

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: Southerly Ten
Subject: New submission from EIS Submission

Declaration and Consent

Privacy

✓ I have read the [Privacy Collection Statement](#) and acknowledge that personal information I provide in my submission may be used or published as part of the EIS process

Publishing

✓ I acknowledge that a copy of my submission may be published in its entirety on this website and/or a government website.

Personal Information

✓ Where personal information about other people (including photos) is included in my submission, I have notified them of the contents of this [Privacy Collection Statement](#) and obtained their consent to their personal information being disclosed and published

Intellectual Property

✓ I am entitled to deal with the intellectual property rights (including copyright) of all material (both mine and any third party's) in my submission and have obtained necessary consent(s) from any and all third parties owning the copyright for such dealings.

Representative Information

Are you making this submission on behalf of someone else and/or an organisation?

No

Your Details

Name

Kimberley Nightingale

Address

[REDACTED]

Email

[REDACTED]

Confirm Email Address

[REDACTED]

Phone Number

[REDACTED]

How would you like to make your submission?

- I would like to enter it into a textbox

Your Submission

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this submission about the EIS and related documents/attachments and appendices for the Star of the South project

to inform you of my concerns and oppose the approval of the project for reasons outlined below.

Why is there little to no real information on the impacts of decommissioning? This part of the application is meant to assess the impact of the project on the environment and community, how is that meant to be done without all the information? I'm aware that regulations and information/knowledge may be different at the time of decommissioning, and therefore a new application/review would be needed. Yet no one seems to be able to tell me if this would go back into the public domain for review and submissions.

What are the potential impacts to the area with decommissioning for the current proposal/intentions vaguely mentioned on decommissioning? What are the risks if cables are left in, versus taken out? Given the area (as stated in the technical reports and main body of the EIS indicates that there) is strong tides etc affecting ocean floor, how does the company intend to ensure that cables stay underground and are not dislodged or damaged and become potential hazards to recreational and commercial vessels, cause damage to land or sea environment and don't leach chemicals, micro plastics etc into the environment?

How will the area be impacted at the end of project? Will the plan for decommissioning go back into the public domain for review/submissions and who will foot the bill for maintenance/rehabilitation/decommissioning should the company go bust or no longer be subsidized? Likewise who would decommissioning fall to in this event?

What examples do the project operators have on successful decommissioning of turbine sites? What steps does the company have to remedy environmental impacts not accounted for?

If the project causes damage to i.e. coastline, in which their EIS report modeling says shouldn't result from the project, how will it be remedied? And at what point/level of impact, would the turbines be removed to remedy the situation? In short: What accountability is there in the event the operators fail to mitigate damage at any point in the proposed operations of the project or after project from remnants left behind?

I have concerns over contamination from micro plastics and other chemicals from general wear and tear on the turbines and related structures adding further strain on the ecosystem. Contamination to the food chain, food crops, insects and food sources for animals, birds and aquatic life, in addition to long term and short term impacts on human health. In addition to commercial fishing, the whole coastline has a lot of recreational fishers that eat the fish caught. Given that there have been instances of turbines coming over with Asbestos in them, I would like to know what tests, assurances and safety steps are in place to ensure any turbines or infrastructure used is free of asbestos and other contaminants, before its put in place. How far can the resins and other chemicals travel in the wind and what quantities leach into the ocean? Given the enormous stress turbines are under, it is unavoidable that there will be breakdown of material, with fine dust and particles released into the environment.

- Why are there no documents, studies, or assessment etc done on natural disasters? Given the sites relatively close proximity to the Selwyn fault line and other smaller fault lines I would of thought that this would be essential to the EIS. What steps/measures are in place should there be an earthquake/seismic activity or other natural disaster in the area? How will this affect cables, connections, infrastructure and risk to community, environment and workers? What are the risks of damage to coastline from displaced turbines/blades/cables in this event? If cables are left underground post project, what would happen to these should there be a natural disaster like a tsunami? Whilst I realize some of these events are less likely, they still need to be considered because they can occur.

I am concerned about the projects close proximity to the ninty mile beach and other protected areas (listed in report i.e." corner inlet ramsar site,marine national park and marine coastal park, mcloughlins beach – seaspray coastal reserve, nintynmile beach marine national park, nooramunga marine and coastal par, wilsons promontory marine national park and marine reserve").

- Close proximity to other projects including abandoned wells, oil and gas exploration and the compounding effects of all this industrial activity to the region. There is limited information about how this project impacts and is impacted by other projects including safety of other high risk projects (ones that could contaminate ground water). Is there a possibility to inadvertently breach an old well etc? Given some of these other projects pose potentially huge environmental health risk, this data is vital for the EIS to be properly assessed.

