

I wish to object to the Hills of Gole Wind Farm for the following reasons.

The project is so marginal that turbines previously recommended for removal for compliance with 2016 noise and visual guidelines, and biodiversity conservation have been reinstated.

The IEAPET assumptions do not include factors that would contribute to the unviability of Hills of Gold Wind Farm:

- Significant increases in build costs.
- Site complexity - steep terrain, narrow ridgeline, erosion, sedimentation and mass movement risk.
- Potential construction delays increasing costs.

Protecting biodiversity is important for Australia. Recommending approval of 62 turbines prioritises private profit for a multinational company instead of biodiversity of Australian native flora and fauna.

Many submissions asked for removal of turbines next to Ben Halls Gap Nature Reserve, yet eight wind turbines and other infrastructure like a concrete batching plant, internal road, turbine foundations, hardstands, and cabling remain. Earthmoving and clearing are proposed within 135 metres of Critically Endangered Ben Halls Gap Sphagnum Moss Cool Temperate Rainforest that only occurs in this location.

Recommending approval of 62 turbines results in increased clearing of vegetation on the range and reduces the infiltration of rainwater into the soil for release via springs into creeks and rivers.

There is no adequate detailed design to understand the extent of mitigation to avoid erosion, sedimentation and mass movement that could result in higher environmental and financial costs.

It is not a public benefit to approve:

- a marginal to unviable wind farm.
- a State Significant Development on unlawfully cleared land.
- Imposing Voluntary Land Acquisition on a non-associated neighbour and setting a precedent for other State Significant Developments statewide.
- A wind farm between two national parks, Crawney Pass National Park and Ben Halls Gap Nature Reserve.
- A wind farm without detailed design of internal roads on steep gradient land, with high erosion, sedimentation, and mass movement risk requiring mitigation with potentially understated environmental impacts and financial liability.

Please reject this proposal.

Yours sincerely

William Archer