

## **Submission to the Inquiry of the Senate Community Affairs Committee into "the social and economic impact of wind farms"**

and in particular:

- (a) Any adverse health effects for people living in close proximity to wind farms;
- (b) Concerns over the excessive noise and vibrations emitted by wind farms, which are in close proximity to people's homes;
- (c) The impact of rural wind farms on property values, employment opportunities and farm income;
- (d) The interface between Commonwealth, state and local planning laws as they pertain to wind farms; and
- (e) Any other relevant matters.

### **Introductory**

(A) Governments' enthusiasm for wind-power, and non-carbon sources of power generally, has been exaggerated out of all proportion by the misconceived and/or falsified assertions (1) that the average temperature of the Earth's surface is not fluctuating normally (2) that the supposedly abnormal, slight increase, of recent decades, in the average temperature, was due to an increasing concentration of carbon-dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) in the atmosphere and (3) that the average temperature of the Earth's surface is still rising.

(B) When we subtract this exaggeration, the remaining justifications for the said enthusiasm are (1) that energy-security is enhanced by a diversification of sources of energy and (2) that undue pressure, on governments, from an ill-identified, but identifiable, "international community", to invest in non-carbon sources of power, is substantial.

(C) If we recognise, however (1) that most non-carbon sources of power are not economically viable - being unduly costly and/or intermittent, or subject to other serious problems - (2) that Australia is amply provided with coal-reserves and (3) that it is the government's duty to serve the interests of the nation, rather than those of the "international community", these justifications too disappear.

(D) In reality, no intermittent power-source (i.e. wind, tide or sunshine) is suitable for connection to an electricity-grid, because a grid must be powered by a continuous, controllable electricity-supply, which *ipso facto* no intermittent source can provide.

(E) Continuing governmental enthusiasm for the large-scale exploitation of intermittent sources, therefore, can only be due (a) to folly - failing to comprehend the foregoing points - (b) to corruption - being eager to enrich a favoured segment of the population, at the taxpayer's expense, through subsidies to "green-power" companies or (c) treacherous - sharing the conviction of the leaders of the "international community" that their desired, autocratic, global government can only be created through economic collapse.

Intermittent sources are, of course, perfectly suitable for isolated installations, which do not require a continuous power-supply.

### **Specific Questions**

(a) *Any adverse health effects for people living in close proximity to wind farms;*

I have heard of many - as, no doubt, you will too - but I cannot attest to them, having never had to live adjacent to one of these monstrosities.

*(b) Concerns over the excessive noise and vibrations emitted by wind farms, which are in close proximity to people's homes;*

Again, by hearsay only ...

*(c) The impact of rural wind farms on property values, employment opportunities and farm income;*

Residential property-values in the UK have undoubtedly been affected adversely by industrial installations, of this type, appearing within view, let alone within earshot.

*(d) The interface between Commonwealth, state and local planning laws as they pertain to wind farms;*

Owing to the EU's, and therefore HMG's, enthusiasm for these absurdities, there has been considerable interference, covertly from Brussels, and overtly from London, in local planning-processes. Numerous battles over planning-applications are always taking place, owing to the determination of residents and their councillors to oppose "wind-farms".

Such is the fury of protesters, that "central government" (EU/HMG) sometimes concedes that discretion is the better part of valour and relinquishes its designs on disfiguring the landscape for no sane purpose; but the legal grounds for protest have been narrowed - rather as your questions (a to c) seem to be narrowing them - so that the refusal of applications is made difficult, while the appearance of effective consultation and democratic decision are preserved.

*(e) Any other relevant matters*

Given the tenor of the comment-categories (a to c) I wonder what "relevant" means, in this context.

Would I be wrong to suspect that this consultation - apart from question (d) - is limited to considering the effect of giant turbines on, respectively, personal health (a) physical comfort (b) and property-assets (c) to the exclusion of scenic considerations, let alone the matter of whether turbine-arrays ("wind-farm" is, in my opinion, a euphemism) are a *scam*?

I except (d) from this suspicion, because, if local planning-laws are honoured, debate on these wider issues will flourish, local government will respond positively to its electors' wishes and genuine consultation will have occurred after all.

I see that the Committee's Inquiry refers to the "social *and economic* impact of wind-farms" (my emphasis) but that the topics you suggest, "in particular", make no reference to economics. However, since it is mentioned, I might say a little more, on this topic, than I said at (C) above.

Denmark and Germany, having led research into turbine-design, and having invested heavily in building wind-turbines, have now declared that they will build no more of them. Another big builder of wind-turbines, Spain, is likely to follow suit. This is because electricity from

wind-turbines is (a) unreliable (b) never reaches its nominal wattage (c) requires extended conduction-lines and, consequently (d) is several times more expensive than conventional power.

Not only does wind-power require continuous back-up from conventional sources, but, if it produces any significant proportion of the grid's power, its variability will cause surges and troughs in the supply, which may be - and in Europe, already have been - catastrophic.

Wind-turbines also *require* power to turn them into the wind, adjust their blades and start them after they have been becalmed. They require considerable maintenance too, and, in Europe, not a few catch fire, when the lubrication of their generators gets low, as it does, particularly in hot weather - even though temperatures in Europe are usually far below those in Australia.

Consequently, wind-turbines exist only because of high subsidies to their fortunate owners. These subsidies may be overt, and directly from the tax-yield, or they may be (as in the UK) hidden in the electricity-bills of the unfortunate subscriber.

Either way, a resource, which is not worth having - is environmentally unnecessary and is now becoming economically dangerous - is being foisted on the many by an idiotic or unscrupulous few.