- The EIS mentioned potential artifacts underground in the area that may be damaged in the process. How are these going to be avoided and dealt with? I am concerned that this region/coastal area is going to look and feel like an industry hub instead of the beautiful coastal sea space the community goes to for relaxation and fun. Star of the South is near the current gas exploration testing (Project Lakes Blue Energy, Seaspray) and I would like to know how land stability and changes in wind and sand deposits could affect or be affected by the other project. There appears to be very little in the EIS and EES on this.

SOCIAL and VISUAL concerns: Environmental spaces like this area of the coast, provide mental health benefits through nature therapy, and are home to a vast array of life. People come to these areas to escape the stress of cities and big towns to get away from the lights, noise, and connect with nature. There is a large amount of tourism, especially in summer months, where families make memories, people connect, grieve loss of loved ones, celebrate life and enjoy recreational and other social activities and interactions that are integral to healthy societies. These natural land spaces are vital to assist in the overall health and well being of our communities. It's essential that people have easy access to these spaces and are able to get away from the noise and light pollution of city, large town areas. People need to de stress and nature (which includes the natural sound space and lack of artificial light) are integral to doing this successfully. Preserving natural spaces for the health of the community

must be paramount when making decisions in areas like this. Wind turbines do produce low resonant sound, infrasound etc. This may not be audible but it does have an effect on human health, animal and marine life. In our industrial world we fail to calculate the accumulative effect of these seemingly small things. But they are not small. In a study by (Hermans, A et al 'Do electromagnetic fields from subsea power cables effect benthic elasmobranch behavior? A risk-based approach for the Dutch Continental Shelf' 2024, Environmental Pollution, Volume 346, (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0269749124002847>)) it touches on these points including how marine life are very attuned to low frequency sounds/pressure waves/infrasound. The sound space and type of sounds are very important aspect to how nature produces a restorative effect on human health. This is why people use sound therapy to alter mood, and treat many different conditions. From a purely aesthetic perspective, wind turbines do not fill me with awe and wonder. They are simply a reminder of industrialization and the demands of life. People look at the horizon of the beach for an unobstructed view. This taps into a deep need for space, (hence my point that we go to escape the stressors of life) NOT to be reminded of them. Again, natural landscape has a huge impact on mental health. Mental health is a major issue in communities right now, so it is vital that the impact wind turbines have on the visual landscape be seen as a serious issue. At 10km distance, wind turbines will be clearly visible, with flashing lights at night. There is a profound difference between and unobstructed/uninterrupted ocean view and a turbine filled horizon. I have strong concerns over the impact of this project on the well being of community and the visual and auditory feel of the area that affects surrounding coastal areas too, including Seaspray where the wind turbines will still be visible.

How do wind turbines interfere with radar? The designated areas for all the wind turbine projects are relatively close to major defense/training areas.

I have strong concerns over the negative effects to bird life as indicated in the technical reports and main body of the EIS. Whilst I can see the height of turbines has been adjusted to reduce the chances of collisions by nearly half, there is still a significant risk especially as some of the bird species identified are endangered or threatened. Whilst the project site may not be a direct flight path, they still use the coastal area for nesting and foraging. (as mentioned pg48 of EIS chapter 12 (<https://southerlyten.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/EIS-Chapter-12-Offshore-ornithology-and-bats.pdf>))

What effect does the electromagnetic field and sound pressure from the turbine have on bird navigation and ability to find and catch food? From the research I have found this area of understanding (wind turbine effect on birdlife) is evolving, however it's clear that birds like marine and other wildlife are fairly attuned to sound/frequencies that are not in the audible range and that the sound pressure waves from turbines and infrasound affect birds in negative ways, including interfering with communication. Some of the material that lead me to this perception included: ('Infrasound acoustic energy produced by offshore wind turbine energy generation may interfere with bird and cetacean navigation cues' (<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-026-37684-1>) (<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00679906>)) Given wind turbines proximity to bird life habitats what steps are in place to stop/mitigate these pressure waves and infra sounds? The other negative impacts to bird life are also highlighted in Chapter 12 (<https://southerlyten.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/EIS-Chapter-12-Offshore-ornithology-and-bats.pdf>)) which includes the negative impacts of artificial light attracting/disorienting birds which "may cause collision, entrapment, stranding, grounding (also known as 'fallout'), interfere with navigation (such as being drawn off course) or may cause some species to avoid areas (a form of displacement). Certain events like fallout may occur under specific meteorological conditions such as poor visibility due to fog, precipitation, and low wind speeds or at specific time periods such as when fledglings leave their burrows for the first time. Based on international and regional evidence, the bird groups most likely to be impacted by artificial lighting in the offshore wind farm area are burrow-nesting shearwaters, petrels, prions and storm-petrels" (p. 40 of <https://southerlyten.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/EIS-Chapter-12-Offshore-ornithology-and-bats.pdf>)).

