

IPC submission February 2024

My family own Head of Peel Road Nundle. Our residence is identified as NAD33 and is highly impacted visually by potentially 64 turbines dominating the ridgeline. The disturbance to our night sky will be unacceptable due to the requirement to light a portion of the turbines and this has not been assessed from our residences and the noise impact has been underestimated due to the amphitheatre effect of the ridgeline surrounding our property. The technician carrying out the noise monitoring at our house NAD 33 indicated we will definitely hear the turbines and if the noise reaches 35 Decibels certain turbines will need to be turned off. Who will be responsible for managing these situations? I request removal of turbine 53 to 63 and 9-11 as a minimum as recommended by the DPE.

There are so many risks to our family farming business if this project was to proceed and the proponent has not even attempted to understand or accept these exist and have not provided us with any risk mitigation strategy. This is a major concern to me as it is my generation will be living on and working the property for most of the life of the project and during the decommissioning phases. The neighbourhood agreements non associated dwelling have been given to sign are extremely broad with a clear message that the signing of these agreements prevents any later objection to any part of the project. With a project that has so many variables and so many options for transport routes and location of infrastructure a neighbourhood agreement as presented to my family is not signable as advised by our solicitor. A number of property owners who were encouraged to sign neighbourhood agreements might be regretting their decision due to changes in the project and the financial benefit they accepted. Multinational Companies should not be allowed to operate in this manner. This has been identified as a problem that needs addressing by Andrew Dwyer in his recent review December 2023 Community Engagement Review Report to the Minister for Climate Change and Energy. The community engagement by the proponent may tick their boxes however many affected landholders were not contacted and some still have not been. The proponent's way of dealing with people who question the project has been intimidating and the Engie Hub in Nundle is not a safe place to visit if you are not a supporter of the Hills of Gold Project.

I have always had concerns about the environmental consequence of the Hills of Gold Project, and I do not feel this has been adequately addressed. The proponent's methods to monitor bird and bat strikes will not be a true indicator as on our property carcasses are removed very promptly by foxes and wild pigs. The use smart curtailment strategies of which there appears to be no detail, do not address the unknown loss of wildlife as illustrated above. An Engie representative at the Question session at the end of the IPC Public hearing was unable to elaborate further on the company's plans and noted the smart curtailment strategies are reported in two papers overseas with no evidence of the effectiveness in Australia. This does not give any security they will work in practical setting such as Hills of Gold Wind Farm. Should we be exposing such a sensitive environment and the endangered flora and fauna to experimental processes by approving this project and then ineffectively monitoring and controlling its impact on the native flora and fauna?

I request the Commissioners reject this project as the effect on the environment, the Nundle Community and Local non associated landholders has not been adequately addressed and far outweighs the potential energy generation

of this project. The Government created Renewable Energy Zone for a reason and projects such Hills of Gold that are located outside these zones and in areas that pose large challenges in the construction phase and result in significant environmental damage should be considered as poorly sited and thus rejected,