

To the Senate Committee on Community Affairs (the 'Community Affairs Reference Committee'):

I am the owner of approximately 11 hectares of land on the coast of Victoria which I purchased as an investment some years ago. Since, the land has been determined to be unsuitable for agriculture or agistment. Further, recent changes to coastal zoning restrictions have rendered the lot "unbuildable".

As a result, the sole source of income for this land, and the land's sole source of value, is the rental and royalties from the single electricity-generating wind turbine that now exists on it. Simply put, my eventual retirement will be possible only because of the income from that wind turbine. Without the turbine I can assure you that I'd be knocking on Centrelink's door at some point in the not-too-distant future.

More importantly, as recent studies have demonstrated, the scientific basis of opposition to wind turbines is nearly non-existent. I can understand the aesthetic arguments, but even the aesthetic concerns are dubious. Who would prefer a coal-fired power station in their view?

Often, what local opposition there is to wind farms seems more driven by sour grapes – the 'tall poppy syndrome', almost literally.

Regardless, I think it is obvious that the benefits of electricity generating wind turbines far outweigh the costs and risks.

I urge you to continue to support the development of wind power in Australia.

Thanks and regards,

Andrew W. Grant