

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Do-Not-Reply IPCN Submissions Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** RE: HILLS OF GOLD WIND FARM NO. SSD-9679  
**Date:** Sunday, 14 July 2024 10:23:05 PM  
**Attachments:** [IPC Submission HOG WF July 2024\\_Rutledge.pdf](#)

---

To the Commission Panel,

Please find attached my submission relating to the new material recently presented.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Independent Planning Commission

14<sup>th</sup> July 2024

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

**RE: HILLS OF GOLD WIND FARM NO. SSD-9679**

I have reviewed the additional material presented by Engie and the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's (DPHI) response. I continue to **object** to the approval of the Hills of Gold Wind Farm (HOG WF) project proposed by Engie and **object** to the consideration of increasing the approved number of Wind Turbines as requested by the proponent.

**REASONS FOR OBJECTION**

**1. Unacceptable Biodiversity Impacts**

A detailed assessment has already been provided by the Department of Planning and Environment (December 2023) which included scientific opinion on likely environmental, social and economic impacts of the Hills of Gold Wind Farm (the Project). Consequently, it was reported to the Independent Planning Commission (IPC) that the project can conditionally proceed with a reduction of 17 wind turbines.

The consideration that the project's wind turbine number could be increased back to 62 simply due to economic viability reasoning is outrageous. All projects must demonstrate sustainability; and preserving native flora and fauna should continue to be highly valued in this assessment.

Returning the Project to the 62 Wind Turbine scenario imposes an unacceptable environmental impact to the site due to clearing of the native bushland, reduction in habitat, increased soil erosion and an increased risk of bird and bat strike.

I oppose any planned return of Wind Turbines or infrastructure being placed in the vicinity of the Ben Halls Gap Nature Reserve where there is significant risk of blade strike from foraging and migrating birds and bats.

**2. Economic Viability**

The purpose of the review by the Independent Expert Advisory Panel for Energy Transition (IEAPET) was only to provide advice on the economic performance and viability of the Project. It was not in the scope of work nor did the panel advise on environmental impacts incurred as a result of each scenario presented.

The assessment of the project has already taken in many aspects, including the economic benefit to the community, and how it supports renewable energy targets for New South Wales. While all projects should strive to be economically viable it should never be at the expense of unacceptable biodiversity impacts.

I object to Engie's insinuation that the Project with a 62 Wind Turbine scenario should be approved based on its own economic viability. If the project; as previously assessed in December 2023; is not viable, then the project plan is flawed and should not continue.

### **3. I oppose allowing acquisition rights of private property**

I strongly oppose enabling Engie acquisition rights to acquire private property DAD01 to resolve unavoidable high visual and noise impact ratings. Engie has stated that both visual and noise impacts cannot be mitigated but refuses to accept the solution to remove these 10 planned turbines (turbines 53-62).

Engie states that acquiring DAD01 is in the public interest, whereas it sets a dangerous precedent imposing land acquisition on a private land holder by a private multi-national company.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment further on this matter.

Regards

██████████