

From: [Kate Durack](#)
To: [Do-Not-Reply IPCN Submissions Mailbox](#)
Subject: Ref: SSD-9679 (Hills of Gold)
Date: Monday, 15 July 2024 10:52:29 AM

To: Commissioner Sykes and Commissioners,

I object to the Hills of Gold Wind Farm SSD 9679, and I object to the changed recommendations of the Planning Department in their recommendations to the IPC.

As a community member living in a rural area with the threat of mass industrialisation hanging over our head, I was heartened to believe that the NSW planning process was robust and independent enough to determine when a project was unviable — now I'm horrified to learn that they are now proposing to reinstating 15 of the 17 turbines previously recommended for removal, claiming to be in the interest of “public benefit” ! How can a project become ‘viable’ – when so clearly, the negatives outweigh these so called ‘benefits’ ... there is nothing about the Hills of Gold project to suggest that it is simply a wonderful/perfect place to put turbines – other than the fact there is a ridge-line and wind blows over it.

And the introduction of a voluntary acquisition as a solution for mitigation – is just the last straw!

It would appear to me that the developer has been given the green light to come up with their own set of rules – does money talk? Letting communistic ideas like this become the norm – sets a precedence in communities like mine – and cannot be left to run riot. Fractured relationships already exist between neighbours for projects like this, and have the potential to take us down a very dangerous path that no one wants So, show me how that is in the benefit of ‘public interest’.

The Hills of Gold project is a poorly designed project that at the end of that day - has (clearly) *marginal* economic viability for the developer anyway! Why not encourage projects – where they are wanted, well planned and economically viable – and leave the rubbish ones where they should be ... in the trash can.

Thankyou
Kate Durack

'Torsmond'
Walcha NSW