

20/01/2011.

To the;

Department of the Senate,

P.O. Box 6100,

Parliament House,

Canberra, ACT, 2600.

## **Why we are against the Wind Industry!**

### **1. We do not believe they are effective.**

**Wind cannot stand alone.** For example one of its most ardent supporters, Mark Diesendorf has made statements such as “they are around 30% effective” - “we are some decades off having the expertise to store the power”. Why are we happy to subsidise anything that is SO ineffective?

**Who is paying the bill?** Wouldn't it be the taxpayer? Why do we have to pay (one way or another) for such an inefficient method of power production? Plus after we have subsidised this inefficient industry we have been informed our own personal power bill will increase by 40% over the next 3 years. Why does the ordinary citizen have to continually pay for the inefficient, non-productive decisions made by politicians? (Examples being; housing insulation scheme, NSW sell off of its power industry just to name 2.) Is it to score the “green” point? How come that continued coal exploration licenses are being granted for some of most productive agricultural land in NSW if Governments are genuine about going “renewable”. They are not – it is simply a scam.

### **2. Health related issues.**

Information a plenty is available from multiple sources, both written and verbal to indicate that turbines DO affect the health of people. So why won't Government at ALL levels listen? (Dr. N. Pierpont, Dr. S. Laurie) are just two among many who have assessed health impacts.

### **3. Noise related issues.**

Again from both written and verbal accounts this is a very real concern. Described as “A train that never stops”, “A constant humming”. We were told by a noise consultant for a wind industry proponent “that they are noisy – but you will get used to it”. (Hubbard @ Shepherd) refer to work done on turbine noise emissions which were part of a report by NASA in the 1980's. Why do decision makers continue to ignore factual information?

#### **4. Visual Impact.**

The impact of 150m high turbines along a pristine mountain range would have to pollute forever a thing of beauty. When an area has already been polluted visually why do Government's want to continue the destruction? If Government's are going to continue with this farce at least have a buffer zone of 10km's from any dwelling. Hopefully this way it will lessen the visual impact as well as the noise.

#### **5. Property Devaluation.**

According to Government at all levels this is "perceived" only by those who are against turbines within their proximity. They may well think that **BUT** for those who are residing alongside turbines the choice should be available for them to have their property purchased at a fair and equitable price. A real estate gentleman in Victoria has noted, "Farming properties appear to drop 10-15% and rural residential 30-40%. No one should have to take that loss!