

NAME DEDACTED

INAIVIE REDACTED		OBJECT	3001111331011 NO. 103403
Organisation:		Key issues:	Biodiversity, Visual impacts, Traffic and transport, Noise and vibration, Heritage, Agricultural impacts and land use, Social and economic, Physiological - infrasound noise / electromagnetic interference / shadow flicker / blade glint
Location:	Location redacted		
Submitter Type:	I am the owner or a tenant of a neighbouring property to the proposed development		
Attachment:			

OBJECT

Submission date: 3/24/2024 12:13:51 PM

Submission No. 165/05

This submission is being made by an arrival on behalf of the business and its respective partners and beneficiaries. These parties are referred to as "we', "us and "our through out our submission. Please note we agree with all recommendations made by the friends f Kentucky Action Group in their submission..

We strongly object to the Thunderbolt energy hub.

How can you name a industrial windfarm after our local hero Bushranger!!

Perhaps Neoen and he have more in common than first thought both dishonest.

We are directly effected neighbours, we are located directly across the highway.

Our property has a 1 kilometre frontage to the highway and we will be neighbour to the first industrial windfarm earmarked for our area. This project has the potential to

cause an avalanche of large scale developments to our local area and this causes great distress to our community and my family, our business the farm. This project has sparked both panic and fear to my family and the local community as we contemplate the potential impacts it will have on our lives. I urge the IPC to listen to the community, the locals we don't want this !!

This project has been 7 long years of stress, uncertainty, mental health, health

issues, relationships, neighbour relations and financially draining. This project had divided our community, divided neighbour relations.

This is not the country way!!

We do not divide and conquer, we are not dishonest, we look after our

neighbours that was until the bushranger Neoen came to town. They are

stealing our way of life, stealing friendships, our neighbourhood trust, our very way of

life and our country. This bushranger (neoen) is not even Australian and either is the Chinese owner of Kyabra yet we are accused of being the NYMBY (not in my back yard) when they are the real NYMBY it is not even in their country.

This is just a business for these companies all about the income they do not care about our landscape or how it might effect neighbours because they are absentee land holders.

I recognise the importance of renewable energy sources but I do believe this is not the right project and not the right area. The risk to our environment is too great. This area is a natural refugia for wildlife with a cooler climate the last of the Alpine areas to the north. The biodiversity of this area is of great importance as it hosts critically endangered box-gum grassy woodlands, home to the iconic Koalas and other endangered species. The



state government has declared the northern tablelands of great significance and allocated millions of dollars to the protection of native bushlands as their native habitats are being diminished. I think this project contradicts these efforts.

.

*Aerial fire fighting will not be available which has been a necessity in the past fire seasons and I believe Neoen haven't considered a fire escape plan. The highway is our only exit point this puts my family at extreme risk in case of a fire without the ability to have aerial support. This also puts the Kentucky community at risk due to thick heavy brush and heavily timbered and populated country.

*Noise impacts- The disruption is of great concern and we do not want to be subjected to to the infrasound and years of site preparation, we will be subjected to blasting of the site that alone is distressing. The extra trucks and traffic on the New England Highway which is already congested with local traffic and transport companies use of the highway to Queensland.

Local resource depletion is another concern- Neoen claim they are investigating an on site gravel pit which creates yet another concern more blasting of the site. Neoen has also engaged another Walcha company regarding transporting gravel from the Newcastle area. This itself creates another biodiversity issue with the import of invasive weeds to the area as well as the extra traffic and pressure once again on the New England Hwy. We have done some maths do you realise that means for each turbine it needs 165 cement trucks for the base alone that does not include steel, gravel or water. A 5MW turbine needs 688 cubic metres in its foundation. Each cubic metre weighs 2.4 tonnes, so that's 52,838 tonnes for 32 turbines? If one trucks carries 10 cubic m, does that mean they need 5283 truckloads?

Imagine all that extra traffic on local roads and the New England Hwy simply not possible.

