

# 1.

## **Submission Regarding Silverton Wind Farm Project Modification 3**

At the start of this submission, I would like to make it quite clear that I am very much against this project as it stands. I do not believe the location for this project is appropriate and as the proponents AGL, have, to date, shown no willingness to compromise with the Silverton Community on set-back distances for turbines, or answer questions sent by email or asked at Community Consultative Meetings, I cannot support this project.

The Modification 3 Report is long and complex, but still covers many of the same issues we went over in past applications and modifications. The simple fact is, this project is, in my opinion, not good for Silverton and as one of the closest residents to the project, I do not think it should be built in this current form. I am aware of a compromise plan which was submitted by a landholder to the Department of Planning back in March this year. The plan outlines an area within the wind farm site which is an excellent alternative to the plan suggested in the Modification 3 Report. The plan would require some extra work on behalf of AGL, the Department of Planning and Department of Lands, but given the ease with which AGL seems to be getting everything it asks for, I'm sure the details could be worked out. I am aware that the alternative plan sits on areas for which only conceptual approval was granted, but the plan offers all four host properties a number of turbines, therefore securing income for them: it offers a good buffer of hills to the township of Silverton, therefore dramatically reducing visual and noise impacts: would still allow for the expected employment benefits the project supposedly offers and would most certainly improve the relationship between AGL and some of the residents of Silverton.

I urge the Department of Planning to look closely at the alternative plan and give it serious consideration, because as things stand currently, nothing has changed.

It appears from the Modification 3 document, that AGL, the NSW Department of Planning and NSW Department of Lands are far more interested in helping the Australian Government reach its renewable energy targets than actually doing anything to protect the environment. AGL's very own comment in the document **"Generally, the modification proposed would have a lesser environmental impact than the Approved Project"**, states

## 2.

quite clearly that this project WILL have an impact on the environment. Isn't renewable energy all about saving the environment? By the time companies such as AGL, supported by the various Australian Government departments, have finished blasting, grading roads into fragile ecological communities, destroying the wildlife, the flora (be it endangered or otherwise), building monstrously high industrial machinery and the associated power lines to transport what little "green energy" is produced, there won't be an environment worth saving! Our pristine countryside, chosen by such companies for their "limited residential dwellings" and "moderate" or "low visual impact" and, "construction noise was considered manageable" will be gone forever. Our children and grandchildren will never know the pleasure of walking through the hills of the Barrier Ranges and seeing the amazing plants and wildlife we have all grown up with. And just as a matter of interest....who is it, exactly, that decides the level of visual impact these industrial monsters will have on those of us who live in such a place and by what means??

This isn't just happening in Silverton, it is happening all over Australia. It appears those energy company employees and government department pencil pushers have absolutely no idea of what lies beyond the city limits in which most of them reside. It is even more interesting that, of all the wind energy employees and government "officials" I have asked "how close is the nearest wind farm to your home?" not one of them lives anywhere near one. It is easy to visit one of these industrial complexes and determine that they are no big deal, no real noise or apparent adverse effects. And what's the big deal if you can see these things from every window in your home? Living near these things over time very obviously does have adverse effects on some people and it is totally demoralising to be told it is all in your head, by people who are used to living with industrial noise and pollution, cars, trains, trucks rattling past their houses all day and night. This is their choice. The rest of us, that small population which is apparently insignificant, choose to live in virtually pristine areas of the country. Many land holders in the Silverton area have managed this land for over 100 years without intentionally killing off any species of flora or fauna. They have managed the goats and other feral pests introduced by early governments for sport, meat or through just plain ignorance. Yet here we have a government who makes it almost impossible for land holders to clear a small area of their land so they may grow meat or other food products for our country and will so easily allow companies such as AGL to bulldoze huge tracts of land and all the flora and fauna that goes with it. No wonder Australia has the worst extinction record for its very special species, in the world. That's really something to brag about considering how young our non-indigenous settlement is.

