

I & Yass Earth Movers has concern and Objects to the Rye Park proposal of the following reasons,

#### CLEARING AND DISTURBANCE OF LANDS,

635 ac of proposed disturbance over a 34km long project

190ac of tree clearing, Including Hollow bearing trees for habitat.

Towers 50mtrs away from a hollow tree ! Is this from the blade or the post ??

This is a lot of land to impacted for such a short 20yr life span project.

Biodiversity Table 6-3 it states "offset" credit requirements??

This is not Biodiversity!! Who ever has made this chart needs to come out to site and look at what they are proposing. It is degradation no biodiversity.

We should be protecting the lands and conservation of lands should be our first objective, Not degradation.

This is not feasible in this type of landscape

The area that this is proposed has been untouched and un farmed for a reason.

This can not be Engineered, Once the area has been disturbed you will never be able to recover or reinstate the land back to what it is now. No amount of work, Design or money that may be available will ever be able to return the virgin timber and habitat areas back to what we have now. It will be lost for ever and remembered as an environmental disaster.

The soils are to fragile and the slopes are to steep, no other work would be approved or be able to be under taken in these areas, So I can not see why this should even be considered now or ever.

You can still see the impact of the Gas pipe line that was put in over 40 years ago from Google Earth. This will be a lot worse as they are clearing and striping all the ridge lines 635ac to bear ground over 34kms long.

The erosion can also be seen on the Eastern side of the ridge line from Rye Park. Any where that there has been clearing or disturbance you will see degradation of the land scape and scaring that can not be repaired.

The power trenches are proposed to be trenched in the access roads, this will lead to tunneling and extreme erosion on the access tracks, And all the silt will be washed into the creeks and gullies.

Water degradation will be unstoppable with any and all environmental implementation procedures in place.

The amount of clearing on the road ways needs to be considered.

The NSW Govt Planning and Environment should be looking to propose more Solar that can be put on flat ground, Roof tops with no problems of clearing or erosion. After 20 years solar is still 80% efficient! Even as a business decision this is a no brainer. Now with battery back up it should be an over ruling factor on a project such as this.

The price of our power and the security of or grid power supply should out way any

RET.

Different land use strategies have been used for years in deciding what is best for the area in which you are proposing a development. Then the lands best suited for best ecologically sustainable outcome for future use and conservation is chosen. This wind turbine development doesn't seem to tick any of the boxes in our area.

WATER USE,

The amount of water proposed is way under estimated.

Getting Water from the Yass or boorowa weir will be unfeasible.

All the creeks and rivers stop running in the summer time, what do you propose then??

A bore, The water table will be affected and then we will have more salinity problems.

Even the dust suppression on such a large project with the roads and the area disturbed on the hill tops will not be able to be suppressed with any amount of water trucks and man power. Air quality will be affected.

TRANSPORT AND ROAD USAGE,

We have a lot of trucks and move heavy and WIDE loads, We know what the roads proposed for use are like as we use all of them. To even contemplate the idea that some of these roads are fit for purpose or the dirt roads can be used as is and just maintained is madness.

No where dose is state the definition of a truck??

The RMS is anything over 4.5t ,Not enough details given.

The amount of traffic movements in the proposal is grossly under estimated!!

Total movement 30,110 for a 2 year project?

I think you should be putting a 1 in front of this and you may be getting close.

130,110 movements (est only)

The amount of workers traveling on all the roads proposed or not will be 3,000 movements a day for over 2 years.

The risk to the locals traveling the roads will be huge! what's someone's life worth??  
How many Co2 is someone life worth??

The mapping used is a disgrace,

The Yellow roads on MAP 6-2 will be main access roads for all traffic excluding extreme loads like tower parts.

All other trucks and staff will travel the shortest distance.

All the information given is conflicting from one document to another.

CONSTRUCTION HOURS,

Mon-Fri 7am-6pm

Sat 8am-1pm

This would be onsite proposed hours of work, this will mean that traffic will start from

any time after 5.30am with the site foreman and office staff going to open up and get ready, they will hold a tool box meeting most days and that will be held at 6.30am. Then everyone will travel from the site sheds to the part of the proposed work area they are in and start work by 7am.

So all people involved will be traveling to site out side the 7am proposed start time and at the end of the day tools down at 6pm and then pack up fuel and grease and travel home. I know this as this is what we do for a living!

