

To the IPCN

Page 10-Samantha McLean

“The Department considered the project, as it was proposed in the EIS, had substantial issues that would have likely led to a recommendation for refusal.”

This statement still stands.

Instrument of Consent:

Refers solely to DAD01 and the impacts. The reinstatement of turbines as proposed will continue to have a cumulative impact on a number of residences. Mine at DAD03 and my brother at DAD05 have not been mentioned. The removal of the turbines benefits multiple dwellings and DAs. This must form part of the consideration and the turbines NOT reinstated.

Micro-siting approval MUST be gained as the Aboriginal Heritage Study is inadequate and new studies are currently being commissioned by the Gomeroi Claimant group and will involve members of the Nungaroo Lands Council. It is imperative that every location of any infrastructure be approved. The proponent has already shown a disregard for our culture and heritage through this proposal.

There is NO agreement with the Nungaroo lands council for access over Crown Lands.

Evidence of consultation is not appropriate. The letter from Samantha McLean clearly identifies the complete lack of professionalism of this proponent and their disregard for our community. Consultation must NOT be the proponent presenting an offer or plan and not listening or taking on board what is said. At this stage, the proponent has shown a complete lack of understanding of culture and heritage through this proposal. The

proponent should be showing evidence of serious negotiations and changes in planning, particularly with local people.

The proponent did NOT include a member of the Nungaroo Aboriginal Lands Council on their CCC. This is a must for any CCC and should be outlined clearly in documentation.

Tamworth Regional Council continues to object to this windfarm proposal. Entering in a VPA with them is impossible, forcing this upon a council that has objected for serious reasons makes a mockery of the whole process and this should not be a condition for council to be forced into a set agreement simply to force a project to be approved.

The removal of turbines was a key feature for a number of dwellings and DAs. The DPHI recommendations pay no attention to this and seem to refer to only DAD01. The removal of the turbines was in place to not only benefit DAD01 but a variety of properties and residence. This must be looked at again. The idea of vegetation screening in a rural area where the lifestyle is about the outside again shows a complete lack of understanding of our community and the reason people live here. The turbines should NOT be replaced.

Again, the lighting of this development WILL impact the dark sky status we are aiming for. It impacts directly on our ability to connect with the area culturally and scientifically.

Blasting in this sensitive area has not been investigated properly. It is not just the vibrations and impact on water systems but the sound and impact on the native wildlife, particularly in proximity to a nature reserve. Again, this is the reason for refusing the application or at a minimum, not reinstating turbines.

In relation to water, there has been no mention at all of the impact on the downstream farms who rely on the catchment for dams. There must be an inclusion of a clause that any impact caused by the proponent's development is rectified immediately.

The proponent has been given licence to clear the habitat of threatened species. The DPHI should not be allowing this at all. Stating 'minimise clearing' does not preclude the proponent from clearing areas. There should be NO clearing of the habitat of threatened species.

The DPHI recommendations have again shown a lack of understanding in relation to Aboriginal Culture and Heritage. All areas are of high cultural importance. This development will destroy those cultural links. Again, the idea that one simply removes items found so a development can proceed is abhorrent. Until a comprehensive and inclusive Aboriginal Heritage Study is completed across the WHOLE of the development, including the micro-locations of infrastructure then nothing can move forward. There are a number of significant sites not registered but are in the process of being registered. Again, the proponent made no effort to include a member of the Nungaroo Lands Council in the CCC and therefore information was not received until well after the EIS was submitted. The proponent's team must undertake a Connecting to Country course to better develop their understanding of Aboriginal Culture and Connection.

Again, the transport information has missed the fact that these are country roads and that our children travel them regularly on school buses. The proponent must NOT be allowed to transport any OSOM items during school bus hours.

The access road through the Peel Inn area has not account for the significant impact that it will have on future flooding events. Those who have lived here for a number of

years will attest to the power of the water and building a road that will in essence curtail flood waters will be disastrous.

Access to information must be better. Stating that the proponent must make it accessible on their website does not allow for those who can't access it nor does it specify a time frame. This information must be available well before any construction starts to allow community or neighbours the time to prepare. Please set timeframes on this.

The acquisition of land is most definitely not voluntary. The DPHI have set the condition to be so draconian that it is basically stating that even though these turbines should not be here and they had been removed we are putting them back and if you don't like it, sell your land to the proponent. This is a dangerous precedent and will be seen clearly as such. This clause must be removed and the turbines not returned. This project is unnecessary and very far from being for the greater good.

The greater good can be much better served in this instance by allowing the area to remain as it is for those impact by developments who are in a REZ. Nundle is not in a REZ for a reason and this area has been excluded for a reason.

There has been no images to show the community what all of the cutaways for different infrastructure will look like.

I request that at a minimum, these turbines not be reinstated. The letter from Samantha McLean from the DPHI clearly shows this is a flawed project and has been from the very beginning. It is the duty of the commission to reject this project for the greater good of our society.

Ian Worley

Crawney Rd

Nundle NSW 2340