In the Modification 3 Report, AGL is asking to build fewer turbines but much larger than previously requested. 60 turbines are now to be built, with a possibility of up to 172. This is catastrophic for Silverton and certainly for those who live here. These larger turbines will

3.

make much more noise and certainly be more visible. AGL says it will use latest turbine technology, but the turbines they are talking about were developed in 2014 and they have

included no actual information about the turbines they want to use. How can this application be approved, given the lack of solid data presented in the document for 180m high turbines of 3.6MW to 5MW. I also question the reasoning behind the scope of the project, of 60 turbines and possibly 172 turbines. AGL would only proceed to 172 if TransGrid were to upgrade the power line from Broken Hill which would then be able to accommodate the extra energy produced by the wind farm. Even though I am aware of mining activities in the area which could possibly also benefit from a power line upgrade, this would still come at an enormous economic outlay. Could the 172 turbine estimate be in order to keep the Silverton wind farms' Major Project Status?

In regards to the 3.6MW turbines, I suggest you wade through the information included in the link below. There is some very interesting reading regarding the Siemens 3.6MW turbines and their bearing issues. There is also some very good information regarding the impacts and infrasound of noise on neighbours to wind farms. The section below I found most interesting "A Brief history of the start of the "modern" wind industry:" The full story can be found within the link.

<https://mothersagainstwindturbines.com/2014/11/16/great-news-useless-wind-turbines-may-soon-kill-the-wind-industry/>

## **A Brief history of the start of the "modern" wind industry:**

The first reported complaints about wind turbine noise pollution arose in 1979, shortly after a single large wind turbine was erected in N Carolina, USA. This led to 9 years of thorough research and field studies headed by NASA and several other institutions to investigate the source of those complaints. The head researcher was physicist Dr Neil Kelley.

The NASA led research proved a number of points:

1. LFN and ILFN noise pollution emissions from wind turbine was the source of the complaints reported by people.
2. Certain frequencies were responsible for health problems reported by people.

4.

3. Cumulative exposure to LFN/ILFN resulted in increased sensitivity and progressively worsening health problems.
4. Buildings amplify noise indoors at their resonant frequencies, exacerbating problems of wind turbine noise pollution emissions.

Dr Kelly presented a paper to the wind industry at a conference in San Francisco in Oct 1987, advising the industry how to minimise exposure of wind farm neighbours to LFN/ILFN emissions. The wind industry buried this information for over 25 years before it was unearthed by some Australian researchers a couple of years ago.

Dr Neil Kelly also informed the wind industry, in 1987, that the use of A-weighted readings would be the worst standards to use to afford reasonable protection to people's health and use of their amenities.

Yet, 9 years later in the UK in 1996, ETSU-R-97 adopted standards that ignored all the above research. Based on this evidence, the wind industry has clearly demonstrated that it is

reprehensible and morally bankrupt – a colossal fraud. With all the research conducted by NASA, it is no wonder that the wind industry continues to fight tooth and nail to avoid having to measure noise emissions in the LFN/ILFN spectrum, and also doing their utmost to discredit the 9 years of thorough research headed by NASA and Dr Kelley.

If you want to get a bit more general background, the following post will give you a very clear and succinct historical picture of the development of the wind industry.

[stopthesethings.com/2015/02/22/three-decades-of-wind-industry-deception-a-chronology-of-a-global-conspiracy-of-silence-and-subterfuge](http://stopthesethings.com/2015/02/22/three-decades-of-wind-industry-deception-a-chronology-of-a-global-conspiracy-of-silence-and-subterfuge)

Also read the timeline embedded in the above blog:

[cdn.knightlab.com/libs/timeline/latest/embed/index.html?source=0Ak2bgr7C0nhPdGR3S1IEekU3T3p4ZDhUNDdRV2Y2ZkE&font=Bevan-PotanoSans&maptype=toner&lang=en&height=650](http://cdn.knightlab.com/libs/timeline/latest/embed/index.html?source=0Ak2bgr7C0nhPdGR3S1IEekU3T3p4ZDhUNDdRV2Y2ZkE&font=Bevan-PotanoSans&maptype=toner&lang=en&height=650)

– it contains a very succinct summary of who knew what and when in relation to the development of the wind industry – it is eye opening if you don't already know the full facts. What I outlined above is demonstrated in the timeline, which contains links to supporting documentary evidence.

The burden to the British National Health Service caused by health problems related to chronic exposure to LFN/ILFN emissions will grow significantly over the next 10-20 years.