Water-Neoen claim water will come from a water resource from a neighbouring farm, this large dam was used during the last bushfire season the water was used as a source to fight the fires. If this is depleted by the windfarm we have no protection. This Dam also contains the endangered species the Bells turtle, Neoen have not done any aquatic research for our water ways. This alone should be reason enough to reject this proposal. Kyabra has always been short of water during drought seasons.

Neighbourhoods agreements-We were emailed an offer of \$6000 dollars initially which was rejected, there has never been another offer by Neoen unless we signed a neighbourhood agreements early on in the process, we refused this as we felt it was a gag order and we wouldn't have any come back down the track.

A near neighbour who was the last speaker of the day who presented to the IPC on the 14.3.24 declaring that Neoen were easy to work with and had kept him up to date on what was happening during the process. Thi

is probably due to the fact he is a potential host to stage 2 of the project and will benefit from the approval. He also did not declare that his sister in-law also works for Neoen as a liaison officer to the community and is also part of the Kentucky community consultative community for this project. We have not had the same consideration from them.

Insurance- It has also been brought to our attention people with other windfarm/solar farms as neighbours have been refused public liability insurance, we cannot operate our business without this insurance. We have also been informed that our insurance policy will change due to the industrialisation of the area and policies with be near unaffordable to have. This is another of our concerns how can we continue to operate a business with this issue hanging over our heads. Who pays our insurance policies? Neoen?

Noise-infra sound I also object to the misinformation and lack of research concerning effects on human health, livestock health and ability to reproduce healthy offspring. Being so close to this project is frightening as we do not know what will happen and what the effects will be on human health. It has already been proven in a court of law at Bald Hills Vic that the side effects are significant when the night sets in and all should be quite. We



currently enjoy a cool breeze in summer and are able to sleep with windows open to enjoy, this will be a thing of the past if this is allowed to go ahead. There was a ruling against the Bald Hills windfarm for this very reason. Neoen have proven they are not honest when it came to the noise tests as they were unsure of the size of the turbines to be used, so tests were done on a smaller model and not the size they are now recommending for use.

Friends of Kentucky action Group had an indepedant sound acoustic scientist Les Huson read the reports and he found them to be non-compliant, he was also the acoustic advisor to the Bald Hills project. For this reason alone this project should be rejected.

Turbines are renowned to cause interfence with T.V reception and phone reception this becomes another issue for our business as we are not unable to have NBN services connected to our area and rely solely on our mobiles for communication, for this reason we recommend that turbines

1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10,21,11,23,24,25,26,27,& 28 be removed to relieve and minimise disruption to our communication abilities. These recommendations will also help minimise and alleviate infrasound to our property.

There are many reasons this project should be deemed not approvable by the IPC even though the Federal and state government has recommended that it is. The Government is in a rush to NET ZERO and this alone should be reason enough to put the breaks on.

We demand that the IPC recommend for future Windfarm applications;

- * Extensive community Engagement.
- * Neighbour Engagement and extensive consultation.
- *The proponent be required to undertake meaningful negotiations with immediate neighbours before the project is approved.
- * Research on Infrasound and its effects on Human and animal health.
- * Research and serious consideration for vunerable and endangered

species, Bird, bats, plants, wildlife and Aquatic systems.

- * Proven commitment to retaining natural environmental surroundings.
- * Windfarms should be non-compliant in high fire danger areas with inability for air support when accessibility and the ability to fight the fire is restricted.
- * Minimisation of Noise and the disruption to neighbours lifestyles during the construction period.
- * Be required to negotiate and implement a community benefit fund, where tenders are called to apply as a local administrators, not to be handed to local councils.
- * Effects on local health services and ability to access in case of an emergency.

I recommend the IPC reject this proposal on the grounds of misinformation, lack of community engagement, the lack of meaningful negotiations with directly effected neighbours,

incomplete biodiversity studies, and the commitment to environment Governance principles, and whether this project complies with NSW modern slavery act(2022)compliance before the project is granted approvable.



If this project has the misfortune to be approved, the development consent documents must be modified to remove these listed impacts.