

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Do-Not-Reply IPCN Submissions Mailbox](#)
Subject: Submissions on additional material for Hills of Gold Wind Farm (SSD-9679)
Date: Sunday, 14 July 2024 10:19:22 PM

This submission is in response to the decision to allow the Hills of Gold Windfarm development application to continue. There appears to be no genuine regard for the devastating consequences to the precious and rare ecology. The industrialisation of the local community's environs, impacting tourism enterprises, and social cohesiveness. Those people who have followed this issue closely in the wider community of Australia and many of those that are directly impacted, are astounded by the dismissiveness of the real and serious concerns that have been voiced. It sets a precedent of low concern on a fragile site on the Great Dividing Range, greenlighting even more destruction in the future. Many, like myself, felt that proper investigation and due process could win out over the greed of a few and the financial benefit of multi-national companies. Instead, given the U-turn on this development people are left questioning the relationships and incentives at play which would allow environmental protection to be thrown under the bus setting further dangerous precedent of jeopardizing the habitat of numerous endangered species, a fragile and precious ecological site, and the iconic visual landscape of the Great Dividing Range.

This development approval is all the more ludicrous given that consideration has been made for the loss of economic viability of the project, due to the outcome of environmental protections restricting the number of turbines. Reinstating the restricted turbines to help the submission is in conflict with conducting the environmental regulations. The economic viability for Engie or any other company involved in a project is irrelevant to whether or not it meets the standards. If this project is given approval to commence it will further illustrate that it is problematic when people who have no skin in the game are employed in relatively short term roles to decide long term outcomes for the environment and our community.

It is further perplexing that so much damage is being considered as acceptable for this project, whilst technological advances are already demonstrating that the future will likely favour small modular nuclear infrastructure across the globe with minimal environmental footprint.

We do not have to destroy the ecology, water supplies, landscape and both the natural and cultural values that make Nundle and it's environs what is. So why would we? There are other sites more environmentally suited, so there is no wonder that many are left dumbfounded that it has continued to this point and question "what is really going on and what precedent is being set?"

Thank you for your time.

Regards,



Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.