Read about this 1 case in Portugal (2 Euronoise documents attached.) and see the list of symptoms that will develop over time in response to chronic exposure to LFN/ILFN. These clinical symptoms of VAD (Vibroacoustic Disease) were derived from 30 years of research By Dr Alves-Pereira et al on the health of aircraft engineers. They have found the same symptoms developing in some wind farm neighbours (see the 2 Euronoise documents).

## Vibroacoustic Disease (VAD)

### *Clinical Stages*

#### **Mild**

***1-4 years of LFN exposure***

Slight mood swings, indigestion & heartburn, repeated mouth & throat infections, bronchitis.

#### **Moderate**

***4-10 years of LFN exposure***

Chest pain, back pain, fatigue, fungal & viral skin infections, allergies, blood in urine, inflammation of stomach lining.

#### **Severe**

***> 10 years of LFN exposure***

Psychiatric disturbances, headaches, hemorrhages of nasal & digestive mucosa, duodenal ulcers, spastic colitis, varicose veins & hemorrhoids, decreased vision, severe joint pain, severe muscular pain, neurological disturbances.

I am amazed at the total lack of concern for the community and residents of Silverton in the Tourism, Lifestyle (View Shed Impacts) section of the report. Who on earth thinks up a term such as view shed impacts?? What we are talking about here is the impact on our daily lives....having to see these damned things ...listen to them day and night, hope that no one in the community suffers from infrasound issues and worry about the impact this project will have on our totally tourism-based businesses. I think few in our community are convinced this project will boost tourism.

I am a photographer and I find the photo montages provided by AGL regarding the visual amenity of the turbines, nothing less than disgusting. The montages are very badly done and certainly are not a true representation of the view we see from the various locations represented. They are a huge smack in the face to anyone living in Silverton and show absolutely no concern for anyone in this community.

I still have concerns about water, or lack of it. An incredible amount is needed to build this project. This community has been on water restrictions for some time, being careful how we use this precious resource, making sure there is adequate for our livestock and domestic purposes and sacrificing the simple pleasure of a garden in many cases. I find it amazing that

AGL can, in conjunction with Essential Water, “find” an alternative water source, or just make this project so important that it can have the water it needs at the expense of people and livestock.

Again, we have some God-like entity deciding that the impact on our plant and wildlife colonies will be “minimal” or “manageable” and “mitigation measures will be taken”. What measures? There is again, no solid information in this report to say how these ecological environments will be preserved and managed. There are lots of words which say very little. How are AGL going to preserve the numerous nesting sights of wedge tailed eagles on the site and how are they going to prevent the birds flying into these huge turbines being requested? What about all the other raptor species in the area and the bats? To simply say the impact is manageable or minimal because of a study someone was paid to do, simply is not good enough.

Again, I would direct the Departments’ attention to the alternative project location mentioned earlier. This area would offer some protection to the numerous species identified in the various documents submitted by AGL over the years. Whilst the alternative plan does not offer complete protection, it is a far better option than the current plan.

Will there be a request from the Department regarding the traffic management plan for this project? Nothing has been discussed about this for some time and I would imagine much larger turbines would result in changes to the current situation?

As for community consultation, again as in my Modification 2 submission, there is no consultation with the community. The Community Consultative Meetings are held only so AGL can tell the Silverton Community what it plans to do and they are usually well on their way to doing it before we are informed. At the last Silverton CCC meeting, held July 28<sup>th</sup> 2016, I asked a number of questions of Project Manager Adam Mackett. He was unable to answer most of my questions and when I pressed him for answers I was essentially shut down by the Chair and told not to interject! I am vocal at these meetings as I feel it is of vital importance that issues of concern are raised and dealt with. I speak on behalf of a number of residents who do not feel confident asking the questions themselves. It would be appreciated if the Project Manager was familiar enough with his project to actually answer questions presented at the CCC meetings.

I see no point in going into any greater depth about Modification 3. There are great gaps of missing information and plenty of misinformation as usual and I could go on for many more

pages. I hope that somewhere in the Department of Planning, there is someone with an ounce of morality who will make sure the right thing is done in regard to this project.

Helen Murray

Silverton Resident