

From Akilina Yakimoff
Objection to the Hills of Gold wind farm.

I am a part owner of lot 22 on Morrisons Gap road. This lot has 6 registered owners on the Title and is also a location of NAD 8 and an approved DA which was not identified by Engie or assessed by the Department of Planning.

The Proponent has not followed the first step of the NSW wind farm guidelines:

Step 1 - Identify and consult with adjacent landholders. The proponent has failed to do the first most basic step, IDENTIFY all owners.

The below table was submitted by the proponent and uploaded on the IPCN website 14/02/2024.

NAD8, NAD4B & NAD4C are grouped together and the proponent apparently consulted with mythical owner of this combined property.

2 Neighbour consultation

The Project has an extensive history of consulting with neighbours within 5km of a turbine, as well as neighbours out to 8km from a proposed turbine. The years of consultation has resulted in 16 neighbour agreements executed and those people now set to receive annual payments from the project. The interactions referenced in Table 1 include all emails, campaign emails, phone calls, in person meetings and any virtual meetings.

Table 1 - Non associated dwellings that made an oral submission during the Public Meeting

Dwelling Identifier	Distance from closest turbine (km)	Consultation History
NAD4 B & C NAD 8	B 2.73	<ul style="list-style-type: none">58 interactions with this landowner from March 2018 to December 2023
	C 2.52	<ul style="list-style-type: none">1 face to face meeting6 phone callsNeighbour benefit sharing program offered

NAD 8, NAD 4b and NAD4c are three separate properties under separate ownerships.

CONSULTATION

The applicant has not conducted proper consultation. Consultation has been in the form of marketing and promoting the project as opposed to consulting with neighbouring land owners, hearing concerns and addressing issues raised. The voice of the opposition has been swept under the carpet and a spotlight placed solely on project supporters.

Their consultation records are records of their marketing campaign. This is deliberately misleading, it gives the appearance that we have been consulted collectively and to a very detailed length when in fact it has been the opposite.

The table notes a total of 58 interactions, 1 of which was face to face and 6 were phone calls. No clarification given on “58 interactions”.

RECORD ACCURACY

I refer back to the table above and note that NAD 8 has been excluded from the distance column. Only NAD4 B & C are listed. We are in fact closer to the proposed site, the closest wind turbine being 1.16 km.

This is another example of the deliberately misleading tabulation of information by the proponent through the omission of essential facts.

Below is the table of the ownership breakdown of these three properties. I am the part owner of lot 22, **Person 5** in this table. I have not had a single contact from the Proponent, no meetings, no email, no calls, NOTHING.

<p>NAD 8 + non assessed DA - Lot 22 Morrisons Gap Road, Hanging Rock</p> <p>This property has multiple owners with Title divided into four (4) shares under Tenancy in Common</p> <p>Each owner of a share has a surveyed exclusive partition.</p> <p>Person 1 + as joint tenants of a share of Tenants in common Person 2</p> <p>Person 3 + as joint tenants of a share of Tenants in common Person 4</p> <p>Person 5 as a sole owner of a share of Tenants in common (this is me)</p> <p>Person 6 as a sole owner of a share of Tenants in common</p>
<p>NAD 4b - 405 Shearers Road, Hanging Rock</p> <p>This property has two owners as Joint Tenants</p> <p>Person 7 + <u>the Son of this couple</u> Person 8</p> <p>This is the person Engie had face to face meeting with</p>
<p>NAD 4c - property “Novgorod” Shearers Road, Hanging Rock</p> <p>This property is under a sole ownership</p> <p>Person 9</p>

There are 3 separate properties but only 1 face to face meeting, how is this adequate consultation, especially since lot 22 is closer to the proposed site?

I request a detailed clarification on the 58 interactions.

Are there 51 emails that they can present as proof of these interactions? Who were they interacting with?

This is an example of the proponent's ongoing misleading and deceitful conduct through false records. I request further investigation into these records in order to find the truth of the matter.

No face to face consultation has occurred with lot 22 owners.

At the public meeting in Nundle hall on the 1st and 2nd of February Lot 22 was represented by [REDACTED], **Person 4** in the above Table, and Vlad Vlasoff, the son of **Person 3** and **Person 4**.

[REDACTED] was represented by [REDACTED], the son of **Person 7** and **Person 8**.

[REDACTED] was represented by [REDACTED] the son of **Person 9**.

I appreciate the confusion with the surnames, we are all members of extended family, but I wish to reiterate, we are separate ENTITIES, when it comes to the property ownership.

At a very minimum, I request that the 7 turbines (64-70) the closest to Morrisons Gap road are removed, and the Proponents should not be allowed to reinstate turbines already recommended to be removed.

But ultimately, I request that the Hills of Gold is rejected because the Proponent failed to demonstrate responsibility when it comes to good project design and consultation with neighbours.