There will be traffic on the roads from est 5.30am -7.30pm for 2 years +  
On theses roads it should not be even considered with out major upgrades to all roads proposed, even the secondary use roads.

#### MICRO SITTING

100m to 250m ?? Why We use GPS for location and set out and get it within 20mm.

#### CCC

I am a member of the CCC and discussed on how it has been ran.

We to have a 3<sup>rd</sup> party involved as a independent taking proper minutes and making people accountable for there actions.

#### LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS,

Boorowa 2012

ULSC 2010

YVC 2013

Do any of these environmental plans include the proposal of an industrial Turbine farm construction??

Has any one read them?

They should include the Development of any infrastructure on elevated lands or ridge ways that will affect the look or impact views. This proposal will have very HIGH VISUAL IMPACT.

The Cumulative visual impact should also be under taken, With the proposal of other Wind Farms in such close proximity of each other. Our area will be saturated with turbines.

549 Turbines are proposed in our area, To Many!

We live in a "Life Style" Area, most of our client and I have moved from the larger Cities to get away from it all or have moved out from town to small acreage to better their life style. Not be confronted with an industrial wind turbine development.

My recreational area and life stile will be taken away from me with the approval of this development.

The impact of all the proposed wind farms will have on our area and social stability will not be known until it is to late.

Waste from the project! Where is this going??

The towers they are proposing are 157m tall and over 3 mw  
Most study have been on 1.5mw, how can we approve something when we don't have the data to support it.

Solar panels don't make any noise.

Aviation, Radio comms, Bushfire, Lighting strikes, Biodiversity Offsets, Visual Impact, Micro sitting, Noise, Transport of over size loads, Road upgrades, Environmental Degradation  
All of this would not have to be considered if we approved a solar farm instead.

#### CONCLUSION,

We have been a local business for 53 years, We pride our self in doing it once and doing it right.

I can not as a businessman make sense of the waste of time and resources, Environmental impact and Visual pollution that a project like this will cause.

I am willing to meet with any of the Planning and environment team and discuss in more detail or go to site and show them the potential of an environment disaster that could be unveiled before it is to late.

Regards  
Andrew Field  
Yass Earth Movers

I Andrew Field of "Wattle Vale" object to the Rye Park Wind Farm for a number of reasons.

Firstly, I must say we have been offered to host towers in the early days, up to 7 on my fathers land. I am a very factual person, fair and just. I don't let sentimentality get in the way of business decisions. I let the facts speak for themselves.

So the more investigations I have done, the more questions I have asked, the more I know how bad they are and how bad this whole project is. Anyone with half an idea that reads the information and sticks to the facts will have the same opinion.

I have worked all my life to buy a property out of town for my family to get away from the daily grind, and finally 8 years ago had the opportunity to buy Wattle Vale. Now, all that I have worked for and why we live there can potentially be taken away from us. The peace and quiet and the views from the hilltops are priceless.

We purchased this property as a "Lifestyle block", not as a rural enterprise. There are a lot of people that have moved into the area for the same reason we have, this makes the land more valuable and more inhabitable.

The closest tower will be 500m from our boundary fence, 3.6 km from our house. Now the micro sighting has been taken to 250m it is possible to have a tower with 250m of my boundary. We use this area for recreational activities and camp with in 350m of the boundary at the end that the towers will be placed. This will be within 600m of our camp site! Also R315 is our shed and our other camp site, this 1.5kms away from the tower grouping in Hugh Cooks, towers 102,103 and 104. We have not been consulted on this at all, I have brought it to the attention of Trust power more than once and I am a member of the CCC and brought it to the meetings as well with no response and no one to consult us on the out come of us being so close and how we are going to be affected. R102 will also be in the boat with us.

How can R56 have so much power on what happens to tower 145 and someone like us that will be affected as bad if not worse. Everything I read asks what is within the 5km distance - why? Does this mean we are going to be affected within the 5km distance?? If we are who is responsible, and who do we seek compensation from??

We can already see other Wind Towers from our property: -

~ Gunning	31 Towers	31 kms away
~ Cullerin	15 Towers	36 kms away
~ Grabben Gullen	73 Towers	39 kms away

All are easily visual from our farm NOW!!

