
Ladies and Gentlemen,

My name is Marshall Baillieu, and I am the owner of Tongy Station, located along Tongy. I am also the sole director of Wiltara Farms Pty Ltd, which operates Tongy Station.

My family has owned Tongy Station for over 100 years.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today and hope you have reviewed my detailed objection and further submissions. A lot of effort has gone into ensuring my submissions are accurate, verifiable, and honest.

I want to correct the record (as there are various errors in the EIS, and other documents):

- Tongy Station comprises 42 lots.
- I own 11 dwellings, all located between the blue and black lines.
- 9 of these (dwellings 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 283, 285) are included in the Assessment.
- 2 dwellings have not been assessed for impacts.
- All dwellings will see between 51-75 proposed turbines.
- The proposed Girragulang cluster of turbines is only 600-700 meters outside my western boundary.
- Approximately 4,110 acres of Tongy Station (30% of my property) falls within the 3.35 km black line due to the Girragulang turbines. This massive overshadowing will significantly impact my operations due to excessive noise levels above acceptable levels, shadow flicker, visual impact, and obstruction to agricultural aerial operations. No existing workplace would tolerate development with these introduced impacts – nor should I.

I have no doubt that I will be forced to reduce my agricultural enterprise if this project proceeds.

The VOTW Project:

- The VOTW project is massive, now 131 proposed turbines, now each 250 meters tall, and each equivalent to a 75-floor residential property, or nearly as high as Sydney's Centrepont tower.
- The impacts of this project are unprecedented yet are narrowly dealt with.
- The inadequacies of the impact assessment are well flagged.
- In all of the reports provided through the Department for the Project, there is no unbiased independent review of the key impacts.
- Few industry experts are prepared to conduct peer reviews for fear of jeopardizing future work with renewable developers and Gov't.
- So relying solely on experts retained by the developers is flawed, undermines due process, and clouds transparency – to the community and tax payers detriment!
- Landowners commissioning their own independent reviews is very expensive, but that is what we have had to do.
- Commissioners, we want independent studies completed to bring full transparency on all the issues and impacts.

- Otherwise, what's the pathway to achieve transparency on the key impacts?
- Should we just be relying on the courts?

Questions for the IPC:

- Will this wind farm project reduce energy prices for end users?
- Is this project in the taxpayers' interest?
- Is this project in our community's interest?
- Is this project in the interest of non-associated land owners?
- How is this project in the public interest?

The cumulative impacts in the Coolah area are enormous. How can the IPC assess VOTW without the NSW Government completing its promised cumulative impact assessment, including neighbouring projects? The IPC cannot rely solely on the Department's view in its Assessment Report.

There has been no accommodation by ACEN of any of MY primary concerns previously stated in writing to the Department.

Some of my primary concerns:

1. West House:

- The Assessment correctly references my intention to re-establish a prior house, known to me, as West House, which was previously destroyed by fire – as is my legal right to do so. I have provided evidence of its prior existence, confirmed my intention to rebuild, which predates the VOTW project. Despite this, ACEN's proposal places turbines within 2 km of West House, well within the black line, with no mitigants for this legitimate house re-establishment.
- West House is not a phantom dwelling – I communicated my intention to rebuild to ACEN in 2019 when I first became aware of the project and on the first occasion they approached me.
- I also have written to the department providing evidence of its prior existence – how can the Department say in its Assessment Report they can find no evidence – I provided key evidence to them!
- Will the IPC instruct ACEN to remove the Girragulang turbine layout, to comply with relevant guidelines (visual, noise, shadow flicker, etc.) for West House?

2. Noise:

- The independent peer review of the EIS I commissioned, by an accredited industry expert, concluded that turbine noise levels at my houses are expected to be materially higher than presented in the EIS, exceeding acceptable thresholds. This is due to the misuse of the "ground absorption factor." In the EIS. The Department have a copy of the peer review I commissioned.
- Let me explain, the nearest proposed turbines are on a ridge line approximately 100 meters higher than my house and when adding a further 250m high turbine on top, makes turbine noise more likely to have a "direct hit." The EIS used a ground absorption factor of 0.5, relevant for ground-level noise emitters, not for

250-meter-high turbines on 100-meter-high ridges. Industry standards recommend a ground absorption factor of 0.0 in such circumstances.

- Will the IPC ask the Department to commission an independent noise assessment using a ground absorption factor of 0.0 to define decibel contour lines from the proposed Girragulang turbine locations?

3. **Tongy Airstrip:**

- The proposed Girragulang turbines are too close to the existing Tongy Airstrip, in operation since the late 1920s. I use it regularly for agricultural aerial work, such as spraying, fertilising, seeding, for travel as well, and it is a valuable asset during bushfires.
- This airstrip is regularly used by others as well.
- The Assessment Report clearly states there will be risks to air safety due to proximity to the proposed turbines. Restricted use of the airstrip will directly impact my agricultural practices, particularly cropping.
- The Assessment's recommendation for mitigation of the impact is pilot discretion – which to me can only imply restricted use – hardly an acceptable impact for an airstrip that has been in continuous operation for nearly 100 years!
- Will the IPC seek ACEN to remove proposed turbines to ensure the continued and unencumbered safe operation of the Tongy airstrip?

4. **Visual Impact:**

- The cumulative visual impact on my houses is immense, with up to 71 turbines extinguishing the value of my western aspect. My peer review concluded a high visual impact, contrary to the moderate impact stated in the EIS.
- The Department says it also assessed the project with the approach prescribed in the Wind Energy Visual Technical Supplement (2024) – but there is no additional information within the Assessment Report that relate the application of the 2024 Supplement to the requirements of the Visual Bulletin 2016 guidelines. This results in a “black box” assessment, where there is no understanding of all the inputs, or the relevance of the outputs, to the 2016 guidelines.
- We need to see all photomontages with grid overlay in the Assessment Report for the 2024 Supplement, with grid overlay to establish magnitude of visual impacts
- We request an explanation of how the magnitude requirement of the 2024 supplement has been applied to the Visual Bulletin 2016 Performance Objectives given the significant differences in methodology in each guideline
- Above all, given the magnitude of the visual impact and lack of effective mitigants, will the IPC seek a redesign of the Girragulang turbines to reduce the visual impact on my property and preserve the high value of our scenic outlook?

I look forward to hearing answers from the IPC to my questions and remain available to answer any further inquiries.

Thank you.
