

Attn: Chairman Independent Planning Commission NSW

I write this letter in opposition to the Hills of Gold Windfarm. I own, with my wife one of the properties identified as part of this project, designated as NAD4c. I strongly oppose this project, residing at my property for the better part of 4 decades this project has caused a small town to be divided and neighbours who previously spoke to each other and would assist each other now drawing lines in the sand and crossing the road just not to cross paths. The reason for my objections are as below:

1. How can we allow the applicants all the time to respond and to delay providing critical information to the IPC, is this not a stall tactic to wear down those opposing the project in hopes they give up and sell their properties
2. We talk about progress and improving our way of living but we oppose someone who wants to build a new house and improve their views, their way of living by having a house they can access with ease and not have to be bound by weather conditions. The majority of residents are aging and try to make their lives easier why should we deprive them of this.
3. Why has the applicant at the 11th hour provided crucial information relating to the viability of project, why have they been given the opportunity to delay responses to requests from IPC and Dept of Planning. They are forcing the IPC to make decisions that will have everlasting affects. Should a voluntary acquisition clause be allowed this will have an everlasting affect on all future projects and open the gates for large organisations to not only devalue landholders property but also remove the potential for a fair market valuation as it would restrict the sale of the property to the project applicants.
4. I continue to express concerns for the turbines proposed along Morrisons Gap road, this is the only access way for residents residing up there and only access route of visitors to the trout farm, how can we allow them to place these turbines so close to a public road with the risk of ice throw or potential risk of a turbine failure affecting the only access route.
5. Financially not viable. Looking at all the proposed turbine variations and volumes this project is not financially viable. Approval was given for 47 turbines and it wasn't until Feb 24 that the applicant stated that less than 62 turbines is not viable. Have the costs of construction factored in the rising costs of materials and costs to build these projects, there is nothing stopping the applicant from amending the project once its been approved stating rising costs require them to sell energy at a higher price especially when the project would not operational for years.

Overall I strongly object to this project, it is not financially viable, it is out of character for the area and will only cause more problems, the applicant continuously applies Visual Assessment draft guidelines 2023 and 2016 guidelines interchangeably to suit their needs. I implore you to listen to residents and reject this project.