

Objection from [REDACTED]

I write this objection as an 86 year old who has lived in Nundle since 1981. I have owned property in Nundle on which I ran a successful grazing business as well as leased a number of properties around the area. I have an intimate knowledge of the proposed construction area having worked it for many years. During this period, I have seen many variations in weather and impacts on the land.

I give warning to the fact that the EIS is deficient in the fact that the study was done during the worst drought on record. This did not allow for the animal movement nor the significant movement of land which I have witnessed. The fact that the koala population has not been regarded as endangered is appalling. I have seen koalas in the area myself. The significant wedge tailed eagle population uses this entire area.

During my time grazing the area I have seen significant land slippage to the point that my own vehicle nearly rolled due to roads giving away.

The proponent has not done a meaningful study on the actual rainfall levels. The rain on the range is significantly different to that below. The disturbance of soils in the project zone has caused considerable damage to the creeks and dams below. My property, has experienced a number of dams being silted and water holes filled due to the movement of soils in this area. The proponent has not made a proper study of this. Evidence of this can clearly be seen in the Constructability Advice included as an appendix in the DPE recommendation. On page 4 of the report, I agree whole heartedly that the soils suffer high erodibility. I have seen this. The fact the report goes on to state that the EIS does not clearly identify the erosion sediment control, or the extent of the disturbance associated with the works is incredibly concerning. The soils have been identified as highly erodible yet the proponent has not given any clear outline of management. This is enough to deny the application as the water sources below the development are going to be severely impacted. Again, I have witnessed firsthand what happens.

As an Aboriginal man, I do not believe this is an appropriate place for this development. Not only based on the scientific evidence but on the connection to the land and the fauna I have seen. Spotted quolls are often in this area, I have photos of them on my property. The bird and bat life is abundant and it is unfair that our native animals should be further doomed due to the desire for profit. This is not about renewables but about money.

Page 5, 4.4 Surface Water Assessment, paragraph 6 states clearly that few measures are given in relation to drainage. The concentration of surface water moving as sheet flows over this area will have a terrible impact on the soils and erosion. Those below who rely on the clean water are going to suffer. The proponent has not paid any attention to the livelihood of those adjoining the project zone who are going to suffer the impact of the lack of study.

On page 6, category 3 slopes are over 30%. Building on slopes in this area of greater than 20% will create a major issue but to even consider building on slopes over 30% is perilous. The visual impact will be huge, the erosion will be massive and the likelihood of major disaster. This is a steep slope. There should not be any building works on slopes greater than 20% in this area.

The proponent has at no time approached me in relation to a visual assessment from my own home. I live on Nundle Creek Road and will be significantly affected by development. I include a picture showing my residence in the foreground. This photomontage looked toward the proposal from the Nundle cemetery.



This is a significant area for my family and me. Some of my children still live here with my grandchildren, my other children come here on a regular basis for the rural lifestyle. One of my daughters has bought property in Nundle and is returning. We are not in a REZ and this project has dragged on due to the variety of issues. It still suffers from not being correctly assessed and with no clear transport route.

I ask that this proposal be rejected.

[REDACTED]