

## **My name is John Washbrooke**

I am the Owner of [REDACTED], so my points are mainly in relation to this property, as other speakers have addressed environmental, community funds, pros and cons of this project.

[REDACTED] has been assessed as a non-associated residence and we have not signed any agreements.

The following points are in addition to my previously submitted submission.

We have owned our property for just on 30 years, it is located in a very quiet valley, some 8 km south east of the Rye Park village.

As a former project officer in DoD, this proposal gives me no confidence in this project being properly managed, by any of the Stakeholders!

To start with the PAC – I only received a letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> March advising of this meeting last Friday 24<sup>th</sup> March 2017. When I rang Aaron Brown on last Monday to express in attending, he advised why this letter had been sent to a residential address (which has no mail service) instead of my post box, it was because DP&E had only forwarded a residential address.

Epuron only supplied a copy of the EIS only after many phone calls, Brian Hall the project officer agreed that we could expect to experience a lot of turbine noise.

Most Surveys and Reports used in the proposal and assessment appear to have been written up to 5 years ago.

### **Assessment Report Appendix F – Independent Review LVIA**

Fig.53 - R38 page 16 – Photomontage taken at R38 was taken from on the back of a vehicle – *which gives a false view of the impending future.*

## **CONSULTATION**

RPRE prepared a *Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan* (see Appendix J of the RTS) dated May 2016 - **GHD** | Report for Trustpower - Rye Park Wind Farm Development Application, 33/1780 *dated May 2016.* (this document has not been updated to reflect the project's new owners!)

Why did it take 5 years for the proponents to deliver the *Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan*? – Quite a bit late!

- 1) Door-knocking and face-to-face meetings?

*Visits to R38 by stakeholders:*

- a) Epuron never tried to contact me; I had to chase Epuron to get any info regarding the project.
- b) Trustpower was very active in making and maintaining contact with me.
  - 1) 7 May 2015 Michael Head (MH) & his boss.
  - 2) 15 May 2015 MH & Phil visited to install a Weather & Sound recording station.
  - 3) 2 June 2015 MH & Chris visited, followed by a guy to replace battery in station.
  - 4) *Note the Sound recording station recorded very low noise levels.*

c) Tilt Renewables, so far has not made any contact with me!

Note Tilt Renewables business name was only registered in September 2016!

d) Staff from NSW Dept. of Planning visited FJP in 2016

## **Rye Park Wind Farm - Environmental Noise Assessment - S3200C9 - February 2016**

An assessment of environmental noise from the proposed development was previously conducted by SLR (Reference 640.01808-R1) in August 2013. This assessment reported on the noise related aspects of the DGRs and included measured background noise levels and predicted noise levels from the wind farm.

**Table 6: Comparison of Prediction Noise Levels with Noise Criteria.**

Residence ID      Representative      Monitoring      Location  
Predicted Noise Level and Criterion (dB(A)) at Hub Height (80m) Integer Wind Speeds  
5 m/s 6 m/s 7 m/s 8 m/s 9 m/s 10 m/s 11 m/s 12 m/s 13 m/s 14 m/s 15 m/s 16 m/s 17 m/s 18 m/s

Non-Project Dwellings

R38 R36 35 25 35 27 35 30 35 32 35 34 35 35 35 35 34 35 34 38 34 41 34 44 34 47 34 51 34

*Note: these initial* Predicted Noise Levels were taken at R36, the property next door!  
This is almost a kilometre away, in a valley and approximately 250 metres lower!

*Note this Report is dated February 2016*

*However, this Environmental Noise Assessment does not mention, that when I raised this point with Trustpower, they then arranged for sound recording measurements at R38 in 2015.*

## **Appendix F – Telecommunications Impact Assessment**

*Rye Park Wind Farm 2016* - Author: Daniel Gilbert BE (Hons) UNSW for EPURON PTY LTD

This is a very poor Report – Table of Contents lists page numbers up to 257! But there are only 39 pages!

**Mobile phone coverage** is available in some of the area around Rye Park but it is worse further away from Rye Park and the main highways and where topography limits coverage, especially to the north east.

