

Letter of Objection to the Bowmans Creek Wind Farm

IPC Submission for the Bowmans Creek Wind Farm Project (SSD – 10315).

Our residence [REDACTED] Muscle Creek property Number under the proposed development G17-1.

I Grant Robertson write my letter of objection to The IPC and DPE. We have been corresponding with the Department of Planning over the past years in submitting our objections to the proposed Bowmans Creek wind farm and attempting negotiations with Epuron, now Ark Energy.

Visual Screening

We have met and discussed with Ark Energy, ways to mitigate the visual impact on our residence but with no outcome reached. The proposal set forward by the DPE is still inadequate in mitigating the visual impact on our day to day lives and our home.

As per site inspections both from The Department of Planning and Environment and The Independent Planning Commission, we have showed and explained that the proposed Hedge Screening at either 15m or 30m from our home with a proposed height of 7m to 8m will not mitigate the visual effects on our property or our day to day lives.

I would also like to bring to your attention our residence is constructed on a raised floor (bearers and Joist) which is 1.3m above our back yard level. The attached photos are taken from our Dining room, and Family rooms located at the rear of our residence facing east. Also showing that the information issued by Ark Energy is Incorrect in the document as below.

Response to Request for more information Page 11 as it states our **Residual Impacts Photomontage** from dwelling G17-1 illustrates direct and open views toward 4 turbines on an elevated ridgeline east of dwelling G17-1. The photomontage is taken from the back of the dwelling. Ther primary living areas of the property are at the front of the dwelling and face in westerly direction, opposite to the development. main living areas are situated on the western side of our residence This is incorrect and misleading as stated in the report.



View from Dining room window looking towards proposed wind farm and Turbines 69, 64, 68, 67, 66 and height guides at 5m and 7m in height closest height gauge (white pole on left) is 15m from residence and 5m in height, furthest height gauge (white pole to the left) is 30m from residence and 7m in height.

You can see that the proposed screen planting will not reduce the visual amenities' impact on our property. Will only reduce the rural view to our property lower paddocks to where our livestock is located.



View from Family room window looking towards proposed turbines 70, 69, 64, 68, 67,66 with height gauge in foreground is 30m from residence and 7m in height.

As you can see the proposed Screen Planting will not reduce the visual amenities impact to our residence

Document from IPC

Record of site inspection and locality tour

The report that the IPC has uploaded on their web site is incorrect and again misleading information has been published for attention. STOP 2 Receiver G17-1, 818 Muscle Creek Rd Muscle Creek.

The photo's taken onsite by an attendee from the IPC tour group has been taken near the height guidepost installed by me, as shown in the photo there is no advanced Pear tree shown in the foreground of the photo and this photo has been taken at 15m from the guide height post and 15m from the back of our residence. These images don't show a true representation of the full effect to our residence.

Please see attached images below from your report.

Stop 2 – Receiver G17-1, 816 Muscle Creek Road, Muscle Creek

Thursday 7 December 2023, 8.30pm-12.00pm

Image No1



View from property towards south-east and indicative locations of turbines 64, 68, 67 and 66. Height pole set up property owners at image centre left.

Image No2



Closer view from property towards south-east and indicative locations of turbines 68, 67 and 66.

Image No3



View from property towards east and indicative location of turbine 64 (image centre right). Height pole set up by property owners at image right.

Image No4



View from outside front gate of property towards approximate location of south-west turbine cluster

Image No3 with description *View from property towards east and indicative location of turbine 64 (image centre right). Height pole set up by property owners at image right*

This is incorrect, the view in question is towards turbine number 70 and 69 .with again view area being incorrect and taken within 10m of the height guidepost.

These photos and report cannot be used in any way for the assessment and final recommendations for the proposed Bowmans creek wind farm and the report.

Increased Fire Danger

I have 35 Years experience as a senior member and senior training officer with Rural Fire Service and have seen many large-scale wildfires up and down the east coast of NSW and western districts of NSW.

Holding qualifications as Air Attack supervisor for NSW Rural Fire Service spending many hours in aircraft issuing guidance for aerial bombing. I have spent many hours conducting public education events in high bushfire danger areas and guiding residence on how to protect their property and reduce the fire risk. In stating the above, ARK Energy and DPE have agreed that screen planting at 15m or 30m from our residence would be acceptable. Under the Rural Fire Service Act the proposed screening planting will increase the fire danger to our residence 10-fold. **This is unacceptable and against the Rural Fire Service act and advice.**

It would also take between 10 to 15 years for the proposed screen planting to reach maturity and the required height as proposed by Ark Energy. This is also unacceptable and will not mitigate the visual amenities to our property. As shown in the attached photos taken on 7/12/2023

Visual Assessments

Due to the DPE assessment for the proposed development the DPE has stated Micro siting of turbine location will or maybe required, in stating this I ask that the IPC recommend our property G17-1 be reassessed under the Visual Influence Zone and reclassified as VIZ1.

