

Jenny Vaughan



Timor

11/7/2024

I am objecting to the Hills of Gold Windfarm project (SSD 9679). My original submission detailed my objections under the issues with erosion, biological diversity, water quality visual impact, lack of community consultation with the Timor/ Crawney communities and lack of deconstruction and rehabilitation plans. These issues are still valid and haven't been addressed properly by Engie.

Lack of information provided to Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) and local communities

The proponent still has not provided the DPE or Timor/ Crawney communities with

- Details on where and how the water will be sourced for construction of the towers
- Mitigation of erosion on south of the ranges -the Timor/Crawney community. Plans for mitigation of soil erosion are non-existent. We have steep grades, land slips and heavy rain events
- A detailed plan for access to the project site and layout and construction of internal roads
- Engie must supply this information. Approval should not be forthcoming without these important details

Unviability of this wind Farm

- The EAPET (Expert Advisory Panel for Energy Transition), have provided a suggested solution to gain viability and approval of the project - Reinstating the non-compliant wind turbines. Apparently 62 turbines are viable, but one less is unviable. This suggests that the project is so marginal, it is not cost affective
- The EAPET have also estimated that Engie would have to spend 7 million dollars on further detailed assessments to reach readiness for consideration as a commercially viable investment. This is not including the extra costs associated with site complexity, such as steep grades, soil instability and difficult access to the site. The original EIS modelling on

construction within and to the site, was carried out on **flat land**. The costings and environmental impacts have been understated. This is a project without detailed design of access roads, internal roads, clearing for construction and transport. All the extra requirements will, also, be a cost to the environment and our endangered flora and fauna species. While there is a push for renewables, we need to look at 'At what cost?' Viability should look at all aspects of a project, not just financial costs. It should look at environmental and human cost.

- I strongly object to the suggestion by the EAPET that the turbines removed, now, be reinstated. These were non-compliant turbines, because they were
 - too close to residents' properties – high noise and visual impact
 - too close to the national park's boundary
 - provide a combined negative visual impact (magnitude of project) as applied to the 2016 Wind Farm Energy Guidelines and the draft 2023 Energy Guidelines.

Many properties would see the turbines from their homes. It is not possible to mitigate the negative view by tree screening. The towers are atop a narrow ridgeline and tree screening, as suggested by Engie, is not possible. It is impractical and unfair to ask residents to plant trees in front of their windows. The magnitude and sensitivity guidelines on combined visual impacts should apply. To reinstate the turbines would be non-compliant with the guidelines. Visual guidelines would not be upheld

Dangerous precedent to give the right to Voluntary Land Acquisition by a private/commercial company

- I object to and reject the DPHI's agreement to grant Engie (a private commercial multi-national company) the right to a Voluntary Land Acquisition imposed on a private landowner's land (property DAD 01) to suit Engie's financial viability.
This is a dangerous precedent that DPHI is setting by imposing land acquisition on a private land holder by a private commercial multi-national company. This means legal dwelling entitlements and approved development applications are not respected or safe in NSW.

In summary, this project has too many negative consequences for the environment, government and communities. It is not in the Public interest to proceed with this project