*Instead of the Community receiving Funds I had suggested to Trustpower that a new Mobile Phone Tower(s) should be part of the RP Wind Farm offer to the local community.*

### **6.3 What are the electromagnetic field implications of wind farms?**

There are four potential sources of EMF associated with wind farms. These are:

- The grid interconnection power line
- The wind turbine generators
- Any electrical transformers
- The underground collector network cabling

The interconnection with the existing grid is usually made above ground and is no different from any other power line used in the existing network. The EMF levels are comparable to typical household appliances which are known to be negligible. The

electrical generator windings are close together and surrounded by conductive metal housing so the electromagnetic fields are effectively zero.

"The switchyard transformer, which will carry the entire output of the wind farm, is generally located in the central part of the switchyard and the protective fencing means it is not possible for members of the public to come close enough to be exposed to significant EMF."

### **Development Consent - Section 89E of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979* - Wind Turbine Height**

7. No wind turbines may be greater than 157 metres in height (measured from above ground level to the blade tip).

While it is noted that the Bango WF are planning on using wind turbines with a height of 200 metres!

### **SCHEDULE 3 = ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS - GENERAL Shadow Flicker**

6. *States* The Applicant must ensure that shadow flicker from operational wind turbines does not exceed 30 hours per year at any non-associated residence.

My residence will at times suffer from more than 300 Minutes per month of Shadow Flicker, from the rising sun into my bedroom, lounge and study.

### **Operational Noise Criteria – Wind Turbines**

11. The Applicant must ensure that the noise generated by the operation of wind turbines does not exceed the relevant criteria in Table 4 at any non-associated residence.

*Table 4: Noise criteria dB(A)*

|                      |    |    |    |
|----------------------|----|----|----|
| R1                   | 35 | 35 | 36 |
| R6, R7, R8, R9, R10, | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| R11                  | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| R17, R19, R20, R22   | 36 | 36 | 36 |
| R26, R29, R38        | 35 | 35 | 35 |

DP&E has used outdated data for this Criteria – see comment above.

### **In the Bird and Bat Adaptive Management Plan**

*There is no reference in the documents to the Wedge-tailed Eagle*

Yet residents and others at meetings with the companies and the DP&E have raised this subject of protecting our Wedge Tail Eagles.

***We have a family of Wedge Tail Eagles who regularly visit our valley and are lovely to watch as they soar over the hills – where the proposed wind turbines are to be located.***

(Words by the [Nature Conservation Trust](#))

Australia's largest bird of prey – the wedge-tailed eagle (*Aquila audax*) – has not been spared the [ill-effects of habitat loss](#) and persecution. It may still be a relatively common

sight gliding majestically on lofty thermals over open country, but its future is by no means assured in NSW.

### **Threats to the wedge-tailed eagle**

Although the extent of [open woodlands in NSW has expanded due to agriculture](#) and livestock production, this has not always been to the eagle's benefit. As we have seen in Tasmania, where [the wedge-tailed eagle is now endangered](#), the clearing of forests has also robbed the bird of potential nesting sites. Disturbances to nesting pairs, accidental poisoning by pesticides or baits, and road injuries pose additional threats.

### **TRANSPORT**

#### **Designated Heavy and Over-Dimensional Vehicle Routes**

26. The Applicant must ensure that all over-dimensional and heavy vehicle access to and from the site is via the designated routes identified in the figures in Appendix 7, unless the applicable roads authority agrees otherwise.

*Notes:*

- *The Applicant is required to obtain relevant permits under the Heavy Vehicle National Law (NSW) for the use of over-dimensional vehicles on the road network.*
- *To avoid any doubt, this consent does not allow the use of Banks Street, Cemetery Drive, Cook Streets, Dirthole Creek Road, High Rock Road and Lagoon Creek Road as over-dimensional or heavy vehicle access routes.*
- *To avoid any doubt, this consent does not allow the use of site access points 1 and 9 identified in the EIS.*

#### **DP&E did not define what they mean by Designated Heavy and Over-Dimensional Vehicle**

#### **Road Upgrades**

27. The Applicant must implement the road upgrades identified in Appendix 6 in accordance with the relevant timing requirements, to the satisfaction of the relevant roads authority.

If there is a dispute about the road upgrades to be implemented, or the implementation of these upgrades, then either party may refer the matter to the Secretary for resolution.

**BUT there is no mention regarding the use of other roads by light vehicles travelling to and from work sites, such as *High Rock Road and Lagoon Creek Roads (Dirt roads)* nor any maintenance schedule for these type of roads!**

Thank you for your time



John Washbrooke

31th March 2017