Why does the EIS say that there is low to moderate species diversity and abundance in soft sediment when a basic Google search shows that much of the life in this area is not seen because it's hidden deep within the sediment? Hence how exactly was the biodiversity of this area actually accessed? If it was all visually based than how accurate was the assessment and therefor what is the true impact? Because soft sediment is full of marine life such as burrowing invertebrates, mollusk and crustaceans, juvenile fish and rays that provide food source for birds and other sea life. I have real concerns over the contamination of the food chain from turbine erosion with resin and other chemicals debris affecting this area. Given the high stress turbines are under it is inevitable that there will be release of micro plastics and other chemicals into the water and air that will go into the system causing habitat alterations. How is this going to be managed? Remember there are multiple areas along this stretch of coast that are protected spaces.

- I am particularly concerned about Noise and vibration in the construction phase on human health/sleep/stress. Safe levels need to apply for children in the area too not just adults. Sleep is an essential part to human health. Light and noise disturbance created by the project will be 24/7 with wind turbines only being from 10km out from the coast. Science shows significant long term health impacts of sleep disruption and noise pollution to human health and this MUST not be underestimated. It only takes a few days of disrupted sleep to produce severe psychological and physical symptoms. This affects all residents, especially high risk populations in the area and will be a deterrent to visitors staying. The constant light and noise also impacts nocturnal wildlife, as the coastline is home to endangered species which would use the dark to hide from predators. Given that the EIS has listed endangered species, what assurances can be given that they will not be seriously affected even when its only short term noise exposure?

- Not all noise is audible. And in terms of onshore works, there is reference to activities that produce vibrations that can affect

structure of surrounding buildings and underground infrastructure. The noise generated varies in intensity, but it appears constant. This produces an accumulated stress on the residents and the area.

I also have strong concerns about the impact of low frequency sound, sound waves and infrasound to humans at receptor sites, and fishers/workers who will be closer to the turbines than onshore community members, as well as all aquatic, aerial and terrestrial life. I am also conscious of the EMF and electrical field effects.

My concerns come from awareness that the standards we place in terms of acceptable risk are based on current understanding and literature. And our understanding of how marine, animal, bird life, even humans are affected by frequency, sound, electric and magnetic fields is very limited. It's only in recent times that we have become aware of social interactions and intelligence of fish and other marine life. Gone are the days when we thought it was ok to stick a fish in a glass bowl and only water. I don't think that the current standard measurement of DBa should be the only basis of noise determination for wind turbines. Which if I understand correctly don't even fall under the same regulations as other machinery? Given that current knowledge says wind turbines produce low frequency sound, infrasound that is different to the quality of normal wind blowing from the coast, I don't agree with the statement in the EIS that the three DBa difference won't be noticeable. Human hearing is attuned to difference in type of sound, tone etc. And I would like to know how far these low frequency, infrasound sound waves travel. In the report the impression given is sound dissipates before it reaches land, yet it also states that sound will be heard on land at three DBa less than normal wind sound. I would therefore like clarity on the types of sounds audible and non audible, how they affect different receptor groups including marine and land animals that use low frequency to navigate, catch prey and feed. Also the db at different heights as the EIS appear to only showed one of two options when calculating distance traveled on wind. I also would like to see receptor sites noise checked over more than just one day to get a clearer comparison in addition to see data on how these different tones and pitches created by the turbines affect human stress levels inclusive of low level continuous exposure and its effect on plant growth. If air pressure is affected by wind turbines then please include information on this as well. Part of the reason for this is that frequencies are used in healthcare and other industries for example frequencies are used to treat kidney stones and there are new research trials on tumor treating fields indicating that electrical fields at different frequencies can also affect our health. Our understanding of this area of science is rapidly changing and given that people have made claims of illness from wind turbines I don't think it wise to disregard it as purely psychosomatic. Especially given that in recent year's conditions like IBS which were thought to be psychological are now known to have physical component, this change may be partly due to changes in testing/equipment and research/ understanding etc. I believe our understanding will rapidly change in this area of sound and frequency and therefore guidelines should change accordingly. While this is occurring I think we need to air on the side of caution and assume their is more risk in this area than currently proposed until proven otherwise. In document 'Do electromagnetic fields from subsea power cables effect benthic elasmobranch behaviour? A risk-based approach for the Dutch Continental Shelf (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0269749124002847>) It shows how some marine life can pick up on very low levels and could be negatively impacted by them.

