

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Saturday, 9 December 2023 4:56 PM  
**To:** IPCN Submissions Mailbox  
**Subject:** Bowman's Creek Wind Turbine Industrial Development - Submission  
**Attachments:** NOTES-Wind Turbines 7th December 2023.doc

[Redacted] [Redacted]

See attached.

Please redact my name

--  
Sincerely,

[Redacted]

-----

1. Please declare your phone number on calling, otherwise my phone will automatically reject the call.
2. Please delete details of all previous senders (including mine) before forwarding again to reduce spam, viruses & identity theft.
3. Its best to use the BCC field while forwarding emails.

Thanks!

-----

This e-mail, including any attachments, is confidential and may contain legally privileged information or copyright material. As the intended recipient you should read, but not copy or distribute, disclose or otherwise use any of the information in this e-mail or it's attachments, without written authorisation.  
If received in error and you are not the intended recipient, you should not read, copy or distribute, disclose or otherwise use the information in this e-mail. Please contact us at once by return e-mail and then immediately delete both messages and any attachments that form part of this e-mail from your system.

## **Wind Turbines:**

These are a blight on the landscape and using the industries numbers, have a payback period of at least 11.6 years and a lifespan of less than 20 years.

These things have a dubious advantage and must be rigorously assessed, with a proper investigation into how the proposal has been formulated.

The proposals must **NOT be rubber-stamped.**

I have serious concerns that the “..government assessment...” relies on the “truthfulness” of the proponent. In other places, the proponents are not truthful and make proposals that are not properly nor assessed with appropriate rigour by the Government departments or responsible instrumentalities.

In many cases that have been proposed, the numbers and economics are simply absent.

In my experience, Ark Energy [Epuron], Korea/Zinc are the worst offenders and with the Chambulin [in FNQ – Far North Queensland] proposal failed to deal with objections, attempting to win “...community acceptance...” by using bribes to the community.

The light pollution, where the norm is a “black night”, is startling with light affecting a large area. This was never expounded by the Kaban proponent. The Chalumbin proposal will just add to this and with Bowman’s Creek will be similar.

There has been a serious situation arising in recent weeks, where Ark Energy is improperly attempting to influence the Minister [Minister Plibersek].

This influence is against in excess of 750 submissions properly made which reject the Chambulin proposal. Ark Energy even went to the length of changing the name, as it would appear to be trying to distance itself from the proposal.

This is becoming common eg Upper Burdekin proposal to an obscure name.

Even mis-stating the number of turbines applied for in the initial proposal to the regulator in Queensland, then claiming a 75% reduction in impact.

On Ark Energy’s own admission, the Company failed to report ALL or any, submissions on the second iteration of Lotus Creek.

I am seriously of the view that Epuron/Ark Energy/ Korea Zinc will attempt the same with Bowman’s Creek, despite assurances [no doubt] that this will not occur.

Our northern experience is quite different.

The removal process on decommissioning is even more unclear, as a broad brush approach is used and there is no compulsory deposits taken to ensure a FULL clean up,

but likely to be left to State Government, Local Government or the actual landholder where there is a land lease in place.

We don't have proper declarations of the materials involved in the blades, turbine, oils and degradation/ shedding of phenols [for example] in blades and other materials which impact the area around turbines, which will likely render surrounding areas to be CONTAMINATED LANDS.

The change in classification will clearly result in areas being sterilised from agricultural use.

The areas proposed are agricultural and should remain so. The gradual erosion and industrial sterilisation in the local area within a region that is one with a large range of agricultural outcomes should be stopped and the determination be to disallow the proposal.

The local visual impacts are huge due to light pollution and being of a height close to the size of Centrepoint Tower, with no stopping exceeding heights

ie. No prescribed maximum that cannot be changed via a further “change” to size of the turbine, with increased impacts due to blade length changes.

*One size - One size – one approval and NO future changes..*

There are serious issues for crop spraying and bird migration, together with aerial firefighting.

Sound generation is poorly dealt with and from experience with Kaban in FNQ, the sound impact, which affects sleep patterns and local amenity is in a range up to 10 km.

**The proposal should be simply rejected as being an unsuitable industrial proposal.**