

From: [Rose Perrott](#)
To: [Do-Not-Reply IPCN Submissions Mailbox](#)
Subject: Thunderbolt Wind Farm (SSD-10807896) submission on new material
Date: Monday, 8 April 2024 8:22:21 PM

Dear Commissioners,

Thankyou for allowing me to comment further on the additional material.

I would like to reiterate that what is proposed by the suggested changes to the table Appendix 3 is not in keeping with what the impacted community wants from the Community Benefit Fund. The intention of this money is to compensate the community for the impacts the project has on the community: environmentally, aesthetically, socially, economically and community cohesion. What is proposed does not meet these intentions.

What is proposed is that \$74,740.00 per year for 30 years is given to Uralla Shire Council (USC). I have significant concerns that USC does not have the intention, nor the capacity, to meet the needs of the impacted community. To date, UCS has not been transparent with their negotiations regarding this the VPA. They have not consulted the impacted community in any way, which is contrary to the requirements set out in the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation, 2021 (NSW)*. USC has barely mentioned the VPA publicly, let alone provided any details of their plans. The fact that they cannot consult where it is required by law, does not bode well for future transparency and management of this funding.

In speaking to Councillors in regards to the VPA, they justify their stance on the VPA to me because they say the broader LGA is heavily impacted by the Thunderbolt Windfarm through new roads, use of existing roads and the cartage of gravel. This is not actually going to be the case. There are no new roads or upgraded roads in the Uralla LGA proposed by the development. Turbines and heavy machinery will be coming from the south and not coming through the Uralla LGA. The entry to the site is in Tamworth LGA and off a state-owned road. USC has a per ton road maintenance levy applied to gravel that is removed from quarries in the LGA. If USC is not getting enough funds to cover the impacts of gravel removed then the levy is insufficient and the cost should not be getting recouped from a Community Benefit Fund.

My community has been already heavily impacted by this proposal. Community cohesion is low and there is a level of tension between the have and have nots, the fors and againsts. We have so much need for the benefits of the windfarm to start flowing into our community. There is so much here that requires an injection of funds that only a project of this scale can bring. Our only shop and cafe is soon to close and the community is trying to get a not-for-profit community co-operative up and running to purchase and run the shop and cafe. The playground is in disrepair, with unusable swings because the soft fall is too low, steps to the slide are missing and a seesaw that is too high off the ground for kids to climb on. The hall is in good repair but is in need of some upgrades to make it the heart of

the community like it used to be before The Tinderbox Drought of 2017-19, Black Summer fires followed by the Covid 19 pandemic. The school has some fantastic plans but these too need to be funded from somewhere and there's only so much fundraising a small school P&C can do. This community will die if the substantial proportion of the Community Benefit Funding does not flow into it. USC has already verbally indicated that they consider Uralla Township to be a directly impacted community from this project, which means the \$24,664.2 p.a allocated to the directly impacted community will have to be shared amongst a significantly increased pool of projects.

I do not want to see the funding go to Uralla Shire Council to run and manage. I would prefer the \$74,740.00 per year available through the Community Benefit Fund to go to in independent entity such as the Community Enterprise Foundation. If USC has projects that they would like funded from Community Benefit Fund then they, like every other community group on the Uralla LGA, can apply for the funding through the Community Enterprise Foundation. This is the fairest way to administer the funding as it will have reduced impact from politics of the day and will be more likely to meet the needs of the community.

This process with the Independent Planning Commission has been our only opportunity to influence the outcomes of the Community Benefit Fund. Please listen to the community's voices in regard to this and at least require there to be public consultation for how the Community Benefit Fund is managed and administered.

Sincerely

Rose Perrott