

10 Feb 2012

With any change there will be opposition on a variety of grounds. I have a housing development, three double story townhouses replacing a Victorian weatherboard occurring next door to me that has generated significant discussion and emotion. I would imagine that this emotional response is behind much of the vocal minority's objections. I have reached the conclusion that the benefits of the development for the wider community, increased urbanisation is an important part of creating sustainable cities outweigh the immediate impact on me and my family.

It is my understanding that Senator Fielding was responsible for calling this inquiry which worries me as he has not shown an open mind as he claims. His page on climate change [http://www.stevefielding.com.au/climate\\_change/](http://www.stevefielding.com.au/climate_change/) is farcical. His reports of his self funded trip to the truth includes his choice of four well known climate change skeptics to "independently" review Penny Wong's response. I would request that the members of the inquiry be required to state their personal and professional opinions on Human induced Climate change so we can be made aware of any potential biases in either direction..

It is interesting to read the submission by Nina Pierpont PhD (of Paediatrics) but as I am sure you are aware there is a degree of controversy over her claims written as they are in a self published non peer reviewed book. It is interesting that in her submission which is available for public viewing she is overtly promoting her book and includes information about where you can purchase her book from in a number of places. A frequent complaint of Climate Change Skeptics is that vested interests are behind a conspiracy of misinformation. I would point to Dr Pierpont's submission as unworthy of your attention for the overtly vested interests demonstrated.

I have briefly read a few of the other submissions and they appear to be of the "what about me it isn't fair" type and I empathise in some instances but to quote from "[Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects: An Expert Panel Review](#) " Annoyance is not a disease." There should be rigorous planning laws to mitigate against potential impact of Wind turbines but my understanding is that there are laws and guidelines already. And that Australia has some of the most onerous. I would hope that your inquiry will look at the relative position of our guidelines from a global perspective and report on that and the potential impact of increasing the onerousness of the guidelines on Wind Turbine development.

I hope that the Inquiry can proceed with an open mind and without bias and put the interests of the many in front of the interests of the few. Nimby-ism in any form is too risky the price of inaction is too high. "What about us it isn't fair" development of our use of renewable energy make sense whether you believe in climate change or not. Their very nature means you don't run out of them and Australia will lose out by dragging its heels. Renewable energy is an essential part of our response to climate change and Wind power has a powerful role to play.

I trust that the Inquiry can proceed without bias or undue influence so that the to use Senator Fielding's turn of phrase "The Truth about Wind Power" can be rediscovered for those skeptics amongst our community.

Yours Dr Peter Morgan