They are older ones that are smaller (132m?) than the ones proposed at Rye Park which are 157m tall.

How the hell is any one going to Curtilage my place??? I want someone to come to my house and block and tell me!

With Rye Park (84 proposed), Bango 122, Conroys Gap 15, Coppabella 82, Gunning 31, Cullerin 15, Grabben Gullen 73, Crookwell 84 and Rugby 54, when it is discovered that they can hook onto one of the other proposals we will have a total of 560 Wind Towers in my area, mostly within 3.6km distance, and 10-30km radius from my house!! That would be TOTAL SATURATION AND VISUAL POLLUTION that could only be measured after it is too late. The area is too populated and too valuable for this type of industrial proposal.

Upper Lachlan Shire Council Mayor John Shaw can be quoted from the Goulburn Post back on 12<sup>th</sup> July, 2013 saying the following: - "It's getting towards a bit of a saturation point now", "Wind Farm over load", "Land Values in the Shire have actually decreased because of the amount of Wind Farms in the area". "We don't really want to get to the point where we would have a Wind Tower on every hill, but it is starting to get to that stage". "I suppose I'm asking when is enough actually enough?" he said.

Remember this is the Mayor of the Upper Lachlan Shire Council, and I agree, when is the Department going to realize that we have already ruined enough land with the visual impacts of these towers.

I have people come and stay at our house and the first time they see the view they fall in love with the place, I can only imagine the distress people are under, living in closer proximity to the towers and non involved like R47, 48, 50, 53, 324. And all the others on Fig. 8-6 (page 131). They will all be affected a lot worse than I, and I can't imagine the stress they would be under at this time.

Even in the Department of Planning and Environment's draft South East and Tablelands Regional Plan, it states that the area proposed is "High Environmental Value" in Fig. 4, 26 & 27. Why you would consider putting such a large amount of Infrastructure that can cause such destruction and have such a high visual impact from up to 50kms + around is beyond me, and in noted "High Environmental Value areas" is unbelievable.

You should be proposing Solar Farms like Royalla, Mugga lane ACT Then you would have a different response. We don't want our landscape ruined for such a short term project and a long term loss for everyone concerned.

I am sure that if you asked the host of the Wind Towers to let them put them on their land for free because it's so "green" we would have a vastly different outcome. Money changes peoples prospective on things.

It worries me that our Government is chasing Co2 – Co2 is only .4% of air and Australia only contribute 1% of that .4% of air. If the Government wants to put our money into renewables to tick the green box we should be looking at more long term returns on our investments. Wind is only good for 20 years, that's not long enough on such a large scale investment. Solar or Hydro has to be more beneficial and more environmentally friendly than this disaster they are proposing here.

We should be looking at electric cars and charging stations for the future. Look further than 20 years ahead and be proud of what we have created, not worried on what the out come will be and destroy our land scapes.

The environmental impact will be unsustainable and unmanageable in our area with the unstable erodible soils we have. I have copy's of maps to prove it.

To propose to clear virgin timber, estimated 190 acres and call this project green or sustainable – it is not. Strip 632acres 'they say' on a 34km long work site, this is madness on any scale.

To be able to place a tower with in 50m from a hollow barring tree is madness. Is this from the tower blade or post?

This type of power generation affects the power grid and still needs to be backed up with Coal or gas fired Power Stations. Wouldn't it be easier with Solar and batteries?

Solar now has Battery back-up, and is affordable for the home owner to put into place without the massive Infrastructure and Environmental destruction proposed here.

Proposed ~ 84 Towers, 157m tall, 3MW +. All data is on 1.5MW Towers!! Nothing should be approved until we have proper Data on all areas of concern on the size and MW output on these towers. We need the data to determine the safe set backs, otherwise we are approving something we know nothing about.

Power lines, the 330v line installation alone will be a massive job. The environmental and visual impact that the project will have on all of us will be with us forever.

The visual impact this project and others like Bango (192m tall, 8km away) is going to be devastating to the whole landscape and the total impact will not be able to be quantified until it's too late.

In the RTS it shows 145 towers and 23 deleted – this leaves 122?? **Has this been cut and pasted from another proposal??** If there are 84 towers now, when are we going to add the 6 monitoring towers to the total??

