building works, the visual, noise and shadow flicker impacts will become unmitigated.

To protect this future house from the bush fires, an asset protection zone must be established. Because the trees are necessary to provide the screening of the turbines, we feel that it will be a choice between a rock and a hard place. Should we accept the fire risk and retain the trees for visual, noise and shadow flicker screening? Or should we remove the trees to increase the firebreak and wear the impacts of the turbines for two decades?

We are asking the commissioners to remove turbines from 66 to 70 to protect our property, our quality of life, our sleep, our health, our safety, our amenity and the experience of arriving at the property.

If this project was to go ahead I ask that the following turbines be removed: 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69 & 70.