

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Do-Not-Reply IPCN Submissions Mailbox](#)
Subject: Submissions on additional material for Hills of Gold Wind Farm (SSD-9679)
Date: Monday, 15 July 2024 8:49:46 AM

Hi,

Please find my response following under the line below. I request that my personal information including my name and email address are not published in the public domain. If this is not possible I request that this response is not published.

Thankyou

[REDACTED]

I am writing to object to the Hills of Gold Wind Farm.

As a resident of Tamworth my concerns relate primarily to the impacts on the Chaffey Dam catchment (the primary water source for Tamworth) and the fundamentally flawed reporting in this State Significant development application, (due to identified extensive land clearing undertaken by the main beneficiary of this project that has not been incorporated into the proponents submission).

In relation to the Chaffey Dam catchment, I am unable to identify anywhere in the application that incorporates the impacts of the "claims of unlawful clearing of land that were consequently found to have weight". It does not identify any related impacts to surface water runoff or erosion for example or any other identified concerns, due to this extensive land clearing of the proposed site - which is at the head of the Chaffey catchment.

I have profound concerns with Engie's response listed in 2.1 (page 2) of the "Response to questions regarding the Hills of Gold Windfarm (SSD9679)". Specifically - 6. WP53 63 have some of the highest yields, and the removal because of DAD01 would set a dangerous precedent for other proposed wind farm developments in NSW.

The process then appears as such:

- the primary beneficiary of the project undertakes extensive alleged unlawful clearing of the proposed site - "claims of unlawful clearing of land that were consequently found to have weight". Some offsets have reportedly been made, details of which

have never been made public

- the proponent commences State Significant development (but neglects to incorporate the actions of the primary beneficiary, even after these actions have been identified and working closely with the primary landholder beneficiary)
- A landholder applies for a Complying Development Certificate, following an established legal process
- The proponent claims " the removal because of DAD01 would set a dangerous precedent for other proposed wind farm developments in NSW"

It is a very interesting claim by the proponent, one of which can be interpreted as hypocritical.

I argue that the process that has been followed by the primary landholder beneficiary and the proponent in this State Significant Development sets a far more dangerous precedent. As a community member I am interested in a legal and transparent process that takes into account all of the impacts of the development, I would argue that this is "in the public interest" as this project will have impacts on our region in perpetuity.

It continues to be my view that the Application should be rejected as the current application excludes the impact of actions the primary beneficiary has undertaken on the proposed site. If the primary landholder beneficiary did not undertake extensive land clearing, these activities would have to form part of any application. As a State Significant development all impacts of the project including those undertaken by the primary landholder beneficiary should be incorporated.