

To The IPCN

I write as a young Kamilaroi woman who has deep connections to the land in Nundle. There are multiple reasons to not reinstate turbines and to ultimately refuse this development.

The proponent has not properly addressed the issue of Aboriginal Culture and Heritage. The Aboriginal Heritage Study did not cover the whole of the site. At the time it was completed, the proponent did not know where turbines were to be located nor were those conducting the study able to walk the entirety of the site. The proponent was not clear on other infrastructure as well. There should be NO approval given at all until this study has been redone in its entirety.

The new conditions do not take into account the cumulative impact of the reinstatement of the turbines on other properties. DAD01 is significant but so are other properties. This must be thought about before moving forward. My family property neighbours the construction zone and is significantly impacted.

The fact that the turbines were removed in the first instance was due to impacts being unable to be mitigated. This has not changed. The DPHI 'voluntary' land acquisition sets a very dangerous precedent regardless of the DPHI stating it is not intended as such. Their intent may not be to do this but they will.

The number of threatened species is significant yet the conditions allow for the proponent to clear their habitat. There should be NO clearing of the habitat of any threatened species. There is a reason they are threatened and it is due to their habitat being cleared. Current research is showing that offset do not work for these threatened species.

Transport routes are not clear and there has not been a study done in relation to the impact on traffic flows. As a young person who regularly caught the school bus, it was frightening enough with the log trucks but to now put OSOM vehicles on the road as well as many more cars is going to make it much more dangerous.

The removal of unique items from Nundle and then allowing the proponent to reinstate them when they see fit is completely wrong. Nundle's character is created by what is

there now and what has been put in place by community. The proponent should not be allowed to remove items such as tress from our street scape.

This project detracts from the greater good of our society. Nundle is not in a REZ and therefore it is important it be protected to allow others to enjoy it. It is not necessary to industrialise every landscape.

I ask that the IPCN at least not allow for the reinstatement of turbines but that ultimately the IPCN refuse this development in totality.

Ella Worley

Nundle