So how can we truly know that these EMF fields and sound waves don't cause harm?

I recently came across some proposed research on koalas and low frequency sounds produced by turbines traveling large distances. Given this evolving space I think it is worth taking a more cautious approach and not assuming that our current equipment accurately assesses how far the fields affect marine and animal life or that there is no harm simply because our understanding is lacking.

I'm concerned about the effect of the project in regards to marine health and navigation. And if any of the wind projects were to go ahead despite my objection to them. I would request that there be a dedicated branch of research funded by the company as part of conditions of project, but chosen by the towns and people affected by the project. Finding should be given to the public free of charge and would allow for more thorough understanding of real life impact's, could inform planning, mitigation or point to other forms of energy production. Having the people affected by project in control of whose chosen to do the research would increase chances of independent/unbiased research into how wind turbines affect the health of people, land, bird, animal and marine life. Any negative impacts would need to be remedied.

Export cables, will be buried at target depth of 1 and 0.6m for inter array. On speaking with the company it was explained that burring them deeper would create another set of issues to do with thermal loading. Why is this type of detail and rationale not in the documents? From what I can see exposed cables produce problems, including cables potentially being damaged. Cables produce EMF hence 'where possible' they will be buried to minimize effect on marine life and minimize area exposed as it dissipates to normal ranges within about twenty meters. As indicated in report this is a highly variable terrain with strong storms, wave, heights and seabed changes. So how is the company in the short and long term and post project going to ensure that the cables are always covered and at the right depth so as not to cause issues? (i.e. overheating because too much sediment has built up?) What issues can develop when they are buried too deep and does this mean that the company will constantly have to dredge and move cables? Likewise as some marine life are highly sensitive to EMF and electric fields how far do these fields go out when cables are not encased, or submerged and what are the real life implications for noise, vibration, social and environmental impacts of ongoing management of cable positions?

In regards to public access: the EIS indicated loss of fishing ground over cable routes. For real life situations, how easy is it for people when on the water to know exactly where cables are? Does this mean the reality of if the project where to go head is this entire section is off bounds?

I'm concerned about the overall environmental cost of the project. Wind turbines construction uses fiberglass and other materials which produce toxic waste. Allot of these projects require mineral extraction, which means other highly toxic and high risk projects get approved to produce the raw materials. At an overall level I'm not convinced these are better for the environment. Carbon footprint is not the only marker to be considered. Water quality, chemical/toxin exposure, air quality, flora and

fauna/deforestation of forests and corals/seabed's, and waste management are also important.

I am concerned about coastal erosion further afield as I recall decades ago a jetty being put into Loch sport and they said there would be no erosion yet the locals who had been there decades all noted major erosion issues further afield as a result. Hence in the event the EIS is wrong what steps will be taken to remedy erosion especially given some of these spaces house endangered flora and fauna?

Will there be any dredging of ports due to the size of turbines and access to site? If so how will this affect land erosion down shore?

Additional feedback: Consultation, advertising/notification and access to EIS/EES and attached documents has been far better with this company than others. I would hope that this would continue should there be any movement forward. With any feedback given after the submission period still being taken into account.

Submission period needs to be longer, the time allocated to read the amount of documents is thoroughly inadequate.

I think the direct route with minimal properties affected and land reserves, to vicgrid are well thought out. Provided there was genuine collaboration, consideration and agreements with land owners and they would be properly and fairly compensated for drop in land value. The preferred route involving less environmental impact and avoiding significant artifact disturbance is good. I would like to make sure that these are only routes proposed?

Minimizing intra array and offshore export cables and number of turbines is sensible. The less land mass, people and property and valued sites affected the better.

I appreciate that there may be economic gain from the project, but I value coastal space more.

The documents attached on potential Australian companies that may be hired, contracted is not a guarantee of local jobs. I am conscious of potential unaccounted for job losses or business that would be negatively impacted by the project and the economic cost/loss. In addition there is loss to some recreational groups like photographers (hobby and professional), who may need to travel elsewhere for unobstructed coastal views.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Submission Declaration

 This submission does not contain any material that could be regarded as defamatory or offensive to any person

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.