We have 3 Wedge tail eagles that live just above our house in virgin timber, there is a tower proposed 500m off my boundary and I am very worried about the bird's welfare. With the 250m micro siting this could be only 250m off my boundary. What about the superb parrot? I thought they were protected! They will have no hope.

Access Tracks – they keep saying they have deleted some to lessen the impact. Yes – they have deleted 7 tracks. BUT they have moved them and installed 7 new ones in a different location, so the situation is unchanged. The maps are so hard to read it is a joke! Where are the tracks now? No one knows, It needs to be in black and white or colour before any approval is given other wise they will be able to do what they like.

Traffic – I am worried about the welfare of my family and myself trying to live on such a dangerous road with the proposed traffic movements for over a 2-year period with little to no improvements. Cooks hill road wasn't being used and now I find out it will be. How many movements a day? And what's the definition of a heavy vehicle? RMS say its anything over 4.5tons, so what is trust power saying now? Its hard to keep up with all the changes and lies.

I am a member of the CCC, the meeting process from when I had my first meeting to now has been a very disappointing experience. From the first meeting with no minutes getting taken and myself being the only uninvolved land holder, to now still not happy with the balance of involved/non-involved land holders, and with mostly no Council Representatives in attendance. It's like no one cares and thinks it's going to go ahead no matter what happens. The whole CCC process should be ran by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party and minutes taken and documented. At the moment it is a joke.

The VPA at \$2,500 per tower is a joke. Trust power is offering neighbor agreements to people within 2km is just a gag clause, remember the Gare Family. Remind me why common sense hasn't prevailed yet ???

The way Trust power conducted themselves at the Public Meeting at the Rye Park Hall was unprofessional and unforgivable. Who has bodyguards at a public open day in a small country town and then calls the Police because they feel threatened by an 80 year old man, and another man that has just had a knee operation?? Was this just to get some press?? The Department of Planning had an open night not long ago with no bodyguards and no issues.

Trust power does a good job of prettying itself as "squeaky clean". With a little investigation the facts speak for themselves, look at South Taranaki Wind Farm Proposal and SA here in OZ.

Have Trust power opened another \$2 shelf company – Rye Park Wind Developments?? which they can walk away from at any time?? Sorry they are calling them self TILT now, Isn't this plain to see that it can be wound up or sold off easily if things aren't going to plan. Changing the name 3 times in a couple of years before it has been approved?? I have No Trust in them!!

Fire Risk – I am an active member of the Rural Fire Service and also operate heavy machinery at fires to assist in the containment of large or dangerous fires. The installation of towers increases the risk of fires starting from lightning strikes and tower failures. Map/fig 8/7 page 133 clearly shows the whole proposal is in a bushfire prone area. The topography of these areas means there is an increased reliance upon aerial support in a fire event. The aerial support will be required to fly 500 meters above 157 meter towers and will be largely ineffective, dropping water from 660m high will have the water dissipating and/or evaporating before it reaches the ground, no affect at all.

We are the only Country placing towers in fire-prone areas, we have too many fires in our area now, we don't need any more. The extra lightning strikes will only make it worse.

Social Brake down – Yass and districts has been known in the past as a great place to come and live. People before all of the Wind tower proposals would do anything to help each other out and pull together in times of need. We are now seeing long term neighbor's not talking and Family's braking apart and not talking any more. The cost of social unrest is never quantified in these projects. We all still have to live here before during and after this is all said and done. Yass will never be the same again, the damage has already been done and will escalate with time.

The Yass region is not the only area where towers can be plugged into the 330 KVA grid, there are other areas that are less inhabited and less intrusive to all involved. Put them away from habituated areas, no complaints then.

A solar farm could be built with no clearing and no disturbance to any person or wild life in the area and could also be built closer to the city that requires the power in the first place with little to no impact on the environment and virtually no visual impact and longer than a 20yr investment return. This should be a no brainer.

I think if the Department took the time to send an Independent Consultant out and see what the locals really thought of this project, with the facts, they would see for themselves. Every poll that I have been involved with is a majority NO.

I thought Australia would learn from others mistakes, but we seem to follow in others footsteps instead of standing alone. We should be setting the standard on renewables, Not wasting money on old tech and unstable power supply.

I think our cost of power and grid security should be put first before any RET.

This is not an ecologically sustainable development; it is an irreversible Environmental disaster.

Andrew Field

"Wattle Vale"