



NAME REDACTED	OBJECT	Submission No: 164350
Organisation:	Key issues: <i>Biodiversity, Visual impacts, Noise and vibration, Agricultural impacts and land use, Social and economic, Physiological - infrasound noise / electromagnetic interference / shadow flicker / blade glint</i>	
Location: <i>NSW 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 10:37:21 AM

*Objection to the proposed Thunderbolt Windfarm Development*

*Biodiversity- critically endangered and irreplaceable:*

â€¢ The NSW Koala Strategy indicates Kentucky is of Koala Significance and a "refuges" for many species under climate change. This presents a clear land use conflict emerging from the same government department. Recommend the project is rejected based on inappropriate siting which has potential to irreversibly damage critically endangered ecological communities and species in a climate change refuge area.

â€¢ Koalas use infrasound to find mates across large distances. Researchers at James Cook University recently raised the alarm about the impact of infrasound emitted from large wind turbines. Additionally, an independent assessment of the noise component of Neoen's EIS by Les Huson & Associates found the EIS Noise report was non-compliant with current legislation. Recommend the project is rejected until the impacts of infrasound are given further research consideration. Recommend the proponent be required to conduct compliant noise assessments before the project is considered for approval.

â€¢ Endangered Bell's Turtles are frequent across the project site and in creeks and dams on neighbouring properties and crown land. There has been no consideration of this species by Neoen in their EIS nor by the Department in their Assessment because they did not conduct aquatic biodiversity surveys. Recommend the proposal is rejected based on inadequate biodiversity assessment and compliance by Neoen.

*Fires:*

â€¢ Aerial support will not be possible due to a 3 km no-fly zone around turbines. Local ground crews are likely to be prevented from suppressing fire within the project site, so by the time it reaches the New England Highway to the east of the project, the front is estimated to be 9 km wide. Recent information from NSW Farmers suggests landholders neighbouring such expensive infrastructure will not be able to source public liability insurance to cover the risk of accidental fire burning into the project area. NSW RFS response totally inadequate. Consultation is required with local crews who have fought fires in the vicinity of the project previously. Aerial firefighting is required and has been required previously. Recommend the proposal is rejected based on inappropriate siting and unacceptable levels of risk to natural and built environments, and human life.

*Community consultation and engagement:*

â€¢ Minimal consultation with community and limited and in some cases no engagement with adversely affected landholders (this includes us). Recommend the proponent is required to re-implement their community engagement under the new NSW Wind Farm Guidelines (2024). Recommend the proponent be required to prove commitment to ESG and Modern Slavery Act compliance before project approval to improve social licence to operate. Recommend the proponent be required to undertake meaningful negotiations with immediate and affected neighbours before the project is approved.



â€¢ Neoen has negotiated a Community Benefit Fund mechanism that will significantly adversely impact the small communities surrounding the project including Kentucky, Wollun, Bendemeer, and Balala. VPA agreed upon, many community members unaware of this arrangement due to no communication from Neoen. Recommend that Neoen be required to negotiate and implement a Community Benefit Fund Model as has been used by other developers in the Bendemeer and Glen Innes areas, where tenders are called for a suitably qualified and structured, local NFP entity to administer the Community Benefit Fund.

*Agricultural Impacts:*

â€¢ The project site is surrounded by numerous large and small landholdings. Many include small and boutique animal studs which the landholders rely on for livelihood. Further, many of the small landholding households in close proximity to the project site have very young children. These landholders have not been provided any form of compensation by the proponent for the loss of income, mutations in offspring, loss of fertility, public perception- animals no longer viable to sell/purchase. These landholders have not been provided any form of compensation by the proponent for the long-term health impacts and implications that will affect the young children of these households due to long term exposure. There is absolutely no research studies that can guarantee that these turbines are safe for human, flora and fauna as a result of long term exposure. Recommend further comprehensive research and studies be communicated and completed by the proponent regarding the negative impacts on human health and stud animal flocks. Recommend the proponent be required to undertake meaningful negotiations with immediate and affected neighbours before the project is approved so that loss of income and health impacts are adequately compensated.

---