

To; The Australian Federal Senate.

Reference; Wind Farm Inquiry.

From; David Morgans.  
U.K..

I herewith submit a Statement for presentation at the Wind Farm Inquiry as follows;

I am writing this as a resident of North Devon, in an area where we have been under threat of having 24 x 103mtr high Wind Turbines virtually surrounding the three villages making up our Parish. These would dominate our lives, and some of them would tower above us.

As well as the destruction of the countryside, and the potential extremely damaging effects on the Landscape for miles around, there are the extreme threats to habitats, health, tourism, and property values, all in order to accommodate structures that are grossly inefficient, expensive, and rather pointless.

In the U.K we are obliged to follow the 'guidance' on noise provided by ETSU R 97. This 'guidance' was, as it implies, written in 1996 and became the Government Guidance in 1997. This 'guidance' was facilitated by the wind industry itself because it had been recognised by the industry that as turbines got bigger there would be considerable noise issues, and these issues had somehow to be circumvented in their favour.

At that time Wind Turbines were a maximum of 45 mtrs in height, whereas today we are considering Turbines that are 3 times that height with blade swept area increasing, and yet the industry guidance takes little or no account of these increase in height, swept area, and wind-shear.

We continually advise that this Standard of ETSU R 97 needs to take much more account of the continuing research work, worldwide, into the effects these huge turbines (which are usually in large groups) can have on all aspects of Human Health and Well-being.

We do receive assurances from our Government that ETSU R 97 will be reviewed, but this review is to be conducted by the very people who wrote the 'guidance' initially ! and who are the leading proponents of it in its current format at Wind-farm Inquiries. Thus we cannot have much faith in the 'robustness' of such a review where it is done 'in house', and we cannot be persuaded unless we are assured that all the studies from around the world are taken into proper consideration (and open to public scrutiny that it is done).

I presume that there are similar guidelines in Australia, and I understand that there are similar and increasing problems with noise, including low frequency noise, and increasing wind-shear.

I consider that there should be a moratorium on the rate of build of these grossly inefficient, and extremely expensive, monuments to Man's folly. Not to do so will merely continue this headlong rush towards possible extreme human health problems, which could and should be avoided.

Thank you,

David Morgans.