

Attn: Chairman Independent Planning Commission NSW

I am writing this in relation to the recent request for submission for the Hills of Gold Windfarm project and wish to register my strong objection to this project. I currently reside at one of the neighbouring properties of the project area on Shearers Road Hanging Rock, NAD\_4c on the maps of this project.

After reading the recent additional case material provided it is apparent that this project is not a viable option and applicants continue to withhold vital information and have delayed this process unnecessarily. The applicant has stated that the project would not be viable based on the original Depts approval for 47 turbines, this key information was withheld and only presented to the commission in January. They further provided their viability report stating that they require at least 62 turbines to make this project viable but with rising building costs is this an accurate statement and there is no evidence that they have considered this as part of their calculations.

Further to the above, approving the additional turbine in close proximity to a proposed dwelling would set a dangerous precedent for this project and any future significant projects, are we going to overlook the interests of an individual for the interests of profitability. Having multiple conversations with the late owner of the property well prior to the project announcement there was always the intention to build a dwelling at the top of their property as access to the current dwelling can be difficult at times and a risk to inexperienced drivers. Due to financial restrictions and responsibilities of looking after their late father there was no capacity to complete this dream. After selling her fathers property and settling his estate she was finally able to make her dreams possible, unfortunately she was never able to see this through. The applicants independent assessment is significantly flawed, their new proposed location of the new dwelling has the opposite effect and would increase risk to the owner, this all completed via desktop assessment and minimal weighting should be given to this report. We must also consider the proposed voluntary acquisition, should this be allowed it will not only devalue to property but also restricts the owner the ability to sell this in an open market, he will be forced to sell it to the applicant only. Further to this the applicant has only addressed this and provided their views on this after the public submissions held in early Feb 2024, indicating they intend to take this matter to the Environmental Court should they not get their way, should they have concerns they should have raised them when the development application was made.

Looking further into this, how can a project be approved where visual screening is the only mitigation they propose. Looking at NAD 11 and NAD 12 we see 9 turbines within a 3km radius and 4 less than 2 kms away. How do you hide turbines that sit over 150m high on the top of the hill side from the view of the dwelling when trees required would take decades to grow and would pose a bushfire risk as well as a risk if they fell on the dwelling.

We consistently hear that this project has been delayed and outcome postponed, yet the majority of the delays as per documents provided to the IPCN were those by the applicant, in some cases over 12 months and withholding key information that would impact the decision making process and forcing the IPCN to make decisions based on outdated information and without all the facts, how can this be allowed.

Lastly I wish to address the turbines that will border Morrisons Gap road, how can we mitigate ice throw and the risk this poses not only residents who use this road to access their property

but the public in general who would travel along this road to visit the Arc-en-Ciel Trout farm located on Shearers Road Hanging Rock.

In conclusion this project should not be approved and should be rejected, the volume of objections and the financial viability of the project has been clearly demonstrated as not being suitable for the area, the applicant continuously applies historic and current environmental guidelines where it suits their interests. How can we trust the applicant has the best interests when their neighbouring scheme explicitly has clauses in them to stop any opposition or objection to the project including visual and noise concerns unless it meets very strict rules.