

From: [Guy Manson](#)
To: [Do-Not-Reply IPCN Submissions Mailbox](#)
Subject: SSD-9679 (Hills of Gold) - Submission of objection
Date: Thursday, 11 July 2024 7:24:47 PM

Dear Commissioners.

I object to the changed recommendations of the Planning Department in their recommendations to the IPC.

This sets a precedent that is unacceptable as it will be used for other wind factory applications. Also possibly set a National precedent. This is also undemocratic in today's society. I am compelled to object.

Voluntary acquisition of affected residents / land is better described as compulsory acquisition because the individuals affected would not be able to reside in the homes due to excessive noise / vibration. To have your environment changed in this way would be devastating. It is well documented that background noise generated by wind turbines will affect the ambiance of the area and fundamentally change the surrounding environment despite an acoustic assessment meeting outdated standards. (Outdated meaning that the standards adopted have not kept up with the turbine technology. Turbines have doubled if not tripled in capacity and set back distances have changed compared to the acoustic assessment criteria.)

The method of calculating what would be "market value" is also not a reasonable form of payment when individuals have different views on their place of residence which are not driven by market value more so by feelings of connectivity with the land they are caretakers of. You can't put a price on this.

Tree screening is not an effective method to mitigate visual impacts caused from poorly placed wind turbines. A view should not be assumed it is static. Changing the classification from high visual impact to moderate impact by using tree screening is neither acceptable nor practical.

In my opinion I think the Planning Department has lost their independence and wind energy projects are being approved ad hoc and not by merit. This demonstrates the lack of good project planning by the developers as clearly the project is not financially viable.

I consider this to undermine the rights to rural freehold as opposed to urban freehold. Will the same principle extend to any private urban development proposal?

"IEAPET agreed that unless the Project was approved with at least 62 turbines, it would not be economically viable." I challenge this statement and ask that I be provided the detailed cost analysis data to support the claim as made by IEAPET. This should also include entire project costings and expected return that will supposedly benefit the greater public by delivering 372MW of energy. (also expected price per MWH NEM – AEMO, efficiency etc, etc, etc)

Yours Faithfully

Guy Manson

[REDACTED]