



NAME REDACTED	OBJECT	Submission No: 164351
Organisation:	Key issues: <i>Energy Transition, Biodiversity, Visual impacts, Traffic and transport, Noise and vibration, Agricultural impacts and land use, Social and economic, Physiological - infrasound noise / electromagnetic interference / shadow flicker / blade glint</i>	
Location: <i>New South Wales 2354</i>		
Submitter Type: <i>I am the owner or a tenant of a neighbouring property to the proposed development</i>		
Attachment:		

Submission date: 3/17/2024 10:39:41 AM

Objection to the proposed Thunderbolt Windfarm Development

â€¢ *Directly impacted neighbour: residence is within 4km (nearest proposed turbine). Additionally, 2x separate proposed 500 KV powerlines, 1x central substation, & possibly an additional proposed solar farm & stage 2 Thunderbolt Windfarm Development- all within 1km of our home. Completely surrounded by a multitude of energy projects & we do not have the financial means to leave/move. We do not have a choice in this matter. We chose to live where we live to be free of industrial infrastructure, visual & noise pollution, & a wholesically unsafe & unhealthy environment. We will be adversely affected by all of the proposed projects.*

â€¢ *Ethicacy of the proponent: Neon has engaged minimally (and in some cases no engagement at all) with neighbouring properties adversely impacted by the project. Further, we have not been provided any psychological support/resources from the proponent during this extremely stressful and distressing time. Neon has not provided ANY information about the impact of the turbines on us. We have not been provided & unaware of the information that Darren Smith has received- presented in his verbal IPC response (our direct next-door neighbour who will be benefiting from stage 2 Thunderbolt Windfarm Development with turbines proposed on his land). Clearly the impact will be greatest on small holdings compared to large agricultural holdings.*

â€¢ *We have not been approached with any forms of compensation for the proposed project. We will be adversely affected from numerous perspectives -sight & proximity of turbines (land value decreased, shadow flicker, blade glint) -noise from turbines (son & husband autistic- will hear low frequency noise), boutique stud sheep (14 yrs old) & boutique stud poultry (30 yrs old) (loss of income, mutations in offspring, loss of fertility, public perception- animals not longer viable to sell/purchase), health (household includes 3, 5, 37 & 38 yr old â€” long term exposure & therefore a multitude of health impacts & implications- cancer, sleep, fertility, mental health etc.) -insurance/fire safety/loss of infrastructure (due to fire classification, vegetation coverage & topography of land, proximity to turbines & thus inability to fight fires aerially (aerial firefighting has had to occur previously in the proposed turbine area), catastrophic consequences for us. Will we be able to obtain insurance for our property or will insurance be excessively expensive?).*

â€¢ *Community Impacts: The proponent has not acted in good faith in broader community engagement - Photo montages inaccurate, deceitful & difficult to decipher. â€” minimal community consultation & forums - When Solicitor Hugh Piper discovered Neonâ€™s plans to on-sell the project to a Chinese owned company upon approval, Neon ceased communication with him immediately & refused to pay for his time (which they had agreed to pay), because he was not acting in support of the project, even though he was meant to be an independent guiding solicitor. -Funding model for community funds has not been made clear or transparent, obvious confusion still in the community as per verbal & written IPC submissions. Neon has refused any assistance from qualified community members (chartered accountants, solicitors etc) regarding these funds. - inadequate biodiversity assessment & compliance (irreversible damage to critically endangered, endangered & vulnerable flora & fauna not considered), -pitted neighbours against each other to erode our community to get the project approved*



â€¢ *By approving this project, it will set a dangerous precedent that these unscrupulous & unregulated companies will have projects approved, no matter the implications & dire consequences for individuals, local communities & the environment. How is it ethical to approve a project where the vast majority of the local community is against the project & has been fighting against its approval for such a sustained period of time?*