Ark Energy has misled the DPE by Micro siting of turbine 64 to 2004m from 1994m, placing a 220m turbine 40m outside the VIZ1 assessment criteria (please indicate how by moving a 220m high turbine 40m outside the VIZ1 assessment area changes to impact on our property)

Can you please explain how the proposed assessment of the Bowmans Creek wind Farm has been carried out, when the only assessing information is based on smaller turbines to a height of 160m turbine on how this will impact our property as the proposed turbine are 220m in height.

As stated in the independent expert(OHD Landscape Architects Review 16/11/23) review the Photo Montage used for the development approval is Incorrect and somewhat misleading as stated below from page 8 of his report. As they also don't comply with the Scottish Natural Heritage Visual Representation of Wind Farms, Version 2.1 December 2014 rule (assessing guidelines)

- Figure 25: G17-1 o has a horizontal field of view of approximately 112 degrees of the most obvious turbines are at distances of around 2.04 km to 2.50km.
- Figure 40: PM1B o has a horizontal field of view of approximately 55 degrees of the most obvious turbines are at distances of around 4.70km to 5.30km.

In these two examples above, the turbines appear at a similar scale within the landscape despite the distance from the viewer to the turbines being approximately double. This comparison demonstrates that by increasing the horizontal field of view, the scale and impact of the turbines is visually diminished. In our opinion, for the reason demonstrated above we consider the photomontages (excluding figures 39 to 41) are non-compliant with the requirements of the VAB, whilst providing an understanding of the layout of the turbine array they should not be used for assessing the scale and magnitude of the impacts as the impact of the turbines is visually diminished.

To Ensure clarity and honest assessment of the Proposed windfarm, the IPC should engage an independent Registered Survey company to undertake a full survey of locations of the proposed positioning to each turbine for all Non associated residences. So Micro-siting of turbines cannot be undertaken and the visual effect on those properties will not be increased.

Night lighting

As stated by Ark energy in the IPC public meeting of Thursday 7th December, Casa has recommended along with the statement from DPE that night lighting is required by the regulator. But the Ark Energy project manager, Rebecca Riggs still stated they are not required.

This shows the amount of information being withheld by the proponent on the night lighting pollutions and this has not been assessed on the effects on surrounding properties and should be recommended for the night light to be reassessed prior to your final determination of the project.

Vibration and landslip Zone

As Muscle Creek area is noted as a landslip risk and the attached photo show previous landslip on our property (this has not been a risk assessed in the proposed development)

There has been no construction methodology or assessment by expert in blast methods carried out to explain during construction as to how many blasts would be required or how many blasts per day would occur.

With what the projected impact maybe on our property and surrounding lands.

This being stated, an assessment would be required on this prior to issuing any final determination for the project.



Increased fire and Hazard risk to the wind Farm

As the Muscle Creek area's first response to emergencies is the Rural Fire Service, with the local Brigade (Muscle Creek) only having a Category 7 Crew Cab, 4x4 800 to 1,600 Litres of firefighting water. No available capacity to carry equipment to protect the surrounding environment for hazardous oil and chemical spills or fires, this has also not been addressed in the proposal and increases the fire risk to our lives and property with only one road in and out of the Muscle Creek area.

In Closing

I would like to bring your attention to our neighboring properties that are within and just out of the 3km zone and know there has been a lack of community consultation since the lodgment of the EIS.

As stated throughout my letter of objection we cannot accept the DPE assessment of the Bowmans Creek Windfarm recommendations, they have not met the fundamental objectives of Mitigating the visual amenity impacts on our life.

I ask that in your determination, the proposed development be rejected or at a minimum remove all four turbines, No's T64, T66, T67, T68. This will mitigate the proposed wind Farm development visual impact on our property.

In state all pervious points though out my objection to the Proposed Bownes Creek Windfarm, I have shown without a doubt that the approval should be denied due to the misleading and false information, and disregarding of the NSW planning regulations and guidelines.

This would be the only acceptable outcome for our day-to-day life and family mental health and wellbeing.

Regards

Grant Robertson

████████████████████

Muscle Creek